



City of Toronto Survey

Mayoral election, affordability and property taxes

Field Dates: September 28-29, 2026 | N = 1,000 residents (18+)

Weighted by age, gender, education and household income

MoE $\pm 3.1\%$, 19 times out of 20



mainstreetresearch.ca | info@mainstreetresearch.ca

Survey Methodology

About Mainstreet Research


Founded in 2010, Mainstreet Research is recognized as one of Canada's top public opinion and market research firms. Since our founding, we have been providing actionable and data-driven insights to our clients to help them make their most important evidence-based strategic decisions. Mainstreet has an impressive track record in accurately forecasting election results in Canada and the United States and has become a trusted source for comprehensive market research, analysis and advice. Our insights are found in major media outlets across the country. Our diverse team has decades of experience in conducting both quantitative and qualitative research, ranging from broad national surveys, to focus groups, to membership surveys, and all points in between. Mainstreet Research is a proud corporate member of CRIC and exceeds all Canadian and international standards for market research and public opinion research.

Methodology

The analysis in this report is based on results of a survey conducted September 28-29, 2026, among a sample of 1,000 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Toronto. The survey was conducted using Interactive Voice Response (IVR). Respondents were interviewed on landlines and cellular phones. The survey is intended to represent the voting population in Toronto. Results were weighted by age, gender, education and household income using City of Toronto 2021 Census profiles. The margin of error for the poll is +/- 3.1% at the 95% confidence level. Margins of error are higher in each subsample. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding. This poll was commissioned by and is the exclusive property of Mainstreet Research. Any reproduction, in whole or in part of this report or the data contained herein is expressly prohibited without written authorization by Mainstreet Research.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Gender					
Response	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	32.2%	39.4%	25.3%	30.6%	44.3%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	30.7%	45.3%	39.0%	26.2%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	6.5%	7.8%	4.0%	16.7%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	1.5%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Another candidate	2.7%	3.0%	2.4%	3.0%	4.7%
Undecided	16.0%	17.1%	14.7%	23.3%	8.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Age						
Response	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Brad Bradford	32.2%	31.0%	35.8%	31.0%	36.4%	28.3%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	37.6%	47.1%	47.5%	29.6%	30.4%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	6.6%	3.8%	1.8%	8.1%	14.4%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.0%	3.3%	1.2%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	2.3%	0.6%	0.0%	4.8%	2.1%
Another candidate	2.7%	0.9%	3.2%	3.7%	3.7%	3.4%
Undecided	16.0%	19.7%	7.8%	14.9%	14.1%	20.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Brad Bradford	32.2%	27.8%	34.1%	32.3%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	27.7%	34.3%	45.9%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	16.1%	8.7%	2.1%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	0.5%	1.2%	2.8%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	1.0%	3.1%	1.4%
Another candidate	2.7%	2.2%	2.7%	3.0%
Undecided	16.0%	24.7%	15.9%	12.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	32.2%	31.6%	33.7%	28.2%	29.0%	55.5%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	31.6%	37.1%	46.3%	48.0%	26.4%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	10.6%	7.6%	5.8%	1.5%	3.3%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	1.2%	2.1%	1.7%	2.7%	0.0%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	1.9%	3.2%	0.1%	1.7%	0.0%
Another candidate	2.7%	3.7%	1.3%	2.4%	3.4%	6.9%
Undecided	16.0%	19.3%	15.0%	15.6%	13.7%	8.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Brad Bradford	32.2%	25.5%	42.8%	30.6%	32.4%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	46.9%	25.7%	39.8%	37.3%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	6.8%	7.9%	6.7%	7.4%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	1.5%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%	2.2%	2.3%
Another candidate	2.7%	1.6%	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%
Undecided	16.0%	15.8%	16.7%	15.8%	16.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Brad Bradford	32.2%	34.6%	31.8%	30.3%	31.1%	27.9%
Olivia Chow	38.1%	35.1%	32.1%	39.7%	47.6%	42.1%
Chris Alexander	7.2%	7.7%	14.4%	7.4%	4.4%	4.9%
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	1.4%	3.7%	0.3%	3.7%	2.5%
Sarah McVie	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.4%	5.9%
Another candidate	2.7%	2.3%	1.0%	4.9%	4.0%	3.5%
Undecided	16.0%	16.9%	17.0%	16.4%	7.7%	13.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Brad Bradford	32.2%	17.3%	49.0%	33.5%	34.1%	n.a.
Olivia Chow	38.1%	50.9%	26.6%	44.5%	38.3%	n.a.
Chris Alexander	7.2%	0.0%	11.9%	0.0%	6.4%	n.a.
Odessa Paloma Parker	1.8%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	n.a.
Sarah McVie	2.0%	2.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.5%	n.a.
Another candidate	2.7%	2.3%	0.0%	3.3%	2.8%	n.a.
Undecided	16.0%	23.4%	11.7%	18.6%	16.7%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for? (decided and leaning voters)

Decided and leaning voters | n = 850



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for? (decided and leaning voters)

Decided and leaning voters | n = 850

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	38.3%	47.5%	29.7%	40.0%	48.2%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	37.0%	53.1%	50.9%	28.5%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	7.8%	9.1%	5.3%	18.2%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	2.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	1.9%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Another candidate	3.3%	3.6%	2.9%	3.9%	5.2%
Unweighted Freq	850	357	447	26*	20*
Weighted Freq	839.8	375.9	419.4	30.7	13.8

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Brad Bradford	38.3%	38.7%	38.9%	36.5%	42.4%	35.4%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	46.9%	51.0%	55.8%	34.5%	38.1%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	8.3%	4.1%	2.1%	9.4%	18.0%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	2.2%	1.8%	1.2%	3.8%	1.5%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	2.8%	0.7%	0.0%	5.6%	2.7%
Another candidate	3.3%	1.1%	3.5%	4.4%	4.3%	4.3%
Unweighted Freq	850	160	114	112	140	324
Weighted Freq	839.8	231.2	160.0	143.7	141.2	163.6

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for? (decided and leaning voters)

Decided and leaning voters | n = 850

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Brad Bradford	38.3%	37.0%	40.5%	36.9%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	36.7%	40.8%	52.5%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	21.4%	10.3%	2.4%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	0.7%	1.5%	3.2%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	1.3%	3.7%	1.6%
Another candidate	3.3%	2.9%	3.3%	3.4%
Unweighted Freq	850	127	276	447
Weighted Freq	839.8	134.5	326.6	378.7

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	38.3%	39.2%	39.7%	33.4%	33.6%	60.3%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	39.2%	43.6%	54.8%	55.6%	28.7%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	13.1%	8.9%	6.8%	1.7%	3.6%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	1.5%	2.4%	2.0%	3.2%	0.0%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	2.3%	3.7%	0.2%	2.0%	0.0%
Another candidate	3.3%	4.6%	1.6%	2.8%	3.9%	7.5%
Unweighted Freq	850	256	288	133	140	33
Weighted Freq	839.8	253.4	295.2	125.8	136.0	29.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for? (decided and leaning voters)

Decided and leaning voters | n = 850

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Brad Bradford	38.3%	30.3%	51.4%	36.3%	38.6%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	55.7%	30.9%	47.2%	44.5%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	8.1%	9.5%	7.9%	8.8%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%	2.3%	1.8%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	1.9%	2.1%	2.6%	2.7%
Another candidate	3.3%	1.9%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%
Unweighted Freq	850	216	143	231	260
Weighted Freq	839.8	197.7	151.0	221.5	269.7

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the election for mayor of Toronto were held today, which of the following candidates would you be most likely to vote for? (decided and leaning voters)

Decided and leaning voters | n = 850

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Brad Bradford	38.3%	41.7%	38.3%	36.3%	33.8%	32.2%
Olivia Chow	45.4%	42.2%	38.6%	47.5%	51.6%	48.4%
Chris Alexander	8.5%	9.3%	17.4%	8.8%	4.8%	5.7%
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	1.7%	4.5%	0.4%	4.0%	2.9%
Sarah McVie	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.5%	6.8%
Another candidate	3.3%	2.7%	1.3%	5.8%	4.4%	4.1%
Unweighted Freq	850	357	79	106	54	116
Weighted Freq	839.8	346.6	80.5	103.9	51.2	118.0


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Brad Bradford	38.3%	22.6%	n.a.	41.2%	41.0%	n.a.
Olivia Chow	45.4%	66.5%	n.a.	54.7%	46.0%	n.a.
Chris Alexander	8.5%	0.0%	n.a.	0.0%	7.7%	n.a.
Odessa Paloma Parker	2.1%	4.8%	n.a.	0.0%	1.5%	n.a.
Sarah McVie	2.4%	3.2%	n.a.	0.0%	0.5%	n.a.
Another candidate	3.3%	3.0%	n.a.	4.1%	3.4%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	850	33	18*	28*	52	7*
Weighted Freq	839.8	33.1	22.9	24.9	53.4	5.2

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the choice for mayor came down to only Brad Bradford and Olivia Chow, which candidate would you be more likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

If the choice for mayor came down to only Brad Bradford and Olivia Chow, which candidate would you be more likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Gender					
Response	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	40.9%	46.3%	35.5%	40.4%	57.2%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	41.8%	52.7%	40.5%	39.9%
Undecided	12.0%	11.9%	11.7%	19.1%	3.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Age						
Response	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Brad Bradford	40.9%	40.6%	41.4%	37.2%	45.6%	40.4%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	47.1%	53.5%	49.8%	43.7%	42.1%
Undecided	12.0%	12.3%	5.1%	13.0%	10.7%	17.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the choice for mayor came down to only Brad Bradford and Olivia Chow, which candidate would you be more likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Brad Bradford	40.9%	36.8%	44.7%	39.3%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	42.9%	45.0%	50.6%
Undecided	12.0%	20.3%	10.3%	10.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Brad Bradford	40.9%	41.9%	44.0%	33.4%	36.2%	56.5%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	45.5%	43.4%	55.3%	53.8%	31.2%
Undecided	12.0%	12.6%	12.6%	11.3%	10.0%	12.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the choice for mayor came down to only Brad Bradford and Olivia Chow, which candidate would you be more likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Brad Bradford	40.9%	36.0%	51.9%	40.2%	39.0%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	53.3%	37.9%	46.4%	48.2%
Undecided	12.0%	10.7%	10.2%	13.4%	12.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If the choice for mayor came down to only Brad Bradford and Olivia Chow, which candidate would you be more likely to vote for?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Brad Bradford	40.9%	43.9%	46.2%	39.7%	33.2%	39.7%
Olivia Chow	47.1%	41.8%	46.2%	50.9%	60.7%	50.2%
Undecided	12.0%	14.3%	7.6%	9.4%	6.1%	10.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Brad Bradford	40.9%	28.0%	35.4%	37.5%	40.1%	n.a.
Olivia Chow	47.1%	53.7%	61.1%	43.3%	45.6%	n.a.
Undecided	12.0%	18.3%	3.5%	19.2%	14.3%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Completely certain	45.9%	47.0%	45.3%	45.2%	33.6%
Fairly certain	33.9%	34.9%	32.7%	37.5%	34.8%
Might change your mind	14.1%	12.4%	15.6%	6.3%	28.4%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.2%	4.0%	1.1%	3.2%
Not sure	3.1%	3.4%	2.3%	9.9%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	850	357	447	26*	20*
Weighted Freq	839.8	375.9	419.4	30.7	13.8

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Completely certain	45.9%	48.9%	47.6%	40.9%	47.1%	43.2%
Fairly certain	33.9%	30.7%	34.9%	41.4%	34.5%	30.3%
Might change your mind	14.1%	14.1%	13.9%	9.4%	13.7%	18.5%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.1%	1.5%	4.7%	2.4%	5.4%
Not sure	3.1%	4.1%	2.2%	3.6%	2.3%	2.6%
Unweighted Freq	850	160	114	112	140	324
Weighted Freq	839.8	231.2	160.0	143.7	141.2	163.6

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Completely certain	45.9%	40.3%	49.3%	44.9%
Fairly certain	33.9%	29.9%	33.1%	36.0%
Might change your mind	14.1%	23.2%	12.5%	12.1%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	4.4%	1.8%	3.8%
Not sure	3.1%	2.2%	3.2%	3.2%
Unweighted Freq	850	127	276	447
Weighted Freq	839.8	134.5	326.6	378.7

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Completely certain	45.9%	47.8%	45.4%	42.5%	42.9%	61.4%
Fairly certain	33.9%	32.2%	33.9%	38.1%	36.1%	20.7%
Might change your mind	14.1%	15.0%	13.3%	13.4%	14.4%	14.8%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.6%	3.1%	4.4%	3.1%	3.1%
Not sure	3.1%	2.3%	4.4%	1.6%	3.6%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	850	256	288	133	140	33
Weighted Freq	839.8	253.4	295.2	125.8	136.0	29.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Completely certain	45.9%	49.3%	53.6%	43.3%	41.1%
Fairly certain	33.9%	32.1%	28.7%	37.7%	35.1%
Might change your mind	14.1%	12.1%	11.5%	14.4%	16.6%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.7%	1.9%	1.6%	5.3%
Not sure	3.1%	3.8%	4.2%	3.0%	1.9%
Unweighted Freq	850	216	143	231	260
Weighted Freq	839.8	197.7	151.0	221.5	269.7

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Completely certain	45.9%	45.4%	49.4%	44.5%	40.7%	45.3%
Fairly certain	33.9%	31.7%	33.7%	34.3%	48.4%	36.7%
Might change your mind	14.1%	17.4%	10.4%	14.1%	10.0%	10.6%
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.5%	2.1%	2.0%	0.4%	4.2%
Not sure	3.1%	3.0%	4.5%	5.1%	0.6%	3.3%
Unweighted Freq	850	357	79	106	54	116
Weighted Freq	839.8	346.6	80.5	103.9	51.2	118.0

Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Completely certain	45.9%	42.9%	n.a.	43.5%	45.5%	n.a.
Fairly certain	33.9%	32.4%	n.a.	33.5%	32.9%	n.a.
Might change your mind	14.1%	17.2%	n.a.	12.1%	15.0%	n.a.
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	3.5%	n.a.	11.0%	6.7%	n.a.
Not sure	3.1%	4.0%	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	850	33	18*	28*	52	7*
Weighted Freq	839.8	33.1	22.9	24.9	53.4	5.2

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How certain are you that you will vote for that candidate?

Asked of respondents naming a candidate in Q1 | n = 850


Results broken out by mayoral preference

Mayoral preference								
Response	Total	Brad Bradford	Olivia Chow	Chris Alexander	Odessa Paloma Parker	Sarah McVie	Another candidate	Undecided
Completely certain	45.9%	45.3%	48.1%	36.6%	42.8%	54.0%	42.2%	n.a.
Fairly certain	33.9%	37.2%	32.8%	28.2%	34.3%	32.8%	27.0%	n.a.
Might change your mind	14.1%	13.1%	12.0%	27.6%	23.0%	11.7%	14.3%	n.a.
Very likely to change your mind	3.1%	2.2%	3.4%	2.8%	0.0%	1.5%	13.5%	n.a.
Not sure	3.1%	2.3%	3.7%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	850	310	388	71	22*	25*	34	0*
Weighted Freq	839.8	321.9	381.3	71.6	17.7	19.9	27.4	0.0

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How important will affordability and the cost of living be in deciding how you vote for mayor?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

How important will affordability and the cost of living be in deciding how you vote for mayor?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Gender					
Response	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Extremely important	44.1%	46.0%	43.0%	42.3%	24.8%
Very important	33.9%	34.0%	34.0%	31.2%	36.3%
Somewhat important	17.0%	15.9%	17.0%	23.8%	31.7%
Not very important	3.0%	2.3%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Not important at all	0.9%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%	7.3%
Not sure	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%	2.7%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Age						
Response	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Extremely important	44.1%	48.5%	41.0%	38.1%	45.1%	44.5%
Very important	33.9%	30.3%	36.7%	39.8%	28.6%	35.9%
Somewhat important	17.0%	18.2%	19.6%	11.7%	20.3%	14.6%
Not very important	3.0%	2.4%	1.7%	4.0%	3.3%	4.0%
Not important at all	0.9%	0.5%	1.0%	2.1%	1.4%	0.3%
Not sure	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	1.4%	0.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How important will affordability and the cost of living be in deciding how you vote for mayor?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Extremely important	44.1%	46.6%	41.6%	45.2%
Very important	33.9%	31.4%	35.4%	33.5%
Somewhat important	17.0%	17.8%	16.3%	17.2%
Not very important	3.0%	3.7%	3.3%	2.5%
Not important at all	0.9%	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%
Not sure	1.1%	0.6%	2.2%	0.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Extremely important	44.1%	47.3%	44.5%	41.8%	37.3%	50.7%
Very important	33.9%	34.2%	33.0%	38.5%	32.7%	25.6%
Somewhat important	17.0%	15.3%	17.4%	15.2%	21.3%	16.9%
Not very important	3.0%	2.3%	3.1%	2.5%	4.7%	3.5%
Not important at all	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%	0.3%	2.3%	3.3%
Not sure	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How important will affordability and the cost of living be in deciding how you vote for mayor?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Extremely important	44.1%	44.5%	44.4%	42.6%	44.7%
Very important	33.9%	34.0%	36.0%	36.8%	30.2%
Somewhat important	17.0%	18.0%	15.7%	14.1%	19.3%
Not very important	3.0%	2.2%	1.6%	4.1%	3.5%
Not important at all	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%	1.8%	0.6%
Not sure	1.1%	0.5%	1.5%	0.7%	1.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

How important will affordability and the cost of living be in deciding how you vote for mayor?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Extremely important	44.1%	46.5%	45.3%	34.5%	49.9%	43.7%
Very important	33.9%	34.4%	32.7%	35.7%	37.4%	32.7%
Somewhat important	17.0%	14.0%	20.3%	22.3%	12.3%	17.3%
Not very important	3.0%	3.2%	0.0%	4.3%	0.4%	4.9%
Not important at all	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Not sure	1.1%	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Extremely important	44.1%	63.4%	36.5%	43.2%	32.6%	n.a.
Very important	33.9%	21.6%	36.7%	35.0%	37.0%	n.a.
Somewhat important	17.0%	8.7%	18.8%	18.8%	24.6%	n.a.
Not very important	3.0%	0.0%	3.9%	3.0%	4.2%	n.a.
Not important at all	0.9%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	n.a.
Not sure	1.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following is the biggest affordability concern for your household?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Which one of the following is the biggest affordability concern for your household?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	35.4%	33.7%	40.9%	46.3%
Property taxes	14.1%	14.4%	13.5%	16.1%	14.9%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	26.6%	26.5%	16.0%	11.2%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	6.6%	7.7%	6.1%	3.0%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	5.8%	7.4%	16.4%	6.8%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	4.0%	4.3%	0.0%	4.7%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	3.7%	4.0%	3.6%	8.7%
Not sure	3.1%	3.5%	2.9%	0.9%	4.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	44.1%	37.8%	32.6%	29.9%	25.7%
Property taxes	14.1%	10.3%	12.2%	16.9%	13.4%	19.0%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	25.4%	22.9%	20.5%	30.7%	29.7%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	6.9%	6.2%	6.1%	8.6%	7.5%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	4.8%	10.3%	10.0%	6.2%	5.6%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	2.1%	8.2%	3.5%	3.4%	4.1%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	4.0%	1.6%	5.0%	6.2%	3.2%
Not sure	3.1%	2.4%	0.7%	5.4%	1.6%	5.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following is the biggest affordability concern for your household?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	28.5%	39.2%	33.8%
Property taxes	14.1%	15.4%	10.5%	16.6%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	30.8%	23.3%	26.2%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	7.5%	5.7%	8.1%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	4.1%	10.1%	5.4%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	4.2%	5.0%	3.0%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	4.6%	3.6%	4.0%
Not sure	3.1%	4.9%	2.7%	2.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	39.7%	36.6%	28.1%	29.9%	27.4%
Property taxes	14.1%	11.1%	12.9%	17.7%	15.6%	30.7%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	31.3%	22.6%	22.1%	26.9%	20.2%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	5.5%	9.8%	5.0%	5.7%	8.6%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	3.9%	6.8%	13.7%	8.2%	2.8%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	2.7%	4.6%	3.4%	6.8%	0.0%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	2.9%	3.6%	4.6%	4.9%	10.3%
Not sure	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	5.2%	2.0%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following is the biggest affordability concern for your household?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	33.6%	37.9%	32.9%	35.9%
Property taxes	14.1%	14.6%	11.1%	16.5%	13.3%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	23.6%	27.3%	28.4%	24.8%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	8.9%	6.1%	5.7%	7.3%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	8.8%	6.7%	7.9%	5.2%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	2.0%	4.3%	4.0%	5.2%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	6.1%	5.0%	0.5%	4.6%
Not sure	3.1%	2.5%	1.6%	4.1%	3.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following is the biggest affordability concern for your household?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	35.2%	32.1%	37.8%	31.2%	36.5%
Property taxes	14.1%	14.5%	15.7%	13.7%	16.3%	14.2%
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	27.2%	32.4%	16.2%	29.6%	20.7%
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	6.6%	5.9%	10.3%	11.3%	6.4%
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	8.2%	3.8%	8.8%	0.3%	6.7%
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	2.4%	2.7%	3.5%	6.4%	8.1%
Another affordability concern	4.0%	2.9%	2.1%	6.3%	3.6%	3.9%
Not sure	3.1%	3.0%	5.3%	3.4%	1.3%	3.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Housing costs, including rent or mortgage payments	35.0%	24.5%	37.2%	30.6%	39.3%	n.a.
Property taxes	14.1%	14.8%	1.5%	20.7%	9.9%	n.a.
Groceries and other everyday expenses	25.9%	28.9%	43.9%	21.3%	29.0%	n.a.
Utilities, insurance and household bills	7.1%	3.1%	0.0%	11.0%	7.4%	n.a.
Transportation costs, including TTC fares and driving	7.0%	8.3%	13.9%	7.3%	2.2%	n.a.
Child care and family expenses	4.0%	4.2%	0.0%	3.0%	7.4%	n.a.
Another affordability concern	4.0%	12.7%	0.0%	6.2%	3.2%	n.a.
Not sure	3.1%	3.5%	3.5%	0.0%	1.6%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the past two years, has Toronto become more affordable, less affordable or stayed about the same?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Thinking about the past two years, has Toronto become more affordable, less affordable or stayed about the same?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	3.7%	4.4%	2.7%	4.3%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	18.6%	14.9%	26.3%	8.6%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	34.3%	33.3%	41.1%	42.6%
Much less affordable	41.0%	40.3%	42.4%	29.8%	44.5%
Not sure	3.1%	2.3%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	5.1%	3.6%	5.4%	2.0%	3.4%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	16.6%	17.0%	18.1%	15.7%	17.3%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	31.4%	41.3%	31.9%	38.5%	30.6%
Much less affordable	41.0%	44.0%	33.5%	39.6%	40.6%	44.3%
Not sure	3.1%	1.9%	3.6%	4.0%	2.7%	3.8%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the past two years, has Toronto become more affordable, less affordable or stayed about the same?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	3.3%	2.2%	6.0%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	20.5%	18.2%	14.4%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	35.3%	34.8%	33.2%
Much less affordable	41.0%	36.5%	41.4%	42.4%
Not sure	3.1%	3.9%	2.5%	3.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.3%	1.3%	0.2%	1.3%	0.0%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	4.3%	2.1%	6.4%	4.7%	7.8%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	15.7%	18.3%	12.3%	20.9%	15.5%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	38.0%	28.8%	40.3%	32.1%	37.3%
Much less affordable	41.0%	39.1%	45.9%	36.2%	38.7%	39.4%
Not sure	3.1%	2.5%	3.5%	4.6%	2.3%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the past two years, has Toronto become more affordable, less affordable or stayed about the same?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.9%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	2.9%	3.1%	3.5%	5.9%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	17.8%	16.0%	14.1%	19.1%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	31.1%	37.2%	35.1%	34.1%
Much less affordable	41.0%	45.5%	40.3%	41.4%	37.6%
Not sure	3.1%	2.7%	3.5%	4.0%	2.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the past two years, has Toronto become more affordable, less affordable or stayed about the same?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.2%	4.2%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	3.4%	4.8%	7.4%	0.0%	3.9%
Stayed about the same	16.9%	16.6%	16.9%	16.9%	14.9%	15.4%
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	36.4%	29.4%	35.2%	28.9%	30.4%
Much less affordable	41.0%	40.6%	41.7%	33.3%	53.3%	46.8%
Not sure	3.1%	2.7%	3.2%	6.1%	2.9%	2.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Much more affordable	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	n.a.
Somewhat more affordable	4.0%	4.4%	0.0%	9.7%	3.7%	n.a.
Stayed about the same	16.9%	21.4%	31.9%	10.1%	18.2%	n.a.
Somewhat less affordable	34.2%	45.3%	25.5%	32.4%	34.6%	n.a.
Much less affordable	41.0%	28.9%	39.1%	41.5%	42.0%	n.a.
Not sure	3.1%	0.0%	3.5%	6.3%	1.6%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the property taxes paid on homes in Toronto, do you believe the current level is too high, about right or too low?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Thinking about the property taxes paid on homes in Toronto, do you believe the current level is too high, about right or too low?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Much too high	21.0%	23.6%	18.4%	24.0%	22.2%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	30.6%	27.8%	24.6%	31.2%
About right	34.9%	31.7%	37.5%	39.0%	37.2%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	5.1%	4.4%	10.4%	6.5%
Much too low	2.0%	1.5%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Not sure	8.0%	7.5%	9.1%	2.1%	3.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Much too high	21.0%	16.8%	21.3%	21.6%	17.8%	28.9%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	28.2%	26.0%	29.4%	34.3%	28.0%
About right	34.9%	38.6%	34.6%	34.9%	29.6%	34.4%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	5.8%	6.2%	2.6%	9.0%	1.5%
Much too low	2.0%	2.1%	3.9%	2.2%	1.9%	0.3%
Not sure	8.0%	8.4%	8.0%	9.4%	7.4%	6.8%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the property taxes paid on homes in Toronto, do you believe the current level is too high, about right or too low?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Much too high	21.0%	26.1%	17.3%	22.3%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	26.7%	29.6%	29.4%
About right	34.9%	34.5%	37.5%	32.9%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	4.4%	4.1%	6.0%
Much too low	2.0%	0.0%	3.8%	1.3%
Not sure	8.0%	8.2%	7.8%	8.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Much too high	21.0%	18.4%	23.1%	20.8%	23.0%	16.1%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	33.7%	25.2%	28.2%	27.4%	35.0%
About right	34.9%	27.8%	40.2%	37.6%	32.9%	45.4%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	6.1%	4.0%	4.1%	6.6%	0.0%
Much too low	2.0%	2.8%	1.8%	2.2%	1.2%	0.0%
Not sure	8.0%	11.2%	5.6%	7.1%	9.0%	3.5%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the property taxes paid on homes in Toronto, do you believe the current level is too high, about right or too low?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Much too high	21.0%	18.5%	25.0%	25.2%	17.2%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	30.0%	28.8%	30.8%	26.9%
About right	34.9%	35.5%	33.4%	30.6%	39.0%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	5.8%	2.5%	4.0%	6.6%
Much too low	2.0%	2.5%	0.7%	1.4%	2.9%
Not sure	8.0%	7.7%	9.5%	8.0%	7.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Thinking about the property taxes paid on homes in Toronto, do you believe the current level is too high, about right or too low?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Much too high	21.0%	20.9%	17.6%	20.9%	22.2%	29.9%
Somewhat too high	29.0%	27.1%	38.5%	26.2%	36.2%	28.0%
About right	34.9%	34.8%	27.0%	35.4%	29.5%	33.5%
Somewhat too low	5.0%	5.7%	9.9%	5.7%	0.0%	2.9%
Much too low	2.0%	2.7%	1.9%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%
Not sure	8.0%	8.8%	5.2%	11.8%	9.7%	5.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Much too high	21.0%	8.8%	28.4%	9.6%	16.7%	n.a.
Somewhat too high	29.0%	35.7%	26.9%	28.3%	25.6%	n.a.
About right	34.9%	36.6%	40.1%	43.4%	48.8%	n.a.
Somewhat too low	5.0%	4.0%	0.0%	4.5%	3.8%	n.a.
Much too low	2.0%	7.8%	4.7%	0.0%	1.6%	n.a.
Not sure	8.0%	7.0%	0.0%	14.1%	3.5%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which approach to next year's city budget comes closest to your view?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Which approach to next year's city budget comes closest to your view?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	27.8%	24.9%	42.1%	33.3%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	24.2%	26.5%	12.8%	31.3%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	34.0%	31.3%	21.3%	17.2%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	9.1%	12.3%	18.0%	6.8%
Not sure	5.1%	4.9%	4.9%	5.7%	11.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	29.5%	21.6%	30.5%	28.1%	24.5%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	23.1%	26.0%	29.2%	22.1%	25.5%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	35.0%	33.2%	20.8%	35.5%	32.9%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	8.8%	13.5%	10.7%	10.3%	12.9%
Not sure	5.1%	3.6%	5.7%	8.9%	4.0%	4.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which approach to next year's city budget comes closest to your view?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	22.5%	29.2%	27.0%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	26.8%	24.2%	24.9%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	31.0%	30.7%	33.4%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	13.9%	11.3%	9.5%
Not sure	5.1%	5.8%	4.6%	5.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	27.5%	29.8%	27.0%	21.3%	21.8%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	25.0%	24.7%	24.4%	23.7%	37.1%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	30.4%	29.3%	35.3%	37.9%	29.6%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	9.7%	11.3%	9.9%	14.5%	8.0%
Not sure	5.1%	7.4%	4.9%	3.4%	2.5%	3.5%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which approach to next year's city budget comes closest to your view?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	24.0%	27.6%	29.5%	26.9%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	26.2%	25.3%	23.8%	24.9%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	31.7%	32.9%	29.6%	33.5%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	14.3%	7.4%	12.6%	9.3%
Not sure	5.1%	3.8%	6.9%	4.5%	5.5%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which approach to next year's city budget comes closest to your view?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	24.6%	27.4%	25.1%	41.6%	28.7%
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	24.9%	37.7%	23.8%	21.5%	21.4%
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	34.2%	22.6%	36.0%	24.9%	31.9%
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	10.4%	7.0%	10.0%	10.0%	15.7%
Not sure	5.1%	6.0%	5.3%	5.1%	2.0%	2.2%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Freeze property taxes, even if some city services must be reduced	27.0%	24.3%	44.8%	27.2%	25.1%	n.a.
Keep any property tax increase below inflation and find additional savings	25.0%	25.5%	6.5%	27.1%	25.1%	n.a.
Increase property taxes by about the rate of inflation to maintain services	31.9%	26.1%	26.4%	30.3%	36.6%	n.a.
Increase property taxes above inflation if the additional money improves important services	11.0%	13.7%	8.2%	9.2%	13.2%	n.a.
Not sure	5.1%	10.4%	14.1%	6.3%	0.0%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	25.0%	22.3%	27.5%	33.3%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	17.6%	15.9%	27.6%	0.0%
Police and public safety	12.9%	13.7%	12.4%	11.1%	10.8%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	13.7%	14.3%	9.2%	21.9%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	7.1%	11.0%	9.1%	4.3%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	4.8%	7.7%	0.6%	9.0%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	12.2%	9.9%	12.2%	16.6%
Another priority	2.9%	4.2%	1.9%	2.7%	1.2%
Not sure	3.1%	1.8%	4.5%	0.0%	3.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	23.9%	25.4%	22.4%	22.9%	24.6%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	16.5%	18.0%	21.2%	11.7%	17.4%
Police and public safety	12.9%	13.4%	8.7%	11.9%	17.8%	12.8%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	9.6%	20.9%	15.4%	12.4%	14.4%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	9.0%	8.4%	7.6%	11.1%	9.4%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	8.3%	2.1%	4.7%	7.2%	6.8%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	14.2%	12.1%	8.5%	10.4%	8.7%
Another priority	2.9%	1.8%	2.5%	3.7%	4.4%	3.1%
Not sure	3.1%	3.5%	2.0%	4.5%	2.1%	2.9%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	20.9%	24.7%	24.4%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	15.1%	19.5%	15.4%
Police and public safety	12.9%	13.8%	13.0%	12.4%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	16.7%	13.4%	13.4%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	11.7%	6.3%	10.4%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	7.9%	5.0%	6.4%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	9.1%	11.8%	11.4%
Another priority	2.9%	2.3%	3.3%	2.9%
Not sure	3.1%	2.7%	2.9%	3.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by income

Response	Total	Income				Prefer not to say
		Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	26.2%	22.0%	24.7%	21.9%	27.8%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	14.8%	14.5%	22.0%	20.7%	22.5%
Police and public safety	12.9%	10.6%	14.4%	11.1%	16.6%	10.7%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	15.3%	13.2%	11.7%	13.6%	22.2%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	11.6%	8.9%	7.3%	7.1%	4.2%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	6.4%	6.2%	7.2%	5.5%	0.0%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	11.2%	14.3%	7.0%	8.0%	9.8%
Another priority	2.9%	1.2%	3.2%	5.6%	3.8%	0.0%
Not sure	3.1%	2.7%	3.3%	3.5%	2.8%	2.8%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	22.0%	22.7%	25.5%	24.6%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	18.3%	16.2%	18.2%	15.4%
Police and public safety	12.9%	11.2%	14.4%	11.7%	14.3%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	12.5%	13.9%	12.6%	16.2%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	9.2%	13.4%	6.9%	8.4%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	6.4%	6.2%	5.0%	6.7%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	13.2%	9.1%	12.5%	9.6%
Another priority	2.9%	3.7%	2.3%	2.9%	2.8%
Not sure	3.1%	3.6%	1.8%	4.7%	2.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Ethnicity						
Response	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	25.2%	16.9%	16.7%	24.4%	27.0%
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	16.5%	19.8%	19.5%	19.4%	14.2%
Police and public safety	12.9%	12.7%	19.0%	15.6%	12.7%	17.0%
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	11.7%	16.8%	17.8%	10.3%	12.0%
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	10.7%	3.4%	13.0%	5.6%	8.9%
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	5.7%	6.5%	2.4%	9.1%	7.5%
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	10.6%	12.1%	10.4%	16.2%	8.4%
Another priority	2.9%	3.8%	2.1%	0.2%	2.0%	1.8%
Not sure	3.1%	3.0%	3.4%	4.3%	0.3%	3.1%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

If property taxes were increased, which one of the following would be the most important use of the additional money?

All respondents | n = 1,000


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Affordable housing and homelessness services	23.9%	27.0%	19.1%	12.4%	37.7%	n.a.
Public transit and TTC safety	16.9%	13.1%	8.6%	22.8%	13.3%	n.a.
Police and public safety	12.9%	9.3%	0.0%	5.9%	3.3%	n.a.
Roads, traffic and basic infrastructure	14.0%	18.8%	24.5%	12.5%	17.4%	n.a.
Parks, libraries and recreation programs	9.1%	5.6%	14.3%	6.3%	4.6%	n.a.
Flood protection and other climate resilience measures	6.1%	10.3%	8.4%	7.9%	5.9%	n.a.
Do not increase property taxes	11.1%	6.7%	21.6%	26.3%	8.3%	n.a.
Another priority	2.9%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	n.a.
Not sure	3.1%	3.5%	3.5%	6.0%	1.6%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following concerns you most about future property tax increases?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Which one of the following concerns you most about future property tax increases?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Response	Gender				
	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	22.8%	19.2%	20.6%	23.4%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	15.7%	20.7%	9.4%	28.6%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	16.1%	16.3%	34.6%	13.7%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	26.9%	24.6%	12.4%	10.6%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	10.8%	11.2%	11.9%	7.7%
Another concern	4.0%	4.2%	3.9%	2.1%	8.7%
Not sure	4.1%	3.5%	4.1%	9.1%	7.3%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Response	Age					
	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	18.3%	16.0%	23.4%	26.4%	22.4%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	23.3%	15.0%	20.1%	20.3%	9.9%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	11.2%	17.3%	7.0%	8.8%	39.2%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	22.5%	27.8%	31.0%	26.3%	20.0%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	13.7%	12.9%	11.4%	10.1%	5.9%
Another concern	4.0%	5.9%	5.3%	2.7%	4.4%	1.1%
Not sure	4.1%	5.0%	5.8%	4.3%	3.8%	1.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following concerns you most about future property tax increases?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Response	Education			
	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	23.0%	19.3%	21.5%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	13.8%	21.0%	17.2%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	31.6%	11.6%	15.6%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	20.6%	27.4%	24.7%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	5.4%	12.4%	12.1%
Another concern	4.0%	2.4%	3.1%	5.5%
Not sure	4.1%	3.2%	5.3%	3.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Response	Income					
	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	17.9%	21.9%	22.4%	23.6%	20.4%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	15.5%	22.0%	10.6%	20.4%	24.0%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	18.6%	16.7%	20.1%	11.0%	16.6%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	27.1%	21.9%	28.2%	22.6%	34.3%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	13.3%	9.8%	9.1%	12.8%	0.9%
Another concern	4.0%	4.8%	2.2%	5.5%	5.2%	3.8%
Not sure	4.1%	2.7%	5.6%	4.1%	4.4%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following concerns you most about future property tax increases?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Response	Region				
	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	21.4%	18.1%	23.2%	20.3%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	17.0%	25.9%	15.2%	16.9%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	17.1%	13.6%	19.6%	16.4%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	24.3%	29.2%	25.3%	22.8%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	10.7%	9.6%	8.2%	14.3%
Another concern	4.0%	5.4%	2.3%	4.4%	3.7%
Not sure	4.1%	4.0%	1.3%	4.1%	5.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Which one of the following concerns you most about future property tax increases?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	20.5%	20.7%	18.2%	11.3%	24.5%
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	18.2%	18.6%	23.2%	19.6%	19.1%
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	18.8%	11.7%	12.2%	21.2%	14.3%
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	25.2%	28.4%	24.8%	24.7%	27.0%
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	10.3%	11.2%	13.1%	15.0%	9.8%
Another concern	4.0%	3.8%	0.0%	5.5%	8.2%	2.6%
Not sure	4.1%	3.3%	9.5%	3.0%	0.0%	2.6%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8


Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Total	Ethnicity				
		Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
The direct cost to homeowners	20.9%	22.0%	25.6%	30.4%	23.7%	n.a.
The possibility that higher costs will be passed on to renters	18.1%	17.2%	9.9%	17.4%	9.0%	n.a.
The effect on seniors and others with fixed incomes	16.9%	23.7%	17.4%	16.1%	18.2%	n.a.
Whether the city will spend the additional money effectively	25.0%	17.9%	31.0%	18.1%	22.9%	n.a.
The possibility of service cuts if taxes do not increase	11.0%	9.7%	3.5%	14.7%	12.0%	n.a.
Another concern	4.0%	1.8%	12.5%	0.0%	7.1%	n.a.
Not sure	4.1%	7.8%	0.0%	3.3%	7.2%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Do you currently own your home, rent your home or have another living arrangement?

All respondents | n = 1,000



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Do you currently own your home, rent your home or have another living arrangement?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by gender

Gender					
Response	Total	Man	Woman	Non-binary or another gender	Prefer not to say
Own	50.9%	50.4%	50.6%	59.4%	54.4%
Rent	43.9%	46.3%	42.1%	37.3%	45.6%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	1.7%	4.5%	3.4%	0.0%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	1.6%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	520	34	22*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	453.3	491.7	40.0	15.0

Results broken out by age

Age						
Response	Total	18 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 or older
Own	50.9%	21.8%	40.7%	63.3%	71.4%	74.0%
Rent	43.9%	74.7%	55.1%	26.8%	23.1%	21.8%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	2.6%	3.2%	5.5%	3.1%	1.8%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	0.8%	1.0%	4.4%	2.5%	2.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	198	123	130	157	392
Weighted Freq	1000.0	288.1	173.5	169.0	164.3	205.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Do you currently own your home, rent your home or have another living arrangement?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by education

Education				
Response	Total	High school or less	College or trades certificate	University degree
Own	50.9%	67.7%	46.1%	48.4%
Rent	43.9%	26.7%	49.1%	46.3%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	3.4%	2.5%	3.5%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	2.1%	2.3%	1.8%
Unweighted Freq	1000	164	322	514
Weighted Freq	1000.0	178.5	388.2	433.3

Results broken out by income

Income						
Response	Total	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	\$150,000 or more	Prefer not to say
Own	50.9%	37.7%	49.4%	63.3%	68.7%	52.5%
Rent	43.9%	54.7%	46.5%	31.7%	27.4%	47.5%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	4.3%	2.9%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	3.3%	1.2%	2.5%	1.5%	0.0%
Unweighted Freq	1000	308	338	158	160	36
Weighted Freq	1000.0	314.0	347.5	149.1	157.5	31.9

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Do you currently own your home, rent your home or have another living arrangement?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by region

Region					
Response	Total	Downtown	Etobicoke	North York	Scarborough
Own	50.9%	47.4%	60.0%	52.4%	47.2%
Rent	43.9%	49.3%	38.6%	41.0%	45.3%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	2.0%	0.7%	3.3%	5.1%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	1.3%	0.6%	3.3%	2.4%
Unweighted Freq	1000	252	167	279	302
Weighted Freq	1000.0	234.8	181.2	262.9	321.1

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.

Do you currently own your home, rent your home or have another living arrangement?

All respondents | n = 1,000

Results broken out by ethnicity (1 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	White	Black	East Asian	Multiracial/Other	South Asian
Own	50.9%	54.5%	48.3%	45.8%	42.4%	50.5%
Rent	43.9%	41.2%	48.2%	51.6%	47.8%	41.7%
Another living arrangement	3.1%	2.9%	2.5%	1.2%	7.6%	3.2%
Prefer not to say	2.1%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	2.2%	4.7%
Unweighted Freq	1000	424	90	127	58	132
Weighted Freq	1000.0	417.2	97.1	124.3	55.5	135.8

Results broken out by ethnicity (2 of 2)

Response	Ethnicity					
	Total	Middle Eastern	Jewish	Latino	Southeast Asian	First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
Own	50.9%	46.2%	54.3%	59.1%	47.5%	n.a.
Rent	43.9%	44.2%	45.7%	36.9%	43.7%	n.a.
Another living arrangement	3.1%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	n.a.
Prefer not to say	2.1%	4.4%	0.0%	4.0%	2.6%	n.a.
Unweighted Freq	1000	42	20*	35	64	8*
Weighted Freq	1000.0	43.2	26.0	30.6	64.1	6.3

n.a. = not available in the supplied results. * Unweighted subgroup base below 30; interpret cautiously.