COMPLETE EDITION

The Zebuun Plan

Our plans for homes, homelessness, streets, reliable buses and a phased light rail transition, the City budget, local businesses and work in London, Ontario.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

What's in the plan

01 A home within reach

02 A home and the help to keep it

03 Getting around our streets

04 A bus you can count on

05 A budget you can follow

06 City Hall that works with business

07 Help getting into work

Published October 19, 2026. Each chapter includes sources, their access dates and the limits of what they tell us. Budgets, project schedules, programs and rules can change, so the delivery reports will need to keep pace.

Where I'll start and what comes next

Over a four year term, I'll focus on a manageable set of improvements to the services London already has. Staff capacity, money and partner decisions will shape what can happen first. The chapters explain the role I'll take and who else needs to be involved.

The first budget choice is what we can actually deliver. I'll ask staff what fits within approved resources, what would need to wait and what requires a funded business case. Housing stability, essential maintenance and reliable services will guide those choices. Residents should see what's approved, what's still being negotiated and what we've decided to leave out.

For transit, the targets are an accelerated BRT finish in 2027, the first rail stage plan that year and a physical LRT construction start in 2028. Within 100 days, publish a joint delivery review showing what contractors, utilities and LTC can support. The budget chapter gives the capped first allocations and the conditions for releasing them.

First 100 days · get the starting picture

I'll ask the City Manager, finance staff and service leaders to put the existing commitments, service results and staffing needs in one place. We'll look at housing delays, housing stability, repair priorities, transit connections and business processes. For BRT, bring contractors, utilities and LTC into one acceleration review. For rail, choose a focused first stage and get early supplier advice on price and timing.

What needs to be in place: I'll request reports and bring partners together. Spending, service standards and new programs still need the relevant staff, Council or agency approval, plus funding and agreement from delivery partners.

Year one · fund the first improvements

Bring forward a manageable first year package, with its cost, delivery lead and expected result. Target BRT completion in 2027 through a priced program. Complete the first rail stage plan and the design and permissions needed for its first construction package that year. Publish what is confirmed, what remains outstanding and any change to the target dates.

What needs to be in place: Capital projects need confirmed funding. Ongoing services need ongoing revenue. Set pilot targets after establishing the starting figures, with a spending cap and a date to review the results.

Years two to four · deliver and check the results

Target physical LRT construction starting in 2028 through a useful, approved first package. Use specialist contractors where their price and delivery case support it. Keep buses operating through the work and publish monthly construction results. Later rail packages need their own design, permissions and funding. Keep improving the other services in the plan alongside this work.

What needs to be in place: Expansion needs results, ongoing money and partner agreement. Construction, housing completions and health capacity also depend on decisions outside the mayor's office. If something is delayed, explain what happened and what comes next.

How we'll account for the money

Show initial construction or setup separately from ongoing operations, staff, renewal and financing. Name the funding sources and who pays if an expected contribution doesn't arrive.

Explain what existing staff and budgets can absorb. If work or money is redirected, name what gets delayed or reduced. Count efficiency savings after checking implementation costs and service effects.

Use restricted grants and growth revenues for eligible work. Land, borrowing and reserves carry costs too, including future maintenance and operating obligations.

Keep rail planning and construction allocations visible in the budget chapter. Release each package against a defined scope, approved funding and the necessary permissions. Count contractor, staff and oversight costs. Price BRT acceleration separately, assume no unconfirmed grants or savings, and disclose the full first rail stage cost before committing its main works.

Tax changes, a total platform price and new housing quotas need staff costing, reliable starting figures and Council decisions. Those numbers will come through the funded proposals, with the assumptions available to residents.

Published October 19, 2026. Each chapter includes sources, their access dates and the limits of what they tell us. Budgets, project schedules, programs and rules can change, so the delivery reports will need to keep pace.

CHAPTER 01

A home within reach

A place you can afford, and a clearer way to get it built.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

01 / A home within reach

I'll push stalled housing files forward, make smaller projects easier to navigate and use suitable City land to secure homes that stay affordable.

IN THIS CHAPTER

What the housing numbers actually tell us

Find out why an approved project is waiting

Make the smaller builds easier to figure out

Put public land to work for affordable homes

Keep the affordable homes we already have

Show what the public contribution pays for

What I'll bring forward during the term

What the housing numbers actually tell us

On August 10, 2026, London reported 11,966 housing units against its three year Housing Accelerator Fund target of 11,803, ahead of the federal deadline. Staff, Council, builders and housing providers put work into that result and deserve credit. We also need to know what the figure counts. Approvals, finished homes and homes people can afford tell us different things about the situation. The announcement alone doesn't establish how many of those homes were finished, occupied or affordable to a particular household. I'll keep those figures separate when I talk about progress. [1]

Someone sharing a student apartment has different needs from a parent looking for a family rental, or an older person who needs an accessible home. I want housing decisions to reflect that. I'll ask Council to look at how many homes are actually reaching residents, and whether homes receiving public support stay affordable for the people they're meant for. Both deserve space in the report. A big overall number can leave a lot of everyday questions unanswered, especially when you're the person still looking for somewhere to live.

Find out why an approved project is waiting

I'll ask for a review of housing projects that have permission but haven't moved ahead. For each one, we need to understand the hold up. It might be a City decision, water or sewer capacity, another agency, financing or the builder's own schedule. When the City can fix it, there should be a named lead and a date for the next action. When a private financing decision is holding things up, residents should hear that too. Council can then put its time where it can help.

The report should separate incomplete submissions from complete applications waiting for review. Time with the applicant and time with the City should be shown separately, including the unusually long waits. Otherwise a decent average can hide a file that's gone nowhere for months. Complicated affordable housing applications need attention alongside simpler files. Planning still comes with public processes and provincial requirements. As mayor, I'll bring the right people together and take staffing choices to Council, while staff do the reviews their jobs require. [5][6]

Make the smaller builds easier to figure out

London already allows up to four total residential units on qualifying properties under the relevant zoning rules. The City announced those changes were in force in October 2024. My focus is helping people use those permissions: understandable instructions, early warnings about servicing limits and a way to get a coordinated answer when departments give conflicting advice. Each property still has to meet its own requirements. A homeowner should be able to find out what's possible before spending a pile of money on plans. [2]

I'll ask staff which mistakes keep sending applications back and which better instructions could prevent. People shouldn't have to discover one requirement at a time, weeks apart. We'll track finished homes and the conditions attached to public help, because the size of a unit alone tells us very little about its rent. Neighbours need information about drainage, trees, construction access and safety. People hoping to move into the neighbourhood deserve to be part of that conversation as well. Theres room to make the process clearer without skipping those questions.

Put public land to work for affordable homes

I'll seek a review of City land that could suit housing, starting with available services and the other public needs a site might meet. Before asking providers to bid, staff should explain contamination, access, servicing, planning limits and the cost of giving up another use. An open selection process should let nonprofit and cooperative providers show how they'd keep homes affordable over time. The number of units matters alongside the quality of the plan for running them.

Residents should get an explanation of what each land agreement buys: rent rules, eligible incomes, accessible homes, maintenance responsibilities, how long affordability lasts and what happens if the provider breaks the agreement. Staff can compare a long ground lease with a sale for the particular site. The right arrangement may differ from one property to another. I'll want follow up well after opening day, when tenants are living there and the building has real repair bills. That's when we find out whether the agreement is holding up.

Keep the affordable homes we already have

The London and Middlesex Housing Stability Action Plan includes protecting existing affordable homes as well as building more. Council has endorsed that direction, so I'll work from it. [4] As we look at land and provider partnerships, I'll ask staff to consider repairs and acquisitions too. Each proposal needs a look at building condition, tenant security, total cost and the length of affordability it would protect. Buying an existing building can be worth considering, with the same care we'd give any other public investment.

When a City supported project could displace tenants, I'll ask for an assessment that explains relocation help, possible return arrangements and the limits of what the City can legally require. Where stronger protections need Ontario's involvement, I'll advocate for them. People already living in a building need to know what a publicly supported change means for their home. Any repair initiative or acquisition fund needs a business case and funding approval, including a clear account of the other work that money could support.

Show what the public contribution pays for

London has used community improvement incentives, including temporary HAF offers whose qualifying permit window ended September 7, 2026. Those particular offers need to be described with their actual dates. [3] Before seeking a replacement, I'll ask which projects went ahead, how much public help they received and what delivery or affordability conditions came with it. Council also needs to consider whether a project would have proceeded anyway. That question helps us compare an incentive with other uses of the same money.

Every new proposal should show the initial building assistance separately from ongoing costs. Discounted land, fee relief, servicing and staff time all count. A construction grant still leaves a provider needing a workable operating budget to sustain the rents. I'll pursue federal and provincial partnerships and clearly mark contributions we're still waiting on. Council should see smaller options, different delivery models and what happens if we don't proceed. Any claim about lower rents or savings per home needs evidence behind it first.

What I'll bring forward during the term

In the first 100 days, I'll ask for the housing delivery review, consistent definitions for the figures already published, a look at common obstacles for small projects and criteria for screening City land. Residents should be able to tell which numbers refer to permissions and which refer to actual homes. That work gives Council something specific to decide on, with sites, providers and funding still assessed before we put dates on construction.

During year one, I'll seek approval for a costed improvement to application services and a first screened housing partnership, with affordability and funding terms available before the vote. In years two to four, I'll push for quarterly delivery reports and an annual check on publicly supported homes, including agreements that haven't been met. Financing or construction conditions may change the schedule. When they do, I'll explain what happened and bring forward the options we have left.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Show where housing gets stuck

I'll ask for a housing update every quarter that separates planning approvals, building permits, construction starts, finished homes and occupied affordable homes. Delays the City controls need a person responsible and a next step.

Who can act: Council can fund and request municipal reviews. Builders, lenders, utilities and other agencies handle important steps too. [5][6]

How we'll pay for it: Start by checking staff workload and the reporting tools we already have. Extra staff or systems need budget approval.

What we'll check: Publish clear definitions, typical waits and the longest waits by application type, plus complete files waiting on City action.

What could get in the way: Protect private business information and report totals consistently. Staff shouldn't get a better score just by picking the easiest files.

02 / Make small projects less of a headache

I'll seek one clear guide and coordinated City answers for additional units and modest infill, using the housing permissions London already has. [2]

Who can act: The City handles zoning and building reviews under provincial law. Servicing, building and safety requirements still apply. [5]

How we'll pay for it: Cost a small service improvement before expanding it. Any incentive needs an actual funding source, including a check on which HAF offers have ended.

What we'll check: Track complete applications, reasons for repeat submissions, review times and homes finished. Keep affordability claims tied to actual evidence.

What could get in the way: Clearer forms help, but construction is still expensive and some lots won't work. Tell applicants about site limits early.

03 / Get lasting value from public land

I'll seek a list of suitable City sites and an open competition for nonprofit, cooperative and other qualified housing providers, with affordability written into enforceable agreements.

Who can act: Council decides on land and funding. Staff check planning, legal and servicing requirements for each site. [5][6]

How we'll pay for it: Show the land value, servicing bill, building subsidy, operating support and financial exposure. Count federal or provincial money once it's confirmed.

What we'll check: Report occupied homes, household eligibility, rent rules, accessibility, the length of affordability and compliance with the agreement.

What could get in the way: Discounting public land costs residents something. The operator also needs enough money to keep the building running at the promised rents.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Ask for the housing delivery review, clear reporting definitions, a review of obstacles for small projects and criteria for assessing City land.

Year one

Seek Council approval for a costed application service improvement and a screened housing partnership, with affordability terms and funding shown upfront.

Years two to four

Push for quarterly delivery updates and annual checks on agreements. Later partnerships depend on results, suitable sites and approved funding.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **London surpasses Housing Accelerator Fund target ahead of federal deadline**
City of London · 10 August 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. The City reports 11,966 units against a target of 11,803. That figure alone doesn't tell us how many homes were finished, occupied or affordable.
Read source

2. **More housing options available in London neighbourhoods**
City of London · 7 October 2024
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains existing additional unit permissions, including qualifying zoning rules and differences near campuses.
Read source

3. **Community improvement and incentives**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Includes HAF offers with a qualifying permit window from April 29 to September 7, 2026. Each offer has its own eligibility rules.
Read source

4. **Housing Stability Action Plan (2026 to 2031)**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records Council endorsement in May 2026 and the next implementation steps. It doesn't establish later provincial approval.
Read source

5. **11. Land use planning: The Ontario municipal councillor’s guide**
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains municipal planning tools, provincial rules and public processes. Individual sites still need legal review.
Read source

6. **1. Role of council, councillor and staff: The Ontario municipal councillor’s guide**
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains Council's policy, service and financial responsibilities, alongside the mayor's leadership role.
Read source

CHAPTER 02

A home and the help to keep it

Help sooner, make care easier to reach and give people a way to keep their home.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

02 / A home and the help to keep it

I'll work to close gaps in prevention, connect housing with support people can choose and report whether people are finding a stable home.

IN THIS CHAPTER

People need somewhere safe to live

Make help easier to reach before an eviction

Have a next step after a temporary bed

Let people choose the care that works for them

Deal with concerns people are living with now

Fund the people doing the work

Put the funded work on a schedule

People need somewhere safe to live

Losing your home says nothing about your worth. People deserve safety while they're dealing with whatever brought them there. I want housing available alongside voluntary mental health care, substance use treatment, practical help and culturally appropriate services. Some people want intensive recovery support. Others need income help, a safer tenancy or assistance with everyday tasks. Those differences should shape the options we offer. A person shouldn't have to fit one service model or tell a perfect recovery story to get help.

London already has a starting point. Both councils endorsed the London and Middlesex Housing Stability Action Plan for 2026 to 2031 in May 2026. It covers prevention, more housing and support to keep people housed. London is the regional housing Service Manager, and the plan recognises Indigenous led responses. I'll seek a costed implementation schedule with providers and people who have lived through homelessness. It should say which actions have funding, which need partners and which are waiting for a decision. [1]

Make help easier to reach before an eviction

The City's services directory already lists the Housing Stability Bank, coordinated access, shelters and outreach organisations. Eligible residents may be able to get help with rent arrears, last month's rent or emergency utility bills. [3] I'll ask where those routes work and where someone keeps being passed along without getting an answer. When a housing loss is days away, people need to understand eligibility, the next step and who will follow up. We can improve those existing services and the connections between them.

I'll seek a limited improvement with clear assessment rules, response expectations and a record of requests we couldn't meet. Financial help needs to sit alongside tenancy advice, income support and realistic housing options. I'll also ask hospitals, corrections and other institutions to work on discharge connections, with the person's consent and an identified receiving service. The City can bring people together and negotiate its part. Each institution still controls its own clinical decisions, and a referral needs somewhere real for the person to go.

Have a next step after a temporary bed

The Whole of Community System Response already connects Hubs and highly supportive housing, and the City publishes a monthly dashboard. [2] I'll ask partners to focus on the gap between a temporary stay and a home someone can keep. Before an expansion comes to Council, we should know who would run it, who it is designed to help, how referrals work and what happens when a resident needs a different level of support. That information belongs beside the number of beds.

For new housing opportunities, I'll want an operating plan covering staffing, supervision, tenancy support, maintenance and changes in a resident's health. An accessible room may still be unsuitable if daily living help is missing. Young people, families and people leaving violence can need different arrangements. Indigenous led services also need a place in the planning. I'll take those needs into design discussions and partner negotiations, with the funding responsibilities spelled out. Every service and site needs a realistic account of what the City and its partners can deliver.

Let people choose the care that works for them

Ontario announced London's HART Hub in October 2025, operated by CMHA Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services. The operator describes a treatment program based on referrals, with eligibility and participation rules. It's an existing option, and I'll ask partners to make those rules easier to understand. People sleeping outside have different needs, so we should explain how this service differs from other Hubs and housing routes. Anyone making a referral needs to know whether the program fits the person they're trying to help. [4][5]

I'll support voluntary, informed access to treatment and housing routes that don't universally require abstinence or treatment participation. Recovery can be someone's own goal on their own terms. I'll press Ontario for dependable mental health, substance use and daily living support, with agreements showing who pays and who delivers. Clinicians keep their professional responsibilities. At City Hall, I can work on coordination and advocate for capacity, while health partners handle the services within their mandate. People need that division of responsibility to work in practice.

Deal with concerns people are living with now

I'll ask for immediate public space responses that connect outreach, sanitation, fire safety and useful contact information. Neighbours and businesses need a safe way to report blocked entrances, dangerous waste or urgent welfare concerns. People living outside need sanitation, reliable information and contact with workers they trust. Staff should explain what existing services cover, where the gaps are and what a funded improvement costs. If someone is moved and remains homeless, the housing report should show that accurately.

Encampment or site responses need current legal advice, a proportionate safety assessment and attention to the options actually available. I'll ask what was offered, why it might not have fitted and what follow up is planned. Someone refusing an unsuitable option may still want help. For new service locations, I'll seek an operating contact, an escalation process and regular neighbourhood conversations that include people using the service. Theres a lot that can be addressed when everyone knows who to call and someone takes responsibility for the response.

Fund the people doing the work

The City's summary of the first research and evaluation report describes encouraging supportive housing results and serious workforce strain. [7] We should pay attention to both. I'll ask business cases to explain who was served, the level of support, housing retention, failed referrals and missing information. Selected experiences give us something to learn from, with limits on what they can tell us about the whole city. We need to understand what helps people with complex needs stay housed as well.

Before an expansion vote, Council should see separate building and operating budgets, staffing assumptions, the length of funding commitments and what the City is left paying. Donations and temporary grants can help a service open, while ongoing care needs dependable funding. I'll pursue provincial and federal help and mark what's unconfirmed. Claims about reduced hospital, police or shelter use need testing with those partners. Any municipal cash saving has to be demonstrated before entering the budget. Providers need room to improve and support difficult cases.

Put the funded work on a schedule

In the first 100 days, I'll bring housing and health partners, prevention providers, Indigenous organisations and paid participants with lived experience into an implementation review. We'll look at unmet prevention requests, referral problems and projects missing operating support. Existing reporting is the starting point, with client information kept private. The review should produce decisions Council can take and a clear list of requests for other governments. People contributing their experience should be compensated for that time.

In year one, I'll seek approval for a costed prevention improvement and a phased housing and support proposal with named partners. Through years two to four, I'll push for regular public updates and an annual look at what needs changing. Stable housing, safety, choice and access to help are the results I'll look for. A job, family connection or personal recovery goal may mean a lot to someone. People should be able to keep housing support as they work through those parts of their life.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Help before someone loses their home

I'll seek a review with existing housing stability services to find referral delays, unanswered requests and gaps when people leave hospitals or other institutions.

Who can act: London manages housing services for London and Middlesex. Hospitals, corrections and health providers need to join through their own responsibilities and agreements. [1]

How we'll pay for it: Cost a limited improvement to existing services first, with eligibility explained and provincial or federal contributions listed separately.

What we'll check: Track first response times, eligible requests met and unmet, housing threats resolved and whether people keep their home at agreed intervals, with consent.

What could get in the way: Emergency money may leave someone in a tenancy they still can't afford. Include income help, tenancy advice and other housing options.

02 / Offer housing with support that fits

I'll seek a funded schedule for supportive housing opportunities and better links to health, recovery and cultural services. Housing routes need room for people who aren't taking part in treatment.

Who can act: Council can consider housing partnerships, land and municipal funding. Health partners control clinical services, treatment decisions and provincial health funding. [1][4][6]

How we'll pay for it: Each phase needs building funding and a sustainable agreement for staff and operations. A building grant covers only part of the job.

What we'll check: Track occupied homes, referral waits and failed referrals, continuity of support, housing retention and residents' own wellbeing, with privacy protected.

What could get in the way: A site needs enough staff and a workable next housing step. Check both before expanding.

03 / Show where the system is falling short

I'll seek a shared update using the City's existing dashboard, connecting housing results with service gaps and giving neighbourhoods a clear contact and response process. [2]

Who can act: Council can request City reporting and set terms for City funded agreements. Other providers need data agreements that meet privacy requirements.

How we'll pay for it: Combine reporting where we can. Bring any extra evaluation or neighbourhood coordination costs through the budget.

What we'll check: Report funded actions, concerns resolved, stable housing, returns to homelessness and gaps in the information.

What could get in the way: Explain who a service supports, how much help they need and what data is missing. Simple rankings can punish providers taking on the hardest cases.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Bring partners together to review implementation, establish prevention and referral baselines and identify projects missing operating funding.

Year one

Seek Council decisions on a costed prevention improvement and phased supportive housing opportunity. Health partners remain responsible for their clinical and funding commitments.

Years two to four

Publish regular results and make annual adjustments. Expand when housing, staffing, ongoing funding and suitable referral routes are secured.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **Housing Stability Action Plan (2026 to 2031)**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records May 2026 endorsement, the regional Service Manager role and Indigenous led approaches. Provincial submission and detailed implementation are listed as next steps.
Read source

2. **Health & Homelessness Whole of Community System Response**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Describes existing Hubs, highly supportive housing and the monthly dashboard this work can build on.
Read source

3. **Community supports & services**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Lists Housing Stability Bank help, coordinated access, shelters and outreach. Eligibility and available capacity still apply.
Read source

4. **Ontario Opens Homelessness and Addiction Recovery Treatment Hub in London**
Ontario Ministry of Health · 23 October 2025
Accessed 18 October 2026. Names CMHA Thames Valley as operator and October 27, 2025 as the service opening date. This is an existing provincial initiative.
Read source

5. **Homelessness & Addiction Recovery Treatment Hub**
CMHA Thames Valley Addiction and Mental Health Services · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains this treatment program's referral and participation rules. Check with the operator for current requirements.
Read source

6. **1. Role of council, councillor and staff: The Ontario municipal councillor’s guide**
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains Council's policy, service and financial roles. Provincial clinical services need the responsible health partners.
Read source

7. **Health & Homelessness Research and Evaluation Report**
City of London, summarising CRHESI at Western University · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Summarises supportive housing results and workforce strain. These descriptive findings don't establish citywide cost savings caused by the program.
Read source

CHAPTER 03

Getting around our streets

Look after the basics, fix unsafe gaps and keep people moving through construction.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

03 / Getting around our streets

I'll make repair priorities easier to understand, pair street renewal with safety improvements and ask construction plans to account for access, disruption and the full cost.

IN THIS CHAPTER

Keep an eye on the work already happening

Show why one repair comes before another

Coordinate what's above and below the road

Fix the gaps in an everyday trip

Make the temporary route usable too

Include the bills that come later

What I'll ask for during the term

Keep an eye on the work already happening

London has a lot of infrastructure work underway. The City's March 2026 Renew announcement described about $285 million in new projects and another $100 million in continuing work from the previous year. That includes roads, intersections, bridges, transit corridors and underground services. These are the announced program figures. Final construction costs and completed work need their own reporting. I'll focus on how the City chooses and coordinates these projects, and how residents can check what happened to the money already committed. [1]

You experience a street differently depending on how you use it. Someone with a mobility aid needs a clear path. A bus passenger needs a reachable stop. A delivery driver needs access, and a person cycling needs a safe connection. Households also depend on the water and drainage systems underneath. I'll ask Council to look at those services together and explain what each project improves. When your road is closed for weeks, you should at least be able to understand the reason, the next step and who can answer a question.

Show why one repair comes before another

London's Corporate Asset Management Policy was reviewed and amended in March 2026. It already covers planning over an asset's life, risk, finances, climate and safe, accessible services. [3] I'll build on that work with a short annual explanation of the next repair priorities. Residents should be able to see what staff consider urgent, what is being put off and what that delay could mean. It should connect the policy to the actual streets and services people recognise.

Surface condition is one part of the assessment. A rough road, damaged sidewalk and vulnerable water pipe can call for different responses. I'll ask staff to show the evidence, what remains uncertain and why they recommend maintenance, rehabilitation or replacement. The most visible reconstruction won't always be the best use of money. Council still has to balance local concerns against risks across the network. Putting the reasoning in public gives residents a fair chance to question it and understand why another neighbourhood's project is going first.

Coordinate what's above and below the road

Renew London already includes underground water and sewer work alongside transportation projects, and its renewal program coordinates several kinds of construction. The public map also includes some private utility projects. [2] I'll seek an annual look at where renewal, utilities, housing servicing and approved mobility projects overlap. Staff can assess whether different timing would avoid digging up the same stretch repeatedly. Urgent repairs still need to happen when they're needed, even when another partner's schedule doesn't line up.

For major corridors, I'll ask why the underground work and surface changes are scheduled together and what other options staff considered. That should include smaller interventions or different stages where practical. Utility dependencies need to be visible before we promise a timetable. Emergency response, waste pickup and deliveries also need access arrangements. I can help bring partners together and bring policy choices to Council. The project team keeps responsibility for technical decisions, with enough information for the rest of us to understand the choices.

Fix the gaps in an everyday trip

Council approved the Mobility Master Plan in July 2025. London has adopted Vision Zero principles, and the road safety page describes work on a Safe Mobility Action Plan. [4][5] I'll ask staff for a focused set of safety and accessibility improvements that fit funded renewal, alongside urgent sites needing a separate response. Where do people actually need to cross? Can someone using a mobility device complete the route? Does a useful sidewalk suddenly end? Those are the sorts of questions that should shape the list.

Local observation belongs alongside network data, especially from people who walk or roll through a location regularly. Options could include crossings, sidewalk repairs, clearer sightlines, signal timing or designs that support appropriate speeds. Each needs engineering review and an explanation of effects on transit, emergency vehicles, parking and turns. Some choices will be difficult. I'll ask for the reasoning and a check after installation, using serious injury trends, actual conditions and accessibility to judge whether the change helped. The drawings should be followed by a look at how the street works.

Make the temporary route usable too

Residents can already use Renew London's construction map, individual project updates and Service London to find information or report concerns. [1][2] I'll ask staff to test those tools from the perspective of someone whose stop moved, whose business entrance is hidden or whose sidewalk is blocked. A reported problem needs an assigned response. The current route, next milestone and project contact should be easy to find. Keeping the information current is part of the work, even when the project has become complicated.

For City contracts, I'll seek recommended requirements for accessible temporary paths, crossings, residential and business access, notice of major changes and correction of unsafe detours. Inspections should look at what people actually encounter, including signs and obstructions. If normal access can't be maintained, explain the alternative and how long it's expected to last. Nearby projects need coordination too. Emergency work, unexpected conditions and other organisations' schedules can change things. When that happens, residents need a revised arrangement and a timely explanation. Small details like a sign pointing the wrong way can make a bad week alot harder.

Include the bills that come later

For significant new infrastructure proposals, I'll ask for the construction estimate, contingency, operating costs and future renewal needs. A construction grant can leave years of maintenance for the City to fund. A larger project may offer more benefits while also creating a bigger ongoing bill. Council should see staged options where practical, what other work would be deferred and how the choice affects the wider capital program. Claims about savings from procurement or coordination need a supported comparison.

Staff should show the lawful funding mix, including municipal budgets, eligible growth contributions, confirmed federal or provincial support and proposed borrowing. We need to know which money is available for this project and which contributions are still being sought. Explain effects on taxes or utility rates where relevant. When a contract changes, show the original scope, the reason and the

revised forecast. The price at award is a useful starting point. We also need to know what residents received by the end and what it will cost to maintain.

Bring street, utility and transit work onto one delivery program. Ask contractors for priced ways to bring BRT completion forward, with a first year target and clear hospital and business access arrangements. Coordinate that work with the first rail stage plan before final surfacing where an approved change could avoid later rework. The LRT construction start target is 2028, with its first package separately designed, permitted and funded. The budget chapter carries the proposed allocations and release conditions.

What I'll ask for during the term

In the first 100 days, I'll seek a review of repair priorities, access arrangements on major projects and gaps in public reporting. Staff should bring forward a manageable set of safety and accessibility candidates with criteria that work across neighbourhoods. The review needs to show what can improve within approved programs and what requires a budget decision. Establishing the starting position gives us something useful to compare future results with.

In year one, I'll seek a costed first package of improvements and standard public reporting for major construction. The transit acceleration review should show what can finish sooner and the price of doing so. Use specialist contractors for defined packages where they offer better delivery and value. Keep one clear lead across the work. In years two to four, seek annual renewal reviews, construction reports and checks after selected projects open. Residents should see why a scope, cost or date changes.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Explain the repair list

I'll seek a readable annual account of why projects are recommended, using asset condition, service risk, accessibility and the cost over their working life.

Who can act: Council sets service and budget priorities. Engineers and asset managers assess condition, design and delivery under the relevant standards. [3][6]

How we'll pay for it: Use existing asset planning and capital budgets first. Any extra repair spending or capacity needs a costed decision.

What we'll check: Report condition trends, service failures, preventive work and a clearly defined backlog. Explain high risk repairs that are deferred.

What could get in the way: Visible damage tells only part of the story. Include what a failure would mean for the service and how certain the assessment is.

02 / Fix safety gaps while the street is open

I'll seek a screened package of crossings, sidewalk links, accessible features and targeted intersection changes, coordinated with planned work.

Who can act: City changes need engineering review, public input, funding and the relevant approvals, building on existing mobility and road safety plans. [4][5]

How we'll pay for it: Estimate each location's construction and maintenance costs. Check possible savings from combining work against designs and bids.

What we'll check: Track accessible connections finished, crossing conditions, actual speeds and serious collision trends, with checks before and after changes.

What could get in the way: Designs can affect parking, turns, emergency access and transit. Explain those choices and review how they work after installation.

03 / Keep access in the construction plan

I'll seek stronger access and communication requirements for City projects, using Renew London and existing updates to show changes, contacts and unresolved concerns. [2]

Who can act: The City sets requirements for its contracts and works with utilities. Other project owners still control their own schedules.

How we'll pay for it: Include access, contingency, inspections and communication in project costs before awarding the work.

What we'll check: Report cost and schedule changes, notices, access complaints, response times, detour inspections and results at completion.

What could get in the way: Tighter access or scheduling requirements can raise bids or lengthen work. Compare those costs with the disruption they prevent.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Review repair priorities and construction access, establish the reporting baseline and screen safety and accessibility improvements.

Year one

Seek a Council decision on a costed first package and standard construction reporting. Coordinate the BRT acceleration target and first rail stage plan with existing contracts, utility work and street repairs.

Years two to four

Seek annual renewal reviews and construction updates. Target a funded first LRT physical package in 2028, keep accessible bus and business access through the work, and use defined contractor packages where they deliver better value.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **London’s 2026 Renew Construction Program: Big work now, big wins later**
City of London · 26 March 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Announces about $285 million in new 2026 work and $100 million continuing from the previous year. These figures describe program scope, with final spending and completion reported separately.
Read source

2. **Road construction: Renew London**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains existing renewal work, the construction map, private utility projects and ways to report concerns.
Read source

3. **Corporate Asset Management Policy**
City of London · Amended and reviewed 3 March 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Sets the current approach to asset life, risk, financial planning, accessibility and climate. Older plans aren't used to estimate a current infrastructure gap.
Read source

4. **Mobility Master Plan**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records Council approval on July 22, 2025. Individual recommendations still need implementation decisions.
Read source

5. **Road safety**
City of London · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Describes adopted Vision Zero principles and work on the Safe Mobility Action Plan. It doesn't establish final approval of that action plan.
Read source

6. **1. Role of council, councillor and staff: The Ontario municipal councillor’s guide**
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing · Undated; checked 18 October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains Council and staff responsibilities for services and finances. Mayoral proposals still follow the relevant decision processes.
Read source

CHAPTER 04

A bus you can count on

Push to finish BRT in year one. Aim to start light rail construction in year two.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

04 / A bus you can count on

My targets are to finish BRT in 2027, complete the plan and approvals needed for the first LRT construction package that year, and start physical work in 2028. Within 100 days, I'll publish a delivery review showing what has to change, what it costs and whether those dates can be met. The current southern BRT schedule extends beyond 2027, so bringing it forward needs a workable agreement with the people building and running it. [11][12]

IN THIS CHAPTER

A bus needs to get you where you're going

Put the BRT finish on one schedule

Choose a first rail stage we can get moving

Finish the first stage decisions in year one

Buy useful work and keep it moving

Start physical rail work in 2028

Give reliability a proper operating budget

Make it possible to reach the bus

Keep the information useful during construction

Be clear about cost and progress

A bus needs to get you where you're going

If a bus gets you to work after your shift starts, the route on the map doesn't help much. The same goes for a missed class, an appointment or picking up your child. I'll judge transit by the whole trip: getting to the stop, waiting, making the connection and getting home again. Riders should be able to plan their day around the service with a reasonable idea of whether it will show up.

I'll ask London Transit to look at early starts, late finishes, weekend work and trips to employment areas alongside busy student and commuter routes. A daytime commute gives us only part of the picture. Riders and employers can help point out the gaps, and the service plan needs evidence to decide which improvements come first. We have limited money, staff and buses. The reasons for choosing one change ahead of another should be available to the people affected.

Reliable transit can also give a household the option to share a car or avoid buying another one. I'll look at whether ordinary trips become more practical and measure what changes. Different neighbourhoods and mobility needs will call for different solutions. Any claim about a particular reduction in congestion needs evidence. The useful starting question is whether someone can reasonably choose the bus for the trip they need to make.

Put the BRT finish on one schedule

My target is to get BRT finished in 2027. London's current program needs a serious push to reach that date. LTC's October 19, 2026 report schedules the east service for fall 2027 and the south for fall 2029. The City's Wellington plans also include civil work in 2028 and 2029, with stations and final surfacing into 2030. I'll put the target and the existing schedule side by side so people can see what has to change. [11][12]

Within 100 days, bring the contractors, utilities, City engineers and LTC together around one completion program. Identify the work that controls the finish date, where crews could work in parallel and which decisions are holding things up. Ask for priced options for extra shifts, additional crews and a different order of work. Keep hospital access, emergency routes, safe crossings and access to shops in that program.

There has been alot of disruption already. Open finished sections as soon as they are accepted and LTC is ready to use them. Look at safe temporary stations where they genuinely bring service forward. Publish the remaining work on each section, including permanent stations and restoration, so residents can see the full finish as well as the earlier service benefits.

Buses and drivers need to be ready too. Ask LTC to cost earlier fleet availability, possible short leases and training in parallel with the road work. Check the condition and availability of any proposed vehicles and the effect on other routes. The delivery review needs an operating plan with the people and equipment to carry it out.

The City's May 2026 report records $454 million in approved infrastructure funding for the three BRT corridors, including $176 million from federal and provincial partners. Work within those agreements and the construction contracts already in place. Any added cost for acceleration needs a clear benefit, an identified funding source and approval before it is spent. [1]

If the review shows the full 2027 finish cannot be reached safely and within an approved budget, publish the earliest supported date, the obstacle and the options. Keep delivering the sections that can open. People should be able to tell which dates have contractor and utility backing and which are still targets.

Choose a first rail stage we can get moving

Start with one useful rail stage. Compare the east and south BRT corridors, then choose the route with the strongest passenger case and the fewest expensive obstacles. Council considered eventual conversion in 2016. Reuse that work and the current drawings where they still help, and get the missing information early. [6]

Favour a route on existing public land, simple accessible stops and a standard vehicle that suppliers can support. Look for a workable maintenance site and a practical downtown connection. A short first stage still needs enough useful destinations and connections to justify its depot, power and operating costs. A small ceremonial line would give London another bill without fixing many trips.

Have engineers review bridge loading, curves, gradients, platform space, street crossings, power and underground utilities before giving credit for reuse. The general conversion research identifies geometry, clearance and station changes as important issues. Any savings from existing infrastructure must be attached to assets we can actually use. [10]

Coordinate the remaining BRT work with the rail choice before final surfaces and stations are finished. Where a modest, approved change would avoid digging the same place up again, price it and seek the funding partner's agreement. Keep BRT opening work moving while those choices are made.

Finish the first stage decisions in year one

Treat 2027 as a delivery year for the rail plan. In the first three months, gather the existing drawings, passenger data and utility records, compare the east and south options and agree on a preferred first stage. Ask suppliers and contractors about delivery capacity at the same time. That early market advice needs to be available to everyone who later bids.

During the middle of the year, complete the initial business case, operating concept, functional design, construction sequence and funding request. Compare the rail option with improving BRT. Check peak loads, ordinary daily trips, transfers and slower growth. Bring in riders, disability organisations, businesses, neighbourhoods and Indigenous communities while the route and construction choices can still change.

Start the environmental and other approval work in parallel once the scope is clear enough. Ask Ontario to confirm the applicable process. Its guide expects substantial preparation and consultation around the formal assessment period. The approvals and final design needed for the first physical package must be complete before that package starts. [7]

By the end of 2027, aim to have Council's route and delivery decisions, the first construction package designed and priced, its permissions secured and a tender ready. The planning ceiling is firm. The initial review must establish whether that package can be prepared within it. Full corridor engineering, every later construction drawing and an operating railway cannot be guaranteed by that allowance.

The deadline applies to the first stage plan and the permissions needed to begin it. Later packages must receive their own necessary designs and approvals before they proceed. If an essential first package task will miss the date or exceed the planning cap, report that early and explain what it means for the 2028 start. Thats part of making the schedule useful.

Buy useful work and keep it moving

Use specialist contractors where they can deliver a defined piece of work more quickly or at better value. Keep the team small, set clear deliverables and have one City lead responsible for coordinating the packages. Publish the price, dates, accepted work and approved changes. Pay for work that meets the contract and keep enough technical oversight to catch a problem early.

BRT construction already has contracted suppliers. Ask the existing firms for priced acceleration options. Where work can be separated cleanly, let other qualified firms compete for it through the proper process. Changes of provider need a net benefit after transition and coordination costs. London's procurement policy governs competitions, contract changes and who can approve them. [14][15]

For rail, invite comparable prices for conventional and prefabricated track, standard platform components and simpler construction methods. European rail research has developed modular track and faster installation approaches. Ask bidders to demonstrate suitability for London's ground conditions, winter operation, maintenance and expected passenger loads. Count savings when the proposal supports them. [13]

Review the whole cost of each bid, including the City's own oversight. Tie any proposed early completion payment to accepted work and a demonstrated benefit. Extra shifts should earn their cost through a shorter, better coordinated program. Keep public ownership of the plans and records so the City can manage the work and obtain competitive prices for the next package.

Start physical rail work in 2028

The target for year two is physical construction on the chosen first LRT stage. A suitable first package could be a necessary utility diversion, rail formation or preparation of an approved maintenance site. Its design must show how it serves the selected railway and fits the funded delivery plan. Another study, a general road repair or a photo opportunity would not meet that commitment.

Keep the first year planning limit at $1 million, brought forward into 2027. The budget chapter sets out that allocation and a separate ceiling for the first physical works in 2028. Each package needs a measured scope, a professional estimate, competitive pricing, the necessary permissions and an identified funding source before release. Select useful work that fits the ceiling and the approved route.

Before the main rail works are committed, Council needs the complete first stage capital cost, inflation allowance, contingency, net operating cost, renewal plan and financing. Compare Canadian project costs on a consistent basis and explain the differences in scope. Existing BRT contributions and possible future grants must be kept to their agreed uses. [8][9] The cost detail is in the budget chapter and the full plan PDF.

Keep accessible bus service operating through the work and coordinate construction around the routes people rely on. Buying standard vehicles, reusing verified infrastructure and building a useful first stage

can keep the scope under control. If the first package cannot be legally and usefully delivered within its approved limit, bring the schedule and scope back to Council before spending it. The 2028 date is a construction start target; the passenger opening date needs its own delivery program.

Give reliability a proper operating budget

The London Transit Commission operates, repairs, controls and manages local transit, including conventional and specialised services. Council and the Commission have separate responsibilities and a required policy relationship. [3] As mayor, I'll bring people together, propose budget priorities and seek Council support. LTC's operational role matters when we discuss routes and service changes. Residents deserve to know who can make the decision they're asking for.

I'll ask LTC for public starting figures on missed or cancelled trips, crowding and reliability by route and time period where data allows. An average can hide poor evening service or an unreliable corridor. Reports should explain delays linked to congestion, construction, vehicles and staffing, and be clear when the exact cause is uncertain. That detail helps identify which changes could actually improve a rider's trip.

The improvement package needs the full ongoing price: operators, supervisors, mechanics, cleaning, fuel or energy, spare buses and depot capacity. I'll bring budget options explaining what each buys and what other work it would displace. Some connection problems may be helped by an operational adjustment with little extra service time. I'll ask for those possibilities to be considered alongside options needing more staff and money.

Make it possible to reach the bus

A feeder arriving just after the main bus leaves can add a lot of time to a short trip. So can a last connection that ends before a shift. I'll ask LTC to check important transfer points and employment destinations against actual work schedules. Employers, schools and riders can help identify problems, with service decisions kept public and supported by evidence. The return journey deserves the same attention as the trip in.

A curb ramp, snow clearing, a safe crossing and readable detour signs can decide whether a person reaches the stop at all. I'll seek a ranked access program with City transportation staff and LTC, developed with disability organisations and riders. Immediate safety and accessibility barriers deserve attention, and each site needs clear responsibility for clearing and maintenance. The path leading to the stop is part of usable transit.

Shelters and seats need space, installation money and ongoing upkeep. I'll ask for site criteria and maintenance costs to be published. Specialised transit also belongs in the reliability discussion, including appropriate booking, accommodation and trip delivery measures. People need options that fit their mobility needs. Improvements to conventional service should work alongside specialised transit and other accessible travel arrangements.

Keep the information useful during construction

Construction can move a stop, break a transfer or turn a familiar trip into a guessing game. I'll seek coordinated disruption information across City construction updates and LTC notices. It should show accessible temporary stops, when a change starts, the expected duration and where to find updates. Printed notices at stops matter too, especially when someone learns about the change halfway through their journey.

Major projects should identify transit access before work begins, including the walk from temporary stops to homes and businesses. Underground surprises can change the plan. A fallback arrangement and prompt updates give riders something to work with when that happens. Businesses also need to know how staff and customers can reach them, and everyone needs a way to report an unsafe temporary route.

Arrival information should make clear whether a bus is actually being tracked or simply shown on the timetable. Accessibility details should be easy to find. I'll ask what existing tools do well and where practical gaps remain before buying another system. Any technology proposal needs someone responsible, an upkeep budget and a way to check whether riders find it useful. Sometimes fixing a confusing notice is the quickest improvement we can make.

Be clear about cost and progress

Within 100 days, publish the BRT acceleration review and the first rail work program. Bring the year one planning allocation through the budget and aim to complete the first rail stage decisions in 2027. For 2028, publish the exact physical package before award and show progress against it each month. Keep bus reliability and stop access work moving alongside it.

The budget should separate construction grants, fares, municipal contributions and other confirmed support. A grant for infrastructure may leave the City funding drivers and annual maintenance. If we need a bigger municipal allocation, I'll explain what service it purchases and the budget effect. If part has to wait, residents should see which part and why. Those are choices people deserve to understand.

Through the term, I'll seek quarterly updates connecting spending to delivered service. Are missed trips falling? Are difficult connections improving? Is agreed access work finished? Targets should follow the baseline and approved service plan. And if the numbers improve but riders keep flagging the same problem, we should look closer. The point of the reporting is to help make the daily trip more dependable.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Show where service is letting riders down

I'll seek a joint City and LTC report within 100 days on missed trips, crowding, transfers and construction impacts, followed by quarterly updates.

Who can act: I'll bring the partners together and propose priorities. LTC supplies and approves operational measures; Council approves City resources and policy.

How we'll pay for it: Use existing planning and reporting capacity first. Show any extra analysis cost before seeking approval.

What we'll check: Publish the starting figures and quarterly results by route and time of day, with definitions and the action being taken.

What could get in the way: Some data may be incomplete or costly to collect. Start with what is available and explain the gaps.

02 / Budget for the service we promise

I'll bring a costed package of reliability and connection improvements through the budget and LTC service planning, including operators, maintenance and vehicles.

Who can act: LTC plans and operates service. The mayor proposes the municipal budget, with Council involved in approval and oversight.

How we'll pay for it: Show ongoing municipal funding and fare assumptions. Seek eligible federal or provincial help and mark grants that haven't been confirmed.

What we'll check: Track funded service hours actually delivered, missed trips, crowding and connections against the starting figures.

What could get in the way: Even funded improvements need drivers, available buses and workable construction schedules.

03 / Plan the first rail stage in 2027 and target a 2028 start

I'll bring the route choice, initial business case, operating concept, delivery plan and first construction package to Council in year one. The target is physical LRT construction starting in 2028, once the required design, permissions and funding are in place.

Who can act: City staff lead the work with LTC, specialist contractors and the relevant approval bodies. Council decides the route, budget and construction release. Funding partners must approve their contributions.

How we'll pay for it: Keep year one rail planning within the existing $1 million ceiling. The budget chapter sets out a separate, limited construction start allocation and the conditions for releasing it.

What we'll check: Publish the first year decisions, outstanding permissions, contractor program and first physical work completed in 2028. Report changes against the original dates.

What could get in the way: Approvals, utilities, market capacity or funding could move the start. The first year review must establish what can be completed within the planning cap and explain any shortfall before contracts are awarded.

04 / Push BRT to completion in the first year

Set 2027 as the acceleration target. Ask contractors, utilities and LTC for a joint completion program within 100 days, including the price and practical limits of bringing work forward.

Who can act: The City manages the construction contracts and road network. Utilities control their work and LTC approves service preparations. Council approves material changes and funding.

How we'll pay for it: Use existing approved BRT resources where the work is eligible. Price any acceleration premium separately and bring it to Council before committing it.

What we'll check: Publish the revised completion program, station readiness, fleet and staffing requirements, and monthly progress. Show construction completion and service opening as separate milestones.

What could get in the way: The current southern program runs into 2029 and 2030. The target needs engineering, contractor and operating confirmation; a partial opening must be reported as a partial opening. [12]

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Publish one BRT completion review with contractors, utilities and LTC, testing the 2027 target. Scope the first rail stage, obtain early market advice and set the year one planning program.

Year one

Target BRT completion in 2027, with a priced delivery program and earlier use of accepted sections. Complete the first LRT stage plan, Council decisions and the design and permissions needed for its first construction package within the planning ceiling. Report any constraint that puts the date at risk.

Years two to four

Target the start of physical LRT construction in 2028 through a defined, approved and funded first package. Keep buses running, publish monthly delivery results and release later rail packages only with their own design, permissions and funding. Set a passenger opening date when the full delivery program supports it.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **London Rapid Transit Readiness & Route Planning**
City of London · May 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. May 2026 readiness position, including $454 million approved infrastructure funding across three corridors and $176 million federal/provincial funding. Use later City updates for corridor service and restoration forecasts. This is BRT infrastructure funding, not an LRT budget.
Read source

2. **2026 Work Program: Second Quarter Update**
London Transit Commission · 31 August 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records construction on the eastern and southern corridors and preparation to use completed infrastructure.
Read source

3. **Commission Information**
London Transit Commission · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains operating responsibility and the policy relationship between LTC and Council. Changing membership details aren't used for these proposals.
Read source

4. **Buses begin using London's first centre-running bus lanes September 6**
City of London · September 2026 service update
Accessed 19 October 2026. Forecasts East London Link service in 2027 and Wellington Gateway in 2029. These are reported expectations, not guaranteed opening dates.
Read source

5. **Wellington Gateway enters final phase of rapid transit**
City of London · 28 August 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Major remaining construction through 2029 and final restoration into 2030; distinguishes service launch from all work being complete.
Read source

6. **Council minutes: Rapid Transit Implementation Strategy**
City of London · 31 May 2016
Accessed 19 October 2026. Council asked that BRT design consider eventual conversion to LRT, subject to a later review and business case. That direction needs to be read alongside the plans and assets actually built.
Read source

7. **Guide to Ontario's Transit and Rail Project Assessment Process: Project assessment process**
Government of Ontario · Online guide; checked October 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Explains preparation, consultation, environmental reporting and formal assessment. The applicable approval route for London rail must be established with the Ministry; formal timelines do not include all preplanning or detailed design.
Read source

8. **Stage 2 ION Initial Business Case: cost appendix, Tables 2 and 3**
Region of Waterloo · 4 November 2025
Accessed 19 October 2026. Full LRT option: $3.130 billion in 2025 dollars; $4.300 billion escalated to 2033; annual operations, maintenance and rehabilitation $23.8 million in 2025 dollars. London would need its own estimate for its route and structures.
Read source

9. **Canada Public Transit Fund: Baseline Funding applicant guide**
Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada · Online guide; checked October 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Planning can be eligible subject to current requirements, project approval and agreements. Normal operations and financing are not automatically covered. No funding award, matching share or unallocated London balance is

assumed.
Read source

10. **Bus and Rail Transit: Modal Integration, E-Circular 145**
Transportation Research Board · 2010
Accessed 19 October 2026. Bus Rapid Transit as a Precursor of Light Rail Transit?, printed pages 138 to 140, discusses conversion geometry, clearances and station changes. General engineering context only, not a London asset assessment.
Read source

11. **Rapid Transit Implementation Status Report**
London Transit Commission · 19 October 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Current east and south service forecasts, fleet and operator preparations, and advance notice for new infrastructure. The plan proposes acceleration beyond this reported baseline; an agreed revised program is still required.
Read source

12. **Wellington Gateway Phase 2B preconstruction presentation**
City of London · 2026 preconstruction presentation
Accessed 19 October 2026. Pages 18 to 22 show civil work extending through 2029 and some station and surfacing work into 2030. The proposed 2027 completion target requires a new supported program, beyond the current sequence.
Read source

13. **URBAN TRACK final report: Urban rail infrastructure**
European Commission, CORDIS · Final project report; checked October 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Research on prefabricated track, faster installation and maintenance. General options for a priced procurement comparison; establishes no saving or London delivery date.
Read source

14. **Procurement of Goods and Services Policy**
City of London · In force 1 October 2025
Accessed 19 October 2026. Competitive procurement, contract changes, approval authority and market capacity requirements apply to the proposed contractor delivery approach.
Read source

15. **Wellington Gateway and Municipal Infrastructure Improvements Phase 2B: tender record**
City of London, Bids and Tenders · Award recorded 23 June 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Confirms the phase has an existing awarded construction contract. Acceleration must account for the existing agreement and project coordination.
Read source

CHAPTER 05

A budget you can follow

Show where the money goes, what changes and what we'll still owe later.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

05 / A budget you can follow

I'll show what each promise costs and keep spending tied to work people can see. The rail proposal brings planning into year one and sets a separate, limited budget for a physical construction start in year two. The allocations, conditions and later costs are set out here.

IN THIS CHAPTER

Start with the budget we've already adopted

Bring the choices into public view early

Show how we got from one budget to the next

Include what happens after opening day

Pay for the first year plan and a second year start

Know the full rail bill before committing the main works

Count savings when the work has changed

Keep an eye on the next few years

Start with the budget we've already adopted

People should be able to understand why their municipal bill changes and what the money pays for. The budget decides things residents feel every day, from transit to repairs to recreation. I'll seek the lowest sustainable cost for the services London needs. When a better service or an unavoidable obligation needs more money, I'll explain the reason and the options. Residents need enough information to judge the choice for themselves.

London already has a 2024 to 2027 Multi Year Budget and an annual update process. The City's engagement page records that the 2026 update was adopted as amended. [1][2] I'll start with that adopted position, including existing contracts, debt, capital projects and funding agreements. Those obligations continue through an election. A change in direction needs an account of remaining costs, legal limits and the effect on people using the service.

A tax freeze, cut or fixed increase would need to be tested against the books. Inflation, assessment growth, collective agreements, demand and decisions from other governments all affect the result. I'll make the priorities and arithmetic available. If we're using temporary money to reduce a bill, residents should know what replaces it later. That matters when you're trying to plan your own household budget beyond the next few months.

Bring the choices into public view early

Ontario's strong mayor framework gives the mayor a particular role in proposing the municipal budget. London's documents explain Council amendments and the later veto and override stages. [3] I'll use that process to put a clear proposal before Council and residents. Legal obligations and the responsibilities of independent boards still apply. The budget needs real revenue behind its assumptions and a clear account of consequences.

I'll discuss major priorities with councillors early and explain my proposed choices while residents can still influence them. People who use libraries, transit, recreation and other services need an accessible way to describe what a change would mean. A meeting is more useful when the decision is understandable before someone arrives. Summaries, accessible formats and contact information can help people participate without reading hundreds of pages first.

For agencies, boards and commissions, I'll seek comparable explanations of pressures and proposed spending, respecting their legal responsibilities. Council needs to understand what's required, what's discretionary and what risk a lower allocation creates. Disagreements should be discussed with that information on the table. Budget priorities give the mayor a role in oversight, while operational responsibilities stay with the people and bodies that hold them.

Show how we got from one budget to the next

I'll publish a short explanation of each material change from the adopted budget to my proposal, reconciled to the official totals. It'll separate maintaining current services, new or expanded services, revenue changes, capital financing and temporary measures. Each important item should link to the formal decision and say whether the cost continues. The complete documents stay available alongside it, including accessible formats and a way to ask questions.

Examples of household impact need their assumptions written down. A figure for an average residential property won't match everyone's bill. Municipal taxes, education taxes, assessment changes, utility rates and fees need to be explained clearly. Renters have a stake in costs and services too, even if the property tax bill goes to the landlord. I'll want budget communication to speak to everyone who lives here.

A small set of service results should sit beside spending: whether funded transit hours ran, whether a project reached its revised milestone or whether a backlog changed. Each service needs suitable measures and an explanation of their limits. I'll build on existing reporting so the figures can be checked against the City's financial records. A dashboard is useful when it helps someone understand a result and ask a better question.

Include what happens after opening day

A new building, road or program can create bills for decades. For major new commitments, I'll seek a standard decision page showing initial construction or setup, annual operations, staff, maintenance and eventual renewal. Include the funding source, confidence in the estimate, alternatives and the consequence of waiting. London's Strategic Financial Framework and asset management approach already connect those questions. I want them easier for residents to inspect in each proposal. [4]

Grants should be marked confirmed, applied for or possible. A temporary grant needs an exit plan or an identified source to keep the service running. A reserve withdrawal should explain the reserve's purpose and how much future capacity we'd use up. Borrowing needs its repayment cost shown alongside the asset's useful life. These are useful tools when the arrangement suits the investment and residents can see the risk.

Growth needs the same care. New development adds assessment while also needing roads, utilities and services. The costs and revenues can arrive at different times. Staff should show that timing and explain which revenues have restricted uses. Where development charges or another restricted source help fund a project, the proposal should state eligibility and the share still falling to existing taxpayers. We need that picture before treating growth as room for other spending.

Pay for the first year plan and a second year start

Bring the full rail planning allowance forward into 2027 and hold it at $1 million. Allow $200,000 for the records, route and passenger case; $300,000 for targeted engineering and the first package design; $200,000 for consultation and approval work; $200,000 for procurement preparation, funding work and outside review; and $100,000 held contingency. These are proposed spending limits. The first delivery review must show which tasks can be finished within them.

For 2028, propose up to $5 million for a first physical LRT construction package. That allows up to $4 million for identified work, supervision and applicable taxes, plus $1 million held contingency. The work must be needed for the selected railway, be properly designed and permitted, and fit the approved funding plan. This ceiling commits no particular length of track or finished railway. Its purpose is to control the first release of capital while the complete first stage cost is established.

The combined proposed allocation is up to $6 million across those two years. Count staff time assigned to the rail program, consultants, contract management, public meetings and applicable taxes in the

relevant allocation. The two contingencies sit inside their ceilings. Keep any extra planning cost visible and within the planning cap; it cannot quietly move into the construction line. If the required work cannot fit, bring back the scope and schedule before award.

Proposed first rail planning and construction allocations

Year	Defined allocation	Maximum release
2027	First stage planning and first package preparation, including $100,000 contingency	$1,000,000
2028	First physical works: up to $4 million base plus $1 million contingency	$5,000,000
Total	Proposed planning and first physical package only	$6,000,000
2029 and 2030	Later packages need separate estimates and approvals	No allocation set here

Proposed authorization ceilings, subject to Council approval and scoped procurement. They are not a whole railway construction estimate. Assume no grants. Both contingencies are included, and later stages remain unpriced.

Assume no grant revenue in these allocations. Any outside contribution reduces the local share of the approved package. Use an identified municipal capital allocation or a named spending offset, and show the tax effect before approval. The figures here create no authority to spend on later rail stages. Work beyond the first package needs its own complete estimate, funding decision and approval.

BRT already has an approved capital program. Ask for acceleration offers against that program first, then show any added premium and the benefit it buys. A faster finish may need extra crews, shifts, fleet or temporary service. Those costs are still to be priced. Existing contract obligations and grant conditions form part of the comparison. The proposed rail allocations do not cover an unpriced BRT acceleration premium.

Know the full rail bill before committing the main works

Choose a useful first stage and price its actual scope. Include land, utilities, tracks, stations, power, vehicles, maintenance facilities, commissioning, inflation and contingency. Add annual operating support, connecting bus service, renewal and financing. Engineers must identify the assets London can reuse before any saving is deducted. The year two ceiling covers a limited first package; the complete rail stage will need a much larger, separately approved budget.

For context, Waterloo's 2025 business case gives its full Stage 2 LRT option a $3.13 billion cost in 2025 dollars, with $23.8 million in annual operations, maintenance and rehabilitation on that price base. Its route, structures and scale differ from London's. Use comparable projects to challenge an estimate, then obtain current local quantities and prices for the chosen stage. [5]

Before releasing the first physical package, Council needs its measured scope, professional estimate, procurement result, permissions, site rights and funding source. It also needs a credible business case and funding path for the railway that package serves. Choose work that retains useful value if later stages move. A package with no justified route or funding path should wait.

Use specialist contractors where the whole cost and delivery case support them. Show supervision and coordination costs alongside the tender price. The City's procurement policy applies to competitions and contract changes. Any proposed early completion incentive needs an identified benefit and accepted work behind the payment. Count the savings after they appear in the completed work and accounts. [7]

For illustration, borrowing the entire $5 million first works ceiling over 20 years at 5% would require about $401,000 a year in level repayments. That is an arithmetic example, rather than a borrowing proposal or quote. It excludes fees, interest during construction, operations and future renewal. Show the actual financing choice and annual effect with the approval request.

Seek federal and provincial help for eligible work, while keeping unconfirmed contributions out of the budget. Capital grants, ordinary operations and financing have different rules. Existing bus contributions keep their agreed uses. [6] Before the main rail works are committed, publish the complete first stage capital and annual cost, signed partner agreements, local exposure and the effect on other services. The first package ceiling cannot be presented as the total cost of bringing LRT to London.

Count savings when the work has changed

I'll seek a staged review of services selected for cost, risk and impact on residents. Some may have avoidable rework, confusing processes or purchasing that could be coordinated. Each review should start with a question and the evidence needed to answer it. The result may be an efficiency, a service change or a finding that more investment is needed. I'll want the conclusion to follow what the review actually finds.

If outside expertise is justified, I'll seek a capped scope, a public result and an explanation of why staff need the extra help. Recommendations should include transition costs, contracts, implementation time and effects on access. Workers who know the process need to be heard. A smaller budget line can leave residents waiting longer or shift work into a backlog. Those effects belong in the assessment too.

Delivered savings should be measured after costs. Removing a vacant job may still leave overtime or replacement work to pay for. Putting off maintenance creates a future obligation that needs recording. I'll keep a public list of recommendations accepted, declined or still being considered, with reasons and the verified financial and service results. If the expected saving doesn't happen, we'll need to correct the budget and explain it. Thats part of following through.

Keep an eye on the next few years

In the first 100 days, I'll seek a readable account of the adopted financial position, existing obligations, upcoming choices and the format for budget explanations. In year one, I'll bring the full cost decision standard and an initial service review scope to Council. We'll stage that work around capacity. Added reporting or review expenses need their own case and approved funding, just like the other proposals being assessed.

I'll ask staff to show effects over the remaining budget period and the next planning cycle, including what happens if uncertain revenues or costs change. A temporary reduction followed by a large catch up increase can be hard on households. Sometimes spending earlier avoids a bigger failure later. Each case needs evidence so Council can compare the options without assuming every preventive investment pays for itself.

Through the term, I'll report choices, service results and unresolved risks. When an estimate changes, residents should see what changed and the available response. If a proposed saving turns out to be unrealistic, I'll say so and bring the correction into public view. People already have enough uncertainty in their own finances. They should be able to follow the decisions being made with their money at City Hall.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Explain what's changing in the budget

I'll publish a short explanation alongside each proposed budget update, showing the move from the adopted budget to the new proposal, the service affected, the funding source and future costs.

Who can act: The mayor prepares the budget proposal through the statutory process. Council considers amendments and finance staff check the figures.

How we'll pay for it: Use existing budget publishing first. Any extra accessibility or analysis work needs an explicit allocation.

What we'll check: Publish the explanation with the proposal, reconcile it to official totals and separate temporary items from ongoing ones.

What could get in the way: A short version can miss detail. Link each summary to the complete official documents.

02 / Show the full cost before the vote

I'll seek a standard page for major new initiatives covering construction or setup, operations, renewal, staff, funding certainty, alternatives and the effect of waiting.

Who can act: The mayor proposes budget standards, Council approves policy and spending, and staff supply professional estimates.

How we'll pay for it: Use the responsible service's budget where possible. Savings and grants need evidence or confirmation before being counted.

What we'll check: Include the page with major proposals and report changed estimates or obligations that still lack funding.

What could get in the way: Early prices are uncertain. Give ranges and explain what stage the estimate has reached.

03 / Fund a defined rail plan and first construction package

Complete the first rail stage decisions in 2027 within the planning limit, then seek a separate capped allocation for a useful first construction package in 2028. Publish its scope and funding before award.

Who can act: The mayor proposes allocations. Council approves the scope, budget and construction release, with staff checking estimates, procurement and permissions.

How we'll pay for it: The allocations below assume the City may need to cover their full cost. No grant or contractor saving is counted in advance. Keep BRT acceleration costs and the complete rail stage price separately identified.

What we'll check: Report actual spending, accepted work, remaining contingency and approved changes. Price the complete first rail stage and its annual costs before committing the main works.

What could get in the way: A useful and permitted package may not fit the limit or the target date. Revise the scope or schedule through a public decision before making a commitment.

04 / Check services and verify savings

I'll seek reviews of selected services based on cost, risk and resident impact, with public recommendations and a record of savings achieved.

Who can act: Council requests and considers reviews. Administration handles implementation and independent boards keep their legal responsibilities.

How we'll pay for it: Cap any added review budget. Count savings after transition and implementation costs.

What we'll check: Publish quarterly actions, verified ongoing savings, service results and reasons for declining recommendations.

What could get in the way: Reviews use staff time and changes can affect service quality. Consider residents and workers before implementation.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Put the BRT acceleration costs, rail planning scope and first construction proposal into the public budget process. Show the assumptions, funding sources and delivery constraints.

Year one

Bring the full rail planning allocation into 2027. Complete the first stage decisions and the design and permissions required for its first physical package, subject to the capped scope. Price BRT acceleration separately and show whether the 2027 completion target is supported.

Years two to four

Seek release of a defined first physical rail construction package in 2028 after its funding and permissions are secured. Publish actual costs and delivery progress. Later packages need their own estimates, design, approvals and funding, with the full first stage cost made public before the main works are committed.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **Municipal budget**
City of London · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains the budget covering several years and the annual update and readoption process.
Read source

2. **2026 Annual Budget Update**
City of London: Get Involved London · 2026 update adopted December 2025
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records the 2026 update's adoption as amended and links formal meeting records. Earlier proposed tax forecasts aren't treated as final figures.
Read source

3. **2025 Annual Budget Update: Strong Mayor legislation and budget process**
City of London · October 2024
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains the mayor's budget role and Council amendments, veto and override stages. Used for the process rather than current financial totals.
Read source

4. **City delivering on transparent, sustainable, and well planned finances**
City of London · 18 October 2023
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records Council endorsement of the Strategic Financial Framework and asset management approach. Historical figures and credit ratings aren't used as current claims.
Read source

5. **Stage 2 ION Initial Business Case: cost appendix, Tables 2 and 3**
Region of Waterloo · 4 November 2025
Accessed 19 October 2026. Waterloo full LRT option: $3.130 billion in 2025 dollars and $23.8 million annual operations, maintenance and rehabilitation in 2025 dollars. The London proposed release ceilings are policy choices, not construction estimates taken from this report.
Read source

6. **Canada Public Transit Fund: Baseline Funding applicant guide**
Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada · Online guide; checked October 2026
Accessed 19 October 2026. Describes eligibility, agreements and cost requirements. Potential planning assistance is not a London award. Normal operations, financing and competing uses of existing allocations must be considered separately.
Read source

7. **Procurement of Goods and Services Policy**
City of London · In force 1 October 2025
Accessed 19 October 2026. Sets procurement and contract change processes, approval authority and supplier competition requirements. Contractor delivery must comply with these rules.
Read source

CHAPTER 06

City Hall that works with business

Clear answers from City Hall, usable access during construction and a fair chance to compete.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

06 / City Hall that works with business

I'll improve the business help London already offers, set useful service standards and make access to shops and workplaces part of construction planning.

IN THIS CHAPTER

Make City Hall easier to deal with

Help people find the right person

Cut down on avoidable back and forth

Plan for businesses to keep trading

Give smaller suppliers a fair chance

Be clear about what business support delivers

Make City Hall easier to deal with

Opening a shop can mean paying rent while you're still waiting for an answer about the space. Expanding a workshop can leave a hiring decision hanging until an approval comes through. Owners need to know what's required, how long a step usually takes and who can help when something stalls. I'll focus on those everyday dealings with City Hall, alongside the infrastructure and public spaces businesses rely on.

London already has a Service London Business Hub, a business checklist, economic development partners and a Small Business Centre with advice and training. [1][2][3] I'll ask how well the connections between them work from an owner's point of view. Someone should get an understandable answer and reach the right person without explaining the same situation over and over. The staff and tools already doing that work give us a place to start improving it.

Council endorsed London: The Centre of Opportunity, the 2026 to 2030 economic development strategy, on June 23, 2026. Implementation is underway and annual reporting is planned. [4] I'll work through that framework and connect priorities to the budget. If I think something needs changing, I'll bring the proposal forward publicly. Existing partners and businesses have already put time into London's direction, and the next steps should recognise that work.

Help people find the right person

I'll ask staff and partners to walk through common business tasks: choosing premises, checking zoning, getting licences and approvals, renovating and opening. Where are we asking for the same information twice? Where are instructions confusing? Where does nobody seem responsible for the next step? The review should include small firms, businesses run from home and owners less familiar with municipal processes, alongside established employers who deal with City Hall often.

I want a clear municipal contact and an agreed way to refer people to partners offering advice. That person should help navigate the process and explain decisions. If a use isn't permitted, an early explanation of the issue and available options helps an owner avoid wasted spending. Professional reviews and approvals still follow their proper process. Human help and accessible information need to stay available alongside online services, especially when a situation doesn't fit a form.

I'll seek response and processing standards based on measured starting figures. An acknowledgement, a useful answer and an approval should each be reported for what they are. Separate files waiting on the applicant from files waiting on the City, and distinguish application types. That gives residents a fairer picture of delays and gives staff a way to identify problems that keep coming up. The standards need to help people understand the next step.

Cut down on avoidable back and forth

Clear checklists, earlier advice and coordinated reviews can prevent late redesigns while protecting safety, accessibility and the environment. When departments ask for conflicting things, the City should resolve it and explain the final requirement. If a rule is unnecessary or disproportionate, Council can consider changing it through the proper process. Applicants should be able to expect the same rules and explanations regardless of who they know.

I'll seek public reporting on question response times, processing of complete applications, the age of open cases and common reasons for repeat work. Confidential business information needs protection. Staff should explain which steps the City controls and which wait on outside approvals. Difficult applications need attention too. A target that pushes staff toward easy files would give us a flattering number while leaving the most stuck owners in the same position.

Before buying technology, I'll ask whether we understand the process we're trying to fix. Any proposed system needs training, maintenance, a responsible service owner and a business case covering staff and applicants. Some problems can be solved with better instructions or a meeting between departments. Those improvements should move ahead as capacity allows. An owner waiting to open needs a useful answer, and that may be a pretty small fix on our side.

Plan for businesses to keep trading

Road and utility repairs can be necessary and still put a huge strain on nearby businesses. I'll seek business access planning within major City projects on commercial streets. Before planned disruption starts, teams should consider walking routes, temporary stops, deliveries, accessible entrances, waste pickup and parking. Owners and business improvement areas can point out details a drawing misses, including delivery times and entrances customers with mobility devices depend on.

A named contact and current access map give owners something to share with customers and staff. Notices should explain the next change, alongside the final expected completion date. Contractors and City staff need a way to escalate problems and update signs as the site changes. Underground conditions and emergencies may force revisions. When they do, businesses should get the new arrangement as soon as practical, with an explanation they can pass along.

I'll ask for access costs in project estimates, coordination with other owners and reporting on whether identified problems were resolved. Any proposed compensation or relief program needs legal advice, eligibility rules, money and a fair way to assess losses. That's a separate decision to bring into public view. Meanwhile, better access planning can deal with problems we already know businesses will face. Keeping a doorway reachable is a basic part of delivering the job.

Give smaller suppliers a fair chance

London's procurement policy calls for fair processes, value and compliance with trade agreements. It also addresses sustainable purchasing and opportunities for small and diverse suppliers within those requirements. [5] I'll support practical supplier guidance and a review of barriers we can reasonably remove. Procurement staff need to run the competitions and awards fairly. Local firms deserve a clear way to compete under the rules that apply to City work.

The review should ask whether insurance and other requirements fit the contract's real risk, whether opportunities are easy to find and whether large bundles shut out capable smaller suppliers unnecessarily. Separating work can improve competition in some cases and add cost or complicate accountability in others. Staff need to weigh those effects. All bidders should have the same important information, with evaluation criteria clear before bids go in.

I'll ask for results beyond the number of training events held. How many responsive bids came in? Are new suppliers competing? How did the contracts perform, and did administration costs change?

Guidance should explain safety, insurance, invoicing and bidding requirements, including that attendance doesn't guarantee work. Businesses put time into preparing a bid. The City should make the opportunity understandable and be able to explain how the decision was reached.

Be clear about what business support delivers

I'll bring employers, institutions, development organisations and other governments together to identify municipal barriers, coordinate infrastructure and work on the adopted strategy. Investment reporting should distinguish discussions, announcements and work actually underway. Private hiring also reflects market conditions and decisions outside City Hall. The City needs to show its own contribution honestly, with enough detail for residents to judge the public benefit.

Any incentive needs a lawful basis, public criteria, an identified cost and a reason to believe it would help achieve something unlikely to happen otherwise. I'll seek measurable conditions, reporting and protection if the agreement isn't met. We also need to consider fairness to existing firms investing without special help. That comparison belongs in the decision, along with the proposed jobs or investment.

In the first 100 days, I'll seek the service baseline and meet existing partners about immediate improvements. In year one, I'll bring standards, construction access requirements and procurement outreach changes to the responsible decision makers, with costs shown. Through the term, results should sit alongside the economic strategy's annual reporting. I'll use business feedback and the figures together to see where the process still needs work. Owners should be able to see follow through on the concerns they raised.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Make existing business help easier to use

I'll review the Business Hub and partner referrals, clarify who's responsible and seek response standards for business questions and municipal applications.

Who can act: The mayor brings people together and proposes priorities. Administration manages services and Council approves resources and policy changes.

How we'll pay for it: Start with existing Business Hub and partner capacity. Extra staff or technology needs a business case.

What we'll check: Publish starting figures and standards for responses, application times, repeat work and unresolved cases by application type.

What could get in the way: A reply to a question and a permit approval take different work. Report statutory reviews and incomplete applications separately.

02 / Keep businesses reachable during construction

I'll seek access and communication plans for major City projects on commercial streets, with a named contact and current delivery, walking, transit and parking information.

Who can act: The City controls its projects and contracts. Utilities and other owners need to agree to coordination, and businesses help identify access needs.

How we'll pay for it: Include eligible access and communication costs in estimates. Any relief program needs its own lawful, funded decision.

What we'll check: Publish plans before scheduled disruption where practical. Report update times, access problems resolved and business feedback.

What could get in the way: Emergencies and site conditions can change access. Relief and compensation require separate decisions about eligibility and funding.

03 / Help small suppliers bid for City work

I'll seek supplier guidance and a review of avoidable barriers, including disproportionate requirements and work bundled into unnecessarily large contracts.

Who can act: Council sets policy and procurement staff run fair competitions under policy and trade obligations. The mayor advocates and oversees results while staff handle awards.

How we'll pay for it: Use existing outreach where possible. Cost administrative changes and check their effect on total contract value.

What we'll check: Track supplier participation, responsive bids, competition, contract results and the cost of changes.

What could get in the way: Smaller contracts can add administration or lose bulk savings. Check legal requirements and value before changing the approach.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Review the Business Hub and partner referrals, establish application and response baselines and identify immediate communication fixes.

Year one

Seek approval for practical service standards, business access requirements on major projects and procurement guidance improvements, with costs and responsibilities published.

Years two to four

Report service results and economic strategy progress annually, adjust processes using evidence and assess the full public cost of incentives.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **Business licences**
City of London · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Provides existing licensing information and the Business Hub contact.
Read source

2. **My Checklist**
Service London Business · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. The existing startup checklist links municipal, provincial and federal requirements and advice.
Read source

3. **Economic development**
City of London · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Describes partners including the Small Business Centre, LEDC, TechAlliance and the Chamber.
Read source

4. **London: The Centre of Opportunity**
City of London · 7 August 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Records June 23, 2026 endorsement of the economic strategy for 2026 to 2030, with implementation and annual reporting arrangements.
Read source

5. **Procurement of Goods and Services Policy**
City of London · 1 October 2025 revision
Accessed 18 October 2026. Sets competition, trade agreement and sustainable purchasing requirements. Changes must follow current law and policy.
Read source

CHAPTER 07

Help getting into work

Help people find the right support, get to work and hear back about applications.

Mustafa Zeboon

London, Ontario · October 19, 2026

This is the plan I'll bring to City Hall. Putting it into action means securing Council decisions, detailed costs and agreements with the people delivering it. I'll report what gets funded, what moves ahead and what has to change.

07 / Help getting into work

I'll improve referrals through London's existing employment network, connect practical help to real vacancies and make City hiring communication clearer.

IN THIS CHAPTER

Take the practical barriers seriously

Make better use of the tools already here

Connect help to an actual opportunity

Give applicants a clear account of the rules

Connect jobs with the rest of someone's day

Bring a funded proposal to Council

Take the practical barriers seriously

A job ad can be the easy part to find. Getting to an early shift, buying required equipment before your first paycheque or completing an inaccessible form can be the thing that stops you. Some people need help explaining their skills. Employers may need a better way to find suitable applicants and help a new employee settle in. I'll focus on those connections and the practical barriers the City can help address.

Through London Regional Employment Services, the City manages the employment service system across London and Elgin, Middlesex and Oxford counties. [1] That's a substantial existing responsibility. Individual providers, funders, training bodies and employers each have roles too. I'll make the responsible organisation and funding conditions clear for each proposal, including the decisions that sit outside City Hall. People looking for work need that network to be understandable and useful.

My first priority is making the existing services easier to reach. Someone should be able to understand eligibility and get a human response when a referral fails. I'll ask where people are being passed between organisations without receiving help. We should track useful contacts and, where possible, sustained paid work. Registrations and website visits can tell us about activity, while the person using the service still needs something concrete to happen next.

Make better use of the tools already here

LEDC's Working in London page links to sector job boards, including health, manufacturing and technology, plus the Workforce Planning and Development Board's Local Jobs Hub. It also links providers and career resources. [2] LRES has its own directory for job seekers. [3] I'll improve the route to these tools and establish who keeps referrals current. Maintaining the resources people already use gives us somewhere practical to start.

I'll ask LRES, LEDC and providers to test common journeys with people seeking a first job, changing careers, arriving in Canada, returning after time away or applying with a disability. That can reveal broken links, confusing eligibility, inaccessible forms and repeat assessments. Telephone and in person options need to be available where an online route isn't suitable. The receiving service also needs enough capacity to respond, or a clearer link just leads to another wait.

With consent, providers could confirm that a referral was received and explain the next step. A person shouldn't have to share their whole case history just to ask a question. I'll seek aggregate reporting on time to a meaningful first contact and completed referrals, with privacy safeguards. That helps identify coordination problems while protecting the people using the service. If a connection breaks down, there needs to be a person who can help sort it out.

Connect help to an actual opportunity

I'll seek a limited work access pilot through existing providers, starting with verified employer demand and participants' needs. Possible supports include eligible travel assistance, equipment or short training connected to an identified opportunity. First, we'll check what existing programs already provide and where gaps remain. Any municipal contribution needs a clear reason and a costed proposal. Providers doing the work should help shape something they can realistically deliver.

Participating employers would need to set out the vacancy, pay, schedule, essential requirements and supervision. Paid work is the objective, with protections against subsidised placements replacing regular staff. Providers would assess the fit and explain conditions to participants. Training can prepare someone for an opportunity, while the hiring decision, business conditions and a person's circumstances can still change. Everyone involved needs an honest account of what participation offers.

I'll seek follow up at agreed intervals to learn whether jobs lasted, hours and pay matched the description and further help was needed. Reports should include unsuccessful outcomes, delivery costs and the quality of work, with identities protected. Participants needing more support deserve a place in the design and evaluation. It's easy for a program to look good by choosing people likely to find work anyway. We need to examine who it reaches and what difference the support makes.

Give applicants a clear account of the rules

Ontario's publicly advertised job posting requirements took effect January 1, 2026. In general, covered employers with at least 25 employees on the posting date have requirements for compensation disclosure, AI use, vacancy disclosure and Canadian experience requirements, with exceptions. The provincial guide explains how employees across Ontario locations are counted and where to report possible breaches. [4] I'll link City information to that guidance so people can find the authoritative rules and enforcement route.

The interview update rule needs care too. Ontario Regulation 476/24 requires covered employers to tell an interviewed applicant whether a hiring decision has been made within 45 days after the interview, or the last interview if there are several. It doesn't guarantee a final decision in that time. The duty concerns interviewees, and preliminary screening is excluded from the regulation's interview definition. [5] People deserve an accurate explanation of what response they can expect.

For City hiring, I'll seek an administrative review of posting templates, accessible applications, compliance, acknowledgements and interview updates. Service standards should explain what applicants can expect and where to get help. Human resources manages recruitment under law, policy and collective agreements. Individual hiring decisions stay with the proper staff process. As mayor, my role is to seek accountable communication and support fair administration, with applicant privacy respected throughout.

Connect jobs with the rest of someone's day

Employment planning needs to connect with transportation. A placement won't work if someone can't reach it at the required time. I'll ask employment partners and LTC to identify major gaps using real shift schedules and available travel options. That information can feed into costed transit planning. Some difficulties may be helped by scheduling or coordinated employer arrangements, while others need service options assessed against available resources.

I'll ask providers about recurring barriers for newcomers, young people, older workers and people with disabilities, while recognising that individuals within those groups need different help. Services should recognise skills and experience. Regulated credentials and immigration decisions sit with the relevant bodies. I'll bring institutions together and advocate where we see problems, and explain when a change needs someone else's decision. An applicant should know who can actually address the barrier they're facing.

Unstable housing, health concerns and caring for family can also shape someone's ability to work. With consent and within program rules, employment services should coordinate with other support. People need assistance suited to their situation as they work towards stability. I'll keep housing and healthcare access separate from employment targets. Providers also need room to support people who take longer to find a suitable role. A useful service should recognise that lives are complicated.

Bring a funded proposal to Council

In the first 100 days, I'll seek a shared service map, a review of failed referrals and a baseline for City hiring communication. In year one, I'll bring a limited pilot to Council after providers and employers help establish its scope, eligibility and price. Changes to provincial funding arrangements need the responsible funder's approval. The proposal should clearly identify any permissions still outstanding before work can begin.

It needs to separate eligible existing employment funding, partner contributions and any municipal cost. Staff time, participant help, evaluation and administration all count. I'll seek a spending cap and a date to decide whether it continues. If current resources can't absorb the work, Council should see what would be displaced or what extra allocation is requested. Any future grant or tax revenue needs evidence before being counted towards the funding.

Through the term, I'll seek aggregate reporting on referrals, paid work, retention, cost and job quality, with the limits of the data explained. Employment across London also depends on the wider economy and individual decisions. I'll focus on the City's own contribution: whether referrals work, people hear back and practical support helps them reach opportunities. Feedback from participants belongs alongside the numbers, especially when the service hasn't worked well for them.

What I'll bring forward

01 / Make employment referrals work

I'll seek a review with London Regional Employment Services, LEDC and providers to find failed referrals and make existing job search and support routes easier to use.

Who can act: The City manages the regional employment service system under funding agreements. Partners deliver services and keep their own responsibilities.

How we'll pay for it: Start with existing coordination and communication capacity. Service changes need eligible funding and partner agreements.

What we'll check: Publish a service map and starting figures. Track time to a meaningful contact, completed referrals and accessible feedback.

What could get in the way: Capacity and eligibility vary between providers. Personal information needs consent and proper protection.

02 / Try practical help tied to real vacancies

I'll bring forward a limited, costed pilot through existing providers for barriers such as travel, equipment or training, tied to verified jobs and employer commitments.

Who can act: Council approves municipal money. LRES and providers follow program rules, employers make hiring decisions, and the responsible institutions handle training and credentials.

How we'll pay for it: Check eligible existing provincial funding first. Disclose and cap any municipal contribution, with new grants counted when confirmed.

What we'll check: Report participation, paid placements, retention, job quality and cost per sustained result, including cases that didn't work out.

What could get in the way: Vacancies can disappear and people may need longer support. Include people who need more help and be clear that a placement can't be guaranteed.

03 / Communicate better with City job applicants

I'll seek a review of City postings, accessible applications, legal compliance and applicant updates, followed by published service standards and aggregate results.

Who can act: Administration and human resources manage hiring under law, policy and collective agreements. The mayor proposes oversight and budget priorities while staff handle individual recruitment.

How we'll pay for it: Use existing HR systems first. Extra staffing or automation needs a costed case.

What we'll check: Check postings, acknowledgements and interview update times. Report totals with applicant privacy protected.

What could get in the way: Processes differ and legal exceptions apply. Define the measures clearly so applicants know what to expect.

When I'll bring it forward

First 100 days

Map employment services and referrals with existing partners, find failed connections and establish a City hiring communication baseline.

Year one

Publish proposed hiring service standards and bring a limited, costed pilot to Council with employer commitments and required funder approvals.

Years two to four

Report aggregate referral, paid placement and retention results. Assess cost and job quality before continuing or expanding the pilot.

Sources and notes

Source numbers refer to this chapter. Publication and access dates are listed below, with notes on what each source tells us. Programs and rules can change, so check the linked source for current details.

1. **Customer Service Charter**
London Regional Employment Services / City of London · 31 August 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains the City's service manager role, the area covered, confidentiality and accessible service commitments.
Read source

2. **Working in London**
London Economic Development Corporation · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Links existing sector boards, the Local Jobs Hub, providers and career tools. Promotional job counts aren't used as unemployment or vacancy statistics.
Read source

3. **Job Seekers**
London Regional Employment Services / City of London · Undated; accessed October 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. The existing local job search and support directory provides a starting point for improving referrals.
Read source

4. **Requirements related to publicly advertised job postings**
Government of Ontario · 24 February 2026 update
Accessed 18 October 2026. Explains January 1, 2026 requirements, the threshold of 25 employees, counting across Ontario locations, exceptions and provincial enforcement.
Read source

5. **Ontario Regulation 476/24: Rules and Exemptions re Job Postings**
Government of Ontario: e Laws · Consolidation from 1 January 2026
Accessed 18 October 2026. Sections 1, 2 and 5 cover the threshold exemption, interview definition and 45 day duty to say whether a hiring decision has been made. That duty applies to interviewees.
Read source