

## SWANSEA MATTERS — SUMMARY DOCUMENT

### Six Governance Failures — A Summary of the Complaint

*Swansea Mews Revitalization — 21 Windermere Avenue, Ward 4 — March 2026*

---

This document summarises the six governance failures at the centre of the formal complaint filed with the Toronto Integrity Commissioner in connection with the Swansea Mews revitalization at 21 Windermere Avenue. Each failure is documented in full in the companion analytical documents. Together they describe a process in which the language and procedural forms of consultation were applied to a sequence of events that was designed to produce a predetermined outcome.

#### **1. Unauthenticated Zoom Consultation Record (September 22, 2025)**

The September 22, 2025 Zoom meeting — designated as a Community Consultation Milestone — generated questions that were never answered in any traceable way. Meeting notes were never distributed to or verified by attendees, breaking the evidentiary chain between what was asked and what was later purported to be answered. The December 2025 Q&A document issued by TCHC/Bousfields cannot be authenticated against what was actually raised, and the Community Consultation Strategy Report (November 7, 2025) failed to map any September meeting feedback to proposal adjustments or studies.

#### **2. Premature Open House Built on a False Premise (November 20, 2025)**

Because the September 22 Zoom meeting record was never authenticated, the November 20, 2025 Open House was premature and out of sequence. It was presented as the formal Community Consultation Milestone — yet it was cobbled together in five business days to fit a false narrative: that a federal housing funding deadline required the application to advance immediately. The local federal MP's office has confirmed no such deadline existed or exists. A statutory consultation right was degraded to a school basement drop-in on the basis of a timeline that was not real.

#### **3. Non-Disclosure of a Known Alternative Proposal**

An alternative development proposal — publicly available since Fall 2024 and known to Councillor Perks throughout 2025 — was withheld from displaced tenants and neighbourhood residents at every consultation session. The Swansea Park Housing Proposal, prepared by local architect David Peterson ([swanseapark.ca](http://swanseapark.ca)), offers 14 mid-rise buildings, 60% open space, mass timber construction, and 331 to 461 units including the 154 mandatory replacement RGI homes. It was never shown to the 108 former Swansea Mews tenants or placed before the Planning and Housing Committee.

#### **4. Misleading Newsletters — A Pattern of Omission (September 2025 – February 2026)**

Councillor Perks' four newsletters pertaining to this process (September 25, November 27, 2025; February 19 and 26, 2026) are each misleading as to what took place: they omit the Swansea Park alternative, mischaracterise unanswered concerns as addressed, report 649 units in the post-Open House newsletter without acknowledging any reduction from the 673 units presented at the Open House itself, and the February 26 newsletter — sent the same evening as the vote, after a former resident's testimony that the majority of tenants are opposed — thanks residents for 'community engagement processes' without any acknowledgment of that opposition.

#### **5. Obstruction of Deputation Preparation (January 22 – February 26, 2026)**

Between January 22 and February 26, 2026, the community's representative made repeated written requests to TCHC and City Planning for the basic records needed to prepare meaningful deputations: the September 22 Zoom meeting notes (not provided until February 12, after three follow-ups); their production date (asked four times, never confirmed); the Open House notes (confirmed by City Planning not yet assembled as of January 30 — ten weeks post-event); and a comparison of this consultation against Regent Park, Alexandra Park, and Lawrence Heights (asked three times, never answered). The format of the Open House itself was confirmed to have been chosen jointly by TCHC, City staff, and Councillor Perks. The community arrived at the February 26 hearing without the records that should have been proactively supplied.

#### **6. Pre-Determination and Ex Parte Conduct (February 20, 2026)**

On the Friday afternoon of February 20, 2026 — six days before he chaired the Committee hearing — Councillor Perks stated in a private recorded call his settled intention to vote in favour of the application, characterised objectors as 'manufacturing reasons' why it should not be built, disclosed pre-decisional planning staff advice not yet formally before the Committee, and conflated CMHC's financial model with planning merit. The verbatim transcript of that call is filed as a supporting document with the Integrity Commissioner. The pre-determination communication meant that community members who were told of the settled outcome concluded deputation was pointless — several did not proceed.