

RENTAL DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT PROCESS FOR VULNERABLE TENANTS

Final Engagement Summary Report

Prepared by Public Progress

December 12, 2025

OVERVIEW

The City of Toronto's City Planning Division is currently reviewing its process for supporting Tenants with Special Needs during the rental demolition and replacement process.

As currently defined, Tenants with Special Needs include tenants 65 years of age or older as well as people living with a mental health condition or physical disability.

In addition to the supports available to all tenants undergoing rental replacement, Tenants with Special Needs receive additional financial compensation. This is calculated as four times the CMHC Average Market Rent on their current unit type, and it is distributed as a lump sum.

The following engagement summary report presents feedback from stakeholders on the current process, as well as proposed changes to the current approach for Tenants with Special needs.

SUMMARY

Phase 1 of consultations yielded areas of high consensus as well as areas of very low consensus.

Overall, stakeholders did not criticize the current provision of support to Tenants with Special Needs. However, a number of gaps were highlighted within the current process. These include the social assistance "claw back" of large lump sum payments to tenants, communication barriers, and a need for a variety of in-kind services tailored to specific tenant needs and barriers.

Stakeholders had highly consistent feedback on the types of additional supports that would benefit Tenants with Special Needs. These include a Tenant Support Coordinator, who would oversee the coordination of supports and referrals for tenants, full-service moving support, and support with financial management for tenants. As well, some stakeholders identified the need for specific, context-driven supports, including for tenants accessing local catchment-based health and social services or who have young children. These stakeholders also highlighted a need for communications and services to be diverse and accessible, especially for newcomers and tenants with limited access to technology.

While there was a high consensus around supports, there was a lack of consistency around who should be eligible for these supports, as well as what this cohort of tenants should

be called. However, what underscored these inconsistencies was context – specifically, a tenant’s individual and changing contexts, e.g., falling ill or welcoming a new child. Stakeholders suggested tailored supports, potentially determined through a flexible and context-driven eligibility framework, which could be made available as needed during the rental replacement process.

Once Phase 1 feedback was summarized and analyzed, City Planning developed a proposed program for Tenants with Special Needs based on stakeholder input. The proposal moved away from lump sum financial compensation to Tenants with Special Needs. Instead, it moved toward a suite of in-kind and choice-based services. During Phase 2 of consultations, the proposed changes were shared with property owners and tenant advocates who had participated in Phase 1 consultations.

Stakeholder responses to the proposed changes were generally positive. However, both property owners and tenant advocates requested further refinement of the proposal to better understand their potential impacts.

For property owners, this was largely to understand the financial implications of the proposed changes. For tenant advocates, this was predominantly to ensure appropriate and consistent supports throughout the process for eligible tenants.

Based on feedback from Phase 2, City Planning have further refined their recommendations for a proposed program for Tenants with Special Needs. Their recommendations will be presented to the City of Toronto’s Planning and Housing Committee on January 22, 2026.

ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

Phase 1

During Phase 1, the objectives of the consultations were to identify barriers for vulnerable tenants in the current rental replacement process, as well as to identify potential solutions. Focus was paid on who should be eligible for additional supports, as well as what these supports might look like. Tenants, tenant advocates, and front-line workers were also asked to reflect on the current terminology, i.e., Tenants with Special Needs or vulnerable tenants, and evaluate and propose alternatives.

Phase 2

During Phase 2, consultations reflected back what Public Progress and City staff heard from stakeholders during Phase 1. The overall objective of these focus groups was to solicit feedback on City Planning’s proposed changes to the rental demolition and replacement

process for Tenants with Special Needs.

METHODOLOGY

Phase 1

In September 2025, Public Progress, on behalf of the City of Toronto's City Planning Division, engaged in a series of focus groups and interviews with diverse stakeholders regarding the current rental replacement process for vulnerable tenants.

In addition to these focus groups and interviews, Public Progress also launched an online survey for tenants as well as a hotline to gather feedback from tenants during the initial consultations. Both were launched to increase the ability of tenants with scheduling constraints or who have limited access to technology to participate in the consultation process.

During this phase of consultations, multiple modes of outreach were performed to solicit tenant feedback, including third-party connection through tenant advocacy groups, front-line workers, landlords, and City Councillors.

As a result of feedback from the Housing Rights Advisory Committee's Maintaining Housing Working Group, Public Progress also conducted an additional engagement with gender-based violence and women's advocates in late October 2025.

The initial series of engagements occurred with the following stakeholder groups:

Property Owner / Development Associations

Date(s): Monday, September 8th, 2025 and Tuesday, September 9th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minute online sessions

Number of Participants: 17

Tenant Advocates

Date(s): Thursday, September 11th, 2025 and Friday, September 12th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minutes, online

Number of Participants: 21

Front-line Workers

Date(s): Monday, September 15th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minutes, online

Number of Participants: 6

Tenants

Focus Groups

Date(s): Wednesday, October 1st, 2025

Length/Format: Two hours, online

Number of Participants: 6

Online Surveys

Date(s): Open from Monday, September 8th, 2025 until Monday, October 6th, 2025

Number of Participants: 12

Hotline

Date(s): Open from Monday, September 8th, 2025 until Monday, October 6th, 2025

Number of Participants: 0

Interviews (for Tenants with Special Needs)

Date(s): Thursday, September 18th, 2025

Length/Format: Two-hours, in-person

Number of Participants: 1

Gender-based Violence and Women's Advocates

Date(s): Friday, October 24th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minutes, online

Number of Participants: 2

In addition to the survey and hotline, 7 focus group sessions were held. In total, 65 individuals were consulted during Phase 1 of consultations.

Phase 2

In November 2025, Public Progress facilitated a second series of focus groups. These consultations summarized stakeholder feedback from Phase 1. As well, they solicited feedback on City Planning's proposed changes to support vulnerable tenants through the rental replacement process, based on stakeholder feedback.

This phase of consultation was intended to be limited to participants of Phase 1 consultations to ensure continuity of feedback. As well, focus was specifically placed on engaging the expertise of the stakeholders most familiar with the rental replacement process, i.e., property owners and tenant advocates. It should be noted that some property owners who participated in Phase 2 did not participate in Phase 1; this is because meeting information was shared between property owners (but not solicited by Public Progress).

Final Engagement Summary Report

Prior to these sessions, participants were provided with a copy of an interim engagement summary report as well as an outline of City Planning's proposed changes to support vulnerable tenants through the rental demolition and replacement process.

Phase 2 consultations occurred with the following stakeholder groups:

Property Owner / Development Associations

Date(s): Wednesday, November 12th, 2025, and Friday, November 14th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minute online sessions

Number of Participants: 13

Tenant Advocates

Date(s): Thursday, November 13th, 2025 and Friday, November 14th, 2025

Length/Format: 90 minutes, online

Number of Participants: 8

In total, four focus group sessions were held, and 21 individuals were consulted during Phase 2 of consultations.

City Planning staff also undertook engagements with the Toronto Accessibility Advisory Committee, the Housing Rights Advisory Committee, and the Tenant Advisory Committee. Feedback from these engagements are not included in this report, as they were city-staff led.

BARRIERS TO FEEDBACK

Phase 1

Tenant Feedback

Throughout Phase 1, Public Progress encountered difficulty successfully gathering tenant feedback from Tenants with Special Needs who have or are currently experiencing the rental replacement process. Public Progress, with support from the City Planning Division, attempted outreach through the following methods:

- Third-party referral through tenant unions and tenant advocacy groups;
- Third-party referrals through front-line workers who have supported tenants with the rental replacement process;
- Outreach to developers replacing rental buildings to post flyers in common spaces;
- Outreach to Councillors to solicit tenant feedback in their newsletters.

Through these pathways, as well as through multiple modes of collecting feedback, Public Progress was able to engage 19 tenants in total who have experienced, or are in the midst of experiencing, rental replacement.

Knowledge of Rental Replacement Process

Throughout Phase 1 consultations, participants – who were distributed a copy of the Rental Demolition and Rental Replacement Handbook ahead of each focus group – demonstrated a lack of familiarity with the rental replacement process. This was particularly true of front-line workers and tenants.

While feedback was nevertheless rich and varied, this unfamiliarity necessitated additional time allocation in focus group sessions for questions and answers regarding the rental replacement process.

Phase 2

Reduced Participation

While feedback during Phase 2 offered representation across sectors and expertise, it should be noted that not every property owner association or tenant advocate who participated in Phase 1 returned to participate in Phase 2, despite multiple solicitations.

WHAT WE HEARD

Phase 1

Feedback on Current Supports

Currently, Tenants with Special Needs receive additional financial compensation, calculated as four times the CMHC Average Market Rent on their current unit type, i.e., studio, one-bedroom, etc. This is paid to tenants as a lump sum.

While financial supports are overall considered an appropriate support for displaced tenants, participants found the calculation of additional compensation for Tenants with Special Needs difficult to understand and, at times, insufficient.

Multiple participants cited that having to calculate the additional compensation given to Tenants with Special Needs – which requires knowing the current CMHC Average Market Rent – is onerous.

Stakeholders, including property owners, also cited difficulties with lump-sum payments. These include social assistance “clawback,” a lack of financial management support, as well

as difficulty in managing the distribution of lump sum payments.

All stakeholders noted that in-kind supports, rather than financial compensation, might be more beneficial for supporting Tenants with Special Needs.

Feedback on Needed Supports

Stakeholders were unanimous in providing supports in the following three areas:

Tenant Support Coordinator

All stakeholders identified a need for a tenant coordinator to oversee the administration of resources and supports. The consensus is that the tenant support coordinator would help connect tenants to supports within the community as well as oversee the supports provided through the rental replacement process.

Property owners felt that it was beyond their capacity and expertise to administer non-financial supports to tenants, such as trusteeship or legal support. Instead, property owners suggested a third-party coordinator to provide referrals and/or direct support to tenants for the duration of the rental replacement process. Several participants in the property owner groups expressed discomfort with receiving confidential medical information relating to tenants.

Tenant advocates and tenants also suggested that these services not be administered by landlords or developers. However, multiple participants, including some participants from the property owner groups, suggested that these services should be paid for by developers to offset costs to the City and/or social service agencies who may be administering these supports. Property owners participating in the consultation wanted clarity on who would be expected to pay for in-kind services.

Both tenant advocates and tenants also highlighted a need for the tenant support coordinator to provide individualized support, including by booking initial one-on-one consultations with individual households to help determine appropriate supports and resources.

Rehousing Support

While many participants appreciated being given additional financial compensation to support moving their belongings, all stakeholders suggested an additional in-kind moving service for Tenants with Special Needs.

This would include a full suite of services, including packing, labelling boxes, physically moving boxes, and unpacking.

Tenants also suggested that a housing worker, as opposed to a leasing agent, would be more appropriate to help tenants find interim housing, understanding that leasing agents are commission-based and may not necessarily be driven by tenants' best interest.

All stakeholders also suggested that developers could offer interim units within their rental portfolio rather than lump sum payments for Tenants with Special Needs.

Financial Management

Some stakeholders suggested that a financial advisor could be beneficial to Tenants with Special Needs to manage the lump sum rent gap payment – especially those navigating social assistance “clawback.” Some stakeholders also suggested that in lieu of a lump sum payment, tenants could have the option of receiving monthly payments to make financial management easier.

Trusteeship was also suggested as an optional support for tenants by tenants, tenant advocates, and property owners. The trustee role could directly administer the monthly rent gap payment on behalf of a tenant. Tenant advocates suggested that the choice to access this support would be at the discretion of a tenant.

Feedback on Additional Supports

Tenants and some tenant advocates also identified the following supports for incorporation into the rental replacement process for tenants with special needs:

Health and Specialized Services Navigation Support

Tenants identified that for people accessing specialized social, educational, and health services within a catchment area additional navigation support could be beneficial to ensure continuity of care. Examples include school children identified with an exceptionality and placed through an Individual Placement and Review Committee, and people receiving treatment for a serious illness from local specialists.

Tenants stressed an additional need to ensure that people receiving catchment-based care be able to remain within their catchment. For example, a school child accessing autism support within their specific school, i.e., a catchment, should be able to continue receiving this support by remaining within their catchment, understanding that wait times for new service access can take years.

IPV and Child Care Support

Tenants stressed a need for additional family and intimate partner violence (IPV) supports. These include emotional supports and an emergency protocol for tenants experiencing IPV,

as well as additional financial support for parents of small children. This additional funding would support tenants to pay for child care to attend meetings, apartment-hunt, and engage in other activities related to the rental replacement process.

Tenant advocates also highlighted a need for confidentiality and the prioritization of safety for tenants experiencing violence. Advocates specifically working in the Violence Against Women (VAW) sector also stressed that there should be consideration of households that either gain or lose members, including through having children and divorce.

Multilingual, Multicultural, and Multi-channel Communication Support

Both tenants and tenant advocates stressed the need for more accessible and culturally and linguistically appropriate communication and supports.

These include translated communications and/or access to translation support for people with limited English and for members of the deaf-blind community.

It also includes multi-channel communication to remove barriers for people with limited access to, or knowledge of, technology.

Culturally relevant supports were also identified as a key need for Indigenous tenants, newcomers, refugees, and immigrants.

Eligibility

Lack of Consensus on Current Criteria

While stakeholders had high consensus on the additional supports that would benefit Tenants with Special Needs, there was no consensus on the eligibility criteria to access these supports.

Generally, there was agreement that both age and disability should be factors in determining eligibility.

However, some participants recommended lowering the age of eligibility to 60 or 50 instead of 65. Others instead pointed to being retired, i.e., no longer earning a wage or salary and being on a fixed income, as being a better criterion for determining eligibility.

Some participants suggested that while age-based criteria have precedent in current laws and by-laws, they aren't fair determinants, as factors like health and wealth are not inherently tied to age.

In lieu of age-based criteria, two participants suggested determining eligibility based on

length of tenancy, understanding that the gap between current and market rents will be higher for tenants who have lived in a rent-controlled unit for a long time.

Some of the participants in the property owner focus groups expressed support for the aged-based criteria because it was easy to calculate and administer.

In terms of disability, some participants cited receipt of social assistance, i.e., the Ontario Disability Support Program, as being the most appropriate marker to determine eligibility. However, other participants noted that disabilities are underreported and may not be captured when using social assistance or medical records to determine eligibility.

Both tenant advocates and property owners suggested income as a criteria for determining eligibility, although some tenant advocates expressed concerns around privacy, how an eligible income might be measured, and it being onerous for tenants to show proof of income.

Context-Driven Eligibility

While stakeholders were interested in ensuring a clear process for determining eligibility, the majority of examples given about who should be eligible were largely identity and context-driven – not solely identity driven. All stakeholders also expressed concerns about the challenges of supporting tenants who don't or won't self-identify as a Tenant with Special Needs.

One tenant advocate suggested that in lieu of the current policy, which creates two groups of tenants – “regular tenants” and Tenants with Special Needs – it might be more beneficial to create a framework in which certain needs or barriers trigger different supports, e.g., being on social assistance triggers a financial advisor.

This tenant advocate also suggested that eligibility could be determined through a pre-screening questionnaire or one-to-one interview with a tenant in lieu of being triggered by specific socioeconomic factors, e.g., asking, “Can you manage this process?”

Tenants also felt that eligibility should be flexible and adapt to changes in a tenant's circumstances, e.g., experiencing a change in a health condition during the rental replacement process.

Process

Barriers for People Living with Disability and Seniors

Participants highlighted gaps and barriers in the current rental replacement process for people with disabilities and people over the age of 65. This includes the “clawback” of social

assistance, i.e., ODSP and OW, as a result of lump-sum rent gap payments. It also includes limited capacity to pack belongings and move without assistance; the appropriateness of some services offered through the rental replacement process – a commission-based leasing agent, for example, and inconsistency in the accessibility of replacement units.

On the latter, tenant advocates and tenants highlighted that tenants with disabilities should be able to preview a replacement unit before accepting it. Without seeing the finished unit – or having input in the design phase – tenant advocates argue that a tenant with a disability may feel pressured into accepting a unit that is not actually accessible to them.

Communication Barriers

Tenants, in particular, highlighted communication barriers at different points during the rental replacement process.

Some participants felt that communications on the status of the demolition and replacement process were too infrequent, e.g., quarterly or biannually, which caused them anxiety. Others pointed to both language barriers for newcomers, refugees, and immigrants. Technological barriers for seniors and low-income people were also highlighted as a communication issue, such as tenants not having the internet, or access to and/or proficiency using e-mail or a smartphone.

Pre-demolition Process

Different stakeholders held different perceptions on the process pre-demolition, i.e., prior to an N13 being issued to tenants.

Property owners expressed a need to balance support for tenants with an expedient approval process.

Before being issued an N13, multiple tenant participants cited efforts by their landlords to pressure them into leaving their unit. These efforts include intimidation; failing to respond to maintenance requests; and, in one case, multiple incidents of a building being below the legal temperature threshold during the winter season.

One unique tenant situation also highlighted a clear gap in supports between when a demolition application is submitted and when a tenant receives an N13 notice to move out.

In one situation, the tenant's building became unlivable through an emergency. While all the building's tenants remain eligible for a rental replacement unit, the status of the tenants and their location is currently unknown. This tenant did not receive support from their landlord to relocate after the fire. According to the tenant, they continued to be charged rent on their

destroyed unit until their caseworker stepped in. They also believe that without the support of their caseworker and other community-based services, they would be homeless.

Terminology

Similar to eligibility and likely driven by a lack of consensus around who should be eligible for additional supports, there was little consensus on what to call tenants accessing these supports. Currently, these tenants who access additional supports are called “Tenants with Special Needs” by the City of Toronto, with direction from City Council to refer to them as “Vulnerable Tenants.”

Consensus from stakeholders was that language should remain non-stigmatizing as well as clear and easy to understand, but participants offered a number of suggestions without any clear preference. These include:

- Tenants with Additional Housing Barriers (as suggested by City Planning)
- Tenants with Additional Needs
- Vulnerable Tenants
- Tenants with Additional Considerations
- Tenants with Unique Needs
- Tenants with Low Incomes and Additional Housing Barriers
- Tenants Experiencing Forced Eviction

One tenant suggested that instead of using this kind of nomenclature, tenants and the supports they require/receive should be described as tiers, e.g., tenants requiring no additional supports are “Tier 1.”

Phase 2

Feedback on Proposed Supports

The following are the proposed changes to the rental replacement process for Tenants with Special Needs, as tested with Phase 2 consultation participants:

- A shift toward in-kind supports rather than additional financial compensation (e.g., 4 x Average Market Rent, based on unit type);
- The provision of priority access to alternative units in the neighbourhood for tenants with additional requirements, e.g., tenants receiving catchment-based medical care;
- The option of monthly rent-gap payments, particularly for tenants accessing social assistance programs, i.e., Ontario Works, Ontario Disability Support Program, and the Guaranteed Income Supplement;

- Identifying the requirement under the Ontario Human Rights Code for a landlord to accommodate a tenant's accessibility modification request as long as it is reasonable;
- Exploring the Tenant Support Coordinator role to provide support to tenants experiencing a rental housing demolition;
- The creation of guidelines for leasing agents;
- Hoarding supports;
- The creation of optional trusteeship services;
- The option of accessing in-kind packing and moving services in lieu of a moving allowance.

Shift to In-Kind Supports

Both property owners and tenant advocates asked for further clarity on the parameters associated with the provision of in-kind supports, versus financial compensation.

Overall, tenant advocates responded very positively to the provision of in-kind supports, especially as a choice-based framework in which tenants can choose to opt in or opt out of certain supports. However, some participants preferred that tenants also have an overall choice between accessing in-kind supports, or else receiving financial compensation.

Property owners requested further clarity on the nature of the in-kind supports, how they are administered and by whom, and the associated costs. Property owners in particular had concerns about the costs of in-kind supports exceeding the cost of providing financial compensation, and about the framework for determining in-kind services being overly complicated. However, property owners also felt that if providing in-kind supports could speed up the development process, this would be beneficial for all parties.

Alternative Units

The provision of priority access to alternative units in the neighbourhood was, in general, positively received by both property owners and tenant advocates. However, both stakeholder groups highlighted a need for further guidelines on how this would function.

Property owners wanted to better understand how tenants would be prioritized for receipt of an alternative unit in the neighbourhood. As well, this group expressed concerns that tenants could refuse multiple offers of alternative units and create hardship for property owners.

Monthly Rent Gap Payments

All stakeholders agreed that there is a clear need to manage "claw back" of lump sum rent gap payments for tenants accessing social assistance. Property owners expressed a need for

provincial policy to change to address “claw back,” which they felt creates problems for both social assistance recipients and property owners involved in the rental replacement process. That is, the option for monthly rent gap payments, versus distributing a lump sum payment to tenants, creates an additional administrative burden on property owners.

For tenant advocates, participants appreciated that tenants have a choice to either receive the rent gap payments as a lump sum or else as a monthly payment. However, they highlighted that there should be a thorough assessment during the rental replacement process of what social assistance and benefits a tenant is receiving, and how their specific circumstances could be impacted by a lump sum payment versus a monthly payment.

Accessibility Requirements of Replacement Units

Tenant advocates were very supportive of additional measures to ensure that replacement units are actually accessible for tenants with disabilities.

Property owners highlighted a need to know as far as possible in advance of what modifications are required to a replacement unit. This is to ensure minimal construction delays; there was concern that determining modifications 120 days before the move-in date is inadequate.

Tenant Support Coordinator

All stakeholders agreed that the provision of a Tenant Support Coordinator would be a valuable addition to the rental replacement process.

Tenant advocates stressed that the Tenant Support Coordinator role should have initial face-to-face interaction with tenants and provide “warm referrals” to tenants to ensure connection to services and supports in the community.

Leasing Agent

Tenant advocates were clear that guidelines regarding the leasing agent should ensure that predatory practices are eliminated. Property owners did not have any substantial feedback on this in-kind support and need to see what the guidelines are before commenting.

Hoarding Supports

Tenant advocates asked for further clarity on what hoarding supports would look like, and how they would be determined, understanding that tenants who hoard may not self-identify as requiring additional support.

In the proposed changes, a property manager is able to identify tenants who may need support with hoarding. There were concerns that tenants may be misidentified in this

process, or else experience stigma. Tenant advocates also reflected that tenants who hoard should not be identified to developers, and that supports should be provided as early as possible, understanding that hoarding is tied to mental health and trauma. As such, it was suggested that hoarding support also be tied to mental health support.

Optional Trusteeship Services

Both tenant advocates and property owners appreciate the provision of optional trusteeship services for tenants. Tenant advocates especially appreciated that these services are optional and not mandatory, so as to minimize any stigmatization of tenants as being unable to manage their finances.

However, tenant advocates had further questions about what the model of trusteeship might look like, emphasizing that autonomy and dignity should be prioritized in the delivery of trusteeship services.

Property owners do not feel that trustee services is something that they can or should provide and that this should be managed by a third party.

Optional Packing and Moving Services

Tenant advocates appreciated the choice between full service, in-kind moving and packing services and a lump sum moving fee. Property owners did not have any substantial feedback on this in-kind support provided that the cost of the in-kind service does not exceed the current moving allowance.

Eligibility

During Phase 1 consultations, stakeholders strongly identified that eligibility for additional supports in the rental replacement process should be context-driven. In order to help identify tenants who may be eligible for additional supports, a tenant needs survey has been proposed. The survey would allow tenants to self-identify any needs or barriers that might require support during the rental replacement process.

Overall, tenant advocates felt positively about using a survey as a tool to ensure tenants receive the support they need. However, these stakeholders cautioned that the survey should be simple, easy to understand, and also have clear instructions and contact information should a tenant need support to fill out the survey. As well, stakeholders suggested that there should be specific mechanisms in place to ensure confidentiality, i.e., storage and access to completed surveys should be compliant with privacy laws and not be shared with developers. Advocates also stressed that the survey should include a feedback form.

Some tenant advocates expressed a concern that tenants may not be able to complete the survey without support. One suggestion is that a tenant be directly contacted if they do not fill out the survey by a certain date. Moreover, a tenant not submitting a survey in time might in-itself be an indicator that a tenant may require additional support.

While property owners did not have any specific criticism of proposed eligibility changes, they did stress that context-driven eligibility is more difficult to quantify. Because of this, there were lingering questions on how context-driven eligibility might impact the overall cost of the rental replacement process to developers.

There was some support in the property owners group for an income-based approach so that people who really need the support receive it.

Process

Property owners requested further clarity on the allocation of responsibility during the revised process. Specifically, they requested clarity on which aspects of the rental replacement process are the responsibility of the City of Toronto, of property owners, and/or of third parties, e.g., social service agencies, under the proposed changes. Property owners also expressed a concern that some of the proposed changes might be beyond what is required of landlords in the Residential Tenancies Act.

Tenant advocates had multiple concerns with the process and proposed timelines, including the creation of the Tenant Support Coordinator as a long-term goal, i.e., to be implemented in 2027 or later. In the interim, tenant advocates were concerned that tenants may not be receiving the supports they need without a dedicated person to assist them with systems navigation, i.e. the Tenant Support Coordinator. These stakeholders stressed that there must be an appropriate contingency in place to ensure that there are no service gaps before the Tenant Support Coordinator role comes online. Proposed interim solutions include outsourcing support to non-profits, with financial assistance provided by the city to perform this work.

Tenant advocates were also concerned about gaps during the initial stages of the rental replacement process. Advocates stressed that clear communications and thorough information should be distributed as early as possible in the process. Some tenant advocates suggested door-to-door engagement with each tenant household to ensure that tenant needs aren't missed. Other tenant advocates suggested that communication materials be distributed in the community surrounding buildings undergoing rental replacement, including to local agencies, health centres, and libraries.

One tenant advocate expressed concern that the proposed changes to the rental replacement process will not be available to tenants facing displacement now. They suggested that a placeholder clause be embedded in Section 111 agreements as soon as possible, so that tenants currently facing rental replacement will be able to access supports as they come online.

NEXT STEPS

Based on stakeholder consultations, as per this report, City Planning has further refined their recommendations for a proposed suite of supports for Tenants with Special Needs.

These recommendations will be presented to the City of Toronto's Planning and Housing Committee on January 22, 2026.

Pending approval and any amendments to these recommendations from the Committee and Council, City Planning will then develop guidelines for the various supports outlined in their proposed approach.

APPENDIX: STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS

Property Owners Associations

Bousfields
Broccolini
Building Industry and Land Development Association
Federation of Rental Property-Owners of Ontario
Fitzrovia
Forum Developments
Gala Developments
Great Gulf
Greater Toronto Apartments Association
H & R REIT
Kaneff Group
MOD Developments
Park Property Management
Rockport Group
Starlight Investments
StrategyCorp
Streamline Development Group
Streamliner Properties
Tenblock
Tribute Communities
WND Associates

Tenant Advocates

Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario
Assaulted Women and Children's Advocate Program, George Brown College
Canadian Centre for Housing Rights
Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
Centre for Immigrant and Community Services
Centre for Independent Living in Toronto
Disability Justice Network of Ontario
Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations
Maytree
No Demovictions Ontario
Social Planning Toronto
Toronto Underhoused and Homeless Union

Willowdale Community Legal Services
Women's National Housing and Homelessness Network
York-South Weston Tenant Union