

STAND WITH LANDOWNERS OR GO HOME

PROFESSOR LEX'S COMMON-SENSE ASSESSMENT

ELECTION-TIME MAPPING ERRORS, DEVELOPMENT HOLDS AND WHO PAYS

A plain-language landowner accountability assessment
WE PAY. WE PAY AGAIN. NOW SHOW US WHO IS RESPONSIBLE.

DATED	September 27, 2026
PREPARED FOR	Landowners, candidates, councillors, researchers and legal reviewers
PUBLIC CONTACT	info.watersheddebacle@gmail.com WatershedDebacle.ca

LANDOWNER NOTICE

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation. Report notification efforts to info.watersheddebacle@gmail.com.

NOTICE TO THE READER

This assessment uses official municipal records and asks direct questions. It does not prove negligence, a conspiracy, provincial liability, a constructive taking or a legal right to compensation. It separates confirmed records, proposals, inferences and missing evidence so that the public case remains credible.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Why should landowners and taxpayers finance the public planning system, then finance private proof to test or correct it, and then finance the government's legal defence - before government has publicly identified who caused the problem?

EVIDENCE - NOTICE - FAIRNESS - COMPENSATION - ACCOUNTABILITY

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

PROFESSOR LEX'S BOTTOM LINE

THE COMMON-SENSE VERDICT

The record now supports a serious systems question. Orillia's staff report expressly calls the Tallwood Drive EP zoning a mapping error. The same report proposes a broad development hold while flow monitoring tests whether modelled sewage-capacity results are accurate. A separate Orillia report proposes a dedicated litigation reserve using \$252,309 in unused legal funding. None of those records proves liability. Together, they justify an independent audit of accuracy, notice, cost allocation, owner impacts and responsibility before more public or private money is spent.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITIONS

H26 means the proposed Holding Twenty-Six Zone: a zoning restriction that would prevent specified building permits and development approvals until stated servicing conditions are met and the hold is removed. Binding means legally operative, enforceable or capable of committing the municipality - not merely discussed or recommended. DSE-26-35 means Development Services and Engineering Report 26-35, Orillia's September 17, 2026 staff planning report. A report number identifies the document; the report itself is not a by-law or court decision.

WHAT THE RECORD ACTUALLY SAYS

Tallwood EP mapping	Orillia staff identify mapping errors at 394, 398 and 402 Tallwood Drive and state the properties should always have been Residential Two.	Staff recommendation. Not yet enacted.
H26 development hold	H26 (Holding Twenty-Six Zone) is a proposed temporary zoning restriction across the Couchiching Point sewage-pumping catchment while flow monitoring tests modelled capacity. Owners may seek hold removal by proving capacity to the City's satisfaction.	Proposed zoning by-law. Not yet enacted or binding.
Stockdale EP boundary	The applicant asks Severn to modify EP boundaries for accuracy and permit a larger home-industry use with a watercourse setback.	Private application. Not a Township finding.
Orillia legal reserve	Staff recommend a dedicated fund for extraordinary legal matters and litigation, seeded with \$252,309 in unused 2025 legal funding. The existing annual discretionary legal budget is \$257,000.	Staff recommendation. Not yet established.

WHAT THIS DOES NOT PROVE

- It does not prove that every Greenlands or EP boundary is wrong.
- It does not prove that H26 is unnecessary or unlawful.
- It does not prove that the Province caused the Tallwood error or owes damages.
- It does not prove that Orillia's legal reserve targets the Watershed Debacle or boundary negotiations.
- It does prove that accuracy corrections, technical uncertainty, owner-funded proof and litigation financing are live public-policy issues that deserve answers before the election.

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

1. RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF AN ELECTION

**CONFIRMED
RECORD**

The reports are scheduled for public or Council consideration on September 28, 2026. Voting day is October 26, 2026.

PROFESSOR LEX'S PLAIN-LANGUAGE VIEW

The timing matters because an outgoing Council may establish policy, restrictions and a litigation-funding structure that the incoming Council will inherit. Timing alone does not make the decisions unlawful. Ontario's election-period restrictions are targeted, not a general freeze on municipal government. The common-sense answer is therefore not to make a legal claim without proof. It is to demand maximum disclosure, recorded votes, transition safeguards and a clear opportunity for the incoming Council to review implementation.

THE FAIRNESS TEST

If these measures are routine and urgent, officials should be able to explain why September 28 action is necessary, what can wait until after October 26, and what protection prevents the outgoing Council from binding (legally committing) the new Council to avoidable costs or weak assumptions.

PROFESSOR LEX COMMON-SENSE QUESTIONS

1. Why must these decisions proceed before voters choose the next Council?
2. What immediate public harm would result from deferring final enactment or implementation until the incoming Council reviews the record?
3. Will every vote, amendment, declaration of interest and direction to staff be recorded and published?
4. Will the new Council receive a complete transition package showing costs, risks, mapping corrections, affected parcels and unresolved owner claims?
5. Will candidates state whether they support the Tallwood correction, the H26 burden-of-proof structure and the legal reserve?
6. Will Council add a sunset, reporting requirement or mandatory post-election review before further reserve contributions or enforcement?

LEGAL CAUTION

The Municipal Act, 2001, section 275 may restrict specified acts after nomination day if its statutory conditions are met. It is not a universal 'lame-duck' prohibition. The validity and application of that section to a particular decision require legal advice and the actual election arithmetic.

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

2. AN EXPRESS MAPPING ERROR - AND A SEPARATE ACCURACY REQUEST

CONFIRMED RECORD

Orillia staff call the Tallwood EP zoning a mapping error and state the three properties should always have been Residential Two.

PROPOSAL

At 2250 Stockdale Road, the applicant requests that Severn modify EP boundaries for accuracy. Severn has deemed the application complete, but has not yet accepted the requested correction.

WHY THE DISTINCTION MATTERS

Tallwood is the stronger admission. It is the municipality's own staff report. Stockdale is still valuable because Severn's public process recognizes that an EP boundary can be examined and changed, but the requested change remains to be tested. Keeping those two records separate prevents a legitimate comparison from being overstated.

THE SYSTEM QUESTION

If one EP error has been identified, the responsible response is not panic and not denial. It is a controlled audit: how did the error occur, how long did it remain, who relied on it, who was told, what costs resulted, and are similarly situated parcels affected?

WAS THERE COMPENSATION FOR THE MISLEADING ERROR?

Not in the published report. DSE-26-35 (Development Services and Engineering Report 26-35, an Orillia staff planning report - not a by-law or court decision) proposes correcting the zoning and states that the amendments have no financial impact, but it identifies no payment to the Tallwood owners, no reimbursement of professional or application costs, no tax or assessment adjustment, and no study of delay, financing, marketability or property-value loss. The report therefore does not answer who pays if a compensable loss is later proven.

PROFESSOR LEX COMMON-SENSE QUESTIONS

1. Who created the original Tallwood EP boundary, using which source layer, date and methodology?
2. Who reviewed and approved it, and what quality-control step failed?
3. When did Orillia first learn the zoning was wrong, and who was told at that time?
4. Were the owners directly notified of the original EP zoning and of the proposed correction?
5. Did the error affect permits, financing, insurance, appraisal, marketability, sale negotiations or professional expenses?
6. Did any owner request compensation or reimbursement, and what written response was given?
7. Has Orillia searched for other parcels created from the same mapping layer or workflow?
8. Will Severn publish the technical evidence and cost pathway used to decide the Stockdale accuracy request?
9. Why should an owner have to initiate and finance a correction when government applied the original map?

RECORDS TO PRODUCE

Native GIS layers and metadata; version history; source surveys and datasets; staff instructions; quality-control records; parcel notices; returned mail; permits and inquiries affected by the mapping; correction criteria; fee and consultant-cost records; owner compensation or reimbursement requests; tax and assessment correspondence; and communications identifying when the error was discovered.

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

3. WE PAY. WE PAY AGAIN.

The slogan is powerful only if each payment is identified accurately. The current record shows a possible three-stage burden. It does not yet quantify every landowner's loss or prove that every stage applies to every parcel.

1. Public planning	Taxpayers	Municipal staff, mapping, engineering, consultants and legal services are publicly funded.
2. Private correction or release	Landowner or applicant	H26 owners may need to prove capacity; the proposed text can make an owner/applicant responsible for required servicing upgrades. Site-specific zoning and mapping work can require private professionals and fees.
3. Government legal response	Taxpayers	Orillia proposes a dedicated reserve for extraordinary legal matters and litigation, initially funded with \$252,309 in unused 2025 legal funding, while retaining a \$257,000 annual discretionary legal budget.

YELLOW NOTICE - THEIR LAWYERS AND OUR TIME - WHO PAYS?

Municipal lawyers may bill for calls, emails, meetings, research and preparation. Landowners can spend comparable time reconstructing records, challenging mapping, attending meetings and retaining experts. Every owner should record the date, task, hours, receipts, lost income and normal occupational rate. If government error and recoverable loss are proven, reasonable professional costs, out-of-pocket expenses, demonstrable lost income or opportunity cost, and other proven damages should be claimed and assessed. Taxpayer money spent correcting or defending the error must also be disclosed, and recovery from any responsible institution, insurer, consultant or third party should be examined. Personal liability should not be alleged against councillors without evidence and legal advice.

PROFESSOR LEX COMMON-SENSE QUESTIONS

1. What is the estimated private cost of the studies, applications, delay and upgrades required to remove H26 from an individual property?
2. Will the City reimburse an owner if monitoring later shows that the hold was unnecessary or materially overbroad?
3. If mapping is corrected, will application fees and reasonable professional costs be refunded?
4. Was any parcel-level market, financing or highest-and-best-use analysis performed before the restriction was proposed?
5. Will MPAC and municipal tax officials be asked whether an imposed restriction or corrected zoning affects assessment or tax treatment?
6. Why does the report quantify the City's budget impact but not the private cost transferred to landowners?
7. Will Council establish a process for owners to submit documented time-and-expense ledgers for review if government error is proven?

EVIDENCE CAUTION

A planning restriction does not automatically produce a tax reduction, compensation entitlement or successful legal claim. A lawyer's billing practice does not automatically make every landowner hour recoverable. Court costs, pre-litigation investigation time, lost income, professional expenses and property damages are legally distinct and require records and legal analysis. The missing analysis is a legitimate accountability issue; it is not proof of the final answer.

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

4. TEST FIRST OR CONTROL FIRST

CONFIRMED RECORD

Orillia Engineering advises that the pumping station may be nearing or at capacity and intends to conduct flow monitoring to determine whether modelled results are accurate.

PROFESSOR LEX'S PLAIN-LANGUAGE VIEW

The City is not hiding the uncertainty: it says the model needs real-world testing. The accountability problem is the chosen order of operations. The proposed sequence is control first, test afterward, and require an individual owner to prove capacity or fund upgrades to escape the hold. That may be defensible as precautionary planning, but the public record should show why a broad hold is proportionate, why some approved properties are excluded, why another approved property remains included, and how owners will be protected if the model proves materially wrong.

THE COMMON-SENSE COMPARATOR

A careful environmental or servicing system can use provisional safeguards. But provisional control should come with a short testing timetable, transparent thresholds, equal rules, direct notice, a low-cost correction path and a remedy when government assumptions fail.

PROFESSOR LEX COMMON-SENSE QUESTIONS

1. What model, assumptions, peak-flow factors and safety margins produced the capacity concern?
2. When will monitoring begin, how long will it run, and when will the results be published?
3. What exact technical threshold will remove or retain the hold?
4. Why are 48 Orchard Point Road and 51 Clifford Street excluded while 625 Atherley Road remains included despite site-plan approval?
5. Will similarly situated owners receive the same treatment, or will existing agreements decide who carries the burden?
6. Can owners obtain an independent review without repeating work or paying open-ended municipal costs?
7. Will H26 expire automatically if testing is not completed by a fixed date?
8. What compensation, fee refund or tax review follows if the hold proves unnecessary?

PLANNING-LAW CAUTION

Ontario's Planning Act permits zoning by-laws to use holding symbols and provides a process for removal. Whether the proposed H26 wording, notice, scope, exclusions and conditions are lawful or reasonable is a matter for planning and legal review; this assessment does not decide it.

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

5. A LEGAL RESERVE SHOULD NOT BECOME A BLANK CHEQUE

CONFIRMED RECORD

Orillia staff propose transferring \$252,309 in unused 2025 operating legal funds into a new reserve for extraordinary legal matters and litigation. Council would approve allocations to specific matters.

PROFESSOR LEX'S PLAIN-LANGUAGE VIEW

A legal reserve is not automatically improper. The report presents it as a way to improve transparency, manage unpredictable multi-year litigation and reduce budget volatility. The concern is asymmetry: government can preserve unused legal money and build a continuing defence fund, while the same published materials identify no matching fund for owner notice, mapping review, private expert costs, tax relief or compensation analysis.

LET THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY PAY - IF THE EVIDENCE SUPPORTS IT

Before local taxpayers or individual owners absorb the full bill, Council should identify whether a provincial direction, dataset, approval, consultant product, insurer, contractor or other third party materially caused or contributed to the problem. If the evidence and independent legal advice support recovery, contribution or indemnity, the municipality should preserve and pursue those rights. The current record does not establish that the Province was at fault, and this assessment does not recommend filing an unsupported lawsuit.

PROFESSOR LEX COMMON-SENSE QUESTIONS

1. Which identified or anticipated legal risks prompted the reserve proposal?
2. Were planning, mapping, servicing, boundary-expansion or landowner claims considered?
3. Will each allocation identify the matter, amount, authority and approving Council decision, subject only to legitimate privilege?
4. Will Council report meaningful annual aggregate totals for outside counsel, experts, settlements and recoveries?
5. Before defending a disputed decision, will Council require a written merits, proportionality and settlement review?
6. Has the City identified every potentially responsible third party and preserved limitation, contribution, insurance and indemnity rights?
7. If provincial policy or data caused a proven error, will the City seek provincial funding or recovery rather than defaulting to local taxpayers?
8. Why is there a litigation reserve without a corresponding owner-assistance or correction-cost policy?
9. Should the incoming Council review the reserve before new contributions or extraordinary allocations are made?

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

6. THE ACTION PLAN BEFORE MORE MONEY IS SPENT

Professor Lex's common-sense recommendation is not 'sue everyone.' It is: preserve the evidence, identify responsibility, correct proven errors, measure private impact, and make the responsible party carry the proper share of the cost.

IMMEDIATE PUBLIC ACTIONS

1. Publish the September 28 votes, amendments and implementation directions immediately.
2. Create a parcel-level audit protocol for known and potential EP, Greenlands and servicing-control errors.
3. Freeze destruction or alteration of native GIS, modelling, email, consultant and notice records.
4. Give every mapped owner a plain-language notice explaining the designation, evidence, consequences, correction process, expected cost and appeal path.
5. Create a no-fee correction route where government identifies or concedes an error.
6. Commission independent review of the private financial burden, including study costs, delay, marketability, highest and best use, assessment and taxes.
7. Require a written responsibility analysis identifying municipal, County, provincial, consultant, contractor and insurer roles before litigation money is committed.
8. Require the incoming Council to review the H26 implementation, correction policy and legal reserve within 90 days of taking office.

THE THREE QUESTIONS GOVERNMENT CANNOT AVOID

1	What was wrong, uncertain or unverified?
2	Who knew, who approved it and who was notified?
3	Who pays to correct the record and the proven loss?

FINAL NOTICE TO CANDIDATES

Landowners should not have to discover controls, corrections, costs or potential claims by accident. Every candidate - new and returning - is called upon to direct landowners to WatershedDebacle.ca, state a position on notice and correction costs, and support preservation of the complete public record.

PROFESSOR LEX - LANDOWNERS' BEST FRIEND

NOTICE TO READERS

We call on every municipal candidate - new and returning - to advise landowners to subscribe to WatershedDebacle.ca for updates concerning potential litigation.

OFFICIAL SOURCES AND EVIDENCE CONTROLS

OFFICIAL MUNICIPAL SOURCES

Orillia Report DSE-26-35 - Municipally Initiated Zoning By-law Amendment

<https://orillia.civicweb.net/FileStorage/574EACF9A8C64D9EACF7C5422B65B8E2-260928%20Public%20Planning%20DSE-26-35%20-%20Municipally-Ini.pdf>

Orillia September 28 Public Planning Meeting agenda

<https://orillia.civicweb.net/document/389952>

Orillia Report CS-26-43 - Legal and Risk Management Reserve Fund

<https://orillia.civicweb.net/FileStorage/3335B0A60E864A47A79C735E2A22181D-260928%20CC%20CS-26-43%20-%20Establishment%20of%20a%20Legal%20and%20.pdf>

Orillia September 28 Council agenda

<https://orillia.civicweb.net/document/389954>

Severn public-meeting notice - 2250 Stockdale Road

<https://www.severn.ca/news/posts/notice-of-public-meeting-concerning-zoning-by-law-amendment-for-2250-stockdale-road/>

OFFICIAL LEGISLATION

Municipal Act, 2001 - section 275, restricted acts after nomination day

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25>

Planning Act - section 36, holding symbols

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>

EVIDENCE-STATUS RULE

CONFIRMED RECORD	An identified official source contains the stated fact. Authenticity, completeness and legal effect may still require verification.
PROPOSAL	A staff recommendation, application or draft instrument. It is not a final Council decision or enacted by-law.
WORKING INFERENCE	A reasonable explanation or concern drawn from the present record. It is a question for testing, not a finding.
MISSING RECORD	A document, analysis or search target not located in the cited material. Absence is not proof of misconduct.
LEGAL OR EXPERT QUESTION	A matter reserved for qualified planning, engineering, GIS, appraisal, accounting, assessment or legal opinion.

PUBLIC-USE CAUTION

This document is for information gathering, accountability and records preservation. It is not legal advice, an expert valuation, a court filing or a determination of liability. Readers should verify current agendas, final decisions, enacted instruments, appeal rights and legal deadlines from the official sources.

SHOW THE SOURCE. ASK FOR THE MISSING WORK. FOLLOW THE MONEY.

7. CASE AUTHORITIES

MUNICIPAL ERROR AND RESPONSIBILITY

A STARTING POINT FOR INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

These decisions provide legal tests relevant to the enquiry. The comparisons below are proposed research applications; the courts did not decide the Severn or Orillia facts described in this issue. Read the judgments with the original parcel records.

A1 | Ingles v. Tutkaluk Construction Ltd., 2000 SCC 12

Start here: Paragraphs 25, 40-47 and 55-60. Supreme Court of Canada; appeal from Ontario.

What the Court decided: The Court restored a \$49,368.80 judgment against Toronto and a contractor for defective construction involving negligent municipal inspection. It upheld the allocation of fault and the City's indemnity against the contractor.

Connection to this enquiry: This supports examining municipal responsibility and contribution from other responsible parties. For Tallwood or Stockdale, identify the precise technical task, the applicable duty, the error, and the loss it caused.

Limit: The case concerns building inspections, not planning-map accuracy. It does not establish a duty or liability for every mapping error. The Court required reasonable care, not a guarantee against every defect.

[Official judgment - A1](#)

A2 | Nelson (City) v. Marchi, 2021 SCC 41

Start here: Paragraphs 16-19, 50-68 and 76-80.

What the Court decided: The challenged snow-clearing conduct was not protected as a core policy decision. A new trial was required on breach and causation; the Supreme Court did not make a final damages award.

Connection to this enquiry: Separate the policy choice from its technical implementation. Preserve who made the mapping or modelling decision, the decision process, budget considerations and technical criteria.

Limit: Calling conduct operational does not itself establish a duty, negligence or recoverable loss. Genuine core policy choices remain protected; applying this personal-injury case to planning-related economic loss requires further analysis.

[Official judgment - A2](#)

RESEARCH QUESTION

Was the alleged problem a protected policy choice, a negligent technical act, or both? Identify the act and the person or institution responsible before drawing a conclusion.

CASE AUTHORITIES

LAND CONTROL AND COMPENSATION

The constructive-taking route has its own legal test. It should be investigated separately from negligent mapping, reimbursement requests and assessment appeals.

A3 | Annapolis Group Inc. v. Halifax Regional Municipality, 2022 SCC 36

Start here: Majority reasons, paragraphs 38-45 and 79-80.

What the Court decided: The majority allowed the constructive-taking claim to proceed to trial. The test requires an advantage accruing to the public authority from the property and the removal of all reasonable uses.

Connection to this enquiry: Investigate the actual public advantage and every remaining reasonable use of each parcel. Paragraph 45 directs attention to the land, historic uses, restrictions, notice at acquisition and reasonable expectations.

Limit: The 2022 judgment did not award compensation or finally find a taking. A reduction in value, loss of the preferred development, or a public environmental benefit alone does not satisfy both requirements.

[Official judgment - A3](#)

A4 | St. John's (City) v. Lynch, 2024 SCC 17

Start here: Paragraphs 61-62; also the Court's linked plain-language summary for the result.

What the Court decided: The 2024 appeal concerned valuation after a constructive expropriation had already been established. The City succeeded: independent watershed zoning had to be considered when valuing the property.

Connection to this enquiry: A watershed restriction can form part of a compensable-taking history. Researchers should separate entitlement to compensation from its amount, and map the sequence of zoning, refusals and alleged taking.

Limit: This is not authority for valuing every restricted parcel as unrestricted residential land. The zoning was found independent of the expropriation scheme. Any proposed highest-and-best-use valuation must address that distinction.

[Official judgment - A4](#)

[Lynch - Supreme Court Case in Brief](#) (staff summary; not the reasons for judgment).

THE EVIDENCE MUST ANSWER BOTH QUESTIONS

What legally supportable claim establishes entitlement? What valuation assumptions and loss evidence establish the amount? One answer does not substitute for the other.

CASE AUTHORITIES

FAIR PROCESS AND THE COST CLAIM

A5 | Canadian Pacific Railway Co. v. Vancouver (City), 2006 SCC 5

Start here: Paragraphs 30-40, 42 and 46; read the taking test with Annapolis.

What the Court decided: CPR's taking claim failed. Reasonable uses remained, and the Vancouver Charter also excluded the remedy. The Court recognized a context-specific fairness duty but found Vancouver's process fair.

Connection to this enquiry: This supports examining notice, meaningful participation, permitted uses and the governing statute. Researchers must identify what affected owners knew and what opportunity they had to respond.

Limit: This is not a compensation victory. It does not create a universal duty to circulate the enquiry's website or litigation notice. Its compensation exclusion was specific to the legislation at issue; the applicable Ontario provisions must be examined separately.

[Official judgment - A5](#)

BILLING COUNCIL: WHAT THESE CASES SUPPORT

They support investigating legal responsibility and claiming losses that can be proved and recovered under the applicable law. None establishes that sending Council an invoice makes it a debt, that every hour is payable at an employment rate, or that individual councillors personally owe the amount.

KEEP EACH TYPE OF COST DISTINCT

Record	Research task
Owner-paid expenses	Preserve invoices, receipts, purpose and connection to the alleged error. Separate correction work from litigation work.
Time and lost income	Log dates, tasks and hours. Separately document actual lost wages or business income; do not treat all personal time as an established debt.
Property loss	Obtain evidence of lawful uses, market effect and causation. Avoid counting the same loss under several headings.
Public spending and recovery	Identify correction and defence spending, contracts, insurers and contribution rights. Public legal spending is not itself a personal damages award.

Counsel review: Select the cause of action, proper defendant, recoverable heads of loss, statutory route and applicable deadlines before presenting a legal demand. The annual ledger preserves evidence; it does not decide liability.

RESEARCHERS' STARTING POINT CONNECT THE AUTHORITY TO THE RECORD

Start with the five judgments above and municipal sources on page 9. Record source, date, evidence status and competing explanations. These are research tasks, not findings of liability.

Issue in this report	First records to obtain	Question to test
Tallwood Drive Pages 2 and 4	Original and corrected zoning; native GIS layers; review history; notices; affected applications and owner invoices.	How did the error arise, who relied on it, and what identifiable loss followed? Start with A1 and A2.
2250 Stockdale Road Page 4	Application, surveys, technical reports, staff analysis, final decision and correction expenses.	Does the evidence establish an error, or only a requested change? A1/A2 are potential analogies, not findings.
Proposed H26 hold Pages 2 and 6	Model inputs; monitoring results; capacity criteria; exclusions; final by-law; hold-removal conditions and costs.	What is policy and what is technical implementation? What uses remain? Start with A2 and A3.
Greenlands / watershed effects	Parcel-specific restrictions; written use decisions; public use or benefit evidence; planning and appraisal history.	Can both taking elements be proved? Which restrictions legitimately affect valuation? Start with A3-A5.
Notice and who pays Pages 3-5 and 7-8	Notice/service records; response opportunities; fee schedules; receipts; time and income records; consultant contracts.	Was the required process followed, and which loss has a lawful recovery route? Start with A1 and A5.

BEFORE RELYING ON AN AUTHORITY

Check later judicial treatment, the applicable Ontario statutes, statutory immunities or compensation exclusions, and limitation or appeal periods. Confirm final Council decisions and enacted wording; a proposal is not an operative restriction. Further research does not itself extend a deadline.

NOTICE TO RESEARCHERS

Test supporting and contrary evidence equally. A missing record is a request for further investigation, not proof of wrongdoing. Deliver a source-linked comparison that distinguishes confirmed facts, reported facts, inference and unresolved legal questions.

Authorities appendix added: September 27, 2026. Selected starting authorities, not an exhaustive review of subsequent case treatment. Original report: pages 1-9; authorities and research guide: pages 10-13.

YELLOW NOTICE - COMMON SENSE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Why must we fight our own council for common sense?

Taxpayers should not fear government. Government should fear taxpayers. Council must answer to us. JOIN US.

Legal foundation: Ontario's [Municipal Act, 2001](#), s. 224(a), (d.1) and (e), assigns council responsibilities for public representation, accountable and transparent operations, and financial integrity. Section 270(1), paragraph 5, requires an accountability and transparency policy. The notice's language of "fear" is political rhetoric; these provisions concern accountability to the whole public, not a duty to fear taxpayers or agree with every demand.