



## Toronto Island Park Master Plan

# Meeting Summary

## Community Advisory Committee Meeting #3 on February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022

---

### Overview

---

On Wednesday, February 16, 2022, the City of Toronto's Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division (PFR) hosted the third Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting for the Toronto Island Park Master Plan. Representatives from approximately 20 on-island and community organizations, waterfront organizations, city-wide organizations attended and participated. The project team members present included representatives from the City of Toronto's PFR Division, representatives from the design team (DTAH, Trophic Design, Common Bond Collective, and North-South Environmental), business strategy team (FS Strategy), and engagement team (Third Party Public [formerly Swerhun Inc.] and Nbisiing Consulting). Councillor Joe Cressy's office was also in attendance. See Appendix A - Participant List for a more detailed list of all participants.

The purpose of the third CAC meeting was to share and discuss the Preliminary Toronto Island Park Demonstration Plan, including the proposed ideas and actions for each of the plan's lenses. The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix B.

The City opened the meeting with a land acknowledgement from Lori Ellis, Project Officer Strategic Projects – Parks Development & Capital Projects. Following the land acknowledgment, Ian Malczewski (Third Party Public) acknowledged the passing of CAC member David Smiley (representative of the Toronto Island / Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation Friendship Group), who had participated enthusiastically in the Master Plan process and many other conversations about Toronto Island. Afterwards, Bob Goulais from Nbisiiing shared an Indigenous teaching moment focusing on the 13 Grandmother Moon Teachings.

Victoria Bell from DTAH presented an overall update on the Master Plan, review of feedback heard to date, and overview of the Draft Demonstration Plan, including the five lenses the Master Plan team had organized its ideas. Following the presentation, Third Party Public facilitated questions and discussion in three virtual breakout rooms, where project team members summarized and sought feedback on ideas for the each of the following lenses:

- Improving Access and Connections
- Enhancing Visitor Experience
- Supporting a Dynamic Environment.

The meeting format included three concurrent, rotating discussions that gave CAC members an opportunity to learn about and discuss all three lenses.

This summary was written by Jacky Li of Third Party Public, the independent facilitation team retained by the City to help support community engagement for the Toronto Island Park Master Plan. It is not intended to be a verbatim transcript; rather, it summarizes key points of discussion from the meeting. A draft of this summary was reviewed by participants before it was finalized.

---

## Key themes in the feedback

---

These points reflect key themes that emerged throughout all the discussions. They are intended to be read along with the more detailed feedback that follows.

**General support for many of the ideas.** In particular, a few CAC members said the ideas to reveal an Indigenous place and elevate equity and belonging are particularly exciting. Some suggested the project team be clearer on how the ideas and actions support the broader vision of conserving and protecting nature at the Island.

**Concern that the ideas are too heavy-handed and risk dramatically changing the park.** Some were very concerned by the number of ideas being included in the plan, saying there are too many human-centric interventions that risk “turning the park into Disneyland.” They said they would prefer minimal programming, less human-centric infrastructure, a strong emphasis on protecting nature (over accommodating growth), and a light touch to the park overall.

**Suggestions to identify priorities to focus the ideas and discussion.** A few people said that the organization of the Ideas into five lenses may be contributing to the feeling that the Ideas being presented were separated and did not appear to relate to one another; and perhaps the Master Plan is proposing too much. They suggested the team consider identifying priority ideas and showing how these how ideas intersect with multiple lenses and themes (rather than discussing the same idea multiple times across different lenses). Another option could be to organize the ideas into near-term and longer-term ideas.

---

## Detailed summary feedback

---

The following summarizes questions, suggestions, and comments shared by participants throughout the meeting. Responses by the project team are included in *italics*, where provided.

The meeting was organized around discussing the Ideas relating to each of the Master Plan lenses; Improving Access and Connections; Enhancing Visitor Experience; and Supporting a Dynamic Environment; and other feedback and questions.

### Feedback about Improving Access and Connections

#### Ideas participants liked

Generally, participants liked the ideas to improve access and connections. Among the ideas participants liked were:

- **Non-motorized zone in Long Pond.** Some CAC members found this idea interesting but said the Master Plan team should look at how this change would impact on marine congestion. Some boat clubs use Long Pond as “pressure relief valve” when the Hanlan’s dock wall is congested, so removing this area as an option for them could have unintended consequences of further congesting other areas.
- **Pathways and connections.** Many said the proposed internal pathways and connections are great ideas, including the water-based connections and nodes. Participants shared suggestions about pathways and connections, including advice to:
  - think carefully about the accessibility of pathways in winter, since winter use of paths is closely connected to how well-maintained paths are.
  - consider designating these pathways as groomed trails in the winter to support cross-country skiing or snowshoeing (saying these are lower impact uses that don’t require costly and environmentally damaging operations like salting and plowing).
  - identify timed “loops,” like Provincial parks, so that visitors could plan an experience based on time and interest.
  - provide regular rest areas along these pathways so people of all ages can enjoy them.

A few participants were concerned that adding pathways could result in too many hard surfaces on the Island and said they would prefer to see the City direct people to explore the park’s vast open areas. *The project team said that many of the proposed pathways build on existing paths and are not new. These proposed pathways are intended to ensure and improve accessibility to all park users. Formalizing pathways can also better protect areas that currently have ad-hoc trails and are experience trampling.*

- **The idea of an accessible tram service.** It was suggested that this service would be especially useful to Artscape, helping it become more of a cultural institution and supporting visitors participating in its programming. Some were interested in learning more about the tram, including its routes, frequency, and number of stops. *The project team said that it’s too early for that level of detail, but that it will share that detail if the idea advances.*
- **Other ideas shared and appreciated;** expanding the non-motorized area near the beach swim zone, separation of vehicular traffic via the proposed service ferry, and the proposed new bridges (which could be an opportunity to do something creative, not just utilitarian)

### Ideas participants were concerned about

Participants were concerned about some of the ideas, including:

- **Combining cyclists and pedestrians on a multi-use trail.** A few said the project team should carefully consider how and when to combine pedestrians and cyclists on the same path. It's especially important to be careful combining different trail users on boardwalks, where broken planks can lead to accidents and injuries.
- **The potential elimination of short-term berthing for private watercrafts.** If the City removes short-term berthing for private vessels, it may be necessary to move this use to another area, like to the south side of Olympic Island, to accommodate people who might require it.

### Where participants had mixed opinions

**Participants shared a range of opinions about the water shuttle network.** Some CAC members said they liked the proposed water shuttle network, saying the additional routes could improve the overall accessibility to the park and help reduce big line-ups at the main ferry terminals. Others shared concerns, including:

- the proposed water shuttle network could result in parts of the harbour becoming busy with motorized uses, making it harder to enjoy the water in a sailboat or canoe.
- the water shuttle network could take business away from the private water taxis.

Several wanted to know more about this idea, including whether the shuttles are intended to replace, supplement, or compete with water taxis, who would operate the vehicles, how frequently they would run, and how big they would be.

### Other suggestions

CAC members shared other suggestions about improving and connections, including:

- look at making more of the existing bridges accessible to the existing quadcycles that are available for rent as well as to people with mobility challenges.
- recommend making the park cheaper or free to access - "it doesn't seem right that Toronto residents and park visitors must pay to access a public park."
- make an effort to reduce cars on the Island (including re-thinking whether events that need cars and a lot of equipment are suitable for Toronto Island Park).
- explore some kind of booking system — similar to Provincial parks — to limit the number of people using the park at any given time.
- consider adding a new ferry landing on the south side of the Island, near Gibraltar Point. *The project team responded that it wasn't considering a ferry dock in that location, in part*

*because demand in that area is limited and the City's ferries aren't designed for outer harbour water conditions where the lake can become quite rough.*

## Feedback about Enhancing Visitor Experience

In general, participants were excited about and supportive of the ideas and actions to enhance the visitor experience. Some, however, were concerned that there seems to be too much planned and programmed space, which may leave little space for the natural environment. They said the team should consider explaining how the Enhancing Visitor Experience ideas are compatible with protecting nature (especially migratory birds). They also suggested the team group amenities together to maximize the amount of in-between natural space.

### Ideas participants liked

Among the ideas participants liked were:

- **Opportunities for new bike rentals.** Some CAC members shared support for expanding Bike Share onto the Island as well as increasing rental times to encourage exploration by bike.
- **New food areas and options.** Some members suggested that new restaurants could operate out of floating shipping containers that don't take up space on the Island, and the City could survey people about what kinds of food options they prefer; the City should also provide more water fountains instead of selling water bottles at the Island.
- **Sharing information to help plan your visit.** There was a suggestion to use QR codes at ferry landings so people can access a calendar of events and a map of the Island once they arrive to minimize information distributed on paper. It would also be helpful if there was an app where people can access all information related to the Island. *The City said developing an app is out of the scope of this project, but of all future information will be available on the City's website. The Master Plan is also looking to improve the Island's Wayfinding Strategy and the City may also look to supporting this with digital wayfinding – but Wi-Fi would be required and currently not available on the Island.*
- **Improved wayfinding and signage.** New signage should include the nearest washroom, incorporate different languages, and be integrated with public art. Signs could also be colour coded to areas since it may be hard for some people to remember names of places.
- **Opportunities for overnight camping and programming.** This idea was suggested and could include small log cabins or small clusters of tents that could be combined with programming (like sugar shacks in Quebec).
- **Enhancing uses on water.** Some liked the ideas associated with kayaking and canoeing to and around the Island, commenting that this might reduce some of the demand on the

ferries. Enhancing the eastern mooring wall is a good idea, too, but will require a lot of money. They also suggested the Master Plan team should: investigate opportunities for portaging at the Island with pathways to Lake Ontario and work with Transport Canada to provide more space for paddlers in the Inner Harbour.

### **Other suggestions**

CAC members shared other suggestions about enhancing visitor experience, including:

- Explore opportunities to incorporate skating into the Master Plan. The skating experience at the Island is popular and unique in Toronto since it's not in a rink and allows people to explore the Island in different ways.
- Provide more shaded areas at the beaches. People don't want to be out in the sun the entire time, so shaded areas and/or renting umbrellas would be good.
- Consider offering tours (online or in-person and guided or self-guided) to highlight the many different treasures around the Island.
- Consider planning or dividing the uses on the Island by specialized interests, for example, family-oriented activities on Centre Island, nature in a specific area, and sports in another area.
- It would be interesting to hear about how the City thinks about the future of the residential areas and private clubs at the Island and if/how they those areas can be integrated into the park.
- In addition to bonfires and stargazing, support activities like night-time stand-up paddleboarding or night walks (as long as there were still ways for visitors to get back to the mainland after dark).

### **Feedback about Supporting a Dynamic Environment**

In the breakout sessions discussing Supporting a Dynamic Environment, most participants shared a general concern that protection of the natural environment needed to be more central to the Draft Demonstration Plan and clearly made a top priority; the plan was too focussed on uses for people and not protection of the natural environment; and promoting access to the ESA areas will negatively impact the natural environment. Other participants liked ideas about season closures to sensitive natural areas, no-go areas, nature education, and stewardship.

### **Ideas participants were concerned about**

CAC members shared the following points of concern and suggestions:

- **Modify the title to "Supporting a Dynamic Natural Environment" so that the natural environment is a clear priority for the plan.** Some participants suggested that the team should consider saying "natural" environment" instead of "dynamic" because a dynamic environment can apply to the built and natural environment.
- **The plan is too human-centric and should be moved to be more eco-centric approach.** Some participants said the plan was too focussed on uses for people and not protection for habitats, flora, and fauna – particularly birds; natural areas should be left to their natural state instead of opening new connections via land and water; there is a too much talk about "balancing" as opposed to prioritizing environmental protection; and nature cannot accommodate more people and environment should be the most critical lens in the Master Plan.
- **Ensure that the proposed boardwalks do not encroach on and impact sensitive natural environments.** Some participants raised concern about promoting access to Environmentally Significant Areas (ESA) and said there needs to be studies that consider what is being added to the Island and how it will impact the natural areas that are currently there – especially for new trails and boardwalks that go into sensitive natural areas. *The Design Team responded that the Master Plan is not a detailed design yet, but the idea is that boardwalks would provide a different a sensitive way to improve access to the different environments. Any new trails or boardwalks being considered will require detailed study, design, and engagement before they are implemented. The team is also proposing to close parts of some trails at times of the year when natural features are more sensitive, such as when there are ground nesting birds.*
- **Terms like "Island Character" and "Dynamic Environment" need to be better defined** so that the public can understand the balance this plan is trying to achieve. *The Design Team agreed and said it will develop a glossary to better define key terms.*
- **Educational signage should not pollute the natural areas or obstruct views of trees.**
- **Motorboats should be excluded across the Island waterways because they pollute and disturb the environment with gasoline and noise.**

### Ideas participants liked

CAC members were generally excited about and supportive of the ideas around:

- **Seasonal closure of some areas on the Island** to accommodate nesting seasons and other seasonal ecological needs and clearly defining and marking "no-go" areas.



- **Promoting education and stewardship (especially Indigenous-led stewardship), naturalization, and efforts to increase visitor awareness of the park's naturalized areas,** such as Muggs Island. Some participants were particularly interested in environmental education and stewardship and provided the following points of feedback and consideration:
  - **Engage with workers on the Island as stewards and champions.** They are knowledgeable about the care of the environment and trained to understand proper maintenance.
  - **The project team should look to conservancy models and partner with businesses or lessees** on the Island, like boat clubs, who could help support a conservancy model.
  - **Include educational elements that are low effort, low budget, and can create a sense of stewardship for visitors** (like the Art Gallery of Ontario). There could be opportunities for people to watch and learn about stewardship at home through online programs and then see it for real at the Island (for example, an audio file downloaded via a QR code that talks about different vegetation or birds). Programs should also include other languages and birdsongs updated seasonally.
  - **Consider creating a program where people can visit different environmental points and use an app to collect stamps (passport of sorts) to learn about the nature on the Island.** Lessons could include bird calls, Indigenous history, and general environmental topics across the Island. Afterwards, people could receive a certificate for participating and have their name displayed digitally. This could create a memorable experience for visitors.

### Other suggestions

CAC members shared other suggestions about Supporting a Dynamic Environment, including:

- Consider how to manage visitors' pets. Participants shared a range of opinions about managing dogs on the island, including requiring that dogs be on-leash at all times (enforced through signage) or banning dogs from the Island altogether. *The Design Team said that, through our engagements so far, there hasn't been much feedback on off-leash dog areas. Currently, the team is not thinking of recommending one but would consider if the suggestion came up repeatedly.*
- It is important to acknowledge that, although natural spaces are supposed to be untouched, they will require some level maintenance. The team could consider maintaining access to some spaces that change seasonally for people to see and experience the seasonal nature of the space.

- Medicinal plants are important for cultural and medicinal use by Indigenous groups. Consider protecting these plants on the Island and only allowing access to these areas for knowledge keepers.
- Consider looking at how the broader waterfront park system could accommodate party boats and encourage these boats to go those parks instead. Motorized boats docking on the Island conflicts with efforts to protecting the environment. *The Design Team said it is considering party boats and the role they might play. They said City policy and park bylaws may limit the Design Team's ability to direct party boats to other waterfront parks.*

## Other feedback and questions

- **Ensure materials for presentation are made available earlier.** Some said the presentation felt abbreviated and participants need materials at least a week in advance in order to understand all of the content and prepare for the discussion. *Project team shared that they like to provide a context for the material that is being shared at these meetings and then give the opportunity for comments following the meeting. In addition, there are going to be Deep Dive Sessions that will go into more detail on particular topics.*
- **Consider illustrating how Indigenous Placemaking ideas are interconnected across the lenses** like how the Equity and Belonging and Business Strategy components are currently illustrated. It's important to not lose any of these important ideas and this could be especially helpful when advocating for funding.
- **What is the vision for the type of pathway from the Lagoon Loop from Muggs Island to Metro Yard?** *This is a design detailed question, and we currently don't have that level of detail yet.*
- **Will the antenna area near the water filtration plant ever be returned to the parkland?** *The ecological community there is interesting but because it is an antenna area, it can't be designated as an ESA. There is some regulation around access to the area. The proposed path goes alongside the area, not through it.*

---

## Additional feedback shared after the meeting

---

Participants shared additional comments after the meeting (Appendix D – Participant Submissions). Points shared in the post-meeting feedback that wasn't otherwise shared in the meeting included:

## Feedback about the Master Plan project overall

- The project should focus on and offer ways to ensure inclusiveness and belonging in nature for racialized and newcomer groups who face barriers of knowing about and getting to the Island.
- Bring people to the Island, but leave city life, commerce, partying, and live events on the cityside.
- The Master Plan should include some explicit points that speak to:
  - How it creates or supports conditions that help ensure the survival of migratory birds. Especially since the City of Toronto recently received a Bird Friendly City Certification from Canada Nature.
  - How it is consistent with and conforms to nature protection policies in the Provincial Policy Statement and Places to Grow Act; the City's Biodiversity Strategy; and climate change policies.
- It is important that the ideas in the Master Plan work well with the efforts in the TRCA's Flood Protection Environmental Assessment.

## Feedback and questions about enhancing visitor experience

- All recreational activities encouraged by the Master Plan should be low impact on the environment, such as hiking trail, bird watching, cycling, cross-country skiing, skating, snowshoeing, etc.
- Event spaces should not significantly impact natural spaces and/or other park users. The proposed event space at Hanlan's may be too small for large events and might encroach into nearby natural spaces.
- The Chemical Building at the Filtration Plant would be a great place for a cafe on ground floor and exhibit about Water Filtration & Deep Lake Water Cooling and Hydrostor (an underwater compressed air energy storage technology).
- Include William Beasley Enterprises Limited in future discussions and collaboration about diversifying food options across the island.
- Will competitive paddling still be accommodated? *Project team response: Existing programs will not be eliminated – unless there is a lack of interest in the program because use patterns have changed. The plan is looking to keep what is working well and enhance or improve where needed.*

- Will the frisbee course be expanded? *Currently there are no plans to expand the disc golf course within the Master Plan context.*
- Any thoughts on reusing buildings at the filtration plan/revitalizing existing buildings like the old Island School/Artscape? *Yes – adaptive re-use of existing buildings is key to our “light touch” approach. We are completing a Cultural Heritage study to help inform and reinforce this idea. Maintaining the Island’s character is key and re-use of existing buildings will go a long way to achieving that.*

## Feedback about supporting a dynamic environment

- Support for reforestation and re-naturalizing spaces and minimizing paved surfaces. Hardscape and built infrastructure should be kept to a minimum and only to comfort essentials rather than to facilitate large, noisy programmed events.
- Any new paths into ESAs should be planned after the City has taken an inventory and mapped the flora, fauna, and bird nesting sites, and the paths should have minimum impact on natural areas. Trout Pond has excellent opportunities for accessible and low-cost lookouts and there used to be a building nearby that would make for a good warming or rain shelter.
- Island champions and stewards should also include waterfront residents and naturalist groups, not just Island residents.
- Ensure that the Emergency Evacuation Dock at the Island School is accessible by emergency services if a non-motorized zone is implemented in Long Pond.

## Feedback about improving access and connection

- Ferry landing and ramps must be made accessible – they are currently difficult to use by people with mobility challenges.
- Maintaining accessible pathways should also consider sand and seasonal changes in water level that may obstruct accessibility.

## Process feedback

- Consider sharing which ideas can be implemented in the short-term and long-term in the next phase of engagement.
- Consider shortening the upfront part of the presentation to maximize time for discussion and consider encouraging participants to change breakout rooms and hear from other groups during the discussion period.

- The Master Plan should consider the 10-year lease horizon of Billy Bishop Airport and how the City might negotiate that lease with the Federal government to ensure those lands can support greater access to the island.
- 

## Next steps

---

Lori thanked Community Advisory Committee members and committed to sharing the presentation and a draft summary in the coming weeks. She also shared the dates for upcoming Phase 2 public engagement activities and encouraged the CAC to share it with their networks.

The Design team will consider all of the feedback shared by the CAC, members of the public, and other project stakeholders in Phase 2 as they contribute to refine the Draft Master Plan, which will be presented in Phase 3 of engagement.

# Appendix A – List of Organizations and Participants

The City invited the following organizations to participate in the combined Community Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Those who attended are bolded below.

---

## Community Advisory Committee

---

### **Artscape**

### **Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association**

### **Centreville Amusement Park**

Cycle Toronto

### **Friends of Cherry Beach and Outer Harbour**

Harbourfront Community Association

Huron-Wendat Nation

Island Bike Rental

Island Café

Island Public / Natural Science School

### **Island Yacht Club**

Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation

Nishnawbe Homes

Pirate Life Theatre

### **Pride Toronto**

### **ProtectNatureTO**

### **Queen City Yacht Club**

### **Shadowland**

Sunshine Senior's Centre

The Pirate Taxi by Water Taxi Now

### **Toronto Field Naturalists**

### **Toronto Island / MNCFN Friendship Group**

Toronto Island Canoe Club

### **Toronto Island Community Association**

Toronto Island Disc Golf Course

### **Toronto Island Marina**

Toronto Island SUP

Toronto Islands Residential Community  
Trust Corp

### **Toronto Public Space Committee**

### **Trans Lobby Group Toronto Trans Coalition**

Urban Minds

### **Waterfront BIA**

### **Waterfront for All**

Waterfront Montessori Children's Centre

### **West Don Lands Committee**

William Beasley Enterprises Limited

---

## City of Toronto, Parks, Forestry & Recreation Division

---

David O'Hara, Project Manager, Strategic Projects, Parks Development and Capital Projects  
Lori Ellis, Project Officer, Strategic Projects, Parks Development and Capital Projects  
Daniel Fusca, Manager, Public Consultation  
Pablo Muñoz, Senior Public Consultation Coordinator  
Alex Deighan, Policy Development Officer

---

### Consultant teams

---

#### Design team

Victoria Bell, DTAH  
James Roche, DTAH  
Terence Radford, Trophic Design  
David Deo, Common Bond Collective  
Ellen Kowalchuk, Common Bond Collective  
Sarah Mainguy, North-South Environmental

#### Business Strategy team

Jeff Dover, fsSTRATEGY'

#### Engagement team

Ian Malczewski, Third Party Public  
Jacky Li, Third Party Public  
Khly Lamparero, Third Party Public  
Stephanie Quezada, Third Party Public  
Bob Goulais, Nbisiing Inc

# Appendix B – Meeting Agenda

## Community Advisory Committee Meeting #3 Toronto Island Park Master Plan

Wednesday, February 16, 2022  
6:30pm–9:00pm • Meeting held virtually



---

### Proposed agenda

---

6:30 PM Welcome, land acknowledgement, agenda review  
introductions, teaching moment

City of Toronto, Third Party Public, Nbisiing

---

6:45 Overview of the Preliminary Demonstration Plan

City of Toronto, DTAH, Trophic

*Questions of clarification*

---

7:10 Discussion: concurrent, rotating conversations

*Topic 1: improving access and connections*

*Topic 2: enhancing visitor experience*

*Topic 3: supporting a dynamic environment*

Thinking of the communities you belong to and represent:

1. Which ideas (if any) do you find particularly exciting? Which (if any) do you have concerns about, and what suggestions do you have to address those concerns?
2. Do you have any other suggestions, considerations, or advice?

---

8:45 Report back and plenary discussion

---

8:55 Wrap up and next steps

---

9:00 Adjourn

---

### Meeting purpose

---

To share and discuss the Preliminary Toronto Island Park Demonstration Plan.

---

### How to share feedback

---

Please share any post-meeting advice or feedback with Jacky Li of Third Party Public (formerly Swerhun Inc.)

416 572 4365

[jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca](mailto:jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca)

The Draft Meeting Summary will include feedback received by **February 23, 2022**.



# Appendix C – Chat Transcript

Project team messages are identified in *italics* below.

- *We have opened the chat function as a secondary option for those more comfortable sharing written feedback/questions with the project team. The chat will not be monitored by the project team. Written responses will not be provided in the chat, however all feedback and questions shared will be included in the meeting summary.*
- *To share additional feedback after the meeting, email Jacky Li at [jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca](mailto:jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca). Feedback received by February 23 will be included in the draft summary distributed to participants.*
- Got it
- *For those who are having audio issues, you could call in by dialling: 647 558 0588, Meeting ID: 845 8457 2721*
- *For those who are joined by phone, you can press \*6 to mute/unmute your mic and \*9 to raise/lower your hand*
- Sport and recreation is important.
- *Hi everyone, there's 5 minutes left in the second breakout room rotation. Please wrap up soon.*
- *Project team members, please move to your final breakout room. Participants, no need to move.*
- *Hi everyone, there's 5 minutes left in the final breakout room rotation. Please wrap up soon.*
- One last thought, as this is a multi-year master plan, I find it disappointing that this study does not engage with the 10 year lease horizon of the island airport and how that future lease can be negotiated with the federal government/ transport Canada o. how those lands and it's infrastructure can support greater access to the island or give it back to the city and its citizens.
- *thanks [name] - understood and we'll track with those negotiating/working on airport discussions.*
- *To share additional feedback after the meeting, email Jacky Li at [jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca](mailto:jacky@thirdpartypublic.ca). Feedback received by February 23 will be included in the draft summary distributed to participants.*

- A big thank you to the project team! I am so encouraged by everything that has been presented tonight! Great Stuff!
- Agreed. Big thanks to the city, the designers and the facilitators for this evening. Great work.
- Thanks! Lots done but more needs to be clarified.
- Thank you.
- Thank you for the opportunity to participate

# Appendix D – Participant Submissions

---

## Submission from Waterfront for All

---

Thanks for the opportunity to respond. Regarding the #3 CAC presentation, next time I would suggest we dive right into the new info without the long introductory preamble of history and where we are in the process, that we have all heard before. We really did run out of time to exchange views and discuss the important new concepts with our fellow CAC members. It would also be good to receive the extensive presentation materials several days in advance. There was no time to digest the large mailing.

Here are my comments. During the discussion, I asked for definitions of “island character” and “dynamic environment”. Is the dynamic change man-made or is it a part of natural forces? Agreeing on the meaning of these terms will help us understand what we’re trying to achieve and will help us to focus.

The long history and attraction of the island is its natural environment, its flora, fauna and bird life. That seems to be the “Island Character”. In this respect it is unique in offering Torontonians a refuge in nature, similar to a conservation area, yet so close to the heart of the city as to make it accessible. People have recognized the attraction of the natural environment and are flocking to the island in unprecedented numbers for that very reason. Languages of new Canadians and tourists are heard on every ferry.

Many stories in the media have documented how much racialized Canadians and newcomers to this country would like to use the outdoors and nature. They don’t always feel welcome. The Island should afford them that opportunity. The island should offer equity, inclusiveness and **belonging in nature**. Noisy partying, large events and club life should be left to the city side. So bring people to nature, leave city life and commerce in the City. If we agree to this description of the island’s unique character then the Master Plan proposals for community programming, business opportunities and partnerships would be designed to enhance that character and afford visitors the opportunities to learn and enjoy it. Interpretive programs focusing on the environment and ecology with guided walks and interpretive displays would be the way to go. The use of the land forms would also be guided by this vision.

I am very supportive of all the Indigenous ideas and initiatives in the materials presented so far. I think they are very much in keeping with the character of the island and the national theme of Reconciliation.

If we adopt the above interpretation of the Island Character then the “landscaping” and land management, in partnership with the TRCA, would flow from that. Hardscape and built infrastructure should be kept to a minimum and only to comfort essentials rather than to facilitate large, noisy programmed events.

All sports, winter and summer, and recreational opportunities encouraged in the Master Plan would be low impact and respectful of the environment. It would be desirable to create more hiking trails which are best experienced in wooded areas. Reforesting and re-naturalizing the extensive grass lawns, which now require mowing and maintenance would be a good first step. Expansive lawns are such a waste of usable space. They are a landscaping vision of the past.

Currently, walking and “hiking” if you can call it that, can only be done on paved roads or lawns. So uninviting. Can we have some paths in the trees with leaves and forest understory under foot? Nature can do much of the work of regenerating itself. “Forest bathing” which offers tranquility and peace, is a new pursuit being practised by many. It’s good to see that the Master Plan has initiatives for the protection and enhancement of ecological areas. But much more can be done and can engage volunteers.

Wooded areas would offer refuge for birds and wildlife, but would also be attractive for X-county skiers, hikers and bird watchers. The town of Collingwood has an extensive network of hiking trails. They are well used during summer for hiking and cycling and winter for skiing and snowshoeing. They are tended by volunteers and are a big tourist attraction.

All the interior of island lagoons should be relegated to non-motorized vessels only, such as kayaks, SUPs and canoes. Motor boats create dangerous wake in narrow lagoons and endanger water fowl and bird nests. The existing club sail boats should be allowed to exit the lagoons to open water under power. But their experienced skippers, are always respectful of navigation right-of-way and know their speed limits.

As first steps could start with improving what exists already and what is affordable. Beaches should be made accessible. Wooden boardwalks, change rooms and rinse-off areas should be provided. Beach maintenance and clean-up is essential. Some of the shoreline areas with water bottles and styrofoam and other refuse, are an embarrassment.

The ferries are a long time problem: annual winter breakdown, summer line-ups, choke points at entry and exit, infrequent and inflexible schedules at peak times, poor communication with users. Transportation and maritime expertise are not a City Parks core service or know-how.

Finally, while I am impressed with the extensive outreach that the TIMP team has undertaken, it's beginning to look to me as if the Plan is trying to be "all things to all people". Trying to please everyone might result in not pleasing anyone. An enormous amount of work is apparent in the material we received. How compatible are these ambitious ideas with the funding and Budget appropriation for the Master Plan. I worry that the Plan's overwhelming vision might lead to nothing being approved. Many well meaning reports have lingered in government limbo forever.

Could we chunk the next steps and talk about near term and longer term "doable deliverables" in future consultations?

---

## Submission from Toronto Field Naturalists

---

1. MASTER PLAN LENS, "**Supporting a Dynamic Environment**" Slide 22

Could this explicitly mention the *Natural* Environment.

Could it be stronger: "Protecting the Natural Environment"?

2. A) "**Supporting a Dynamic Environment: Promoting stewardship...**" Slide 47, point 1:

"Better engage Island residents and others as champions and partners in the management, activation, and advocacy of the park." In the Memorandum, p. 6, there is only mention of Island residents.

Island residents are too few (population apx 600, lots of old people) to draw enough volunteers to undertake activities such as plantings and invasive plant removal in this large park (presumably this is what "activation" means). There are tens of thousands of Waterfront residents for whom the Island is their local park. Also, Naturalist Groups have expertise and experience in stewardship. Could this point be expanded to:

"Engage **Island and Waterfront residents and naturalist groups** as champions and partners in the management, activation, and advocacy of the park."

2. b) "**Promoting stewardship... Develop ...charter ... to... communicate etiquette.... benefits long term vision for the Islands.**" Slide 47, point 2: "long term vision" isn't defined. I suggest:

"...Island etiquette towards use and behaviour **that minimizes impact on the natural environment.**"

3. "**Improving Access to Natural Heritage**"... Slide 48, point 2, A and B

**“A. ...Lagoon Loop Pathway and ...undervalued natural areas”** -- these areas *are* valued for their availability to shy wildlife. Route needs to be planned after flora and fauna inventories are undertaken and plant communities and bird nesting sites are mapped.

Criteria for new routes through ESAs should emphasize quality (e.g. interest) over quantity (e.g. length):

1. “Enhancing visitor experience:” provide **maximum** interest by routing through a variety of habitats, with opportunity for diverse interpretative panels (e.g. sheltered inlet; sand-plain tall-grass community; cottonwood woodlands; deep lagoon edge; sheltered lagoon wetland; etc.) and

2. **Minimum** impact on wildlife by only *modest* incursions into ESAs, especially Wildlife Sanctuary.

**“Lagoon Loop Pathway ... to provide controlled access... large watercraft:”**

- Great to control large boats but there will still be medium-sized boats tying up together in the middle of the lagoon and blasting their sound-systems for hours.
- Will the extremely long bridge (>100 m) across the middle of Long Pond have an opening for police and fire boats? As well as the need to access Long Pond itself in an emergency, the school’s Emergency Evacuation Dock may need to be accessible by emergency services.
- How will the loop get through the Marina – I’ve heard it’s tight for space there already.
- The IYC would need to be aware that it might have to invest \$\$\$ in security.
- How will City service this extensive loop (e.g. garbage, graffiti, damage/rot, beaver felling trees across it) and how will maintenance and operation be funded?

**“B. Develop Trout Pond Boardwalk”**

Need to determine whether look-out platforms giving great views would be more suitable than full boardwalk; or a combination of the two. Trout Pond has some excellent look-outs that are accessible from the road and could be made wheelchair accessible at a low project cost. There used to be a small building nearby – its existing concrete base would be perfect for a warming/rain shelter.

4. **“Make the Island more accessible for people experiencing disabilities”** slide 14

**“Provide accessible transportation to and from the Island...”** Slide 34, point 3

a) *Ferry and dock ramps*: In my observation and experience, the first barrier for wheelchair users are the ferry ramps and dock ramps. There are curved metal plates that join the dock ramp to terra firma where wheelchairs often almost tip over, as well as ill-fitting ferry ramps that can be extremely difficult to navigate. We've been told the docks will not be modified for the new ferries but this really needs to be dealt with.

b) "Provide **accessible paths** within natural areas...Slide 34, point 3

Design of *and* maintenance budget of these paths (presumably through the dunes and onto the beach) need to take into account: blowing sand, burying by sand, vandalism, and seasonal and yearly changes in lake level.

c) "Provide **accessible connections to existing spaces**" Slide 54, point 3 B and Slide 87, point 3B

Identify opportunities in **existing** assets: Slide 10 "Poor state of some amenities" Slide 12

The examples of existing assets in slide 10 are all buildings, but paths are also candidates. For example:

- Two existing short paths that should provide wheelchair access from the road to the boardwalk (one of them even passes a washroom) desperately need to be re-paved (no budget currently??);
  - The small road/path that meanders along the lagoons (from Works Yard to beyond RCYC bridge) is a charming and ideal wheelchair-accessible path if only there was budget to maintain it. The worst parts were re-paved after the flooding but with frost-heave and use by vehicles taking short-cuts some of it is pretty bumpy. Repair and year-round maintenance of this small road would benefit everybody, able or not, especially with the addition of more rest stops, shelters, and interpretive panels.
5. "Formalize...event space at Hanlan's Point (e.g. landform, amphitheatre)" Slide 42, point 5 B
- Hanlan's is too close to airport to hold concerts or other events that aren't *very* loud
  - space between road and airport fence is too narrow for "events" not to impact significantly on other park users (including getting to and from Hanlan's dock and beach)
  - as greenspace in Toronto is *continually* being chipped away at, it would be better if the Hanlan's space could be naturalized (e.g. for pollinators) rather than paved over. Hold concerts at Dundas Square!

6. “Reinvesting in **Existing** Infrastructure...” Slide 33, point 1

The “**Chemical Building**” at the Filtration Plant would be a great place for a cafe on ground floor and exhibit about Water Filtration & Deep Lake Water Cooling and Hydrostor on the second

---

## Submission from ProtectNatureTO

---

I appreciate that ProtectNatureTO was invited to participate in TIMP the Community Advisory Committee's efforts.

ProtectNatureTO and our affiliates advocate for the protection of Toronto's natural areas, especially protected ecosystems - the ESA/ANSIs - focusing on preservation of the natural features and the ecological function.

TIMP was highly anticipated by all naturalists groups and protection advocates hoping to achieve successful implementation of the existing protection policy adopted into the City Official Plan in 2015 (OPA 262 was approved by the Province in May 2016. The OPA is in full force and effect) to ensure preserving for the long term of one of the critical natural area in TO for birds migration and other significant flora and fauna.

Toronto plays a critical role in the North American bird's migration. According to the recent research birds populations are experiencing staggering decline in the North America due to urbanization and climate change.

City of Toronto received recently Birds Friendly City Certification from Canada Nature that comes with obligation to promote/implement progressive municipal policies created to protect bird's populations. Protecting the habitats utilized by birds to ensure nesting and foraging can take place is the most effective way how to stabilize declining birds populations together with safety codes buildings preventing bird strikes.

We know that tall buildings are a big problem but so are our human activities and intense use of the very natural areas providing for the birds and significant/flora/fauna.

I appreciate receiving the link to the presentation from the meeting on Feb 16 as below and extending of the deadline for post-meeting feedback to Sunday Feb 27.

### **Toronto received Birds Friendly City Certification from Nature Canada**



# About The Program

Nature Canada has developed a certification standard to certify eligible cities as a "Bird Friendly City", to recognize and celebrate the contributions they have made to save bird lives in their municipalities. The goal of certification is to provide local partners with a clear standard that reflects what a city needs to do to make it safe for birds. Certification is a badge of honor and a source of community pride. It tells the world that your city or town does things to help birds and reverse their declines in your own backyard. We are looking towards **World Migratory Bird Day 2022** as a timeline to certify at least **thirty eligible** Canadian cities as a Bird Friendly City.

Saving bird lives starts with local action! Across Canada, people are coming together to make their cities bird friendly.

Nature groups, municipal officials, and other community groups are teaming up with Nature Canada to ensure our urban environments are safe havens for birds rather than a source of threats. From predation by domestic cats, to window and car collisions, cities and towns present many preventable hazards to birds.



### A Bird Friendly City is a community where:

- Key threats to birds are effectively mitigated;
- Nature is restored so native bird populations can thrive;
- Residents are actively engaged in admiring and monitoring local bird populations;
- Organizations are creating events to protect birds;
- Progressive municipal policies are created to protect urban bird populations; and **/or existing policies are IMPLEMENTED**
- A Bird Team has been created to oversee and lead these initiatives.

## HOW DO WE REVERSE HUMAN IMPACT?

### 1. THREAT REDUCTION

Reduce threats to birds through educational and regulatory measures to create more opportunities for birds to survive and thrive.

### 2. HABITAT PROTECTION, RESTORATION, AND CLIMATE RESILIENCY

Factor in the well-being of birds and communities when planning urban development projects to ensure that habitat conservation and restoration are prioritized.

### 3. COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

Officially recognizing and celebrating days like World Migratory Bird Day will allow communities to celebrate birds and the diverse places they call home.

Memorandum TIMP narrative and the Master Plan lenses seem to tip the focus somewhat away from protection of TI's unique natural areas, critical for migratory birds, in direction of a more commercialized approach aiming to accommodate pressures of the growing city with emphasis on enhancing of visitor's experience and more access.

**Rather than prioritizing protection of natural heritage, ESA/ANSI/PSWs, for the long term,** as required by the relevant protection policies of the Planning Act, A Place to Grow and Provincial Policy Statement 2014 adopted into the City OP (OPA 262 was approved by the Province in May 2016. The OPA is in full force and effect), **Memorandum emphasizes: “This master plan must consider how to embrace that change, manage, and respond to the pressures of growth, and balance uses and protection—to make all visitors to the Island accountable as Stewards of this space”.**

**This below paragraphs from Memorandum sums up this well:**

*“Consistently through conversations, workshops, and surveys, we heard that the islands should—for the most part—not change, that new development and expansion of intensive uses should be avoided, and that the sensitive ecology of the islands needed protection. That the park was an oasis and a getaway from the city to **“save and protect”.**”*

***So, while the public desire for protecting and preserving this significant and treasured Island escape is clear, the realities of a growing city and the inevitable change within and around the park will continue. This master plan must consider how to embrace that change, manage, and respond to the pressures of growth, and balance uses and protection—to make all visitors to the Island accountable as Stewards of this space. It must cultivate respect for Land and Water and furthermore elevate belonging through programs, processes and management practices that are transparent and accountable for this generation and generations to come.”***

#### **Comment 1**

**TI Master Plan will determine for foreseeable future how Toronto, as the biggest and fastest growing city in the North America, deals with its obligation to fight climate/biodiversity crisis including creating friendly conditions for enhancing survival of migratory birds.**

Several areas at TI were designated as the ESAs for remarkable flora and fauna, while the ecological function is “a notable stop over for migratory birds providing for about 1/3 of birds populations”

*“The City of Toronto is an annual stopover location for thousands of migratory birds. **Seasonal migration is a critical component of many birds’ life cycles in North America,** and elsewhere, and yet this phenomenon is often overlooked as an important consideration in habitat and*

wildlife conservation initiatives. **The diversity and abundance of birds that continue to migrate through Toronto means that the City has both an opportunity and a responsibility to support the safe passage of these birds.** The City has already begun to undertake a number of initiatives targeted at migratory bird conservation (e.g., Bird-friendly Development Guidelines, Bird Flyways Project). The purpose of this report is to summarize the current understanding of bird migration, analyze the available data on migratory birds in the City, and develop recommendations to build on existing migratory bird conservation efforts based on the findings of this report.”

“Over the past 17 years the most common migrant bird groups in Toronto have been warblers, shorebirds and sparrows. The most consistent and greatest migratory bird concentrations identified with this data are natural areas on the lakeshore. **The Toronto Islands, Tommy Thompson Park and High Park together account for more than 70% of the TOC’s migrant bird records for the period between 1990 and 2007.** Most of the remaining concentration areas are associated with some of the larger natural areas within the City, mainly located along the lakeshore and within the West Don and Humber Creek ravine systems.”

**Migratory Birds in the City of Toronto, A Literature Review & Data Assessment FINAL REPORT August 2009 DOUGAN & ASSOCIATES Ecological Consulting & Design with North-South Environmental Inc.**

**“From Graham Saul, Nature Canada, recent communication:**

**The cities play a vitally important role in the survival of Canada’s migratory birds.**

Many Canadians think that our most critical habitats are untouched wildernesses far beyond the borders of our cities and towns. While millions of birds nest or over-winter in our cities, billions more pass through or over them during their annual migrations. **Canada’s urban centres can tip the balance for the survival of large numbers of birds.**

**Over the last three decades, our cities have become increasingly hostile places for birds to survive. Environmental degradation and loss of greenspace has limited nesting areas, light pollution has disrupted flight paths, collisions with glass-windowed buildings, roaming cats and pesticides and plastic pollution are all threats to bird lives.**

**As a result, North America has lost nearly 25% of our birds.** That’s almost 3 billion birds fewer, and it includes many common species in our towns and cities. *It’s heart-breaking!*”

**Comment 2**

**TIMP needs be consistent/ in conformity with protection policy relevant in time of conceiving of this plan. This a mandatory requirement.**

**Provincial Policy Statement:**

***“2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.”***

**The Places to Grow Act, 2005**

*“As provided for in **the Places to Grow Act, 2005**, this Plan prevails where there is a conflict between this Plan and the PPS. The only exception is where the conflict is between policies relating to the natural environment or human health. **In that case, the direction that provides more protection to the natural environment or human health prevails.**”*

Protection is based on **precautionary principle** which means that we are preventing rather than mitigating harm.

Section 3 of **the Planning Act** requires that all decisions and advice affecting land use planning matters **“shall be consistent with” the Provincial Policy Statement**. The **“shall be consistent with”** standard is a strong implementation standard that focuses on achieving policy outcomes.

To protect we **must “recognize the need for the most protection in areas of the province with the greatest development pressures”** as opposed as indicated in Memorandum: ***“This master plan must consider how to embrace that change, manage, and respond to the pressures of growth, and balance uses and protection”.***

On PPS Natural Heritage (Policy 2.1)

*“The Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 aims to protect our environment through policies that safeguard, enhance, and mitigate potential impacts to our natural heritage features and areas, while reflecting geographic variation. The Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 provides clear direction for planning matters and decisions under the Planning Act to protect our water, woodlands, wetlands, coastal wetlands, and endangered and threatened species habitat, **and recognizes the need for the most protection in areas of the province with the greatest development pressures.** Natural heritage features and areas contribute to Ontario’s long term economic prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being and it is in the public interest to protect these resources even where they are abundant.”*

**Under pressures of growing city, we must protect more not less to achieve results.**

**Comment 3**

**“Balancing of uses and protection”** is not in conformity with protection policies as a principle in protected natural areas or in the areas adjacent to these natural areas where **protection is prioritized over use.**

Having to protect more not less is becoming paramount now as climate/biodiversity crisis are deepening.

**Proposed Biodiversity Principles for Toronto Islands** prepared by Biodiversity Working Group, February 17, 2022 well describes TI’s unique ecosystems, flora and fauna and the framework efficiently accommodating protection principles and praxis for successful conservation efforts and management of public use.

### **Island Biodiversity Working Group**

For Stewardship Committee of Toronto Island Community Association: Jenny Bull, Tony Farebrother

For Toronto Ornithological Club:  
John Nishikawa

For Toronto Field Naturalists:  
Nancy Dengler, Ellen Schwartzel, Diana Turchin

### **To protect, it is critical to manage public use:**

***“Activities will be limited to those that are compatible with the preservation of the natural features and ecological functions attributed to the areas”*** (bolded text is taken from 2015 Official Plan, City of Toronto, applying to ESAs)

Strategies for managing of public use are crucial to ensure conservation and protection.

### **Following observations from recent High Park – Terrestrial Biological Inventory prepared by TRCA are also relevant for TIMP:**

- *The main disturbances affecting High Park at present are intensive trampling from park visitors and off-leash dogs*
- *The abundance of dogs-off leash found outside the fenced in dog park at Dog Hill may be contributing to the lack of ground nesting birds*
- *As long as traffic on trails within the Study Area is not too high and restricted to foot traffic only (no bikes), these species are less likely to be impacted. However, heavy visitation to the area increases the threat of predation and/or disturbance by off-leash dogs*

- *Uncontrolled recreational activities present a risk to the quality of the habitat in High Park - High participation rates increase the negative effects on habitats and species*
- *At the Study Area, visitor pressure is currently high and is expected to increase. Strategies for managing human-use are needed if ecological health is to be maintained, or enhanced*
- *Some areas should be left as refuges for flora and fauna with minimal access, especially Species of Concern; they are generally sensitive to human presence*
- *Where off-leash dog use occurs (regardless of whether it is officially permitted or is not), there is a considerable risk of disturbance to low and ground-nesting birds and herpetofauna such as American toad and gartersnake in upland foraging habitats*

#### **Comment 4**

**It is concerning at this point in time that Memorandum and the Master Plan lenses do not deal with climate and biodiversity crisis lenses and do not mention even once the word biodiversity.**

If anything, the lenses of deepening climate and biodiversity crisis require from us to give **“more room for nature”**, while demanding less for ourselves and this way leaving more for nature. In this respect, Memorandum and Master Plan Lenses still represent an anthropocentric view as opposed more ecocentric take on our demands on nature.

#### **Comment 5**

**We need the Environmental Impact Study or EA to make an informed decisions on these important efforts to evaluate proposed Master Plan Lenses and Ideas from a protection point of view.**

TIMP is a monumental undertaking that will make or break the long term ecological carrying capacity of a significant

Toronto natural treasure and critical habitat for North American bird migration.

Before this Master Plan is finalized we need to know how proposed changes may affect the overall TI's natural features and ecological function which is to provide *“a notable stopover for migratory birds”*, including cumulative impacts over time and space.

TRCA and North-South Environmental Inc., e.g. know how to do this and know the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement and the official guide to PPS, Natural Heritage Reference Manual to conduct such a Study.

With so many ideas and proposed new uses and more access via land and water, the pressures on habitats, fauna and flora will be a big challenge. Increased traffic or any group use creates

disturbance for wildlife, inhibits feeding and nesting. Pets are a particular problem Factsheet Oct 2019 as it also follows from above TRCA Report. Recreational fishing is no longer considered a benign activity as it impacts birds and reptiles in particular: Factsheet: Impacts of Recreational Fishing on Wildlife and the Environment, Updated Apr. 12, 2017

BUILDING A SUCCESSFUL CITY

CHAPTER THREE

Toronto Official Plan Office Consolidation - February 2019\_Chapter 3,4 Natural Environment

Development or site alteration, with the exception of trails, where appropriate, and conservation, flood and erosion control projects, is not permitted on lands within the natural heritage system that exhibit any of these characteristics. Activities will be limited to those that are compatible with the preservation of the natural features and ecological functions attributed to the areas. New or expanding infrastructure should be avoided unless there is no reasonable alternative, adverse impacts are minimized and natural features and ecological functions are restored or enhanced where feasible. An impact study, as referred to in Policy 12, will be required for any proposed undertaking in those areas not already the subject of an Environmental Assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act.

Known areas exhibiting these environmentally significant characteristics are shown on Map 12A. Where these areas extend onto lands above the top of bank which have underlying zoning permissions, the lands may be used to calculate permissible density in the zoning bylaw. An impact study, as referred to in policy 12, will be required for any proposed development adjacent to these areas. Any proposed development will avoid these areas, minimize negative impacts and, when possible, restore and enhance the ecological functions attributed to these areas.

15. Provincially significant natural heritage features will be protected by:

- a) prohibiting development or site alteration in provincially significant wetlands;
- b) prohibiting development or site alteration in significant portions of the habitat of threatened or endangered species and fish habitat, except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements;
- c) only permitting development or site alteration in the following locations if it has been demonstrated, through a study, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or the ecological functions for which the area is identified:
  - i. lands adjacent to provincially significant wetlands, or significant portions of the habitat of threatened or endangered species;
  - ii. lands adjacent to fish habitat; and
  - iii. in or on lands adjacent to provincially significant areas of natural and scientific interest, woodlands, valleylands and wildlife habitat; and
- d) avoiding new or expanding infrastructure unless there is no reasonable alternative, negative impacts are minimized and natural features and ecological functions are restored or enhanced where feasible.

Provincially significant wetlands and areas of natural and scientific interest identified by the Province are shown on Map 12B. Where development is proposed adjacent to these areas, their boundaries will be more precisely determined. The Province may identify additional areas to which these policies apply.

16. Protecting, restoring and enhancing the natural heritage system will recognize the joint role of, and opportunities for, partnerships among public and private landowners, institutions and organizations.

**The Natural Heritage System and Inventory (continued)**

- terrestrial natural habitat types, including forest, wetland, successional, meadow, and beaches and bluffs;
- significant aquatic features and functions;
- vegetation communities and species of concern; and
- significant biological features that are directly addressed by Provincial policy, such as Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest.

The natural heritage system is illustrated on Map 9, which is not a statutory map. When development is proposed on or near lands shown as part of the natural heritage system, the proposed development's impact on the system is to be evaluated and an impact study may be required. As part of the evaluation, the natural heritage features on or near the property in question and their location will be more precisely defined.

The City of Toronto and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority have developed an Inventory, as part of a Natural Heritage Study, which identifies and contains data on the various components of the natural heritage system and provides strategic direction for improving the natural ecosystem and increasing biodiversity. This inventory information, and any other relevant information provided through impact studies, will be made public, subject to statutory constraints, and used to evaluate development proposals and identify priority locations where the system should be protected, restored and enhanced.

The City has undertaken a program of further study and fieldwork to confirm and identify areas within the natural heritage system that are particularly sensitive and require additional protection to preserve their environmentally significant qualities. These areas are shown on Map 12A. Most provincially significant wetlands and areas of natural and scientific interest that have been identified by the Province are shown on Map 12B. Where development is proposed adjacent to these areas, their boundaries will be more precisely determined and any negative impacts will be identified through an impact study as referred to in Policy 12.

Further study and fieldwork will continue to update and refine the natural heritage system inventory and assist in identifying strategic directions for improving natural ecosystems, promoting biodiversity and increasing resiliency.

---

## Submission from Centreville Amusement Park / William Beasley Enterprises Limited

---

Thank you for the opportunity to be part of the meeting last week. It was a lot of information to take in, and I appreciate the amount of work your team has to take into consideration when accumulating our input to create the plan.

Is it possible to send through the avatar of the proposal for the tram to move island visitors around? It wasn't working in our breakout room, and I would like to review this part of the proposal with my team.

Also, with regards to the aspect of the proposal regarding diversifying food options across the island, we believe this area deserves further clarification and discussion with WBEL directly. We would like to be a direct and integral part of the discussion and possible change that is coming to the island. As stated last week, this plan will not be immediate and will be implemented over a period of years, but in this regard open discussions with our food services can have a direct impact on a collaboration to make the changes more efficiently than waiting for implementation of the plan in full.

With regards to the organization of the meetings, I would like to suggest that the participants change in the breakout rooms instead of the team members. While I found the opinions of the participants in my group informative, I would have gained more insight into the various stakeholders' positions on the plan if I had heard what they also had to say instead of the one-sided perspective of our group towards each module presented.

---

## Submission from Queen City Yacht Club

---

A couple of items I meant to bring up during the session dealing with existing users on the Island. The competitive paddlers use of Long Pond as an annual Canada Day regatta course was mentioned in passing but I did not hear how that was going to continue to be accommodated under the present proposals.

In a similar vein, I did not hear any discussion related to the existing Frisby Golf course on the Island. Is that to remain? I understand that the Frisby Golfers are actually lobbying for a second 18 holes.

Another item was the proposed reuse of existing buildings on the Island. There are a number of unused buildings in the Filtration Plant. Any thoughts about incorporating them? What is the



thinking around the old Island School? It is now occupied by Artscape. Is that planned on continuing. The building needs extensive repair.

Control of water taxi access has been discussed but I did not see it addressed in any of the recent proposals. The use of new shuttles is being proposed but it is not clear how these would interact with the water taxis.