

**SWANSEA MATTERS — CRITIQUE MEMORANDUM**  
**Zoom Meeting Notes and Q&A Response — Why the Record Cannot Be Authenticated**

*21 Windermere Avenue (Swansea Mews Revitalization) — March 2026*

<b>Documents under review</b>	Bousfields Meeting Notes, September 22, 2025 Zoom Webinar (never distributed to participants); 'Swansea Mews Response to Community Members' Q&A, December 2025
<b>Reference documents</b>	Bousfields Post-Meeting Summary Report, September 22, 2025; City of Toronto Official Plan ss. 3.1.1, 5.5.1; Ontario Planning Act, 1990, ss. 17, 34; TCHC Tenant Charter
<b>Date of review</b>	March 2026
<b>Classification</b>	Consultation Record Integrity Assessment

**FINDING**

The December 2025 Q&A cannot be supported as an accurate or authoritative response to community input because the meeting notes on which it is ostensibly based were never distributed to, verified by, or made available to participants. An unverified, unilaterally prepared internal record does not constitute the evidentiary foundation for a public consultation response document. The Q&A represents TCHC's institutional narrative about what was asked — not a verified record of what the community actually said.

**1. The Chain of Accountability is Broken**

The consultation record for the September 22, 2025 Zoom webinar depends on an unbroken evidentiary chain: the community asks questions; those questions are accurately recorded in meeting notes; those notes are distributed to participants for verification; and the Q&A response document responds to the verified record of what was asked. That chain does not exist here.

The meeting notes were prepared internally by Bousfields Inc., the consultant engaged by TCHC. They were not distributed to participants. They were not made available for review or correction. No participant was asked to confirm whether their question was recorded accurately or completely. The notes therefore represent the unreviewed internal record of the recording party — not the collective memory of the participants.

When the December 2025 Q&A was published three months after the meeting, it provided polished, policy-oriented responses to questions without tracing those questions to specific participants, timestamps, or verbatim dialogue. There is no traceable chain of evidence linking each Q&A response to a documented, participant-verified question.

## **2. Specific Deficiencies**

---

### **2.1 No Verification — No Authenticity**

Meeting notes function as a public accountability tool in any consultation process. Without participant access and confirmation:

- There is no verification that questions were recorded accurately, completely, or in appropriate context
- There is no transparency regarding whether omissions or modifications were made before the Q&A was created
- There is no opportunity for correction — essential when community members raise complex concerns about displacement, affordability, or built form
- There is no basis for any participant to confirm whether the Q&A's characterisation of their question matches what they actually asked

### **2.2 The Three-Month Gap Compounds the Problem**

The Q&A was issued three months after the meeting. During that interval: interpretations of community concerns may have evolved within TCHC; policy justifications for density, servicing, and built form continued to develop as the planning application progressed; and the community had no meeting notes against which to evaluate whether the Q&A reflected their original comments or a subsequently developed institutional narrative.

### **2.3 The Q&A Responds to the Institutional Summary, Not the Community**

The meeting's 'Height and Density' section in the notes contains generic summary questions such as 'What considerations went into determining the height and density?' The December Q&A's response provides a specific defence of 35- and 20-storey towers aligned with the Initial Development Proposal. If the original meeting notes had been shared with participants for verification, attendees could have confirmed whether their concern was about building form, shadow impacts, livability, or density policy — rather than accepting the institutional translation of their concern as the basis for the response.

This evolution from community inquiry to institutional justification cannot be validated without a participant-verified meeting record. Its absence is not a procedural gap. It is the mechanism by which the consultation's accountability to the community it consulted was severed.

### **2.4 Questions That Were Not Answered**

The Bousfields Post-Meeting Summary Report documents specific themes from the September meeting. The December Q&A does not respond to all of them. In particular:

- The request for independent shadow and wind studies received no specific commitment in the Q&A

- The question about alternative built form models — specifically the community’s stated preference for townhouse or low-rise forms — received no substantive engagement
- The question about co-operative or non-profit tenure models was not addressed
- The Swansea Park alternative proposal — publicly available and known to TCHC — was not acknowledged
- The school capacity concern was not addressed with any reference to TDSB engagement

## **2.5 Procedural Fairness**

Public consultations for projects involving displacement and affordability concerns depend on demonstrable procedural fairness. The process as conducted — unverified notes, three-month delay, no participant confirmation, response document that omits significant questions — appears closed and internally controlled. The resultant Q&A reads as a one-directional communication tool rather than a genuine response to documented community input.

## **3. Legal and Policy Framework**

---

Ontario Planning Act, 1990, ss. 17 and 34 require that consultation provide information sufficient for meaningful participation. City of Toronto Official Plan ss. 3.1.1 and 5.5.1 require that community members have a genuine opportunity to shape built form outcomes. A consultation record that cannot be verified by participants, and a Q&A that responds to an unverified internal summary rather than participant-confirmed input, does not satisfy these requirements.

*Applicable law: Ontario Planning Act, 1990, ss. 17, 34 — meaningful participation as statutory requirement; City of Toronto Official Plan ss. 3.1.1, 5.5.1 — community shaping of built form outcomes; TCHC Tenant Charter — honest, transparent engagement with tenants and community; National Housing Strategy Act, 2019, s. 4 — meaningful participation as federal funding condition.*

## **4. Conclusion**

---

Because the September 22, 2025 meeting notes were never distributed or verified, they cannot serve as the evidentiary foundation for the December 2025 Q&A. The absence of an authenticated record breaks the evidentiary chain between what was asked and what was later answered. The Q&A’s accuracy — and its legitimacy as a consultation summary — is fundamentally unsubstantiated. It should not be treated as a reliable record of what the community said at the September meeting or of how TCHC responded to it.

## **CONCLUSION**

The December 2025 Q&A is not a valid consultation response document. It cannot be cited as evidence that TCHC engaged with and responded to specific community concerns because the record on which it is based was never verified by those who raised the concerns. A compliant consultation record would have: (1) distributed meeting notes to all participants within two weeks of the meeting for verification; (2) incorporated corrections before publishing any response document; and (3) traced each Q&A response to a participant-verified question with a specific attribution.