

COLLECTIVE RESIDENT LETTER

Toronto Standard Condominium Corporation No. 2745, Eau du Soleil

20 & 30 Shore Breeze Drive, Etobicoke, Ontario M8V 0J1

To: The Board of Directors, TSCC 2745, and Zoran Properties Inc. (Property Management)

Date: July 20, 2026

Reference No.: TSCC2745-RL-2026-001

We, the undersigned residents of Eau du Soleil, owners and tenants alike, are writing collectively to raise the following concerns about the enforcement practices and management of our building. A growing number of residents feel they are being policed rather than served in their own home. We share a common interest in this building's condition and reputation: deferred maintenance, poorly supervised contractors, and an adversarial management culture affects the desirability and value of every unit, and enforcement overreach comes at a cost to both owners and tenants. The Corporation and its management exist to serve the entire resident community, and we ask that our concerns be addressed in that spirit. We request a substantive written response and a town hall meeting with residents, the Board, and management within 30 days of receiving this letter.

1. Repairs take too long and the building is deteriorating

Repairs are left outstanding for extended periods and basic upkeep has suffered. A gym treadmill has been out of service for months, the sauna was down for months before management even acknowledged it by email, and elevator breakdowns repeatedly leave residents with long waits. The revolving door at the Water Tower has produced loud mechanical noise for months with no repair, an elevator tile has been broken for months, and the fob system in the Water Tower was non-functional for an extended period with no timeline given. In several cases the status and timeline of the work remain unknown to residents.

Meanwhile, management has invested significant time and resources in new enforcement systems while these basic items go unaddressed. The massage chair, for instance, was installed in a high-traffic gym area, displacing existing equipment despite better-suited rooms being available. These are the things residents pay for through common expenses, and ongoing deterioration of common elements directly affects the market value of every unit and the reputation of the building. We ask for timely repairs, clear updates on amenities residents pay for, and a rebalancing of priorities toward physical upkeep, building systems, and vendor accountability.

2. Amenity suspensions without a fair or published process

Residents have been given full amenity bans without any prior written warning or published escalation process. In at least one case, security said a resident would get only a "mild warning," after which management imposed a full suspension. The only Rule authorizing denial of access, Rule 20(d), permits it only where the measure is "proportional to the complaint." Where a suspension is said to relate to footwear, we note the only footwear rule in the book is Rule 16(j), so which Rule is being relied on to ban residents?

A recurring pattern makes this worse: management issues an accusation, offers some form of proof, and then stops responding once a resident objects or asks for the basis, treating the matter as closed rather than engaging with the objection. We ask the Board to publish a written enforcement process with graduated warnings, to respond to residents who challenge a penalty, and to lift any restriction that was imposed without following the proper Rules and the Condominium Act.

3. Management notices are being used to override the Rules

When enforcing restrictions, management issues notices that contradict the registered Rules rather than applying them. The July 14, 2026 hookah/shisha notice restricts the Designated Smoking Area to “cigarette smoking and vaping only” and cites section 117 of the Act. But Rule 4(h) already defines “smoking” to include “shisha” and “molasses,” and permits smoking in the Designated Smoking Area without distinguishing between substances. Narrowing that Rule to exclude shisha is a substantive rule change, one that appears targeted at a specific group of residents, which under section 58 of the Act requires a Board resolution and notice to owners with a right to requisition a vote, not a management notice. We ask that the Board confirm the legal basis for this restriction, and that enforcement notices apply the actual Rules rather than override them.

4. A guest limit is being enforced that does not exist in the Rules

Security has repeatedly told residents at the BBQ and terrace that they may have no more than six guests. This limit appears in the registered Rules in only two places, Rule 18(e) (Water Lounge) and Rule 19(e) (Sky Lounge), and applies only inside those restricted lounges. The only Rule for the general common elements, Rule 3(e), simply requires a guest to be accompanied by a resident, with no numeric limit. There is no basis in the Rules or the Condominium Act for a six-guest cap at the BBQ. We ask that this enforcement stop.

5. Contractor oversight

Management described the garage power wash as substandard only after the work was finished. The job also started late, and residents on P2 vacated their parking spots for no result and were then required to do so again on less than 24 hours' notice on the final day. The cleaning contractor was also changed, and the drop in quality is visible throughout the building. The same pattern shows up in repairs left in a substandard state, including the noisy and faulty revolving door system at the Water Tower entrance on both sides and many accessible-entry switch that do not work properly. The common thread is inadequate vetting and supervision of contractors. We ask that contractors be properly vetted and their work inspected as it proceeds, so that jobs are done correctly, on time, and without repetition, and that residents not be left to absorb the cost of work the Corporation's contractors failed to do properly.

6. New systems for problems that do not exist, including the BBQ booking system

Management builds new systems for problems residents did not raise while real problems sit unaddressed. The clearest example is the mandatory BBQ booking system. The May 15, 2026 notice admits the BBQ ran for years first-come, first-served and was changed over “the occasional standoff,” not a demonstrated problem. In practice the system reduces access: the BBQ often shows as “booked” while sitting empty or not working, residents stay away, it is easily abused through unused bookings, and it creates friction with security. The notice imposes suspensions with “No exceptions. No overrides.” We ask the Board to confirm whether this system was adopted as a proper rule under section 58 of the Act, with a Board resolution and notice to owners, and if not to suspend the penalties, and more broadly to stop introducing new enforcement systems at undisclosed cost while basic upkeep is neglected.

7. Security and management conduct, overreach, and misdirected priorities

Security and management conduct has been escalatory and disproportionate. In more than one incident, seven or more people were seated together at the BBQ; when a resident confirmed the additional person was his guest and asked that they not be counted separately, security responded, in front of guests, that they would “file a report, and if it turns out you are lying, you will be banned.” On another occasion, security demanded to inspect

the contents of a resident's bag. Nothing in the Rules or the Act authorizes staff to search residents' belongings or to threaten bans over an invented guest count.

At the same time, serious property crimes go under-addressed. Residents have had vehicles stolen from the garage and belongings taken from storage lockers, and in several cases security did not review available footage or attend the scene. Security resources should be redirected away from punitive monitoring of residents and toward core responsibilities: patrols, access control, and assisting residents and police with theft prevention. We ask for written confirmation that the escalatory practices will stop and that security priorities will be refocused on building safety.

8. Pool area: cleanliness, reporting, and hours

Management has introduced amenity restrictions citing hygiene and safety, yet the pool area itself goes unaddressed. Foam and bubbles in the jacuzzi suggest inadequately treated water, the pool is visibly hazy at times, and people regularly enter in full clothing or outdoor shoes, or through the back door rather than the change room. Rule 16(j) prohibits outdoor footwear in the pool area, yet residents have no discreet way to report violations without confronting each other directly. The pool walls are also visibly dirtier than under the previous contractor. We ask that cleaning standards and water quality be properly monitored and that a simple reporting mechanism be made available.

The pool also closes at 11:00 PM while other fitness amenities stay open until midnight. Rule 16(o) expressly allows the Board to change pool hours, and we request the pool be open until midnight.

9. Management responsiveness

Residents report a consistent pattern of unacknowledged emails, particularly when the inquiry concerns serious matters or challenges a management decision. Routine or administrative messages get replies while substantive concerns are left unanswered. Selective communication erodes trust between residents and administration. We ask that management commit to acknowledging written resident inquiries within two business days and providing a substantive response within a reasonable time.

If these concerns are not addressed, signatories are prepared to pursue every available channel, including the Condominium Authority Tribunal (CAT), the Condominium Management Regulatory Authority of Ontario (CMRAO), and other appropriate avenues. We raise them here first because we would much prefer a direct and constructive resolution.

We value this community and want a respectful, transparent, and accountable relationship with the Board and management. We look forward to your written response and to a town hall meeting within 30 days of receiving this letter.

Respectfully,

Full Name:

Signature:

Unit #:

Email Address:

Date: