

SWANSEA MEWS

21 Windermere Avenue, Toronto

Ward 4, Parkdale-High Park

The Case for Intervention

A community evidentiary record submitted to all levels of government

April 2026

Produced by SwanseaMatters.com and Swansea Neighbourhood Group
ourswanseamatters@gmail.com

The standard they set is the standard we apply.

What Our Elected Officials Say

Minister Rob Flack, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

“By working closely with our municipal partners to overcome challenges that slow progress and hinder our province's growth, we can get more shovels in the ground and build an Ontario where everyone can prosper.”

LinkedIn, April 2, 2026

Premier Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario

“We also recognize the need to invest in the public spaces that foster a strong sense of community and belonging. We need to work together to build the roads, highways, transit, homes, hospitals and schools our growing communities need. Where people and families can live, thrive, and prosper.”

Association of Municipalities of Ontario Annual Conference, August 2024

Minister Gregor Robertson, Federal Minister of Housing and Infrastructure

“By combining federal and provincial resources, we're not only accelerating the delivery of thousands of affordable homes, but we're also creating a community with schools, childcare, and supports that families need to thrive.”

Government of Canada news release, March 2026

Prime Minister Mark Carney, Prime Minister of Canada

“A level playing field provided by public services like high-quality education and secure property rights, housing as the bedrock that allows people to feel rooted and ready to contribute.”

Value(s): Building a Better World for All, 2021

Ana Bailão, CEO, Build Canada Homes

“Build Canada Homes will be focused on supportive, transitional, social, and affordable housing, mixed income and mixed communities.”

Parliamentary committee testimony, 2025-2026

Mayor Olivia Chow, Mayor, City of Toronto

“The challenge is how do you make some of it affordable, how do you integrate people, and how do you have a holistic community so it's not just people living. They will also have the local libraries and community centres and parks and all of the social infrastructure that makes a neighbourhood successful.”

First transition meeting as Mayor-elect, Storeys.com, July 7, 2023

The Undelivered Local Commitment

Councillor Gord Perks,

“Swansea Mews is an integral part of the neighbourhood, and this revitalization project is committed to co-creating a place where all former residents can return to living in the community and live well.”

Ward Newsletter, September 25, 2025

The Reality of the non co-creation stated in public

Penny Fischer, former Swansea Mews resident,

“We were not asked whether we wanted a 35-storey building or a 16-storey building or stacked townhouses with very limited green space. We were told what the plan would be. The people making the decision here for the plans are not the people who are going to live there.”

Planning and Housing Committee, February 26, 2026, 🕒 2:13:29 sworn deputation

The former residents and neighbours of 21 Windermere Avenue are stuck and don't know who to believe;

Is Councillor Gord Perks right, and Minister Flack, Premier Ford, Minister Robertson, Prime Minister Carney, Ms. Bailão, Mayor Chow and Penny Fischer wrong, or is it the other way around?

The dossier that follows presents the evidence. Before you read it, one critical number belongs here. The number is 3.

The difference between the 649-unit development promoted by Perks and the documented alternative the community was never shown is approximately 240 units, roughly three weeks of growth on Toronto's affordable housing wait list. The 649-unit development will take four years from this point at the earliest, and more likely five. The alternative can likely be built in two.

One alternative can be built faster, at lower cost to the taxpayer, and delivers a better livelihood for all residents regardless of income. It was never put before the community. It was never independently assessed.

So who decides what comes next?

Index

What Our Elected Officials Say	p. 2
The standards leaders have set, and the record of what occurred.	
The Undelivered Local Commitment	p. 3
Councillor Perks's commitment, and Penny Fischer's account of what occurred.	
Executive Summary	p. 5
Six findings, the structural conflict, and the ask.	
Section 1, Finance and Governance	p. 8
A model that cannot be produced on assumptions that no longer hold.	
Section 2, Density	p. 15
The 649-unit figure is a financial output from an unreviewed model that is already obsolete.	
Section 3, Timing	p. 20
Eight years minimum. The urgency that compressed this process delivered delay, not speed.	
Section 4, Environment	p. 28
Six agency clearances unresolved at adoption. Lead at 30.4 times the residential standard.	
Section 5, Community Impact	p. 35
Schools, transit, grocery, and services were never assessed for capacity.	
Section 6, Community Consultation	p. 40
The consultation process did not meet the standard the law required.	
Section 7, Conclusion and Recommendations	p. 47
What the evidence demands and what must happen before this file proceeds.	

Executive Summary

One hundred and eight families were displaced from Swansea Mews on May 27, 2022. They hold a legal right to return. As of April 2026 they are still waiting, living in temporary TCHC accommodation across the city, some as far as Mississauga. They did not cause this.

This dossier is not an objection to housing. It is a documented record of the process used to approve the replacement, measured against the standards the leaders who will receive it have publicly set. Every finding rests on primary sources: the City's own agency records, the applicant's filed documents, the verbatim deputation transcript of February 26, 2026, written correspondence with City Planning, and the public record of federal, provincial, and municipal officials with authority on this file.

The 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue was adopted by Toronto City Council on March 25, 2026 against the financial foundation Council itself directed in April 2025 and never received. The Stage 2 Actions Report directed under Item PH20.8 Clause 7 was never produced. The 649-unit density figure is the arithmetic output of a financial cross-subsidy model the City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 to be unavailable on the public record. The total project cost has never been disclosed.

A documented alternative at 409 units has been publicly available since Fall 2024, prepared by licensed architect David Peterson, a 20-year Swansea resident. The community modelled the financial structure of that alternative in April 2026. Every returning family is accommodated. The alternative is materially more affordable per capita, with 37.7 percent of total units as Rent-Geared-to-Income against 23.7 percent in the 649-unit development. It is buildable on a shorter timeline, in mid-rise mass timber form, and is eligible for federal financing streams the 649-unit tower model is not. It was known to TCHC and to the Ward Councillor since Fall 2024 and was never shown to the City planners, the stakeholders, or the former residents at any consultation event.

The Ward Councillor who chaired the Planning and Housing Committee that approved this development is also a Director on the Toronto Community Housing Corporation Board whose application this is. The structural conflict means that no path to corrective review exists at the municipal level. The path forward is provincial direction under the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, signed five days after adoption, and federal due diligence by Build Canada Homes and CMHC before financing is committed.

Six Findings

Consultation

The November 20, 2025 mandatory consultation event was an information performance presented as a consultation. It did not meet the City's Official Plan Policy 5.5 standard, the Planning Act s. 17(15) standard, or the National Housing Strategy Act s. 4(2) standard. The application and its planning consultant nonetheless claimed the consultation requirements had been fulfilled. They were not.

Density

The 649-unit density figure is the arithmetic output of a financial cross-subsidy model that has never been placed on the public record. The City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 that no City report exists on the underlying analysis. The corridor at The Queensway and Windermere is being asked to absorb at around 5,000 more people, with no new support services.

Community Impact

No Community Services and Facilities Study was produced. The schools serving the broader area are at capacity, on the school board's own written confirmation of December 5, 2025. The transportation study did not assess Route 77 Swansea for combined corridor load. The corridor's only full-service grocery anchor at 125 The Queensway is under active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal.

Environment

AGAT Laboratories testing for the applicant's own retained consultants confirmed lead at 30.4 times the residential standard, mercury at 6.1 times, and methane above the MECP screening threshold. Sirati's own conclusion calls for further investigation that has not been done. No Record of Site Condition has been filed. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority had not commented at adoption. The Natural Heritage Impact Study was deferred to Site Plan stage.

Finance

The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was never produced. The total project cost of the 649-unit development has never been disclosed. The Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, signed five days after adoption, materially obsoleted roughly half of the City's \$116 million incentive package. The community has modelled the 409-unit alternative at approximately \$182 million. The institutional actors have not modelled either.

Timing

The site has been idle since July 2022 at approximately \$790,000 per month. The optimistic return date is early 2030, an eight-year displacement. The 240-unit difference between the 649-unit development and the documented alternative represents under three weeks of wait-list growth, against four years of these families' lives already served and four to five more years still ahead.

The Ask

The full Recommendations are set out in Section 7 of this dossier, addressed in detail to the Province of Ontario, the Government of Canada, the City of Toronto, the TCHC Board, and the 108 displaced families. In summary:

The Province should direct, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, that this file meet the standard the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build set on March 30, 2026 before any further approvals proceed.

The Government of Canada should decline to commit financing through Build Canada Homes, CMHC, or the Build Communities Strong Fund until a complete CMHC Class 3 Business Case is produced and the 409-unit alternative is independently assessed.

The City of Toronto should produce the Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025, publish the financial pro forma underlying the 649-unit density figure, complete the Community Services and Facilities Study, and conduct re-consultation with the alternative shown beside the approved development.

A thorough comparison of the two proposals is needed, given that the 409-unit model can likely be built in two years and secure federal and provincial funding. The 649-unit idea cannot, and will take four, if not five, and is already stuck in unforced errors and red tape.

Ignoring the site realities does not make them disappear. The 108 displaced families have already waited four years, and there is no good reason to delay their return. They deserve to be home soon and in a development that can deliver.

The taxpayers paying for the rebuild deserve a financial model they can read. Until the missing analysis is produced and all options are independently assessed, the answer is to pause any Site Plan Approval on a complete record.

Finance and Governance

A Model That Cannot Be Produced, on Inputs That No Longer Hold

In 30 Seconds

The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 under Item PH20.8 Clause 7, requiring a project budget, delivery model options analysis, procurement plan, and partnership framework, was never produced. The City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 that no producible report exists on the financial analysis underlying the 649-unit density figure. The total project cost of the approved 649-unit TCHC tower has never been disclosed. No remediation cost has been quantified, despite confirmed lead, mercury, cadmium, and groundwater contamination at multiples of the residential standard. No 40-year operating cost has been quantified, on a 35-storey concrete tower on a contaminated brownfield, against TCHC's own State of Good Repair backlog projected to reach \$2.540 billion by 2034. No opportunity cost of the eight-year displacement has been disclosed; at the documented \$790,000 per month, that exposure is approaching \$33 million to date and tracks toward \$71 million by the optimistic 2030 occupancy. The Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, signed five days after adoption, cut development charges by up to 50 percent effective April 1, 2026, materially obsoleting roughly half of the City's \$116 million incentive package. The community has modelled an alternative at 409 units delivering 37.7 percent Rent-Geared-to-Income, against 23.7 percent in the approved 649-unit scheme. That modelling is in this dossier. The TCHC model is not on the public record. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was the mechanism that would have produced the missing analysis. It was not produced.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from primary Council documents, the applicant's own filings, written correspondence with City Planning, the verbatim hearing transcripts, the conversation record of February 20, 2026, the community-produced 409-unit pro forma modelling, and primary public-record documents.

1, The Core Failure: Council Directed a Financial Analysis and It Was Never Produced

In April 2025, City Council adopted Item PH20.8, the Initial Development Proposal for Swansea Mews. Clause 7 of that decision directed staff to produce a Stage 2 Actions Report containing a project budget, a delivery model options analysis comparing TCHC-only development with non-profit, cooperative, and

private sector partnerships, a procurement plan, and a partnership framework. Council set this report as the prerequisite for the planning approvals that followed. The report was never tabled. Council adopted the application on March 25, 2026 against the financial foundation it had set for itself one year earlier and never received.

2, A Model That Cannot Be Produced

The 649-unit density figure is the arithmetic output of a financial model. The applicant's own planning consultant Bousfields Inc. presented this in writing in the Planning and Urban Design Rationale.

Councillor Perks confirmed it directly in the conversation record of February 20, 2026, on the record:

"For every rent-g geared-to-income unit, the offset is three market units. And you do that math, and you wind up with this density."

Councillor Perks, conversation record, February 20, 2026, SD-01 🕒 27:00

City Planning Senior Planner Doris Ho, the planner of record on this file, confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026, that the City has no producible report on the underlying financial analysis:

"There is no report that I can point you to on the determination of the estimated '...increase of roughly 550-700 homes on the site...'. TCHC would have completed the background analysis for the IDP which I am not privy to this information."

Doris Ho, written correspondence, March 3, 2026

The density was approved on the basis of a financial model the City Planner of record cannot access and the public has never seen.

The Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, signed March 30, 2026 by Premier Ford and Prime Minister Carney with Mayor Chow present, cuts municipal development charges by up to 50 percent effective April 1, 2026. Approximately half of the City of Toronto's \$116 million incentive package for Swansea Mews was tied to development charges. The model that justified the density was materially obsolete five days after Council adopted it. The current quantum of public exposure has not been independently recalculated on the public record.

3, The Cross-Subsidy Model Is Built on a Market Its Own Proponent Declares Dead

The 3:1 market-to-RGI ratio that drives the density depends on robust market-rate sales. The applicant's own institution has stated publicly that those market conditions no longer exist.

Toronto Star, December 5, 2025: TCHC's Chief Development Officer Yves Cheung, on the Lawrence Heights Phase 2 revitalization, stated *"the current market conditions do not support the traditional*

revitalization model previously envisioned." Toronto Star, February 21, 2026: TCHC's CFO Wayne Slater described TCHC's funding situation as *"a double crisis: funding falling off a cliff steeply."*

In the same week as those filings, Bousfields Inc. and TCHC presented Swansea Mews to Council on the basis of a financial model identical in structure to the Lawrence Heights model TCHC's own CDO had publicly declared unsupported.

4, TCHC's Own Financial Health

TCHC's 2024 operating budget was \$749 million for approximately 41,000 households, approximately \$18,270 per unit per year before capital repairs. The 2026 operating budget reflects continued pressure from insurance, municipal taxes, and utilities. The City's 2025 budget projects TCHC's State of Good Repair backlog growing from \$1.752 billion to \$2.540 billion by 2034 despite sustained investment. Source: City of Toronto 2024 Budget Notes; BudgetTO 2026 Budget Notes, TCHC.

A new 35-storey concrete tower with elevator systems, mechanical systems, facade repair, and structural maintenance for a high-rise on a contaminated brownfield will carry materially higher per-unit operating cost than the portfolio average. None of this lifecycle exposure has been quantified for Swansea Mews.

5, Federal Financing Is Not Committed and the Application Does Not Yet Qualify

The Decision Report references Build Canada Homes financing as a target. No commitment exists. CMHC's Class 3 Business Case framework, the threshold federal staff use to formally assess a project for Build Canada Homes financing, requires a full financial pro forma with sources and uses, a governance and risk management plan, an implementation schedule, and an affordability certification matrix. None of these have been produced for Swansea Mews. Source: CMHC Class 3 Business Case program guidance, 2024-2025.

In January 2026, Minister Gregor Robertson withheld a \$10 million Housing Accelerator Fund payment from the City of Toronto on process compliance grounds. He stated:

"We want to be sure that everyone's following through on their commitments. Every agreement that the Government of Canada signs, we have to be looking at the integrity of the agreement."

Minister Gregor Robertson, CBC News, January 22, 2026

The same federal Minister, the same statute, the same standard. Swansea Mews seeks federal financing under the framework that standard administers.

6, The Alternative Financing Models Dismissed Without Assessment

The IDP directed by Council in April 2025 was explicit: the Actions Report would consider non-profit rental, cooperative, and private sector development partners. That assessment was never produced. The financing streams below are available to a cooperative delivery model and not to the TCHC-only tower model.

Financing Stream	Availability
Federal Co-operative Housing Development Fund	Cooperative tenure only. Not available to TCHC-only tower.
CMHC MLI Select, deeper affordability tier	Cooperative model with higher non-market percentage qualifies for more favourable terms.
Build Canada Homes, cooperative and non-profit priority stream	BCH explicitly prioritises cooperative, transitional, and non-market housing.
Homes Ontario, provincial affordable housing financing	Available to non-profit and cooperative housing providers.
Mass timber construction incentives, federal and provincial	Swansea Park mass timber model directly eligible. TCHC concrete tower is not.
CMHC Affordable Housing Fund	Requires NHTA s.4 meaningful participation. Deficient consultation jeopardises eligibility for TCHC model.

When community member Sherif El Tawil named VanCity, Canada's largest credit union by assets, as an alternative cooperative-housing lender at the November 20, 2025 event, City Planning Manager Dan Nicholson stated on audio that he had never heard of VanCity. The community was told there was no other lender. The Stage 2 Actions Report that Council directed in April 2025 would have produced an independent assessment of these financing streams. It was never produced.

7, The Swansea Park Financial Case: Modelled at 409 Units

In April 2026, the community produced a financial modelling exercise for a 409-unit version of the Swansea Park alternative. The work was prepared by SwanseaMatters.com and the Swansea Neighbourhood Group as an order-of-magnitude planning-level sketch using publicly available TCHC data, CMHC MLI Select program terms, City of Toronto 2026 Average Market Rent figures, and standard Toronto operating cost benchmarks. It is published as a planning-level sketch, not a CMHC-submission-

ready full pro forma. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was supposed to produce the full version. The community produced this modelling to fill the gap that the institutional actors refused to fill. Source: Swansea Park 409 Pro Forma Modelling, SwanseaMatters.com and Swansea Neighbourhood Group, April 2026.

The most consequential finding: at 409 units, the proportion of Rent-Geared-to-Income units rises to 37.7 percent of total units, compared to 23.7 percent in the approved 649-unit scheme. The alternative is materially more affordable per capita than the model Council adopted.

Parameter	409-Unit Modelling
Total project cost estimate	Approximately \$182 million, \$445,000 per unit, no land cost on TCHC-owned site.
154 RGI replacement units	Maintained. Every returning family accommodated.
RGI as proportion of total units	37.7 percent at 409 units, vs 23.7 percent at 649 units.
Operating cost assumption	\$950 per unit per month, all-in.
CMHC debt capacity, four options	\$48 million to \$57 million, DSCR 1.20, 4.0 percent interest, 40-year amortization.
Equity and grant gap, four options	\$125 million to \$134 million, substantially covered by City incentive package plus modest additional grants of \$9 million to \$18 million.
Cost saving versus 649-unit scheme	Approximately \$85 million to \$105 million, with no reduction in RGI replacement obligation.

The TCHC 649-unit total project cost is not on the public record. No remediation cost has been quantified for the documented contamination. No 40-year operating cost has been quantified for the 35-storey tower. No opportunity cost has been quantified for the displacement. A like-for-like comparison cannot be made until those figures are produced. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was the mechanism for producing them. It was not produced.

When modelled with the same assumptions, the 409-unit alternative is the winning proposal.

8, The Lifecycle Cost Comparison That Was Never Done

Peer-reviewed lifecycle cost analysis of comparable buildings finds mass timber construction outperforms concrete on total lifecycle cost over the building's life. A 2020 US Forest Service study of a 12-storey mass timber building against a functionally equivalent concrete building found a 2.4 percent decrease in total lifecycle cost for mass timber, driven by longer lifespan and higher end-of-life salvage value. A University of British Columbia study of two residential towers, one hybrid mass timber and one concrete, found the mass timber building outperformed across lifecycle cost. Sources: Gu et al., US Forest Service / Forest Products Journal, 2020; Teshnizi et al., UBC / Science Direct, 2018.

The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed would have required a delivery model options analysis, including a lifecycle cost comparison between the approved 35-storey concrete tower and the Swansea Park mass timber alternative. It was not produced. TCHC's State of Good Repair backlog will reach \$2.540 billion by 2034. The long-term maintenance liability of the approved tower has never been quantified.

9, Governance Failures

The Swansea Mews site is City-owned land. It was assigned to TCHC as the sole delivery vehicle without a competitive process. No Request for Proposals was issued to assess whether alternative delivery models, non-profit, cooperative, public-private partnership, or mass timber specialist, could deliver the housing objectives at lower cost or faster timeline. The City's own Framework for City-owned land development requires competitive procurement above defined thresholds.

TCHC is both the former owner of the occupied buildings and the sole development proponent. No independent financial peer review was commissioned. The confidential financial model on which public concessions were committed has never been reviewed by any entity other than the Housing Development Office that prepared the Decision Report.

Councillor Gord Perks occupied three concurrent roles in relation to this application: Ward Councillor for the community it will displace and house; Chair of the Planning and Housing Committee that assessed and approved it; and member of the TCHC Board of Directors whose application it was. He chaired the body that approved his own board's application. On February 20, 2026, six days before the hearing, he told a community representative in the conversation record that he had already decided his vote. He then chaired the hearing. The Office of the Integrity Commissioner has been made aware of the Community's concerns regarding the November 20, 2025 event, the lack of transparency throughout the consultation process, and the Councillor's concurrent roles on this file. A formal filing is being considered.

The Publicly Owned Publicly Accessible Open Space was deliberately not delineated in the zoning diagram. The applicant's own resubmission states this was done to *"provide flexibility as we go through*

the detailed design." The community was told at the November 20, 2025 event that the design was fixed. The applicant's own filed documents, submitted six weeks after the event, confirm it was not.

10, What Must Happen Before Federal Financing Is Committed

When modelled with the same assumptions, the 409-unit alternative is the winning proposal. The Stage 2 Actions Report directed by Council in April 2025 was the mechanism for testing it. It was not produced. The decision gates remain open. The Site Plan Application has not been filed. Federal financing has not been committed. Swansea Mews is precisely the file where the integrity of those commitments will be tested.

Required Step	Basis
Produce the Stage 2 Actions Report directed by Council in April 2025, PH20.8 Clause 7	Council direction. The prerequisite Council set for itself before these planning approvals proceeded. It was not met.
Independently review and update the financial pro forma at post-April 1 development charge rates	Approximately half of the \$116 million City incentive package was tied to DCs cut by up to 50 percent on April 1, 2026. The model must be re-run on current inputs.
Produce the complete CMHC Class 3 Business Case for the approved model	Council adopted a project that has not yet met CMHC's threshold to formally assess it for federal financing.
Complete the provincial engagement directed by Council in April 2025, PH20.8 Clause 8a	The province whose DC regime governs a material input has never been formally engaged on this file.
Produce an independent comparative assessment of the Swansea Park 409-unit alternative against the approved 649-unit model	The Stage 2 Actions Report was supposed to produce this. The Build Canada Homes portal is currently open.
Commission a lifecycle cost comparison	The Stage 2 Actions Report was supposed to produce this. TCHC's \$2.540 billion projected SOGR backlog by 2034 makes lifecycle exposure non-optional.

Confirm whether the November 20, 2025 event meets the NHTSA s.4 meaningful participation standard	Robertson withheld \$10 million from Toronto in January 2026 on equivalent process grounds.
---	---

The Housing Accelerator Fund and the Co-operative Housing Development Program are scheduled to expire, with total federal housing program spending projected to decline 56 percent from 2025-26 to 2028-29. Build Canada Homes is active now. A complete review must happen before the window closes, not after. Source: Parliamentary Budget Officer, Build Canada Homes and the Outlook for Housing Programs under Budget 2025, December 2025.

SECTION 2

Density

The 649-Unit Figure Is a Financial Output, Not a Planning Conclusion

In 30 Seconds

The 649-unit density figure is the arithmetic output of a financial cross-subsidy model that has never been placed on the public record. The City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 that no City report exists on the underlying analysis. The corridor at The Queensway and Windermere is being asked to absorb at around 5,000 more people, between this 649-unit proposal and the more than 1,000 additional units approved or in application at 34-50 Southport Street, with no new support services on a corridor whose schools, transit, and grocery infrastructure is already over capacity. The applicant's own resubmission of January 9, 2026 confirms that the local schools cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed. The transportation study filed with the application addressed road intersections only and did not assess Route 77 Swansea, the only TTC route serving the residential neighbourhood, for combined corridor load. The corridor's only full-service grocery anchor at 125 The Queensway is under active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal. The justification for the 649-unit figure shifted across seven distinct rationales between September 2025 and March 2026, ending with City Planning's written confirmation that no underlying report is producible. The proposal includes 654 square metres of commercial retail that no displaced tenant requested at any consultation event. A documented alternative at 409 units, prepared by architect David Peterson and modelled by the community in April 2026, delivers 250 percent of the original homes within neighbourhood-scale form and was never assessed against the approved 649-unit model. The 240-unit difference between the two proposals represents under three weeks of wait-list growth, against four years of these families' lives. Overloading a City-owned site with people, in disregard of livability, is bad decision-making and sloppy planning.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from the applicant's own filings, the Bousfields Inc. Comment/Response Matrix, written correspondence with City Planning, the verbatim hearing transcripts, and primary public-record documents.

1, The False Premise: TCHC's Own Filed Documents Refute TCHC's Consultants' Conclusion

The Decision Report adopted by Council on March 25, 2026 endorsed Bousfields Inc.'s Planning and Urban Design Rationale, which describes the proposal as compatible with neighbourhood infrastructure capacity. The applicant's own resubmission of January 9, 2026 records, in writing, that the local schools cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed. The transportation study filed with the application addressed road intersections only and did not assess Route 77 Swansea, the only TTC route serving the residential neighbourhood, for combined corridor load with the more than 1,000 additional units now approved or in application at 34-50 Southport Street. The 649-unit density figure originates in a financial cross-subsidy ratio set by Bousfields Inc. and TCHC, not in an independent capacity analysis. The City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 that no City report exists on the underlying analysis. The density was approved on a foundation that the applicant's own filings refute and that the City's own Planner cannot produce.

2, The Shifting Rationale: Seven Justifications for 649 Units

Between September 2025 and March 2026, seven distinct justifications were offered, in writing or on the record, for the 649-unit figure. Each replaced the one before it as the previous justification was challenged.

Stage	Justification Offered	Source
September 2025, Pre-Consultation Zoom	Neighbourhood density already supports it	Bousfields Inc. presentation, Pre-Consultation Zoom, September 22, 2025
November 7, 2025, Strategy Report	Site capacity will accommodate 550 to 700 homes	Public Consultation Strategy Report, Bousfields Inc., November 7, 2025
November 20, 2025 event	Required to meet replacement obligations	Bousfields presentation slides, November 20, 2025 event
February 10, 2026, Decision Report	Aligned with Avenue intensification under Provincial Policy Statement	Decision Report, City Planning, February 10, 2026
February 20, 2026, conversation record	3-to-1 market-to-RGI cross-subsidy ratio drives the math	Councillor Perks, conversation record, SD-01, 🕒 27:00

February 26, 2026, Committee hearing	The financial model was approved at the IDP stage	Decision Report rationale and Bousfields response to deputations
March 3, 2026, Doris Ho written correspondence	No City report exists on the underlying analysis	Doris Ho, City Planning, written response to community

By the seventh stage the justification had reduced to acknowledgement that the underlying analysis is not on the public record. Doris Ho, City Planning Senior Planner of record:

"There is no report that I can point you to on the determination of the estimated '...increase of roughly 550-700 homes on the site...'. TCHC would have completed the background analysis for the IDP which I am not privy to this information."

Doris Ho, City Planning, written correspondence, March 3, 2026

3, The Private Condominium Comparison Is Not a Planning Argument

In an interview broadcast on CBC News Toronto, March 31, 2026, Councillor Gord Perks defended the density at 21 Windermere Avenue by reference to the high-rise condominiums at 34-50 Southport Street, immediately south of the site:

"Look across the street. There are buildings that are taller than this. So the form is consistent with what's already there."

Councillor Gord Perks, CBC News Toronto, March 31, 2026

The Southport buildings at 34-50 Southport Street are private condominiums approved under different zoning instruments through different planning processes for a different applicant under different financing structures. They are not a planning precedent for a 35-storey TCHC tower on TCHC-owned land subject to the Planning Act, the Housing Services Act, and Toronto's Tenant Charter. Furthermore, the cumulative impact of 34-50 Southport's two approved towers (27 and 30 storeys, more than 625 units) plus the third 32-storey tower with 397 units now in application, totalling more than 1,000 additional homes on the same corridor, has not been assessed against the 649-unit Swansea Mews proposal. The argument that proximity to existing private condominium high-rises justifies adding a 35-storey TCHC tower next to them is not a planning argument. It is an argument that the corridor is large enough to absorb anything.

4, A Housing Project That Became a Commercial Development

The application includes 654 square metres of commercial retail floor space at the base of the towers. No displaced tenant requested commercial space at any consultation event. The Initial Development

Proposal of March 2025 did not specify retail. The Strategy Report of November 7, 2025 did not mention retail as a community priority. The 1,001-signature petition filed February 6, 2026 did not request retail. The 250-plus pages of community deputation at the February 26 hearing did not request retail.

The retail produces revenue. The revenue supports the financial pro forma that justifies the density. The density, in turn, is what creates the commercial frontage to support retail. The reasoning is circular. The retail is in the proposal because the financial model needs it. The financial model is built around 649 units because the retail can support that ratio of activity. Neither was driven by a community need.

5, The Nunziata Exchange and the False Premise That Entered the Committee Record

At the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing, Councillor Frances Nunziata asked the applicant whether the proposed buildings were taller than the existing condominiums on Southport. The applicant replied that the proposed towers were comparable. The exchange was recorded. It produced a false premise that entered the Committee record without correction:

What Was Asked	What Was Implied	What the Filed Documents Show
Are the proposed buildings taller than the Southport condominiums	The Southport buildings are the planning precedent	The Southport buildings were approved under separate zoning instruments through separate planning processes; combining them with the proposed Swansea Mews towers as a single corridor without cumulative impact assessment is a planning fiction.

The Decision Report adopted on March 25, 2026 cites the comparison without addressing the absence of a cumulative impact assessment for the corridor.

6, What Architect David Peterson Told the Committee

David Peterson, licensed architect, 20-year Swansea resident, and former employee of the predecessor organisation to TCHC, presented sworn deputation at the February 26, 2026 hearing. His Swansea Park alternative, publicly available since Fall 2024 at swansepark.ca, proposes 14 mid-rise buildings at 6, 8, and 10 storeys on the same site, including the same 154 mandatory RGI replacement units. At 409 units as modelled in the community pro forma of April 2026, it delivers 255 net new homes above the mandatory baseline, 266 percent of what originally stood there. The Floor Space Index is 1.42 against

the approved 3.38. The form sits within the neighbourhood context rather than above it. None of this was assessed by Bousfields or by City Planning against the approved 649-unit model. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was the mechanism for that assessment. It was not produced.

7, The Wait-List Arithmetic: Under Three Weeks of List Growth

The approved 649-unit proposal delivers 495 net new units above the 154 mandatory RGI baseline. The Swansea Park alternative at 409 units delivers 255 net new above the same baseline. The difference is 240 units. At the Toronto centralized wait list's current growth rate of 4,402 households per year, or 12.06 households per day, 240 households is the number added to the wait list in 19.9 days, in under three weeks. Over the four-year build, the wait list will grow by approximately 17,608 additional households, 73 times the 240-unit difference between the two proposals.

The 108 displaced families of Swansea Mews are being asked to wait four more years for a development justified by a density premium of 240 units, which represents under three weeks of wait-list growth. The approved proposal does not close the gap between the wait list and housing supply. It changes the wait list by under three weeks over four years.

8, Questions That Must Be Answered

The questions below are not advocacy positions. They are the questions the Decision Report does not answer and that the Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was supposed to answer.

- On what report does the 649-unit density figure rest, given that the City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing that no such report is producible - On what cumulative impact assessment for the corridor does the comparison to the Southport condominiums rest - On what financial pro forma does the 3-to-1 cross-subsidy ratio rest, given that the underlying TCHC analysis has not been placed on the public record and the model is materially affected by the April 1, 2026 development-charge cuts - On what assessment of the Swansea Park alternative does Council's adoption of the 649-unit model rest, given that the Stage 2 Actions Report directed in April 2025 was never produced - Why was 654 square metres of commercial retail included in the application when no displaced tenant requested it at any consultation event

When modelled with the same assumptions, the 409-unit alternative is the winning proposal.

SECTION 3

Timing

The Human Cost of the Wait

In 30 Seconds

These 108 families have been waiting since May 27, 2022 to come home, and they will wait at minimum until early 2030 under the approved 649-unit TCHC tower model that was never compared to a faster, cheaper, more livable alternative publicly available since Fall 2024. The earliest optimistic return date is eight years from the night the ceiling fell. Some were displaced as young adults and will return in their late twenties. Some were displaced in their eighties. The Swansea Park alternative, prepared by architect David Peterson and modelled by the community at 409 units, delivers 250 percent of the original homes in mid-rise mass timber cooperative form. It was known to TCHC and to the Ward Councillor since Fall 2024 and never shown to the displaced families at any consultation event. The 240-unit difference between the Council adopted 649-unit tower model and the documented alternative represents in under three weeks of wait-list growth, against four years of these families lives already served and four more years still ahead. Premier Ford, standing at a Toronto Community Housing building in October 2014, said of TCHC residents, they do not want a handout, they just want a hand up. Four more years of waiting for a model that was never compared to the alternative is not a hand up. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was the mechanism that would have produced the comparison. It was not produced.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from primary Council documents, the applicant's own filings, the Comment/Response Matrix filed by Bousfields Inc. on behalf of TCHC, the verbatim hearing transcripts, the conversation record of February 20, 2026, and primary news reporting.

1, The Human Cost of the Wait

On May 27, 2022, a ceiling collapsed at 21 Windermere Avenue. A woman was injured. Every one of the 108 households living at Swansea Mews was displaced. By July 2022 the site was fully vacant. Each family holds a legal right of return to replacement housing on the same site under the Planning Act and the Housing Services Act, 2011. The earliest realistic occupancy date is early 2030. That is eight years from the night the ceiling fell.

Jardel Sallay-Ferreria was 21 at displacement. He told CBC News on September 25, 2024: *"I feel like the main struggle has been communication. We need to have some sort of open channel so we can actually feel like we're getting something out of this."* He is 25 today. At the optimistic return date he will be 29.

Naomi Galit was displaced with four children, moved to a hotel when shoring began, and moved again when the hotel contract ended. She described TCHC's handling of her family's situation to CBC News in September 2022 as *"their way or the highway."*

Penny Fischer lived at Swansea Mews for 14 years before the collapse. In sworn deputation at the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing, she testified that for those 14 years she had lived with a 250-volt wire hanging loose in her unit. No committee member asked her a question.

2, The Wait They Were Sold, and the Wait They Got

Urgency was invoked at every stage of this process to justify how it was conducted. The November 20, 2025 mandatory consultation event was held on five business days' notice, by hand-delivered flyer because Canada Post timelines could not be met. The justification for that compressed notice was a federal housing funding deadline. The office of the local federal Member of Parliament confirmed on the record that no such deadline existed.

The urgency claimed in November produced neither speed nor process. As of April 2026, the Site Plan Application has not been filed. The Record of Site Condition required under Ontario Regulation 153/04 has not been filed. Federal financing has not been committed. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority had not commented on the groundwater strategy at adoption. The Natural Heritage Impact Study required for development adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland was deferred to Site Plan Application stage, after the planning instruments fixing the tower heights and density are already adopted in law.

Stage	Claimed	Delivered
November 20, 2025 consultation event	Federal funding deadline required compressed notice	The deadline did not exist. The MP's office confirmed in writing.
February 10, 2026 Decision Report	Application is complete	Six critical agency findings unresolved. Not disclosed to committee.
February 26, 2026 hearing	Committee heard the community	Four of six members present. Fischer sworn, no question asked.

March 25, 2026 Council adoption	Urgent housing need justified the process	SPA not filed. RSC not filed. Financing not committed.
March 30, 2026, five days later	Carney, Ford, Chow, DC cuts up to 50% effective April 1	Financial model materially outdated the day after adoption.

3, The Faster, Cheaper, More Livable Alternative That Was Suppressed

Since Fall 2024, a documented alternative has been publicly available at swanseapark.ca. The Swansea Park Housing Proposal was prepared by David Peterson, licensed architect, 20-year Swansea resident, and former employee of the predecessor organisation to TCHC. It proposes 14 mid-rise buildings of 6, 8, and 10 storeys on the same 5.24-acre site, including the same 154 mandatory RGI replacement units. At 409 units as modelled in the community pro forma of April 2026, it delivers 255 net new homes above the mandatory baseline, 266 percent of what originally stood there, in the order of 250 percent. The proposal was known to TCHC and to the Ward Councillor since Fall 2024. It was never shown to displaced families at any consultation event.

The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 under PH20.8 Clause 7 was specifically required to include a delivery model options analysis comparing TCHC-only development with non-profit, cooperative, and private sector alternatives. It was never produced. Shane Bourne, TCHC's Senior Manager of Revitalization Engagement, told CBC News on March 31, 2026: *"We are engaging intentionally on the project that we've done our due diligence on."* TCHC has not assessed the alternative. It has no intention of doing so.

The 35-storey tower requires deep foundation engineering on a site with peat to 10.7 metres depth, contamination at multiples of the residential standard, and methane above the MECP screening threshold. A 6-to-10-storey mid-rise on shallower foundations does not impose the same Record of Site Condition delineation, the same dewatering treatment burden, or the same TRCA review scope. The Natural Heritage Impact Study required adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland is materially shorter, more focused study for a mid-rise than for a 35-storey tower casting cumulative shadow on the wetland. The 35-storey tower triggers wind-tunnel peer review, expanded shadow-study peer review, specialised mechanical and envelope engineering for high-rise wind and fire loading, and elevator and life-safety code compliance at a scale a mid-rise does not require. Each is a review cycle. Each takes time.

Mass timber assembles from prefabricated panels manufactured off-site, materially faster than cast-in-place concrete for buildings under 12 storeys. The City of Toronto built mass timber affordable housing at 35 Bellevue Avenue precisely because the construction speed is one of its documented advantages, attended at groundbreaking by Mayor Chow on December 19, 2024. The City's own news release states

the building *"will be constructed with mass timber which is a building material that is a renewable resource and has a lower carbon footprint than concrete"* and *"will exceed Tier 2 of the Toronto Green Standard v.4 and will achieve the City's TransformTO Net Zero Strategy goal."*

The TCHC 649-unit total project cost, the cost of remediating the documented contamination on the site, and the 40-year operating cost of a 35-storey concrete tower on that brownfield are not on the public record. The community has modelled an alternative at 409 units. The institutional actors have not modelled either. The City of Toronto incentives figure of approximately 116 million dollars originally identified for the 649-unit scheme is materially affected by the April 1, 2026 development-charge cuts under the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build. The community-modelled alternative delivers 37.7 percent Rent-Geared-to-Income, against 23.7 percent in the approved 649-unit scheme. Cooperative tenure as proposed in the Swansea Park alternative is eligible for the federal Co-operative Housing Development Program, the Build Canada Homes cooperative and non-profit priority stream, and CMHC MLI Select with deeper-affordability incentives. The TCHC tower model is not.

The approved tower places 1,558 residents on 5.24 acres at 16.6 times the Toronto city average density and three times the density of the Bay Street Corridor. It includes 654 square metres of commercial retail no displaced tenant requested. The schools serving this area, confirmed in writing by the school board in the January 9, 2026 application resubmission, *"are operating at capacity and cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed."* The corridor's only grocery anchor at 125 The Queensway is under active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal. Route 77 Runnymede is the only TTC route serving the site and was not studied for combined corridor load with the Southport lands. The Swansea Park alternative proposes 60 percent naturalized landscape, a Floor Space Index of 1.42 against the approved 3.38, and a form that sits within the neighbourhood context rather than above it.

4, What the Density Premium Actually Costs the Wait List

The approved proposal delivers 495 net new units above the 154 mandatory RGI baseline. The Swansea Park alternative at 409 units as modelled delivers 255 net new above the same baseline. The difference is 240 units. At the Toronto centralized wait list's current growth rate of 4,402 households per year, or 12.06 households per day, 240 households is the number added to the wait list in 19.9 days, in under three weeks.

The 108 displaced families of Swansea Mews are being asked to wait four more years for a development justified by a density premium of 240 units, which represents under three weeks of wait-list growth. Over those four years the wait list will grow by approximately 17,608 additional households, 73 times the 240-unit difference. The approved proposal does not close the gap between the wait list and housing supply. It changes the wait list by under three weeks over four years.

5, The Sequential Gates Still Ahead

Dependency, Current Status	What It Gates
Record of Site Condition not filed. Methane study failed TOR. Second round December 17, 2025. Documented groundwater exceedances.	Demolition permit cannot issue. Construction cannot begin for residential use under O. Reg. 153/04.
Toronto Hydro municipal consent not provided as of January 9, 2026.	Building permit cannot issue without utility sign-off.
TRCA has not commented on groundwater strategy.	Site Plan Application cannot be finalised until TRCA confirms the Humber watershed strategy.
Natural Heritage Impact Study deferred to SPA stage. Not commissioned. Must be conducted by a qualified ecologist.	SPA cannot be approved until NHIS is complete.
Site Plan Application not yet filed.	Building permit cannot issue before SPA is approved.
Federal financing not committed. CMHC Class 3 Business Case not produced.	Demolition cannot begin before financing is secured.

These gates are sequential, not parallel. None of them runs faster on a 35-storey tower than on a 6-to-10-storey mid-rise.

6, What the Wait Costs the Public

The IDP filed March 27, 2025 states that TCHC incurs approximately \$75,000 per month to secure and maintain the vacant site. The full public cost, including lost rental income on 108 occupied units, security, shoring, fencing, emergency response, and the opportunity cost of idle land, is approximately \$790,000 per month, documented in the Community Evidentiary Record, April 2026.

Milestone	Approximate Public Cost at \$790,000 per month from July 2022
March 25, 2026 Council adoption, month 44	Approximately \$33 million to date
End of 2026 earliest demolition estimate, month 53	Approximately \$42 million

Early 2030 optimistic occupancy, month 90	Approximately \$71 million
---	----------------------------

7, Three Statements, Eighteen Months, the Return Keeps Receding

Between April 2025 and March 2026, Councillor Gord Perks, the Ward Councillor, Planning and Housing Committee Chair, and a TCHC Board Director, made three public statements to CBC News about when the displaced families could expect to return home. Placed in sequence, the timeline lengthened.

Date	Statement	Implied Return
April 11, 2025	<i>"Once shovels are in the ground, it may take about two to three years before tenants move in."</i>	Shovels end of 2026, plus 2 to 3 years, equals 2028 to 2029.
November 7, 2025	<i>"At least a couple of years before the build is completed, even if everything goes right."</i>	2028 to 2029 or later.
March 31, 2026	<i>"Hopes residents will be able to return to Swansea Mews in three or four years."</i>	2029 to 2030.

8, Premier Ford: A Hand Up, Not a Hand Out

In October 2014, standing at the Toronto Community Housing building at 275 Shuter Street, Doug Ford, then a Toronto mayoral candidate, said this about the residents of TCHC:

"They don't want a handout, they just want a hand up."

Doug Ford, at a TCHC property, CBC News, October 16, 2014

The 108 families of Swansea Mews are TCHC residents. They want to come home. They have been displaced nearly four years. Their unit mix does not yet match what they lived in before. The school their children will attend has confirmed in writing it cannot accommodate additional students. The corridor's only grocery anchor is under active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal. The transit study did not model Route 77 with the adjacent Southport lands. The shadow study on the Grenadier Pond wetland was conducted by the applicant's planning consultant, states its conclusion three times as *"our opinion,"* and has not been reviewed by an ecologist.

Premier Ford's August 2024 statement to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario named the standard: *"We also recognize the need to invest in the public spaces that foster a strong sense of*

community and belonging. We need to work together to build the roads, highways, transit, homes, hospitals and schools our growing communities need. Where people and families can live, thrive, and prosper." Measured against that standard, Swansea Mews at 21 Windermere Avenue is not a complete community. It is 649 units of a financial model, delivered at the cost of an eight-year wait for the 108 families whose right of return is the only reason this project is being built.

9, What Must Change for These Families to Come Home Sooner

When modelled with the same assumptions, the 409-unit alternative is the winning proposal.

The Province of Ontario, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, holds statutory authority over the Planning Act and the process by which housing is approved in Ontario. The Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build signed March 30, 2026 commits \$8.8 billion in joint federal and provincial funding to reduce the cost and accelerate the delivery of housing in Ontario. That agreement was signed five days after Swansea Mews was adopted.

The federal government, through Build Canada Homes and the Build Communities Strong Fund, has named the standard for federal financing: housing connected to the infrastructure and services that make a community work. Prime Minister Carney, launching the Build Communities Strong Fund on April 7, 2026: *"more homes, lower housing costs, tens of thousands of new careers in the skilled trades. We're looking to reduce the cost to build."* Minister Gregor Robertson, on Build Canada Homes in March 2026: *"By combining federal and provincial resources, we're not only accelerating the delivery of thousands of affordable homes, but we're also creating a community with schools, childcare, and supports that families need to thrive."*

What must change, measured against those standards: a pause on further approvals while the Stage 2 Actions Report directed in April 2025 is produced, including the delivery model options analysis comparing TCHC-only development with cooperative and non-profit alternatives; provincial intervention through MMAH to verify this file meets the standard the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build committed to on March 30, 2026; federal due diligence through Build Canada Homes and CMHC before any financing commitment is made to the approved TCHC tower model; and a written answer from the responsible parties, to the 108 families, on why the Swansea Park alternative was known since Fall 2024 and not shown to them at any consultation event.

10, What the Record Shows

The number	The source
May 27, 2022	Ceiling collapse date. CBC News; TCHC website.

July 2022	Site fully vacant. Ontario Construction News, March 2026.
41 of 154 units already vacant at collapse	TCHC spokesperson Robin Smith, CP24, June 2022.
\$75,000 per month, TCHC direct site cost	IDP, March 27, 2025.
\$790,000 per month, full public cost	Community Evidentiary Record, April 2026.
Approximately \$33 million to April 2026	\$790,000 times approximately 44 months since July 2022.
154 mandatory RGI replacement baseline	Planning Act and Housing Services Act, 2011; both proposals.
649 units, TCHC approved proposal	Decision Report, Item PH28.2, February 10, 2026.
409 units, Swansea Park modelled alternative, 331 to 461 range	Swansea Park Housing Proposal, December 2024; 409 Pro Forma Modelling, April 2026.
240-unit difference between proposals, above mandatory baseline	649 minus 409 equals 240.
Under three weeks of wait-list growth equals 240 households	240 divided by 12.06 households per day equals 19.9 days.
17,608 additional households over 4-year build	4 times 4,402 annual growth.
73 times the density premium	17,608 divided by 240.
8 years minimum displacement	May 2022 to early 2030.
6 critical agency clearances unresolved at adoption	Bousfields Inc. Comment/Response Matrix, January 9, 2026.
Stage 2 Actions Report, never produced	City Council Direction PH20.8, Clause 7, April 2025.
\$8.8 billion Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build	Announced March 30, 2026. Five days after adoption.

\$51 billion Build Communities Strong Fund

Launched April 7, 2026 by PM Carney in
Brampton.

SECTION 4

Environment

The Site Is Contaminated, the Clearances Are Unresolved, and None Was Disclosed at the Hearing

In 30 Seconds

The site is contaminated. The applicant's own retained consultants confirmed lead at 30.4 times the Ontario residential standard, mercury at 6.1 times, cadmium at 22.6 times, and groundwater suspended solids at 760 times the storm sewer discharge limit. Sirati and Partners' own conclusion in the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment of November 26, 2025 states further investigation is required to delineate the extent of the soil impacts. That further investigation has not been done. Methane was recorded at 11 percent of the Lower Explosive Limit at one well, exceeding the MECP screening threshold. Only two monitoring events were conducted. The study calls for additional rounds. None has been done. Sirati's own geotechnical report identifies peat to a depth of 10.7 metres, classifies the site Seismic Site Class D, and rules out shallow foundations. Sirati's own hydrogeological report states the contaminated water generated from this site cannot be discharged into the local sewer system without treatment. No treatment plan has been designed, engineered, or costed. No Record of Site Condition has been filed. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority had not commented on the groundwater strategy at adoption. The Natural Heritage Impact Study required by Provincial Policy Statement 2024 was deferred to Site Plan stage, after the planning instruments that fix the 35-storey tower height are already in law. The corridor's water-system history is on the public record: a sinkhole on Coe Hill Drive in 2015, a sinkhole on Windermere Avenue in January 2026, and the City's own Basement Flooding Protection Program Notice of Study Completion confirming the sewer infrastructure does not meet Level-of-Service targets for extreme rainfall. None of this was disclosed to the Planning and Housing Committee at the February 26 hearing. Council adopted on March 25, 2026 against this evidence.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from Sirati and Partners under Project SP25-01471-00, AGAT Laboratories Work Order 25T353541, the City of Toronto Basement Flooding Protection Program Master Plan Study for Areas 42, 44 and 62, primary news reporting on the February 2015 and January 2026 sinkholes, the Comment/Response Matrix filed by Bousfields Inc. on behalf of TCHC, the sworn deputations at the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing, and primary public-record documents.

1, The False Premise: TCHC's Own Filed Documents Contain Unresolved Environmental Findings

The applicant's own retained consultants conducted environmental testing on this site. The results were filed with the application. They confirm contamination and methane hazard above provincial thresholds. They identify regulatory clearances that have not been obtained. They were not disclosed to the Planning and Housing Committee at the February 26, 2026 hearing. Council adopted the application on March 25, 2026 against this evidence.

Unresolved Finding at Adoption	Status, March 25, 2026
Record of Site Condition under O. Reg. 153/04	Not filed. Required before residential use change on a site with documented contamination.
Methane Hazard Clearance under MECP Guideline D-4-1	One well at 11 percent LEL exceeds 10 percent screening threshold. Two monitoring events only. Sirati calls for more. None done.
Soil and groundwater contamination	Lead at 30.4 times Table 2 residential standard. Mercury 6.1 times. Cadmium 22.6 times. Groundwater suspended solids 760 times storm sewer limit. Extent not delineated.
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority sign-off	Not provided. Watershed regulator silent at adoption.
Natural Heritage Impact Study, OP 3.4.14 and 3.4.15, PPS 2024	Deferred to Site Plan stage, after planning instruments are in law.
Toronto Green Standard Tier 2 compliance	Deferred to Site Plan stage. Not demonstrated at planning approval.

2, The Lab Results: What the Applicant's Own Consultants Found

The contamination on this site is documented by Sirati and Partners Consultants Ltd. under Project SP25-01471-00. Laboratory analysis was performed by AGAT Laboratories under Work Order 25T353541. Results below are compared against Ontario Regulation 153/04, Table 2, Residential, Parkland and Institutional Standards.

Contaminant, Location	Measured	Standard	Multiple
-----------------------	----------	----------	----------

Lead, BH/MW-20, duplicate	3,650 ug/g	120 ug/g	30.4 times
Lead, BH/MW-20, primary	1,650 ug/g	120 ug/g	13.75 times
Lead, BH/MW-08	1,090 ug/g	120 ug/g	9.1 times
Mercury, BH/MW-20	1.64 ug/g	0.27 ug/g	6.1 times
Cadmium, BH-10	27.1 ug/g	1.2 ug/g	22.6 times
Arsenic, BH-10	55 ug/g	18 ug/g	3.1 times
Benzo(a)pyrene, BH/MW-15, groundwater	0.11 ug/L	0.01 ug/L	11 times
Total Suspended Solids, BH/MW-18, groundwater	11,400 mg/L	15 mg/L storm limit	760 times
Methane, BH/MW-20, October 30, 2025	11 percent LEL	10 percent screening threshold	Above threshold

Sirati's own conclusion in the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment of November 26, 2025 states further investigation is required to delineate the extent of the soil impacts. That investigation has not been done. The methane study calls for additional monitoring rounds. None has been done. Lead poisoning in children is permanent and irreversible. There is no safe threshold.

3, The Record of Site Condition: The Statutory Gate That Has Not Been Cleared

Ontario Regulation 153/04 under the Environmental Protection Act requires that a Record of Site Condition be filed with and acknowledged by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks before land use changes to a more sensitive category on a site with identified contamination. Residential use is among the most sensitive categories. The RSC requires completion of all Phase assessments and, where contamination is confirmed, either a Phase Three risk assessment or full remediation to Table 2 standards.

No Record of Site Condition has been filed for 21 Windermere Avenue. No Phase Three risk assessment has been initiated. No remediation plan has been prepared. A building permit for residential construction cannot legally issue until the RSC process is complete. The RSC gate sits with MECP. It has not been cleared.

4, Groundwater, the Subsurface, and What This Corridor Has Already Told Us About Its Own Water Table

Sirati's Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated January 5, 2026, identifies peat deposits to a depth of 10.7 metres beneath the proposed site, classifies the site as Seismic Site Class D, and rules out shallow foundations. Sirati's Hydrogeological Investigation Report, also dated January 5, 2026, states explicitly that the contaminated water generated from this site cannot be discharged into the local sewer system without appropriate treatment. No water treatment plan has been designed, engineered, or costed. No Excess Soil Management Program has been prepared under Ontario Regulation 406/19, despite the confirmed lead, mercury, cadmium, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon contamination in the fill material that will be excavated.

The water-system history of this corridor is on the public record. On February 12, 2015, a sinkhole approximately two metres wide and three metres deep opened on Coe Hill Drive. CBC News Toronto reported the same day that the sinkhole began with a water main break and that the sewers beneath the road subsequently collapsed; residents told the broadcaster the road had been seemingly unstable for several years. The TTC 71 Runnymede route was diverted around it. On January 7, 2026, a four-foot-deep sinkhole opened on Windermere Avenue at Waller Avenue, before any construction activity at 21 Windermere. Two drivers sustained vehicle damage. Sources: CBC News Toronto, February 12, 2015; CBC News, CTV News, CityNews Toronto, CP24, January 7, 2026.

The City of Toronto's Basement Flooding Protection Program identifies 21 Windermere Avenue within the geographic scope of Study Areas 42, 44, and 62, extending from St. Clair Avenue West to Lake Ontario and from Jane Street to the Don Valley Parkway. The City's own page describes this study area as having experienced basement and recurring surface flooding during extreme rainfall events. The Master Plan Study advanced through public consultation in 2024 and a Notice of Study Completion was issued, confirming that the existing infrastructure does not meet the City's own Level-of-Service targets for handling extreme rainfall, including 90 millimetres of rain within six hours. Source: City of Toronto Basement Flooding Study Area 42, 44, 62 public consultation page; Master Plan Study materials, 2024.

The site sits within the Toronto and Region Source Protection Area established under the Clean Water Act, 2006. Highly Vulnerable Aquifer designations within this framework carry a groundwater vulnerability score of 6 out of 10, the standard score for granular or fractured-rock aquifer materials with high permeability near the surface, where contamination introduced at the surface can reach

groundwater quickly. Source: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Source Protection Plan; Province of Ontario Source Water Protection guidance.

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority holds regulatory jurisdiction over the Humber River sub-watershed adjacent to this site, which includes Grenadier Pond and Catfish Pond. The TRCA had not commented on the groundwater strategy at the time Council adopted on March 25, 2026. Architect David Peterson confirmed this in sworn deputation at the February 26 hearing.

5, The Natural Heritage Impact Study: Deferred, Not Done

City of Toronto Official Plan Policies 3.4.14 and 3.4.15, and Provincial Policy Statement 2024, require a Natural Heritage Impact Study for development proposed adjacent to the natural heritage system, including a Provincially Significant Wetland and an Environmentally Significant Area. The High Park Environmentally Significant Area and the Grenadier Pond Provincially Significant Wetland are immediately adjacent to this site.

The NHIS was formally deferred to the Site Plan Application stage. Council adopted the planning instruments on March 25, 2026. The tower heights, massing, and building footprints are now fixed in law. The study that would assess whether those heights and footprints are ecologically acceptable has not been commissioned. Deferral to Site Plan stage cannot now influence the built form. It is a sequencing failure that forecloses the study's ability to perform its intended function.

6, Shadow Impacts on Grenadier Pond: Dismissed Without an Ecologist

Parks Planning identified net new shadows cast on the east bank of Grenadier Pond at 3:18 p.m. on December 21, contrary to Official Plan Policy 3.2.3.3. The applicant's response, recorded in the Bousfields Inc. Comment/Response Matrix of January 9, 2026, was that skating on Grenadier Pond is not permitted. No ecological assessment was produced. A shadow impact on a Provincially Significant Wetland was dismissed with a statement about skating permissions.

The shadow study itself, prepared by Bousfields Inc. for TCHC, sampled four dates: the spring and fall equinoxes and the summer and winter solstices. On December 21, the proposal casts shadows on Catfish Pond from 12:18 p.m. onwards (approximately six hours) and on Grenadier Pond from 2:18 p.m. onwards (approximately four hours). The study did not model the days, weeks, or months surrounding those four sampled dates. The flora and fauna of a Provincially Significant Wetland respond to cumulative light exposure, not discrete sampling. The study cites Official Plan Policy 3.1.1(17)(d), which requires shadows on natural features be minimized to preserve their utility and ecological health. The study assesses utility. It does not assess ecological health. The study's own conclusion is described in its own words as "our opinion," used three times in the closing paragraph. It is the planning opinion of the

applicant's paid consultant. It was not reviewed by an ecologist, by the TRCA, or by any party with jurisdiction over the natural heritage features the shadow falls on.

David Peterson, architect and Swansea resident, named the deficiency in sworn deputation at the February 26, 2026 hearing:

"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."

David Peterson, sworn deputation, Planning and Housing Committee, February 26, 2026, 🕒 1:30:58

7, Toronto Green Standard Tier 2: The Obligation on City-Owned Land

The TransformTO Net Zero Strategy, adopted by City Council, commits Toronto to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040 and requires City-owned developments to meet Toronto Green Standard Tier 2 as a condition of approval. The Decision Report confirms this obligation applies to Swansea Mews. Tier 2 compliance has not been demonstrated at the planning approval stage. The full Tier 2 assessment, including net-zero energy pathway, embodied carbon, and mechanical systems, is deferred to Site Plan Control.

The City's own 35 Bellevue Avenue project, attended by Mayor Chow at groundbreaking on December 19, 2024 with Councillor Dianne Saxe, is constructed using mass timber and, in the City's own news release, will exceed Tier 2 of the Toronto Green Standard v.4 and will achieve the City's TransformTO Net Zero Strategy goal. The Swansea Mews proposal is conventional concrete. The Swansea Park alternative uses mass timber. Neither has been assessed against the TransformTO standard. Source: City of Toronto news release, December 19, 2024.

8, The Provincial and Federal Standards This File Fails Against

The Province of Ontario holds direct statutory jurisdiction over the three largest unresolved environmental obligations on this file. The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks administers Ontario Regulation 153/04, which governs the Record of Site Condition. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority operates under provincial authority through the Conservation Authorities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.27, and holds jurisdiction over the Humber River sub-watershed. The Provincial Policy Statement 2024 is the Province's own consolidated land use planning policy and requires that development adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland, an Environmentally Significant Area, and the natural heritage system demonstrate no negative impact before approval.

Premier Ford reversed the Greenbelt changes in 2023 after the Auditor General found the process flawed. His public statements on the reversal acknowledged that ecologically sensitive land adjacent to communities requires a higher standard of scrutiny.

The Government of Canada, through the Build Communities Strong Fund launched April 7, 2026 by Prime Minister Carney in Brampton, has committed \$51 billion over 10 years to building infrastructure that makes communities resilient. Federal housing financing under CMHC and Build Canada Homes requires environmental clearance as a condition of financing commitment. No RSC has been filed. TRCA has not commented. The NHIS has not been produced. CMHC environmental clearance standards require RSC discharge before construction financing can be advanced.

9, What Must Be Resolved Before Demolition Proceeds

The following are not advocacy positions. They are the regulatory clearances and assessments that the documented evidence requires, before any further approvals proceed.

- Record of Site Condition under O. Reg. 153/04 must be filed and acknowledged by MECP before Site Plan Approval is granted. Phase Three risk assessment or remediation to Table 2 standards must be completed first. - The full extent of soil and groundwater contamination must be delineated, as Sirati's own Phase Two ESA expressly requires. - The methane monitoring program must complete the additional rounds Sirati's own report calls for, and a formal Methane Risk Management Plan must be accepted by MECP. - The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority must formally assess the groundwater management strategy and the watershed implications of dewatering a 35-storey foundation on a contaminated site. - The Natural Heritage Impact Study must be completed by a qualified ecologist before Site Plan Approval, including an ecological assessment of cumulative shadow exposure on the Grenadier Pond Provincially Significant Wetland. - An Excess Soil Management Program under O. Reg. 406/19 must be prepared and accepted before any demolition or excavation proceeds. - A water treatment plan for the contaminated dewatering effluent must be designed, engineered, and costed. - Toronto Green Standard Tier 2 compliance must be demonstrated at the planning approval stage, not deferred to Site Plan Control.

SECTION 5

Community Impact

A Neighbourhood That Cannot Support It

In 30 Seconds

No Community Services and Facilities Study has been produced for the 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue. The City of Toronto Official Plan, Policy 5.5, requires one for residential development of this size and scale. City Planning Senior Planner Doris Ho confirmed in writing on March 6, 2026 that the City relied on the Bloor West Village Avenue Study of 2018, prepared for a commercial corridor, in lieu of a residential capacity study. The corridor at The Queensway and Windermere is being asked to absorb at around 5,000 more people, between this 649-unit development and the more than 1,000 additional units approved or in application at 34-50 Southport Street. All of the broader area schools are operating at capacity and cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed. This was confirmed in writing on December 5, 2025 in the January 9, 2026 resubmission. The applicant's filed response was two words: "Information. Noted." The transportation study did not assess Route 77 Swansea, the only TTC bus serving the residential neighbourhood north of The Queensway, for combined corridor load. The corridor's only full-service grocery anchor at 125 The Queensway is under active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal, confirmed in writing by City Planning on March 6, 2026 and never disclosed at the February 26 hearing. The Swansea Community Recreation Centre was already fully booked when TCHC tried to use it as the consultation venue, before anyone could attend. The Initial Development Proposal committed 1,400 to 1,860 square metres of community space; what was filed delivers 1,204 with no allocation to childcare. A complete Community Impact Study, assessing this development in the cumulative context of the towers approved and pending around it, is essential. It cannot be deferred to Site Plan stage, after the tower heights are already adopted in law.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from the school board's written response in the applicant's own January 9, 2026 resubmission, the verbatim transcript of the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing, written correspondence between the community and City Planning, the applicant's filed Public Consultation Strategy Report, and the community-prepared Forensic Q and A Assessment of March 6, 2026.

1, The Study That Was Never Done

The City of Toronto Official Plan, Policy 5.5, requires a Community Services and Facilities Study for residential development of this size and scale. No CS&F Study has been produced for 21 Windermere Avenue. City Planning Senior Planner Doris Ho confirmed in writing on March 6, 2026 that the City relied on the Bloor West Village Avenue Study of 2018 in lieu of a CS&F Study. The Bloor West Village Avenue Study was prepared in 2018 to assess the commercial Avenue along Bloor Street West. It is not a residential capacity study and does not address the corner of The Queensway and Windermere Avenue. The substitute study does not satisfy the Official Plan requirement.

Service	Assessed for Cumulative Capacity	Source
Schools	No	TCDSB written response, January 9, 2026 resubmission, applicant's own filing
Transit, Route 77 Swansea	No	Transportation study filed addressed road intersections only
Grocery, full service	No	Sobeys at 125 The Queensway under active OLT appeal, undisclosed at hearing
Recreation, Swansea Community Recreation Centre	No	Centre already fully booked at the consultation venue stage
Libraries	No	No library capacity assessment in the application
Public health	No	No assessment in the application
Childcare	No	550 sq m community space allocated, no childcare component
Emergency services	No	No assessment in the application

2, Schools: All of the Broader Area Schools Are at Capacity

In a written response submitted on December 5, 2025 and included verbatim in the January 9, 2026 resubmission, the Toronto Catholic District School Board stated:

"The local elementary and secondary schools are operating at capacity and cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed."

Toronto Catholic District School Board, December 5, 2025, Section 8.1 of the resubmission

The applicant's filed response in the Comment/Response Matrix was two words: *"Information. Noted."* No additional accommodation plan, no school site dedication, no boundary adjustment, no enrolment cap, no capacity expansion, no transportation alternative, no offsetting investment was offered.

The schools serving the broader area are at capacity. At Toronto's city-wide multipliers of 0.28 to 0.40 children per unit, 495 net new units would generate approximately 138 to 198 additional children of school age. The schools they would attend cannot accommodate them.

3, Transit: One Bus Route, Two Developments, No Cumulative Study

Route 77 Swansea is the only TTC bus route serving the residential neighbourhood north of The Queensway. The Transportation Impact Study filed by the applicant on January 9, 2026 addressed road intersections, vehicle movement, and parking. It did not assess Route 77 Swansea for combined ridership with the more than 1,000 additional units now approved or in application at 34-50 Southport Street, immediately south of the site. Doris Ho confirmed this in writing on March 6, 2026.

A complete cumulative assessment would have modelled combined Route 77 ridership at peak hours, considered service expansion options, and assessed peak-hour operating cost at the corridor level. None of this was done. The Decision Report does not address Route 77.

4, Grocery and Daily Services: The Anchor Is Under Active Appeal

The corridor's only full-service grocery anchor is the Sobeys at 125 The Queensway, half a block south of the proposed site. Doris Ho confirmed in writing on March 6, 2026:

"The Sobeys at 125 The Queensway is currently under appeal at the Ontario Land Tribunal."

Doris Ho, City Planning, written correspondence, March 6, 2026

The active OLT appeal was not disclosed at the February 26 hearing. The Decision Report does not address it. If the appeal succeeds, the corridor's only full-service grocery option for the existing population, plus 1,500 new residents from this proposal, plus approximately 3,000 new residents from the Southport towers, will be displaced. No replacement grocery commitment exists in any planning instrument.

The 654 square metres of commercial retail at the base of the proposed towers is not a grocery replacement. The Strategy Report and Decision Report describe it as ground-floor retail, neighbourhood-serving. There is no commitment to a full-service grocery occupant.

5, Recreation, Childcare, Libraries, Community Space

The Initial Development Proposal of March 2025 committed 1,400 to 1,860 square metres of community space. The approved application delivers 1,204 square metres. The reduction of approximately 200 to 650 square metres has not been justified in any filed document. No childcare allocation appears in the 550 square metres designated as community space.

The Swansea Community Recreation Centre, the area's primary recreation facility, was the venue first sought by TCHC for the November 20, 2025 consultation event. It was unavailable because it was already fully booked, before anyone could attend. The Centre's capacity is fully utilized by the existing population. The 649-unit development places no investment in additional recreation capacity to serve approximately 1,500 new residents.

The proposed open space is elevated above the towers, not at ground level. The Swansea Park alternative proposes 60 percent of the site as naturalized landscape, with ground-level courtyards and porches at every building. At 409 units, as modelled in the community-prepared pro forma of April 2026, the alternative delivers 37.7 percent of total units as Rent-Geared-to-Income, compared to 23.7 percent in the approved 649-unit scheme. The returning community was never shown the alternative. Sources: Swansea Park Housing Proposal, David Peterson, Architect, swanseapark.ca, December 2024; Swansea Park 409 Pro Forma Modelling, SwanseaMatters.com and Swansea Neighbourhood Group, April 2026.

6, The Families Who Are Returning: Unit Mix, the Lottery, and the Question That Cannot Be Answered

The approved unit mix is 233 one-bedroom, 188 two-bedroom, 163 three-bedroom, 52 studios, and 13 family units. Toronto's Growing Up Guidelines require a minimum proportion of large-family units in family-oriented developments. The approved mix delivers 33 fewer large-family units than the Guidelines specify. Bousfields Inc.'s presentation to the November 20, 2025 event characterised the mix as "*well above and beyond*" the Guidelines. The Community Submission filed February 6, 2026 documented the shortfall against the Guidelines, line by line.

The 154 mandatory Rent-Geared-to-Income replacement units have no published bedroom-type breakdown. No household survey of the displaced families has been conducted to determine what each family needs. On December 2, 2025, the 108 returning households were assigned units by random lottery. The lottery format is a departure from the needs-based allocation standard used at Regent Park, Lawrence Heights, and Don Somerville, where unit assignment was based on household composition,

accessibility needs, and the unit type each family had occupied before displacement. The Decision Report does not justify the departure.

A former resident, audio recording, November 20, 2025 event:

"We are people. Just fix it."

7, Equity

The Initial Development Proposal references equity-deserving groups. No equity impact assessment was produced for this application. The 108 displaced families include single-parent households, persons with disabilities, seniors aging in place, and newcomer families. The applicant has not assessed how the design choices documented above bear differentially on these groups.

The 108 households are TCHC tenants. TCHC is the proponent of the application that determines their housing. The structural dependency means dissent is not safe. This is documented in the depositions of multiple former residents at the February 26, 2026 hearing.

No accessibility survey of the returning community has been completed. The TCHC Tenant Charter, sections 1 through 9, sets out tenant rights to participation, dignity, and accessibility. Multiple sections were breached at the November 20, 2025 event and have not been addressed by the TCHC Board.

8, What Must Happen Before This Proceeds

The deficiencies documented above fall across multiple jurisdictions. School capacity is administered by the Toronto District School Board and the Toronto Catholic District School Board, both operating under the provincial Ministry of Education. Public transit policy and funding decisions affecting Route 77 Swansea operate under the provincial Ministry of Transportation. Public health services capacity is administered through the provincial Ministry of Health. The Ontario Land Tribunal, the body adjudicating the active appeal on the corridor's only grocery anchor at 125 The Queensway, operates under the provincial Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The Province of Ontario therefore holds direct or supervisory jurisdiction over the analysis required to close the gaps documented here.

Required Step	Basis
Complete a Community Services and Facilities Study under Official Plan Policy 5.5	The Bloor West Village Avenue Study of 2018 is not a residential capacity study and does not satisfy the requirement.
Cumulative transportation assessment of Route 77 Swansea, including the Southport developments	Doris Ho confirmed in writing March 6, 2026 that no such assessment exists.

Capacity assessment from the Toronto District School Board, with the response disclosed publicly	TDSB response was not in the application file.
Disclose the OLT appeal at 125 The Queensway and a corresponding grocery-replacement commitment	Active OLT appeal was undisclosed at the February 26 hearing.
Childcare allocation and recreation expansion commitments	No childcare in the 550 sq m community space; Recreation Centre at capacity.
Bedroom-type breakdown for the 154 RGI replacement units, household-needs survey	No needs analysis has been conducted; lottery assignment proceeded without one.
Equity Impact Assessment	None has been produced.

Community Consultation

An Information Performance Presented as a Mandatory Consultation

In 30 Seconds

The November 20, 2025 event was an information performance presented as a mandatory consultation, and it did not meet the City's Official Plan Policy 5.5 standard, the Planning Act s. 17(15) standard, or the National Housing Strategy Act s. 4(2) standard. It was held on five business days' notice in a school basement on a federal funding deadline that did not exist. The notice was hand-delivered because Canada Post timelines could not be met. The MP's office confirmed in writing that the federal deadline did not exist. The venue had no amplification. Persons with disabilities were turned away. The format was drop-in, not facilitated dialogue. The outcome was declared fixed before anyone spoke. The community survey closed three days before the event was held, recording no input from any attendee. The event was conducted by a Councillor occupying three concurrent roles, Ward Councillor, Chair of the Planning and Housing Committee that adopted the application, and Director on the TCHC Board whose application this is, who told a community representative on the record six days before the hearing that his vote was already decided. The application and its planning consultant nonetheless claimed that the consultation requirements had been fulfilled. They were not. The Office of the Integrity Commissioner has been made aware of the Community's concerns regarding the November 20, 2025 event, the lack of transparency throughout the consultation process, and the Councillor's concurrent roles on this file. A formal filing is being considered. The Province, through MMAH, has statutory authority to direct re-consultation under the Planning Act. The federal government, through Build Canada Homes and CMHC, has authority to require it under the National Housing Strategy Act before financing is committed. The site should not advance until re-consultation is held, with the Swansea Park alternative shown beside the approved 649-unit model and a record authenticated by attendees.

What follows is the evidence that supports each of those statements, drawn from the applicant's filings, the Bousfields Inc. Public Consultation Strategy Report of November 7, 2025, audio recordings made at the November 20 event, sworn deputations at the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing, written correspondence between the community and City Planning, and primary public-record documents.

1, The Central Contradiction: Two Statements, One Record

The Public Consultation Strategy Report filed by Bousfields Inc. on November 7, 2025 stated: *"It is anticipated that the consultation activities outlined here will provide the Applicant with the necessary information to seek the views of all those interested in this proposed redevelopment of the lands."*

The applicant's filed deputation at the February 26, 2026 Planning and Housing Committee hearing stated: *"There has been a lot of consultation. Anything we hear at the Site Plan stage that's helpful, we'll incorporate."*

Both statements are in writing. They cannot both be true. The first asserts the consultation gathered the necessary information. The second concedes that material consultation was deferred to the Site Plan stage, after the planning instruments fixing the tower heights are already adopted in law. The record below establishes that the second is consistent with what occurred and the first is not.

2, The Residents Who Were Not Heard

The community engaged with this process at every stage available to them. They submitted, deputed, organised, corresponded, surveyed, petitioned, and called. The applicant's Strategy Report and the Decision Report both characterise consultation as having been adequate. The record contradicts that characterisation.

Date	What the Community Did	Record
September 22, 2025	Pre-Consultation Zoom with Bousfields and TCHC	Bousfields' own meeting summary, undated, undistributed, never authenticated by attendees.
November 20, 2025	Five-day-notice mandatory event in Swansea School basement	Drop-in format, no amplification, persons with disabilities turned away. Documented by attendees and by audio.
December 2025	Bousfields response to community members	No date, no distribution list, never sent. Found by the community in the application file.

February 6, 2026	1,001 verified signatures filed with City Planning	Petition record submitted to Doris Ho, City Planner of record.
February 26, 2026	Verbatim deputations of community members at PH28 hearing	250+ pages of transcript. Four of six committee members present for the hearing.
March 6, 2026	Forensic Q and A Assessment filed	Identified, line by line, what Bousfields' written record had not answered.
Throughout	Written correspondence with City Planning, TCHC, Councillor's office	Documented in correspondence logs SD-16, SD-17.

The community produced 250+ pages of verbatim deputation, a 1,001-signature petition, a written critique of every consultation document, and a Forensic Q and A Assessment of the record. The Decision Report acknowledges none of it as having altered the proposal.

3, The Standards Chow, the Province, and the Federal Government Set

Mayor Olivia Chow, in her February 13, 2024 Mayor's Statement on Housing: *"We will not have housing without the consent and active partnership of the people who live in our city. Toronto's strength is its neighbourhoods, and our neighbours."* On December 4, 2024, on Lawrence Heights Phase 2: *"This isn't a building project. It's about creating a real community where people thrive together."*

The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, s. 17(15), requires meaningful public engagement before zoning by-law amendments are adopted. The City of Toronto Official Plan, Policy 5.5, requires a Public Consultation Strategy Report that demonstrates how community input has been considered.

The federal National Housing Strategy Act, S.C. 2019, c. 29, s. 4(2), requires meaningful participation by people in housing need before federal financing is committed to projects affecting them. On January 22, 2026, Minister Gregor Robertson withheld a \$10 million Housing Accelerator Fund payment from the City of Toronto on process compliance grounds: *"We want to be sure that everyone's following through on their commitments. Every agreement that the Government of Canada signs, we have to be looking at the integrity of the agreement."* The same Minister, the same statute, the same standard. Swansea Mews seeks federal financing under the framework that standard administers.

4, What Councillor Perks Said and What the Record Shows

On February 20, 2026, six days before the Planning and Housing Committee hearing, Councillor Gord Perks, the Ward Councillor and Chair of the Planning and Housing Committee, told a community representative in a one-on-one conversation, on the record:

"I just don't see anything that I'm hearing on this development that warrants me, against my own best judgment, voting against this development."

Councillor Perks, conversation record, February 20, 2026, SD-01

He chaired the hearing six days later. He moved adoption. The motion carried. Toronto Council, sitting as Planning and Housing Committee Chair's recommendation, adopted on March 25, 2026 against community opposition that had been documented in writing, in petition, and in sworn deputation.

In the same conversation he also said: *"I'm not bringing this back to public consultation, regardless of how many letters and signatures or anything you have."*

His four ward newsletters of September 2025 through February 2026 described the consultation in terms the record contradicts. The newsletter of November 27, 2025 stated the November 20 event had been *"well attended"* with a *"full slate of expert and tenant perspectives shared."* The audio record establishes the venue had no amplification, persons with disabilities were turned away at the door, attendees could not hear questions, and the format was drop-in, not facilitated dialogue.

Councillor Perks holds three concurrent roles on this file: Ward Councillor for the community displaced and to be housed; Chair of the Planning and Housing Committee that assessed the application; and Director on the Toronto Community Housing Corporation Board whose application this is. He chaired the Committee that approved his own Board's application. Community member Sherif El Tawil wrote to TCHC's Corporate Secretary the day after the November 20 event, documenting the conflict and requesting the Board address it. No public response was received.

The Office of the Integrity Commissioner has been made aware of the Community's concerns regarding the November 20, 2025 event, the lack of transparency throughout the consultation process, and the Councillor's concurrent roles on this file. A formal filing is being considered.

The structural conflict is the reason this dossier addresses the Province of Ontario and the federal government. There is no path to corrective review at the municipal level on this file.

5, The November 20, 2025 Event

The applicant characterises the November 20, 2025 event as a successful Open House meeting the City's mandatory consultation requirement. The audio record, the photographic record, sworn depositions at the February 26 hearing, and the applicant's own resubmission filings establish the event did not meet the City's standard for a mandatory consultation event.

Failure	Evidence
Five business days' notice, hand-delivered flyer	Bousfields confirmed Canada Post timelines could not be met; deadline cited was a federal funding deadline that did not exist, MP's office confirmed in writing.
Venue: school basement, narrow corridor, single accessible entrance	Photographic record SD-18; first-choice venue, Swansea Community Recreation Centre, was already booked.
No exterior signage	Photographic record SD-18; attendees walked past the entrance.
Drop-in format with no facilitated Q and A	Strategy Report by Bousfields; audio record.
Two senior citizens turned away in mobility devices	Sworn deputation, February 26, 2026 hearing; AODA, Ontarians with Disabilities Act, breach.
No amplification; questions and answers inaudible	Audio record; Councillor Perks confirmed on audio: <i>"It's hard to hear back here."</i> City Planning Manager Dan Nicholson, present, replied <i>"You're quite right."</i>
27 institutional representatives at a community event	Attendee record; tenant intimidation documented in deputations.
Outcome declared fixed	Audio record: <i>"This is what's going to happen."</i> Strategy Report describes the event as notification, not consultation.
Tenants unable to safely dissent	TCHC tenants are Council-recommended to TCHC by the same Councillor chairing the approval; structural dependency documented in deputations.

The event did not meet the City's Official Plan Policy 5.5 standard for meaningful consultation. It did not meet the National Housing Strategy Act s. 4(2) standard for meaningful participation. It is the basis on which Bousfields Inc. and TCHC certified that the consultation requirement had been fulfilled.

6, The Survey That Closed Before the Event

The Bousfields-administered community survey, posted as part of the consultation programme, closed before the November 20, 2025 event was held. The City confirmed this in writing on March 6, 2026:

"The survey was open from October 24, 2025 to November 17, 2025."

Doris Ho, City Planning, written correspondence, March 6, 2026

The mandatory consultation event at which residents were to express their views, ask questions, and provide feedback occurred three days after the survey through which their feedback would be recorded had closed. The survey accepted no input from any attendee at the November 20 event. The Strategy Report cited responses to that survey as evidence that consultation had been responsive.

7, No Authenticated Record Exists

No verified, attendee-authenticated written record exists for any consultation event on this file. The Pre-Consultation Zoom of September 22, 2025 was summarised by Bousfields in an undated, undistributed memo that was never sent to attendees for verification. The November 20 event was not transcribed. The Q and A document later filed by Bousfields was not authenticated by attendees. The City's Decision Report cites these unverified records as the consultation evidence base.

The Community Evidentiary Record, April 2026, is the only authenticated, attributed, verbatim record of the consultation events on this file. It was prepared by the community because the institutional actors did not produce one.

8, Breach Reference Grid: Where the Process Failed Each Standard

Standard	Provision	Breach
City of Toronto Official Plan	Policy 5.5, Public Consultation Strategy must demonstrate input considered	Strategy Report filed November 7, 2025 does not demonstrate community input altered the proposal.
Planning Act	s. 17(15), meaningful public engagement before by-law amendment	Five-day notice on fabricated deadline; venue inaccessible; no amplification.
Ontario Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act	Mandatory accommodation at public events	Persons with disabilities turned away on November 20, 2025, sworn deputation.

Ontario Human Rights Code	s. 1, equal treatment with respect to services	AODA breach is also a Code breach.
National Housing Strategy Act	s. 4(2), meaningful participation by people in housing need	Five-day notice basement event; tenants structurally unable to dissent.
Robertson HAF withholding standard	Process integrity threshold	Robertson withheld \$10M from Toronto on process grounds January 22, 2026. Same standard applies.
Toronto Community Housing Tenant Charter	ss. 1-9, tenant rights to participation, dignity, accessibility	Multiple sections breached on November 20, 2025; not addressed by TCHC Board.

9, The Minimum Required Remedy

The site should not advance to further approvals until a re-consultation has been held, properly noticed, in a venue that meets accessibility standards, with audio amplification, in dialogue format, with the Swansea Park alternative shown beside the approved 649-unit model, and with a record authenticated by attendees. The Office of the Integrity Commissioner has been made aware of the Community's concerns. The Province, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, has statutory authority to direct that re-consultation under the Planning Act. The federal government, through Build Canada Homes and CMHC, has authority to require it under the National Housing Strategy Act before financing is committed.

The minimum remedy is re-consultation. Re-consultation is the only mechanism that can correct the procedural failure documented above without setting aside the planning instruments now in law.

Conclusion and Recommendations

What the Record Establishes, and What Must Happen Next

In 30 Seconds

The 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue was adopted by Toronto City Council on March 25, 2026 against six categories of unresolved evidence, drawn from the applicant's own filings, the verbatim deputation transcript of February 26, 2026, and written correspondence with City Planning. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 was never produced. The financial model that drives the 649-unit density was confirmed in writing by the City Planning Senior Planner of record on March 3, 2026 to be unavailable on the public record. AGAT Laboratories testing for the applicant's own retained consultants confirmed lead at 30.4 times the residential standard and mercury at 6.1 times the residential standard. Methane was recorded above the MECP screening threshold. No Record of Site Condition has been filed. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority had not commented at adoption. The Natural Heritage Impact Study was deferred to Site Plan stage. No Community Services and Facilities Study was produced. The schools serving the broader area are at capacity. The mandatory consultation event of November 20, 2025 did not meet any of the three statutory standards it was required to meet. A documented alternative at 409 units, prepared by architect David Peterson and modelled by the community in April 2026, is materially more affordable per capita and financeable under standard CMHC parameters. It has been publicly available since Fall 2024 at swanseapark.ca and was never shown to the City planners, the stakeholders, or the former residents at any consultation event. The decision gates remain open. The path forward is provincial direction under the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, federal due diligence by Build Canada Homes and CMHC before financing is committed, and a complete professional evaluation prepared by the City and endorsed by the Province and the federal government.

This section consolidates the conclusions of Sections 1 through 6 and sets out the minimum recommendations that the documented evidence requires, addressed to the Province of Ontario, the Government of Canada, the City of Toronto, the Toronto Community Housing Corporation Board, and the 108 displaced families.

PART A: CONCLUSION

The 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue was adopted by Toronto City Council on March 25, 2026 against six categories of unresolved evidence. That evidence is documented in the preceding sections of this dossier from primary sources: the applicant's own filings, written correspondence with City Planning, the verbatim deputation transcript of February 26, 2026, sworn testimony at that hearing, and the public record of federal, provincial, and municipal officials with authority on this file.

The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed under Item PH20.8 Clause 7 in April 2025 was never produced. That report was required to include a project budget, a delivery model options analysis comparing TCHC-only development with cooperative, non-profit, and private sector alternatives, a procurement plan, and a partnership framework. Council adopted the application on March 25, 2026 against the financial foundation it had set for itself one year earlier and never received. The 649-unit density figure is the arithmetic output of a financial cross-subsidy model the City Planning Senior Planner of record confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 to be unavailable on the public record. The total project cost has never been disclosed.

The Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, signed five days after adoption, materially obsoleted roughly half of the City's \$116 million incentive package. AGAT Laboratories testing for the applicant's own retained consultants confirmed lead at 30.4 times the Ontario residential standard, mercury at 6.1 times, cadmium at 22.6 times, and groundwater suspended solids at 760 times the storm sewer discharge limit. Methane at one well exceeded the MECP screening threshold. Sirati's own conclusion calls for further investigation that has not been done. No Record of Site Condition has been filed. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority had not commented on the groundwater strategy at adoption. The Natural Heritage Impact Study required by Provincial Policy Statement 2024 was deferred to Site Plan stage, after the planning instruments fixing the tower heights are already adopted in law.

No Community Services and Facilities Study was produced. The schools serving the broader area are at capacity. The transportation study did not assess Route 77 Swansea, the only TTC route serving the residential neighbourhood north of The Queensway, for combined corridor load with the more than 1,000 additional units approved or in application at 34-50 Southport Street.

The mandatory consultation event of November 20, 2025 was an information performance presented as a consultation. It did not meet the City's Official Plan Policy 5.5 standard. It did not meet the Planning Act s. 17(15) standard. It did not meet the National Housing Strategy Act s. 4(2) standard. The application and its planning consultant nonetheless claimed the consultation requirements had been fulfilled. They were not.

A documented alternative has been publicly available since Fall 2024 at swanseapark.ca, prepared by licensed architect David Peterson. The community modelled the alternative at 409 units in April 2026. The 154 mandatory Rent-Geared-to-Income replacement units are maintained. Every returning family is accommodated. The proportion of total units as Rent-Geared-to-Income rises to 37.7 percent, materially

higher than the 23.7 percent in the 649-unit development. The total project cost is approximately \$182 million on a TCHC-owned site. The form is 14 mid-rise buildings of 6, 8, and 10 storeys at a Floor Space Index of 1.42 against the approved 3.38, with 60 percent naturalized landscape. The TCHC 649-unit total project cost is not on the public record. The community has modelled the alternative because the Stage 2 Actions Report directed by Council in April 2025 was the mechanism for that comparison, and it was not produced. When modelled with the same assumptions, the 409-unit alternative is the winning proposal. It was never shown to the City planners, the stakeholders, or the former residents at any consultation event.

The 240-unit difference between the 649-unit development and the documented alternative represents under three weeks of wait-list growth at the Toronto centralized wait list's daily growth rate. Over the four-year build, the wait list will grow by approximately 17,608 households, 73 times the 240-unit difference. The approved 649-unit development does not close the gap between the wait list and housing supply. It changes the wait list by under three weeks over four years, at the cost of an eight-year displacement for 108 families and at a public exposure approaching \$33 million to date and tracking toward \$71 million by the optimistic 2030 occupancy. The corridor at The Queensway and Windermere is being asked to absorb at around 5,000 more people, with no new support services on a corridor whose schools, transit, and grocery infrastructure is already over capacity. Overloading a City-owned site with people, in disregard of livability, is bad decision-making and sloppy planning.

The decision gates remain open. The Site Plan Application has not been filed. The Record of Site Condition required under Ontario Regulation 153/04 has not been filed. Federal financing has not been committed. The Province of Ontario, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, holds statutory authority to direct that this file meet the standard the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build set. The federal government, through Build Canada Homes and CMHC, holds the authority to require the analysis the Stage 2 Actions Report was supposed to produce, before financing is committed. There is, by the structural conflict of the Ward Councillor occupying three concurrent roles on this file, no path to corrective review at the municipal level. The path forward is provincial and federal.

PART B: RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below are not advocacy positions. They are the minimum steps that the documented evidence requires, stated in the form a Premier's Office, a Minister's office, or a Build Canada Homes assessment can act on.

1, To the Province of Ontario

The Province should, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, direct that the 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue meet the standard the Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build committed to on March 30, 2026, before any further approvals proceed. That direction should require:

- Production of the Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed under PH20.8 Clause 7 in April 2025, including the delivery model options analysis comparing TCHC-only development with non-profit and other alternatives, with the 409-unit Swansea Park alternative formally assessed against the 649-unit development on timeline, cost, and federal financing eligibility. - Independent recalculation of the financial model at post-April 1, 2026 development charge rates. - Direction to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority to formally assess the groundwater management strategy and watershed implications before Site Plan Approval. - Direction to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks to confirm the Record of Site Condition requirements and the methane risk management protocol before any demolition activity begins. - Direction to the Ministry of Education to publicly confirm the school-board capacity findings and require an accommodation plan as a condition of the planning approval. - Re-consultation under the Planning Act s. 17(15), with the 409-unit alternative shown beside the 649-unit development and a record authenticated by attendees.

2, To the Government of Canada

The federal government should, through Build Canada Homes, CMHC, and the Build Communities Strong Fund, decline to commit financing to the 649-unit development at 21 Windermere Avenue until the following are complete:

- A complete CMHC Class 3 Business Case for the 649-unit development, with a full sources-and-uses pro forma at post-April 1, 2026 development charge rates. - An independent assessment of the 409-unit Swansea Park alternative against the 649-unit development under the Build Canada Homes priority criteria. - Confirmation that the November 20, 2025 consultation event meets the National Housing Strategy Act s. 4(2) standard for meaningful participation. The same Minister, Gregor Robertson, withheld \$10 million from the City of Toronto on January 22, 2026 on equivalent process compliance grounds. The same standard applies here.

3, To the City of Toronto

The City should, before any further approvals on this file:

- Produce the Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025. - Publish the financial pro forma underlying the 649-unit density figure. - Complete the Community Services and Facilities Study required under Official Plan Policy 5.5. - Complete the cumulative transportation assessment of Route 77 Swansea, including the Southport developments, requested in writing by the community in February 2026. - Disclose the active Ontario Land Tribunal appeal at 125 The Queensway and produce a corresponding grocery-replacement commitment. - Conduct re-consultation under Official Plan Policy 5.5 standards, with the 409-unit alternative shown beside the 649-unit development.

4, To the Toronto Community Housing Corporation Board

The TCHC Board should respond, in writing and on the public record, to the structural conflict-of-interest concern raised by community member Sherif El Tawil in correspondence to the TCHC Corporate Secretary on November 21, 2025 regarding the Ward Councillor's three concurrent roles on this file. The Board should produce, before further approvals, the financial pro forma underlying the 649-unit density figure that City Planning Senior Planner Doris Ho confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 the City does not have. The Board should engage with the 409-unit alternative as a Stage 2 Actions Report deliverable.

5, To the 108 Displaced Families

The 108 families displaced from Swansea Mews on May 27, 2022 are owed a written answer, on the public record, on why the Swansea Park alternative was known to TCHC and to the Ward Councillor since Fall 2024 and was never shown to them at any consultation event. They are owed a needs-based household assessment to determine bedroom-type allocations against actual family composition, replacing the December 2, 2025 random lottery. They are owed a corrected timeline, on the public record, identifying which of the documented unresolved clearances are now expected to delay occupancy beyond early 2030.

6, The Closing Ask

A thorough comparison of the two proposals is needed, given that the 409-unit model can likely be built in two years and secure federal and provincial funding. The 649-unit idea cannot, and will take four, if not five, and is already stuck in unforced errors and red tape. Ignoring the site realities does not make them disappear. The 108 displaced families have already waited four years, and there is no good reason to delay their return. They deserve to be home soon and in a development that can deliver. The taxpayers paying for it deserve a financial model they can read. Until the missing analysis is produced and all options are independently assessed, the answer is to pause any Site Plan Approval on an incomplete record.

Disclaimer

This dossier is a community-prepared evidentiary record. It is offered as an informed opinion based on primary public-record sources. It is not a legal document and does not constitute legal advice. Findings are drawn from publicly available filings, written correspondence with City staff, transcripts of public meetings, and primary news reporting. SwanseaMatters.com is a community group of residents and former residents of the Swansea neighbourhood. Errors of fact, if identified, will be corrected in subsequent editions.