



Ed Hore, Deputation to Planning and Housing Committee, June 11, 2026

The staff report of May 28 before you today confirms something that has been evident for a while: everything about the current jet proposal is amateurish and vague. It's not a serious proposal at all.

So the City has an absolutely key role: it has to be the grown-up in the room, the fact-finder. It has no choice; no one else seems to be asking what the actual impacts of the proposal are.

As the staff report says, there's almost no information available. Impacts can't be assessed. The City was never consulted. It learned about the new jets plan from the newspapers.

Neither the Federal government nor the Provincial government seems to think the details matter.

Many Federal MPs are saying there's no proposal yet so we can't comment, yet the Federal government wants the public to comment, through a survey – even though there's no information.

A serious proposal would be based on studies by authoritative third parties saying there's a need to expand the island airport. There's nothing like that.

What we do know is that the impacts on the waterfront are huge. Earlier this year, TPA released a 1000-page environmental assessmentⁱ completed almost nine years before but withheld from the public. It said that the 2013 jets proposal had all kinds of negative impacts on marine navigation, neighbourhoods and public health.

The staff report says the impacts of this jet proposal on housing and water quality are probably even worse.

There's a report from Air Canada's consultants in 2015ⁱⁱ that said the whole jets plan was unworkable and uneconomic due to limited ground space at the island airport, and the constraints of an urban setting.

We also passenger numbers at the island airport are dropping, as the staff report mentions. There's the UP Express. Pearson is being expanded. Billions have been spent on waterfront revitalization

If you want to build something, say a building, the first step is to do detailed plans, visuals, maybe a model so everyone can see what you are proposing. Also do financial projections. Explain to the bank how the numbers make sense. TPA hasn't done that.

The TPA has a track record of non-serious proposals. At the time of the 2013-2015 jets proposal, in which I was heavily involved, no detailed plans were ever submitted to Transport Canada for approval. For two and a half years, everyone had to guess at the details and the impacts. TPA hadn't done its homework.

Eventually, the Federal government saw that the jets proposal was nonsense, and quashed it in 2015.

When Council voted in 2024 to extend the island airport lease to 2045, TPA didn't inform councillors of the 2017 EA. It never told them there were serious health impacts from the airport including tumours,ⁱⁱⁱ with or without jets. City staff recommended a "holistic review" of the island airport before that vote which would have included a public health assessment. Council, not knowing of the health findings in the EA, voted that suggestion down.

Toronto Port Authority is notoriously difficult in negotiations. It recently demanded \$20 million dollars from Waterfront Toronto for a water lot.^{iv} Other governments transfer land needed to help with waterfront revitalization at nominal prices.

TPA also sold the old harbour commissions building for \$96 million a few years ago.^v It got these properties for free. It gets to keep the money, rather than turn it over to the federal treasury or contribute it to waterfront revitalization. TPA is

always secretive, and always interested primarily in getting money in the door, not in its duty to the public as a public agency.

There's a cost to the vagueness and amateurishness of this jet proposal. Hundreds of thousands of people are impacted by the planning disruption in the highest growth areas in the city, the staff report tells us.

The City should say to the Federal government and TPA, get serious or quash the proposal.

If you're serious, we need the details. What flight paths and instrument procedures will Transport Canada approve? What are the impacts on building heights, housing and city growth? What are the effects on recreational boating, and the quality of life? When are you filing detailed plans with the regulators?

What runway and airport configuration will the regulator approve? Will there be runway approach lighting dominating the harbour and Humber Bay? Will the Western Gap be closed to boat traffic? What about water quality?

What are the health impacts? What infrastructure on the city side is needed if we increase the number of passengers travelling to the airport by five or six times? How much will it disrupt the waterfront? How much will it cost?

Could it be TPA never files detailed information about the jet proposal with regulators, as happened last time?

The City must keep asking for details and assessing the impacts as more information becomes available. No one else is doing it.

Ed Hore
Chair
Waterfront for All
ejbhore@icloud.com
416 455-9323

ⁱⁱ https://www.waterfrontforall.ca/port_authority_ea_confirms_problems_with_jet_expansion_at_bbtca

ii "Jet Operations at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport, Infrastructure Requirements," a 2015 [presentation deck](#) by Air Canada's consultants Oliver Wyman.

iii EA page 62.

iv In 2022 Waterfront Toronto purchased Toronto Port Authority's Parliament Slip water lot for 20.2 million in order to construct roads and public parks with tri-government funding. In typical transactions on the waterfront, the City generally transfers land to Waterfront Toronto for nominal consideration.

v <https://www.torontoportauthority.com/media-room/news/porttoronto-to-sell-head-office-property-at-30-bay-street-to-oxford-properties-and-cppib/>