

**SWANSEA MATTERS — VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT**  
**Planning and Housing Committee — Full Deputations Transcript**  
*Item PH28.2: 21 Windermere Avenue (Swansea Mews) — February 26, 2026*

<b>Committee</b>	Planning and Housing Committee, Meeting 28
<b>Item</b>	PH28.2 — 21 Windermere Avenue (Swansea Mews)
<b>Date</b>	February 26, 2026   Committee Room 1, City Hall, Toronto
<b>Chair</b>	Councillor Gord Perks
<b>Members present</b>	Councillors Nunziata, Matlow, Crisanti
<b>About this document</b>	Verbatim record of the 19 public deputations. Each deputant is identified by name, role, and stated position. Committee member questions and responses follow each deputation. Timecodes reference the start of the recording. The Committee Questions of Staff that followed the close of all deputations are not included here — they appear in the companion document, Planning and Housing Committee — Chair Perks Questions and Exchanges.
<b>Name corrections applied</b>	Greg Homonylo (listed in original as Hommello); Keith Pardee (listed as Keith); Katie Yew (listed as Katie U.)

**DEPUTANTS — SUMMARY LIST**

#	Name	Role / Affiliation	Position
1	<b>Greg Homonylo</b>	Neighbour / Former Resident Representative	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
2	<b>Emma West</b>	Planning Consultant (Bowfield) for TCHC	IN SUPPORT
3	<b>Anna Gorka</b>	Former Resident / Area Resident	MIXED / CONDITIONAL
4	<b>Karen Monroe</b>	Swansea Resident (60+ years)	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
5	<b>Keith Pardee</b>	Area Resident / Planning Professional	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
6	<b>Katie Yew</b>	Resident — 30 Windermere Avenue	MIXED / CONDITIONAL
7	<b>Michael Lazour</b>	Executive Director, FLAP Canada	MIXED / CONDITIONAL
8	<b>Cynthia Black</b>	Tenant Organizer	IN SUPPORT
9	<b>Diana Chan McN.</b>	Resident / Housing Rights Advisory Committee	IN SUPPORT
10	<b>Stephanie Melagana</b>	Area Resident	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
11	<b>Cleona Dan Paul</b>	Resident — Cohill Drive, Swansea (25+ years)	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL

12	<b>David Peterson</b>	Architect & Area Resident (Alt. Plan: SwanseaPark.ca)	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
13	<b>Niels Zangel</b>	Ward 4 Resident / Former Swansea Public School Student	IN SUPPORT
14	<b>Alex Kerman</b>	Swansea Resident	MIXED / CONDITIONAL
15	<b>Nancy Rabbat</b>	Resident (reading letter by Kamine Peroy Lee)	IN SUPPORT
16	<b>Ken Lei</b>	Swansea Resident (25+ years)	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
17	<b>Veronica Wynn</b>	President, Swansea Area Ratepayers Association	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
18	<b>Penny Fischer</b>	Former Swansea Mews Resident / Tenant Leadership	OPPOSED / DEFERRAL
19	<b>Deborah (Debbie) Green</b>	Ward 4 Environmental Organizations	IN SUPPORT

DEPUTANT 1 ⌚ 32:41

**Greg Homonylo**

*Neighbour / Former Resident Representative (speaking on behalf of adjacent neighbours and some former Swansea Mews residents)*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

⌚ 32:25

**Chair Perks** *[opening the item]*

We now go to item PH28.2, 21 Windermere Avenue. We have deputants. The first deputant is Greg Homonylo. Hi, Greg. Good to see you again. Settle in. You've got five minutes.

⌚ 33:10

**Greg Homonylo**

As Gord said, my name is Greg Homonylo and I'm here to speak on behalf of the neighbours who live adjacent to the Swansea Mews as well as some of the former residents who I met at the open house. My mother bought her house on Cohill Drive in 1981 and we moved there under duress. She was a single parent and I'm the youngest of three children and I moved there when I was 14. I'm also here to speak on behalf of some of the former residents I met at the open house who felt disenfranchised and, to a degree, intimidated, candidly.

We find that the application is not complete. It's not compliant under the Planning Act RSO 1990 and fails multiple policy tests at every level of government: Provincial Policy Statement 2024, Places to Grow 2020, City of Toronto Official Plan, Secondary Plan, and the National Housing Strategy 2019. For this reason, I'm requesting that Council withhold the approval until

essential meeting materials are provided. My comments are organized in five areas of deficiency.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION.** Only one pre-application and one public meeting took place. Neither have really met the requirements of Toronto's public engagement policy. The community felt they had to get together and build a website and create a petition that was signed by a thousand people in less than two weeks — that speaks volumes. The residents from many equity-deserving communities found the process intimidating and tokenistic. To have their voices heard, they had to pool their resources to pull this together on short order. That's not fair. The consultation violates Official Plan section 3.1.1 and 5.5.1 requiring residents shape built form outcomes, not just be spoken to. Under Municipal Code 415-38, the submission cannot be considered complete without meaningful engagement.

**TRANSPORTATION.** The infrastructure hasn't been fully thought out. The traffic impact study omits cumulative congestion data for the Queensway/Bloor corridor and includes no multimodal or transit capacity analysis. That contravenes Complete Street Guidelines 2017, Growth Plan policy 3.2.2.4, and Official Plan policy 2.2.1, all requiring infrastructure planning aligned with land use capacity. There are also three additional units being built in the area that will add an additional 1,200 units on top of the 649 proposed.

**LIVABILITY.** The proposal does not meet the Growing Up Guidelines 2020 for family housing. It ignores the Swansea Secondary Plan's mid-rise direction and omits the required community service and facility study. This violates Official Plan section 3.2.2 and Provincial Policy 2.3.1.3 on building complete communities.

**ENVIRONMENT AND GEOLOGICAL RISK.** Methane levels are above screening thresholds, triggering Ontario Regulation requirements. Yet no Record of Site Condition is filed. The site's proximity to a provincially significant wetland requires hydrogeological policy analysis (section 4.2.2) and review under the Conservation Authority Act — none of which are provided. The non-compliance also breaches the Toronto Green Standard 2 and Growth Plan policy 2.2.1 on avoiding hazardous lands.

**FINANCIAL VIABILITY.** The project is entirely dependent on foregone city revenues and unsecured federal funding, contrary to Council Policy Executive 225.1 which requires verified financing before rezoning. It fails both Ontario Regulation 588/17 on asset management and National Housing Strategy objective 1.2, which demand fiscal sustainability with no financial performance cycle reserve plan. This development is financially unsound.

The precedents are significant. Successful revitalizations at Regent Park (2005), Lawrence Heights (2010), and Don Somerville (2023) all completed verified partnership, community and environmental studies and peer reviews before approval. None of these standards have been met for Swansea Mews. This should concern everyone on this committee. And remember, I'm here representing some of the neighbours and some of the former residents who could not be here.

*Questions from committee following the deputation:*

## Councillor Matlow

Just as a courtesy — you said that you had a recommendation. I'd like to ask you just to say what that recommendation is.

## Greg Homonylo

We'd like an independent environmental, financial, and infrastructure review to have those completed. We'd like consultations with the former residents and the neighbours. And we'd like verified sustainable funding to know that it's secured for the asset management cycle — because it's very difficult to imagine that something would be put up that can't necessarily be financially viable for the long term.

DEPUTANT 2 🕒 39:42

### Emma West

*Partner & Planner, Bowfield Planning Consultants — acting for TCHC as planning consultants on the application*

[ IN SUPPORT ]

🕒 39:42

### Emma West

I'm Emma West. I'm a partner and planner at Bowfield. We're the planning consultants for TCHC on the application.

I just wanted to spend a little bit of time going through some of the key points on what has happened to date and the merits of the proposal. I do want to thank staff. There has been a substantial amount of work completed for this — a complete application and their review of all of the required materials to support the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications.

**SITE CONTEXT.** One of the key considerations in all of that work has been the context. The site context map helps you see what we have considered within the surroundings for all of the supporting studies. It also helps you see that there are several tall buildings in the immediate surroundings, as well as mid-rise and low-rise, and lots of open space areas to consider. Today the site has 154 stacked townhouse units — those have been vacant since 2022 due to a ceiling collapse and the evacuation that followed.

**OBJECTIVE.** The objective for TCHC is to replace all of those units and to also add additional high-quality homes to the site, to provide open space areas that will be available to the broader community as well, and to add retail and community uses. The proposal is 649 units. Over 65% are family-sized units — well above and beyond the Growing Up Guidelines. 154 of the units will be the rent-geared-to-income replacement.

The Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are required to re-designate from Neighbourhoods to Apartment Neighbourhoods and to add regulations to permit the development, including adding space for retail and community uses within the base of the southern building.

DESIGN AND OPEN SPACE. There are two buildings. The southern building is a 35-storey tall building. The northern building has a five-storey element, an eight-storey element, and a 20-storey element — all with consideration for transition to the surroundings. Nothing is going to be built below grade and everything will be constructed above the groundwater table.

There is a significant amount of open space. There is a large open space area accessible from the Queensway. There is an elevated courtyard area that replicates the courtyards on the site — when we heard from the tenants, that was an important thing for them. There are also rooftop amenity areas.

ENGAGEMENT. There has been a significant amount of engagement: meetings with the broader community, the city-led community meeting, several meetings with tenants and tenant leaders, ratepayers associations, smaller stakeholder meetings. There was a survey, a website, and an email address made available for people to communicate with the team.

In conclusion: we support the recommendations. We ask that the applications for the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment be approved. It's good planning. It's consistent with the PPS. It conforms generally with the city's Official Plan. And importantly, it aligns with city objectives.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 3 ⌚ 45:01

**Anna Gorka**

*Former Resident (75 Windermere) / Area Resident / Environmental Advocate*

**[ MIXED / CONDITIONAL ]**

⌚ 45:01

**Anna Gorka**

I'm a resident. I used to live at 75 Windermere, which is directly adjacent to the Mews. At the time, in 2011, I noticed right away with my three children that there was a real shortage of third spaces. The library was far away. The early learning centre was closed and there's really no commerce or community space down in the area. So the third space became nature — and nature became really important to us.

I want to get to the point and just get to the technical issue. If there's a lot of groundwater displacement going on and an increasing number of huge excavations with seven buildings south of the roundabout, you're displacing water. The western beaches storage tunnel receives combined sewage and stormwater overflow. Rather than retroactively install bio-swales and implement low-impact development and green stormwater infrastructure, you could do so upfront and pay attention to the very kind proposal that an architect put forward — which I've had some time to review and admired greatly — keeping the scale of this project at 21 Windermere at six storeys. That would also add a lot of dignity, because this building will be completely shadowed by the structure.

To prevent future costs, you could install bio-swales early to retain stormwater. It used to be that in the vast sort of no man's land south of Lakeshore, there were high-rises — which was acceptable — but we haven't taken the time to designate the 1971 mid-rise/high-rise community where we are, because it's a special thing. We all live in flats above ground in order to enjoy ample space.

With the RFP process, we don't get to see visions. I'm sure that the people at KPMB, the procured architects, would love to be a part of a vision that's ecologically sound. As someone who's planted 250,000 trees in the north, I know that we have to protect biodiversity.

In Toronto it's incumbent on us to let wildlife pass through. This is a low point in the watershed — a riparian zone between the Humber and Grenadier Pond. If you get a lot of bird collisions on this building, we'll be watching. Last night I met with the Parkdale Housing Justice Network and we talked about the shortage of third spaces for high-rise dwellers. I'm happy to work with you. We'll be watching.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 4 51:26

**Karen Monroe**

*Swansea Resident (60+ years)*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

51:26

**Karen Monroe**

My name is Karen Monroe. I'm a resident of Swansea for the last 60-plus years. I'd like to start by saying that I support redevelopment that is thoughtful and safe, that creates a resilient and inclusive city with a high quality of life for everybody. This is also the city's philosophy — that the current proposal for 21 Windermere Avenue doesn't fulfil. I also support the return of the displaced residents who were forced to leave their homes in 2022.

I'd like to object and ask for a deferral. The 35-storey building plan is not appropriate for this site for many reasons.

**LAND HISTORY.** The land on which the 35-storey building is planned was historically a pond. A City of Toronto map of 1890 clearly shows this. The pond was subsequently filled with tailings — that's mining waste — and later became a municipal dump. The southern part of the site where the 35-storey building will sit was the site of a gas station, a car dealership, and a car repair shop called Insign Motors. The site is also located on top of a sand plain in a highly vulnerable aquifer that is part of the Humber River sub-watershed wetlands.

**CONTAMINATION.** According to the city's hydrogeological study, the study found contaminated soil and water. According to that study, no remediation of this contamination is planned. The plan is to build on top of the contamination, on top of the sand plain, and on top of the highly vulnerable aquifer.

NATURAL HERITAGE. No natural heritage impact study was done, despite the fact that the 35-storey building will potentially have negative impacts on the identified environmentally sensitive areas of Catfish Creek and Grenadier Pond in High Park. A natural heritage impact study is mandated when a development or site alteration is proposed within or adjacent to an identified natural heritage feature. It's required to assess the potential negative impacts on the biodiversity and habitat of the rare and threatened species in the area.

ALTERNATIVE. There is an alternative plan called "Swansea Park" by architect David Peterson that addresses a lot of the problems of the current proposal. He proposes a mid-rise plan that increases density but in a safe and thoughtful way.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 5 🕒 55:24

**Keith Pardee**

*Area Resident / Planning Professional (appearing online)*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 55:24

**Keith Pardee**

Good morning, chair and members of the Planning and Housing Committee. I want to begin clearly: I support redevelopment of the site and the safe replacement of the former Swansea Mews buildings. Rebuilding safe housing after the evacuation is necessary and appropriate. However, the scale and the policy implications of the current proposal require careful reconsideration before rezoning proceeds.

The application proposes 35- and 20-storey buildings for a total of 649 units. The former site consisted of 154 four-storey low-rise units. This is not simply replacement housing. It is a more than four-fold increase in density and a fundamental shift in built form with broad implications to both residents and the community.

SCALE AND TRANSITION. A 35-storey tower located roughly 50 metres from existing low-rise homes and apartments represents a significant change in proportionality. The city's own Official Plan sets guidelines for appropriate transition between apartment neighbourhoods and adjacent neighbourhoods. At this separation distance, the relationship between height and nearby homes and apartments deserves deeper scrutiny. Reduced height and density alternatives, greater setbacks, or stepped massing toward low-rise properties should be evaluated before rezoning.

POLICY PRECEDENT. This application requires re-designation of lands from Neighbourhoods to Apartment Neighbourhoods — a major change amendment. Approving this scale of development in proximity to the existing neighbourhood through re-designation will set a precedent for how similar edge-case conditions are treated elsewhere in the city. The decision should be grounded in strong planning rationale and demonstrable appropriate transition.

LIVABILITY. If this project is advanced in part to rehouse displaced residents, then livability standards should be exemplary. Transitioning from four-storey buildings to 20- and 35-storey towers introduces significantly higher density, a materially different living experience with no direct access to grade or outdoors, and different environmental conditions including wind and noise impacts identified in the technical studies. It is reasonable to ensure that the built form supports long-term quality of life for returning residents and the surrounding community.

CONSULTATION. The city's Official Plan, section 5.5.1(C)(2), for development projects strongly encourages early and effective consultation. Given the scale of change proposed — in terms of height, density, and the required policy re-designation — the minimum statutory notification does not necessarily equate to meaningful engagement. Notification was limited to 120 metres. There are community-wide implications of the proposed project and it should involve formal feedback from residents and community organizations. The sentiment that this was not the case is reflected in the number of community members who have signed a petition asking for proper consultation, which is now over a thousand signatures.

MY REQUEST: Reconsider the proposed tower heights and analyze reduced height alternatives. Strengthen setbacks and step down massing towards adjacent neighbourhood lands. Provide structured consultation allowing for formal feedback focused specifically on alternative build form and density options.

*Questions from committee following the deputation:*

🕒 1:00:36

**Keith Pardee** *[over time]*

Considering Councillor Perks is a strong proponent of the project and the chair of this committee, he appears to be in conflict.

**Chair Perks**

Keith, I'm going to stop you there because you're way over time. Just for the benefit of the public — some people have raised this issue about whether a local councillor can be the chair of a committee or in this case also be on the board of Toronto Community Housing. I have sought advice from the integrity commissioner. The integrity commissioner is very clear: not only is there no conflict, but it's actually welcome to have members of council be on boards and chair committees.

DEPUTANT 6 🕒 1:01:43

**Katie Yew**

*Resident — 30 Windermere Avenue (15-year resident, family with children, appearing online)*

**[ MIXED / CONDITIONAL ]**

🕒 1:01:43

**Katie Yew**

Thank you so much for letting me speak today. Good morning everybody. I live at 30 Windermere Avenue, which is across from the primary — and only — point of vehicle access into the new proposed site. I've lived in Swansea for approximately 15 years with my family. My kids go to Swansea Public School. We visit the community centre every week doing Toronto recreational programming. We visit the Runnymede Public Library weekly and we do our shopping within the community.

I just wanted to set that stage to let you know how much we are embedded as a young family within the Swansea community and how important it is for me to let you know the community and neighbourhood feel that we currently have.

What I'm asking for is further consultation and adjustments to reduce any negative impacts that will happen with the current plan. My primary concern — and again I support development and redevelopment — is the overall scale and density of the redevelopment. It's far too large for the neighbourhood context. The scale of the development will lead to substantial increases of noise, construction, and disruption over an extended period of time, especially for me living right across from the only entrance.

TRAFFIC. An important point to bring up is the traffic increase to the area. We're already experiencing congestion with another project being built on Southport Street. There are dump trucks parked and coming up Windermere Place, down Windermere Avenue, and going into the Queensway or Lakeshore. The streets in my particular neighbourhood — Windermere and Windermere Place — were not designed to handle this level of construction vehicle traffic, and even emergency vehicles such as fire departments will be impacted. This will create a major increase in traffic and I'm concerned about road safety, pedestrians, seniors on Southport which is directly one street away from the site, and limited parking which is already strained.

TRANSIT. I'm also concerned about transit. There is one Line 77 bus that wiggles its way up through the streets on Windermere Avenue to the subway. The bus traffic up to the subway station is only one bus. The traffic pressures will change the character of the neighbourhood and create long-term safety and accessibility issues.

CONSULTATION. I do have to disagree that there was not a lack of clear communication and community engagement. It made it difficult for any nearby residents that weren't within, I think, about 100 metres or so, to fully understand what this project was going to do to the neighbourhood. There was a lack of engagement, a lack of communication. And even when there was consultation, it was a delivery of information — and that was how it felt in the community.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 7 🕒 1:06:44

**Michael Lazour**

*Executive Director & Co-founder, FLAP Canada (Fatal Light Awareness Program) — appearing online*

**[ MIXED / CONDITIONAL ]**

🕒 1:06:44

**Michael Lazour**

Good morning. My name is Michael Lazour. I'm Executive Director and co-founder of FLAP Canada. FLAP Canada is an organization that addresses the bird building collision issue. I'm here to speak on behalf of the birds this morning.

For context, there are two issues with buildings. It is the reflective and transparent qualities of glass that deceive birds, where they see their environment reflected from those structures. Upwards of a billion birds are dying each year as a result of collisions with buildings across North America.

What's so important to recognize about this development is that it's being situated in what we would call the perfect storm. It is surrounded by an abundance of habitat that these birds rely on when they're migrating to and from their breeding territories — all the lush habitat, green vegetation, the lakefront, the Humber River. They are like a magnet to these birds. So whatever is built within this area is going to have a significant bird strike problem. It's our responsibility to try and ensure that the building itself is as safe as possible for birds.

There used to be a bird-friendly component under the Toronto Green Standard. But Bill 17 has stripped the powers of municipalities to impose green standards. So we have to now rely heavily on the goodness of our hearts.

What's really important to understand — something that has changed since the Green Standard for Bird Friendly was first introduced in 2010 — is that we now have a law. It is now illegal to harm or kill a migratory bird due to a collision with a building. This is not just the end-user responsibility. It's not just the building owner's responsibility anymore. It's now going back as far as the designer. Anyone that understands the issue is there and designs or builds a structure knowing that this could harm or kill a bird and be in violation of the law can be held accountable. Over the past three years, Environment and Climate Change Canada is now responding to complaints and opening investigations based on complaints from buildings across the country.

We now have a standard called the Bird Friendly Building Design Standard under the Canadian Standards Association. It's our responsibility to do everything we can to ensure that this particular development — because of its proximity to all those natural heritage sites — does its best to be as safe as possible for birds.

*Questions from Chair Perks following the deputation:*

🕒 1:10:27

**Chair Perks**

Michael, do you mind if I ask you a couple of questions? First, as I recall, FLAP was involved in the development of the Toronto bird-friendly guidelines, right? You were involved in it and you were supportive of it?

**Michael Lazour**

Yes, indeed.

**Chair Perks**

You raised an interesting question about the Province of Ontario and our Green Standards. We still do ask applicants to meet them, but given that this is a project being led by a corporation owned by the City of Toronto, we can get those bird-friendly guidelines applied here. Would that be a good thing to do?

**Michael Lazour**

Oh gosh, for sure. This is awesome. If this can be addressed, I guarantee you, you're going to be saving countless bird lives. It really is the perfect storm where this location is, and the last thing you want to be dealing with is bird strikes.

**Chair Perks**

Thanks, Michael. That's very helpful.

DEPUTANT 8 🕒 1:12:02

**Cynthia Black**

*Tenant Organizer / Former renter displaced by financialized landlords — appearing online*

[ IN SUPPORT ]

🕒 1:12:02

**Cynthia Black**

I am here today in support of the Swansea Mews revitalization at 21 Windermere Avenue. I'm speaking today as a tenant organizer and someone who has personally been displaced from my own community because of relentless rent increases and cramped one- and two-bedroom units designed to maximize returns on investments for shareholders. Those apartments were not designed for real long-term living. And the few three-bedroom units that did exist were renting for prices completely out of reach for most families who rent. That experience is exactly why I believe this project is not only acceptable but necessary.

Some have asked for this decision to be delayed or deferred. I want to be very clear about what delay means from a tenant perspective. The families of Swansea Mews have already been displaced since 2022. Every month of deferral is another month children spend away from their school community, seniors are cut off from longstanding networks, and all neighbours remain scattered across the city.

It is easy to call for more process when you are securely housed. It is much harder when more consultation means more years of instability. The most respectful thing we can do for Swansea tenants now is to move forward and get them back home in safe, purpose-built housing.

A major strength of this proposal is that it doesn't just rebuild what was there. It adds rent-controlled rental homes to the neighbourhood. These are not speculative condo units that may or may not be rented out and may or may not sit empty. They are real apartments in a real rental building with rent control and a mix of family-sized units. As someone who spent most of her adult life renting — at one point moving about once a year for about a decade — that distinction matters. It means the building exists to house people, not to serve as an investment vehicle.

I want to speak to where the money goes. Too many renters are watching more and more of their paycheques flow to giant for-profit financialized landlords, pension funds, and real estate investment trusts that treat tenants like ATMs. This revitalization offers a different model. There are thousands of renters out there who would much rather see their money go towards keeping their neighbours housed than padding the pockets of incredibly rich executives.

Finally: there are people who do not mind living in a tower. It's a way to look out and view the community as a whole. People in towers love community too. The thing that would have made a big difference is if the units in those towers had been run by a for-profit company and if the units didn't actually meet tenant needs. The difference here is that they're designed to.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 9 🕒 1:17:28

**Diana Chan McN.**

*Resident of Parkdale-High Park / Member, Toronto Housing Rights Advisory Committee*

[ IN SUPPORT ]

🕒 1:17:28

**Diana Chan McNeil**

My name is Diana Chan McNeil and I am both a resident of Parkdale-High Park and a member of Toronto's Housing Rights Advisory Committee. Public housing should be safe. It should be healthy, decent, and beautiful — the quality of housing that all people deserve. Unfortunately, years of underinvestment in Toronto Community Housing has led to buildings in decline — most egregiously, Swansea Mews, which was closed in 2022. But in the aftermath of this incident, it's very promising to see new changes and proposals to ensure that the city's public housing is what it actually should be: well-maintained, safe, and healthy for residents.

This includes much-needed upgrades to 300 Dufferin, also in Parkdale-High Park, and a new proposal for Swansea Mews that both responds to the needs of displaced TCHC residents as well as future residents, and accounts for the demand for purpose-built rental housing that reflects the realities of the day. After all, half of Toronto are renters.

Having a diversity of housing options within a community is crucially important. It enables people to adapt to changing life circumstances by giving residents options to upsize but also downsize without leaving their neighbourhoods. In Swansea in particular, we do need more affordable rent-controlled housing options so that young people starting their own lives can

stay in the community that they actually love. Friends of mine — some of them deputizing today — who have grown up in Swansea had to leave, not by choice, but because there was no affordable housing option for them to actually stay. This project can begin to create a neighbourhood where people across life stages can actually live and grow together.

What I see in this proposed redevelopment of Swansea Mews is exactly what's needed: the maximizing of a valuable mix of housing types including 495 affordable and rent-controlled rental units, as well as space for increased community services. Ensuring our neighbourhoods are diverse — both in terms of residents and built forms — is to the benefit of absolutely everyone. The current on-site parking plan positions Swansea Mews to attract residents that do not own a private vehicle — a growing segment of young people as well as families across our city.

TRANSIT. I am concerned with the current TTC service levels. A long-time request of the community in Swansea is to increase the service of the 77 and the 80 buses. This increase in density that the proposal brings should actually come with a commensurate increase in transit service.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT. I ask that displaced TCHC residents continue to be absolutely central to this planning process and that their needs are prioritized as this project moves forward. While I hear from others that community engagement was inadequate — this is ultimately a provincial issue. The province has unilaterally reduced the timeline for redevelopment application reviews and collectively we need to take that up with Premier Ford. We need to push for a review timeframe that facilitates more and better engagement with local neighbourhood groups, including especially displaced residents.

All this said, I absolutely support this plan. This proposal is aligned with the reality of the residents that it would house. What we want are the best outcomes for everybody in our community. Therefore I urge the committee to adopt the recommendations of the report before you.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 10 🕒 1:22:08

**Stephanie Melagana**

*Area Resident — appearing online*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 1:22:08

**Stephanie Melagana**

I appreciate this opportunity to have a say in this very important building in our neighbourhood. I want to address two things.

LACK OF PUBLIC PROCESS. It's been really disappointing in a democratic society that I find all the processes have been unilateral — just Bowfield and the city telling us what they want to do. There has not been any genuine community engagement. There was a meeting on

November at the public school which was inaccessible to anyone who was disabled. It was in the lunchroom or cafeteria of the school. There was so much outcry that there had to be an impromptu meeting held in the hallway where the residents — including returning residents — were expressing their living conditions.

I couldn't believe it. At the end, when they asked Councillor Perks if he was willing to consider any changes, he flat out said no. There was no possibility for any change in this planning. And that was just heartbreaking. I felt so sorry for those returning residents that their needs weren't being respected. They weren't being considered.

NO VISION. This development has absolutely no vision. There are other developments like Kennedy Green where it's award-winning, where it's cooperative, which means a long-term community approach. And we are getting a 35-storey glass building and a 20-storey. This is one of the nicest, most ecologically and hydrologically sensitive neighbourhoods. I don't understand why this is all the city can do.

I really hope that the city councillors reflect on this and give us more time to think of a sustainable, beautiful development for this incredible neighbourhood. We want to make these returning residents happy with their living conditions.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 11 🕒 1:25:30

**Cleona Dan Paul**

*Long-standing Resident — Cohill Drive, Village of Swansea (25+ years) — appearing online*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 1:25:30

**Cleona Dan Paul**

I want to bring to everyone's attention that this proposal is built on contaminated land with major settlement and dewatering problems. That endangers the residents of Swansea Mews and the adjacent communities. I'm here to speak as a long-standing resident of Cohill Drive in the Village of Swansea — a neighbourhood distinguished by its environmentally sensitive landscape, complex terrain, and challenging, unstable soils. Having lived in this community for more than 25 years, I have observed firsthand the fragility of the land and the severe structural stresses that my home and many others around me have endured.

I'm here to formally object to the proposed 35-storey and 20-storey towers at Swansea Mews, and I want to state clearly right from the beginning that I support replacement housing and the full right of return of the Swansea Mews residents who were displaced in May 2022 following the ceiling collapse and emergency evacuation. They deserve safe and stable homes. The most responsible action is to genuinely listen to the residents of Swansea Mews and the broader community who have consistently voiced that such densification will compromise their quality of life.

**GEOTECHNICAL RISK.** My family home and others have visible and progressive foundation cracking, sinking in the yard and garage, and structural shifting consistent with unstable soil and groundwater movement. These reflect active ground movement. What this proposal requires is deep excavation, large-scale soil removal, continuous heavy vibration, and most critically, aggressive dewatering. Dewatering alone can permanently alter water tables. Lowering groundwater in a neighbourhood already prone to settlement can accelerate foundation settlement, trigger further sinking of the land, and compromise foundations across a wide radius — not just the development site.

**CONTAMINATION.** This area has shallow groundwater and historical industrial uses. When you excavate deeply and dewater contaminated or unstable soil, you mobilize pollutants. Contaminants do not stay neatly within property lines — they migrate through groundwater. This means potential impacts to schools, green spaces, and our drinking water. Once groundwater is contaminated, it is extremely difficult to remediate. This is not hypothetical — the warning signs are already visible in the structural settlement occurring throughout Swansea. There was a sinkhole on Windermere just last month, in January 2026.

**REQUESTS BEFORE ANY APPROVAL:** A fully independent comprehensive hydrogeological assessment of the entire impact zone; detailed contamination testing and public disclosure; a rigorous dewatering impact study modelling long-term groundwater shifts; and reconsideration of tower heights and massing including lower-rise alternatives such as depicted at swanseapark.ca, with greater setbacks and stepped-down massing. If we proceed without fully understanding the impacts of contaminated soil, settlement patterns, and groundwater behaviour, we risk creating irreversible structural and environmental damage. I ask that you defer approval until these risks have been thoroughly assessed.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 12 🕒 1:30:58

**David Peterson**

*Architect & Area Resident — Author of Alternative Proposal (swanseapark.ca)*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 1:30:58

**David Peterson**

My name is David Peterson. I am an architect and area resident of Swansea. I am requesting a deferral. Before I speak to the reasons, I just want to say that like all of you, I care about the housing authority. I have my own kind of personal history with them — it was the first place I worked after graduation. I made friends there, still have friends at the housing authority. During my time there what I saw — what you all know — is that they struggle to maintain their buildings because of a lack of funding. So I applaud the proposal to create new funding sources for the housing authority. On the need for more affordable housing inside our city, we are also aligned.

Where there's a departure of ideas is really around the balance. The question is: when we look at housing proposals — especially as a kind of public builder — is it balanced? Yes, we need to create more housing units on one side, but are we also balancing it with other values? We shouldn't, as a public builder, also create harms. And the question is: is this proposal creating any harms? In part, we don't know this to be true yet, because we are missing some key reports.

REASON 1 — SCALE: The scale of buildings is a problem. The idea of a 35-storey tower next to a two-storey building — many people would call that aggressive. It's not to say our city shouldn't have high-rise communities. We do have high-rise communities and they're functioning well. But is this the right site for more towers? It is substantially a low-rise community and it feels very aggressive. There should be other alternatives for built form considered.

REASON 2 — ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: We've heard from planners and engineers that the shadow impacts onto ecologically sensitive lands of High Park and Rennie Park are minimal. Engineers and planners are telling us this. We haven't yet heard from an ecologist who has done that assessment. The committee members and the public should have in hand an ecological assessment that says the shadow impacts are minimal. We don't yet have that study. That's a second reason for deferral — we're building adjacent to ecologically sensitive lands and we should have a heritage and ecological assessment.

REASON 3 — GROUNDWATER: We have hydrogeological reports. That hydrogeological report tells us that the TRCA is the agency that regulates sub-watersheds and that they haven't commented yet. They should be provided an opportunity to review the applicant's proposal and confirm that the groundwater strategy proposed is actually reasonable and working well on behalf of the public.

REASON 4 — ALTERNATIVE PLAN: It is unusual that there is an alternative proposal in place that we could all look at and evaluate against what is proposed by the applicant. Given an alternative, it's an opportunity for the city to also seek out new partners — partners that would be interested in making mid-rise modular housing, which the federal government has signalled they are interested in — and to create new opportunities for how we might approach development of public lands.

I understand that once we've got to this point we've all made lots of decisions and we're heading down a certain path. Changing course requires a kind of strength of will that is very difficult. But it is what the community is asking, and the studies — and lack of studies — is really suggesting that we take this moment to pause, defer the application, and do our due diligence around some of these questions to make sure that we are doing the best we can for public lands.

*Questions from Chair Perks following the deputation:*

🕒 1:36:30

**Chair Perks**

I was listening carefully to what you said. You talked about consultation and looking at options. You also talked about transition — having a very tall building right next to two-storey buildings. In the process to get here, there was an initial development proposal which was shown to the community, and it did have more of the height and density at the north end — and folks in the community said no, we don't think that's good transition, so the density was moved to the south end and it was stepped down before it became the neighbourhood boundary. Is that the kind of thing you're talking about?

**David Peterson**

I'll tell you — that beginning point already solved the problem in that it was a schematic idea that already envisioned towers. It already envisioned a site plan idea that wouldn't have dealt with some of the concerns that have been raised. Right from the get-go, that initial development plan should have been part of a public process that would have had all these concerns included — including the need for creating revenue for the housing authority and balancing those concerns. The fundamental problem you're hearing from many people around the proposal is that it's unbalanced. It's not that there isn't a concern for housing or a desire to have returning residents come back to the neighbourhood — it's that it's not balanced enough and it's not asking questions about the ecological concerns.

**Chair Perks**

The transition thing you spoke about — the neighbourhood did raise that. And TCHC did change their proposal significantly inside the IDP. How is it rigid when they changed it?

**David Peterson**

Because it doesn't leave room. It doesn't take into account that if the built form was going to default to towers, those shadows would end up onto High Park. So imagine the transition — it's not just the transition I'm concerned about. It is also the height of towers casting shadows onto tall trees. Tall towers onto sensitive lands.

**Chair Perks**

Okay. Now I think I understand. Thank you. Any other questions for David? No. David, thank you so much, and thank you for answering questions too.

DEPUTANT 13 🕒 1:39:27  
**Niels Zangel**  
*Ward 4 Resident / Former Swansea Public School Student*  
**[ IN SUPPORT ]**

🕒 1:39:27  
**Niels Zangel**

I'm here today to encourage the Planning and Housing Committee to approve the Zoning By-law Amendment for this redevelopment. My name is Niels Zangel and I grew up in the Swansea area. I attended Swansea Public School and I went to school with many kids who lived in the Swansea Mews and the many apartment buildings and condos in the neighbourhood. The mix of people in Swansea is part of what makes the community special. Kids from some of the most expensive houses in Toronto attended school with kids living in rent-g geared-to-income housing and everything in between. This created a unique experience I still remember fondly.

When the Mews was condemned, it was a loss for the many residents who called it home and for the broader community they were a part of. Now before us we finally have an opportunity to rebuild.

When the Mews was built as low-rise townhouses in the 1970s, it reflected the needs of social housing and housing economics of the time. Both have changed dramatically since then, as has the need for new housing — especially non-market housing. A shortage of housing has driven rents and new home prices to an unattainable level for most Torontonians. Here we have the opportunity to build nearly 500 new homes and 154 replacement homes near major streetcar lines, the Maple Leaf Quay, and some of the greatest outdoor amenities our city has to offer.

These will be proper homes that both single residents and families can comfortably live in, unlike many of the studio condos we've seen built in the last few decades. The height of the proposed buildings is in line with other development on the Queensway. Crucially, the height of the buildings allows for efficient use of this land while maintaining green space which will be publicly accessible.

All three levels of government have committed to building more housing. Yet Canada lags far behind peer countries when it comes to housing construction, and specifically our share of non-market housing, which has made the housing crisis especially acute. Here we have an opportunity for a city-led project on city-owned property to not just replace rent-g geared-to-income housing stock, but also add more affordable and crucially rent-controlled market housing. As a resident of Ward 4, I would be happy to welcome more neighbours to our community, and I encourage the Planning and Housing Committee to approve this rezoning request.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 14 🕒 1:42:32

**Alex Kerman**

*Swansea Resident / Cyclist — appearing online*

**[ MIXED / CONDITIONAL ]**

🕒 1:42:32

**Alex Kerman**

Good morning. My name is Alex Kerman and I live in the Swansea community, right in the neighbourhood this project will affect. I want my community to grow and improve, but growth has to be done right. When I read through the applicant's own documents, I found problems that could make life worse for everyone already living here. I think this Council deserves to hear them before making a decision.

**TRAFFIC.** My first point is that the main intersections already can't handle today's traffic. Anyone who drives or walks through the Queensway and Windermere Avenue knows it is already a mess. What you may not know is that the applicant's own traffic study confirms it in writing. This intersection is already failing grades on multiple movements before the project adds a single resident. When the study shows that adding this development pushes it over capacity entirely — with the volume-to-capacity ratio going to 1.1, meaning more cars than the intersection can handle — what's the fix? The applicant recommends tweaking the traffic signal timing. That's it. But those signals are run by the TTC, and we need a proper plan. Before any approval, those traffic improvements need to be locked into a legal agreement, not left as a suggestion.

**CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE.** I'm an avid cyclist and Windermere Avenue is the only street in and out of this development. Right now there are no bike lanes, no sharrows, nothing that makes it safe for cycling. The applicant is projecting that roughly 9% of residents will cycle regularly — for a building of 600-something units, that's a lot of people on bikes every single day on a street with zero cycling infrastructure and no safe connection to the bike lanes. When I looked at how the applicant addressed this in the transportation study, the cycling section was literally one sentence confirming that electrical outlets will be provided for charging bikes. That's it. The city had explicitly asked them before the application was even filed to show how cyclists would safely access the site, and there is no answer for that. Cycling infrastructure on Windermere Avenue should be required as a condition before this gets built.

**MISSING DOCUMENT.** My last point is about the process. The central document justifying the entire application — the planning and urban design rationale — was not available on the city's public portal when community members were supposed to be reviewing it and responding to this project. This is the document that explains why the applicant believes that height and density are appropriate. Without it, residents couldn't meaningfully evaluate the core of the application. Under section 34 of the Planning Act, consultation has to be meaningful. It cannot be meaningful if the main planning document is not available to read on the city's website. I'm asking that the public meeting not proceed until this document has been posted and residents have had at least two weeks to review it.

Everything I've raised this morning comes directly from the applicant's own submitted documents. These aren't opinions. These are gaps and contradictions in the materials already on file, and I'm asking staff to address each of these points.

*Question from Chair Perks following the deputation:*

🕒 1:47:03

**Chair Perks**

I'm curious — what's this document that you say is missing? I don't understand your question.

### Alex Kerman

There should be a document called the Planning and Urban Design Rationale. One planning design rationale document is on the website but it's actually a reference to it — it's a cover letter that refers to it. The document itself is not available. There is just a cover letter that refers to it.

### Chair Perks

Okay. I'll look into that, Alex. Thank you.

*[Note: During the following deputant's setup, Chair Perks confirmed with City Planning staff (Alex) that the planning rationale document link on the Application Information Centre was sending visitors to an appendix rather than the document itself. Staff confirmed it had already been corrected and was now available online.]*

DEPUTANT 15 🕒 1:47:53

### Nancy Rabbat

Resident — reading letter written by neighbour Kamine Peroy Lee

[ IN SUPPORT ]

🕒 1:47:53

### Nancy Rabbat

I'm going to read a letter written by my neighbour Kamine Peroy Lee. I agree completely with what she has written, and our priority really is to provide supportive housing for the thousands of people who desperately need it, and the return of the Swansea Mews residents to their homes.

### Letter from Kamine Peroy Lee:

"I write to you today to express my support of the proposed amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to allow for the proposed development at the Swansea Mews site (Item PH28.2 in the February 26 Planning and Housing Committee meeting). As I understand it, the proposed development maintains the number of units of affordable and rent-geared-to-income housing. And as such, I support the proposed development and the necessary Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments. On this basis, the project is more than just physical structures. From my perspective, it is a vital instrument for community well-being and social responsibility.

I understand that a lot of changes have been made to the original built form and that neighbouring homes will also be impacted. It is also my understanding that these changes were made to ensure the financial viability of the project as a whole. Personally, I would much have preferred that the original form was simply rebuilt and funded through a small local levy,

thereby returning the same style of affordable housing to the previous residents of Swansea Mews while also avoiding the significant adverse effects to neighbouring properties.

However, I recognize the complicated financial situation the city finds itself in. I do not want to diminish the effect on neighbouring homeowners and how they are disproportionately impacted by the proposed structure. I myself have recently had a neighbouring house receive a variance approval to build an excessively large luxury home next to my bungalow that will cast my own home completely into shadows. Quite frankly, going through that made me feel like the planning system in this city is broken right now. However, I have expressed many times throughout my own ordeal that I would find it a little bit more tolerable if they were at least building a multi-unit rental, so there would be a good reason for what I'm losing.

What I'm trying to say is that I can't in good conscience speak against the most economically vulnerable who are reliant on community housing while the most wealthy people abuse this broken planning system to build luxury homes. While I have great compassion for the neighbouring homes and to the objectors of the project, as a resident of Swansea, I feel it is my duty to protect the affordability of housing to the economically vulnerable in my neighbourhood and my city. I hope we can move forward as a community, balancing progress with compassion, but we can't move forward at all until we rebuild these affordable and rent-geared-to-income homes and bring back the people who were displaced. I reiterate my support for this project and the requested amendments and I urge the Planning and Housing Committee members as well as City Council as a whole to do the same."

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 16 🕒 1:52:31

**Ken Lei**

*Swansea Resident (25+ years) — appearing by phone*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 1:52:31

**Ken Lei**

Thank you very much for having me this morning and allowing me to speak. I'm a Swansea resident — lived here 25-plus years, just up the hill on Windermere. Honestly, this whole affair upsets me. I found myself a bit late to the affair — it's not like there was big notice around. There was no major community meeting saying, "Big things are happening at the bottom of the hill — you should be there."

Anyway, here we are. I have a lot of questions. Why are we making this so big? There were 150 units before. Now we've got 650. Why so many? The towers are so tall. There's one person trying to help the birds — I guess we just forget him. I guess we forget the birds. You've got to have 35 stories. It doesn't seem right.

Why is there no environmental assessment? There's Grenadier Pond and all of High Park right there. You're going to drain the water on a non-stable, ex-Stelco site and put up a 35-storey tower. You're going to have the leaning tower of Swansea at the bottom of the hill.

It's madness to try and jam this giant complex with all these people into what was once a nice little community for people who needed help. Now I've got market rent. 35 stories. How many studios? Look around the neighbourhood — there are studios for rent everywhere. We're building more all the time. Whatever happened to any consideration for the neighbours who live there? You're going to jam yourselves in there, make this giant footprint, and suddenly you rescue neighbours — “Too bad. Don't be NIMBYs. Just take it.” It's not right.

You say yourselves there should be transit. Where's the transit? I don't see any transit nearby. The Queensway is a mess. The streetcar is a mess. There's no 77 service — you can stand there for 20 minutes and hope for a bus.

As some of the other people said, TCHC and their security arm are not good landlords. They're not good at taking care of completely rental buildings. People are running in and out of these buildings. I've read Star articles — vandalism, drug use in hallways, people who don't live there are there. How can you control it?

This new place you're asking for — I looked it up. The standard density of the City of Toronto is 4,428 people per square kilometre. What you're asking for here is about 18 times that density per square kilometre. You want to put about 1,750 people in there. There were maybe 600 before. Before, there was 15,000 square feet of livable space. Now you've got more than 72,000 — more than five times. Why are we doing this? Who's making money? Who's happy about this? The developers? The locals are not happy. The neighbours are not happy. The birds are not happy.

I beg you, defer this for further review. It's been four-plus years since that roof fell in. We've got time. What's the rush? Please, I beg you, listen to the people. Try another option. Don't just give up on us. Please consider David Peterson and Greg Homonylo — they have good reasons, scientific reasons why not to do this.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 17 ⌚ 2:07:15

**Veronica Wynn**

*President, Swansea Area Ratepayers Association*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

*[Note: Veronica's deputation was delayed by approximately 7 minutes due to technical difficulties connecting her laptop to the committee room display system. A 5-minute recess was taken at approximately 1:59:19 and resumed at 2:06:09.]*

⌚ 2:07:15

**Veronica Wynn**

I'm Veronica Wynn and I'm the president of the Swansea Area Ratepayers Association. We've been working with the community and with members of the returning residents from the Swansea Mews to get their opinion and to work towards ensuring that both the community and the residents can return to a safe, secure, healthy, and sustainable community. Unfortunately, this isn't happening with this development.

Another feature of what Swansea ratepayers do is this: if we're going to do a critique of something, we also should be able to provide a solution. What we have done is ensure that we have a solution. That is swanseapark.ca — which is what our previous speaker David Peterson was working on. It checks off all the items and it will be the best thing in the interest of all. And it is what the residents of the Mews want to return to.

CONTAMINATION. Our main concern is that the structure is being built on stilts in contaminated water, which they say cannot be removed. It is a requirement. We've gone through all the buildings in our area and we found one that had a gas station on it too. It took them six years to actually dig out the soil before they could get authorization that the soil was clean. Yet they say this contamination cannot be removed here. And then we have three different updated hydrogeological reports that say, essentially, we're getting there — and the last one says we're going to leave the contamination there, but if the water rises in this contaminated aquifer we'll get containers and take it away. But they don't tell you where they're going to take it away to.

GRENADIER POND / ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT AREA. Grenadier Pond has been designated as a significant environmental area, and that requires lots of policies and rules. The City's Official Plan — section 3.2.1.4 (approximately) — says that if you have a building within, I believe it's 120 metres of a designated significant area, you cannot simply build without dealing with it. The line goes through the Swansea Mews site. So it needs to be dealt with. They didn't present the document that says this, and the ecological report and the positions on that rule were not provided.

There is also another by-law that requires shadow analysis not just at the equinox and solstice.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 18 🕒 2:13:31

**Penny Fischer**

*Former Swansea Mews Resident (displaced 2022) / Member, Swansea Mews Tenant Leadership Committee*

**[ OPPOSED / DEFERRAL ]**

🕒 2:13:29

**Penny Fischer**

Hi, my name is Penny Fischer. I'm a former resident of Swansea Mews who was displaced. This is the second time I've been personally displaced by the City of Toronto. I was a former homeowner on the Toronto Islands and the Housing Authority came over with the sheriff to

evict us. I'm also a member of the Swansea Mews Tenant Leadership Committee and I'm speaking on their behalf.

We respectfully ask that the Council not approve this current plan for Swansea. The majority of the tenants are against it, and the reason we're against it is because we do not feel that the infrastructure is there to support what the plan is. We support the redevelopment of Swansea Mews as long as it works for the people who actually live there. The people making the decision here for the plans are not the people who are going to live there. We ask, before you decide, that you ask yourselves: if you would live there.

The plans are theory, but theory is not practice, and it has to work for the people who are going to live there for the next 20, 30, 40 years. When it comes to the plan as it stands — with the 35-storey building, the 16-storey-plus building, and townhouses — we're talking about five times the number of tenants living there in the same space.

CONSULTATION. 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. We were asked whether we'd like a Tim Hortons or what kind of grocery store, but we were not asked how Swansea would look or what would work for us.

INFRASTRUCTURE. As mentioned before repeatedly, the area is a bottleneck. You've got two highways, two major streets, transit that takes up to 45 minutes sometimes to get a bus — there's only one bus on that route. There are a lot of hills in the area that people have a problem with. There's limited shopping — one small grocery store up on Bloor Street that services the entire High Park area. And we do not have the schooling. Swansea Public School is at capacity. Where are the kids going to go to school with this plan?

OVERCROWDING. If you've looked at the studies on overcrowding, you will know that what it leads to is increased crime and other social issues, and mental health issues. These are preventable. You have the chance to prevent these issues from happening.

MAINTENANCE. When I moved into Swansea Mews in 2008, my unit was not livable among all the other huge safety and fire issues in my unit. There was a 250-volt wire hanging free next to the dryer and my kids' bicycles — it could have killed them. It took me 14 years to bring my unit up to standard. And unfortunately that was the time when the ceiling fell, so I didn't really get to enjoy the work I put into that unit. Before the ceiling fell, there were 30 units in Swansea Mews that were not livable — they were empty because they were not livable. What we're saying to you is: whatever you plan, it has to be maintained up to standard for the next 30, 40 years. However long you want those buildings to stand, that's how long they have to be maintained.

I also suggest that the housing crisis can be dealt with in this council by making rent the equivalent of 30% of a person's income, as it used to be.

*No questions from committee members.*

DEPUTANT 19 🕒 2:19:23

**Deborah (Debbie) Green**

*Representing Ward 4 Environmental Organizations: Parkdale-High Park for Climate Action and Green 13 — appearing online*

**[ IN SUPPORT ]**

🕒 2:19:23

### **Deborah (Debbie) Green**

Thank you to the committee for having me this morning. My name is Debbie Green. I'm here representing the Ward 4 environmental organizations Parkdale-High Park for Climate Action and Green 13, and we are supporting the increased density proposed for the upcoming Swansea Mews rebuild.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CASE FOR DENSITY.** We generally support greater housing density because it's good for the environment. Dense housing reduces energy consumption, lowers carbon emissions, and preserves natural land. By concentrating residents, more density supports efficient public transit, reduces car dependence, and uses less energy for heating and cooling due to shared walls. Density also limits urban sprawl, which protects ecosystems. I would point out that Ward 4 is behind other parts of the city in densification. In fact, between 2016 and 2021, the population of Ward 4 actually declined while the rest of the city's population increased. This does not contribute to a healthy neighbourhood. Nor is it reasonable when there are so many of our fellow Torontonians who need a place to live, particularly an affordable place to live.

**ECONOMIC CASE.** Greater density is needed for our local businesses. Many of us walk around and see shuttered stores on Bloor Street, Roncesvalles, and Queen. More neighbours mean more local shopping and a healthier local economy.

**CONDITIONS.** For residents of the redeveloped Swansea Mews, we hope to see good air quality monitoring, awnings for shade, and ideally community gardens. Every new building should be built for energy efficiency and climate resilience. We look forward to welcoming returning and new neighbours to our beautiful Ward 4.

*No questions from committee members.*

---

*[Close of deputations — Chair Perks: "Seeing none, that completes the deputations. Are there any questions of staff?" — 🕒 2:21:59]*

*Source: Verbatim transcript, Planning and Housing Committee Meeting 28, February 26, 2026. Name corrections applied: Greg Homonylo (source document: Hommello); Keith Pardee (source document: Keith); Katie Yew (source document: Katie U.). Companion document: Planning and Housing Committee — Chair Perks Questions and Exchanges.*