

Appendix A: April 15 Plenary Q&A and Comments

**Engagement Summary:
Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings**

Appendix A: April 15 Plenary

Q&A and Comments

1. Attendee question: Can City staff speak to the issues identified in the report?

City answer: Status update report was shared with Council on April 12, 2023 and the Applicant has not received comments yet. In the status report, the City is looking at the location of the entrance, massing and size of the main building, among other issues. City encourages the public to read the status report.

2. Attendee question: There is a contract to build an underground parking lot, why is it so large? How does parking fit within the transit goals of the Province and what are the impacts of construction?

Applicant answer: This will be discussed in the public spaces & activities breakout room. Transit will be the primary mode of transportation. Transportation modelling shows that about 10% of visitors will drive and use the parking lot. The parking lot is only focused on those visitors. From a transportation perspective, this is a shift of modal split.

3. Attendee question: Concerned that for the first 1.5hr of the meeting because it's focused on talking to the attendees. Everyone has been asked to share and attend, but the meeting didn't even give enough time for attendees to share and comment. If the meeting is equitable, what is the scope of influence for the public on this project?

Facilitator answer: The meeting format also includes breakout sessions. The City will work with the applicant on the feedback received during the public community consultation meetings. City staff will collect the feedback form responses and will be used to inform their decision on the proposal. The City is present but scope is on the physical elements of the site.

4. Attendee question: Ontario Place was built on landfill, was there consideration to add more land to the site?

Applicant answer: The environment breakout session includes talking about the approach to lake fill and West Island expansion. There will be an increase in the total area of Ontario Place. Expansion will provide more public open space with program partners and parking lot.

5. Attendee question: Two private companies have large spaces to maximize their profits, can they make concerts affordable and affordable access in perpetuity. What is the role of the private companies? There are no provisions for families, didn't see any wheelchairs or mention of accessibility in the presentations.

Applicant answer: 2/3 of the site will be publicly available and will be AODA compliant and will also include spaces for family activities. Public means free access. Therme is considering making public spaces with community benefits based on other Therme facilities and sites around the world. Live Nation is a current tenant.

6. Attendee question: There is wide opposition to a spa on public land, what is the alternative once the Therme Spa is a no-go?

Applicant answer: Infrastructure Ontario stated that they are not considering an alternative. 2/3 of the site will be publicly accessible and completely free and will include site improvements and programming for all uses.

7. Attendee question: Shore erosion is supposedly not true; tree protection isn't ambitious. There is healthy algae and the stones around the shore won't make it accessible for everyone. Based on where the current beach is located right now, it will be covered with sewage because the service pipe is still there. The beach won't be accessible and the current beach should stay where it is.

Applicant answer: Shoreline experts will be in the environment and sustainability breakout room to further discuss this.

8. Attendee question: Who In this room is excited about a spa?

[A table of people raised their hands]

9. Attendee question: Would you expand Indigenous community involvement? Would Therme consider creating a Sweat Lodge? Or redesign to include this? What is the current engagement with the Mississauga's of the New Credit First Nation (MCFN)? Why aren't there Indigenous panelists? Why is the panel all white?

Applicant answer: Indigenous engagement has started since early 2021 to ensure the duty to consult for treaty rights holders. This process is led by the Ministry. There is engagement on the development concept with the MCFN. Elder Shirley Charles from Georgian Bay is leading Indigenous engagement with 7 treaty rights bearing organizations/nations. Plants, materials, and soils have been discussed so far and Indigenous groups have provided information. Elder Charles will provide more information at the next meeting.

Appendix B:

April 15 Break-out Table Notes

Engagement Summary:
Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

Table of Contents

Appendix B:	4
April 15 Break-out Table Notes	4
Built Form, Heritage, and Character Table Notes	4
Public Spaces and Activities Table Notes	15
Environment and Sustainability Table Notes	21

Appendix B:

April 15 Break-out Table Notes

Built Form, Heritage, and Character Table Notes

City Note-taker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #1

- Concerned that indigenous consultation has not informed the design of the proposed built form, and concerned with the extent of indigenous consultation
- The proposed design, materials, proposed palm trees and indoor plantings, are not representative of Ontario
- The West Island is characterized by a binary split between public and private experience, with private experience being prioritized
- The proposed building is out of scale, out of proportion to the public realm
- Concerned with the rationalization of transportation uses – particularly the justification for extensive underground parking prioritizing automobile use
- Concerned with impact of building footprint on West Island and its ecology, notably bird life and migratory bird route
- Would like to see edible shrubs and trees
- Want to reduce hardscaping, amount of cement used
- Mitigate the impact of proposed building on existing bird life by reducing building footprint and conserving existing trees
- Compares Therme proposal to Bota Bota in Montreal – why does Therme have to be so large in comparison?
- Scale, obstruction of views to existing heritage mega structures (pods, cinesphere) from west and north. Reduce scale of proposed buildings to mitigate impact on heritage views
- Make proposed Therme main building much smaller to mitigate impact to existing ecology
- Entry pavilion is completely out of scale to West Island and public realm and heritage, reduce building footprint and height
- Public/private – concerned with privatization of what currently functions as public space. Concerned with a private firm building in a park
- When will the public find out about the terms of the lease?
- We want more info about cost of Therme uses, ticket costs etc.
- “Its like a private castle with a public strip around the edge” lower the height so it isn’t so dominant and so there is more equity between public and private users
- Have doubts about proposed attendance projections particularly during winter – its going to sit empty in the winter, is too large for this use
- The proposal is not responding to Canadian cultural context where people do outdoor activities in the winter
- What happens when this business fails and we’re left with this single purpose building?
- Public realm of east island generally moving in right direction

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #2

- Taking European business model and imposing it on a city with diverse cultural heritage – how does the proposal respond to Toronto’s diverse cultural heritage?
- How has building been designed to be able to be adaptively reused if the spa business fails?
- Concerned about sustainable design issues – would like to see more walls less glass, heating and cooling issues with proposed materials/design, bird collision and wind impacts

- Concerned with “who is this really for?” – Issues of affordability and gentrification, public needs to have more info re: ticket costs especially for lower income communities such as those living in nearby Parkdale. Concerned this project won't be of use to lower income communities living nearby and could contribute to gentrification of those neighbourhoods
- Concerned with consultation process (both Provincial and City), no transparency in consultation process, feels top down, project largely decided upon and public not being given meaningful opportunity to co-create the vision for Ontario Place. Local communities not represented in current City consultation – who's not here? Why aren't they here?
- Can the City impact this development?
- Question the need for private uses to make Ontario Place “world class” – note existing world class parks across world, defined by their public uses. Would like to see greater % of public uses. Although there was a small fee to enter when Ontario Place opened, we're in a different era where public realm is more necessary, with intensification of the inner city and existing deficit of public realm
- Who's not here? Why are they missing?
- We need to look at realistic numbers of ticket prices etc., To understand how lower income folks can access this kind of use
- Looks like the rich get to climb stairs above the poor below, there's a prioritization of private uses over public ones, with an associated class dimension
- Safety concerns re: use at night, lighting
- Would like to see reuse of heritage structures proposed to be removed, specifically for sustainability
- “Way too big” building in relation to public realm – “shocked they said its bigger than the BMO”
- Existing beach works well, concerned with proposed new beaches, particularly proposed west one

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #1

- What makes the building world class? – Respecting heritage, what makes the building different
- Met husband at Ontario Place, long winter came and pandemic. Fully endorse improvements -> boasting, light development on island, integrating Indigenous perspectives. Better not bigger. Better for island if not spa. No private use on public land
- This is unique location -> again not the spa @ this location. Scale and preparation are just dreadful. Shoreline is losing, wrong concept for this place
- Spa would not in diagram. They are talking about flood mitigation with underground parking. What are the risks of this. Concern about flooding
- Concern about levels of parking
- Heritage design -> plastic things. The orange is unattractive. Looks like a mushroom. Sweat place for long line up
- Environment impact mean the water
- What about environmental assessment
- Who gets the revenue from 2000 parking?
- Concern about taxpayers paying for parking garage.
- How is this going to work with M Goodman trail
- How many people are going into building. I.e., paying to use the Therme location -> \$2 million per year and building capacity 7000 twice over
- Concerned about climate crisis
- Concerned about traffic congestion -> is there forethought when the problems compounds?
- Why do we need 2700 parking spots?
- Terms of lease and revenue. Ongoing -> what happens if it fails
- We do not want a spa on our land

- Who/how many do we know will be coming to this?
- Wellness if free when you walk in the park?
- I don't want cocktails on public land -> love free but I want it to remain public
- It seems inauthentic
- This is not world class compared to other places
- I am kind of liking this decision. I am low income; Do I want to be able to go to Mexico. I want an affordable option.
- Parking affordable package
- I am depressed with this was a brilliant place that is going to be obliterated.
- How did it fall into disrepair? Disallowed vision
- Interesting to see the built form come in
- How are we accommodating cyclists in left turning lanes? How are we designing for intersections here?
- The province is building the parking lot
- If we do it wrong, we can't get it back
- Concerned about ratio of building to land
- What is the contingency plan for this building if this anchor amenity does not work? What happens to the building, how will it be used?
- How are you representing today's cultural heritage -> not just this one white guy?
- Copied model from Europe and putting it here. How does it make sense? Especially in the most culturally diverse city?
- Most forward-thinking cities in the world are expanding their green space not privatizing it. I.e., Paris, NYC, Chicago, etc.
- Why isn't Toronto embracing this movement?
- Why are we stuck with old thinking about development on public land?
- Ignoring climate crisis impact

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #2

- How is today's cultural heritage/design representative of today's time? European foreign company
- Size of building in relation to size of site (scale). Suggestion: provide physical model
- Need for parking structure?
- Public space
- More pedestrian access (foot bridges)
- Limit glass – alternate energy/efficient material
- Local businesses
- Low scale buildings (2 Storey)
- West island – 22 Acres
- Proposal – 11 Acres
- General observations:
 - Residents want to hear from one another
 - Refreshments ended too soon
 - Passionate about public space and active transportation. Especially cycling infrastructure

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #1

- Provides free outdoor space
- Idea of revitalization and bringing more people to Ontario Place

- Privatization of public space
- Against raising of soil and destruction of trees. No need to destroy
- Like the building – all seasons
- More public space inside especially winter. Spa could be too expensive and include city-run pool
- Public integration between sauna and beach
- Revitalization is good
- Remediation and improved public access are good
- Not a place for Ontarians – not incorporating Ontario theme
- Glass is bad for birds and material is not local
- Scale is too big
- Sustainability is question
- Not seeing heritage concept
- Lots of palm trees – does not look like Ontario and is not inspired by Ontario
- Does this accommodate Ontario climate?
- Gentle density – small pockets of density/building
- Proposal is one big mass and out of proposal
- Heritage elements could be explored more
- To consider each buildings/programming separately isn't comprehensive/not fair.
- Reduction of footprint of spa building
- Public space is on periphery
- How does city space and Ontario Place be integrated?
- Welcome centre – does not respond to location and not necessarily world class
- Will Japanese bell remain or relocated? Should be maintained.
- Continuous bike lane
- Reduction of scale
- Bird habitat, species -> glass as a material. **Materials are very important.**

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #2

- Scale is important
- Next time a physical model would be helpful.
- Relationship between Therme building and public space very important
- Support for terracing
- All public land -> now only a percentage left -> not clear on how much public land on west island?
 - Not been answered.
 - Not a lot of transparency on proposal
 - What happens if this fails. Can't get answer from IO
- Can it be called a park? If development application
- OK for some buildings to pay for revitalization
- How affordable will Therme be?
- Not a lot of public assets/open space.
- Shrinking building far more public realm. Public access -> not just through my balconies
- How much is the land expanding? Map shown by Urban Strategies
- 20m is not enough for a park, it's a promenade (Corus), not suitable for all seasons
- Support for remediation and revitalization
- Separate bike and pedestrian path
- "Parks should have to pay for themselves"
- Scale – should be reduced but by how much is difficult to say as its difficult to understand renderings. Visuals are not clear

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #1

- Don't agree with going a spa
- How is the building sustainable?
 - LEED platinum compliant (CA from applicant)
 - Geothermal natural ventilation (CA from applicant) [roover upen]
 - Triple glazing for heat retention, 40% green roof
 - Habitat and stormwater retention
- How much energy does it use, what modelling has been done/how much carbon produced? A from applicant: will meet Tier 4 of City's sustainability standard
- TD Centre has problem with birds hitting windows – how is this addressed? A: bird friendly glass
- Why does the building have to be 40m tall? "Obscene height for a building on the shoreline. A from applicant – only a small portion is that tall, it has 3 tiers due to smaller footprint of the site
- Why do we have to expand the lake with fill?
- Who is paying for construction of public realm on the East Island?
- Is public via province subsidizing the construction of the parking garage to be used by Therme, how is that fair? A lot of the people using the garage will be those driving to go to Therme.
- There is nothing for me as an elderly person in Therme. I would like to go to Ontario Place to have outside fun in the winter. Don't see skating rinks or other outside amenities for the public.
- Would like shelter for if it rains, wind protection. More planning for bas weather which is most of the year
- Walking from the GO station to the lakefront will be brutal in winter. Should be weather protected way to access especially in winter
- Where does data for visitor numbers come from? How did they determine 40,000 visitors? Seems very high compared to 5,000 for Canada's wonderland.
 - Not sure about parking number and how often visitors besides those who drive would get there
- Studies of congestion? Worry about streets closing for summer, congestion that happened. Can the streets accommodate the amount of travel activity to the site?
- Most access seems to be from the East. How can you access from the west – people want to be able to know they can access without paying the Therme fee. Can you put a bridge at the waters edge of west island?
- Has Therme ownership been screen by City/Provincial standards to ensure that they are not on any current [sonetiar lift]
- Affordable is a relative term – not sure what the definition of affordable is. Would be nice to have concessions for resident's vs tourists. The definition f what is affordable varies from each person's situation
- How long is the lease and what happens to the buildings after the lease ends? Don't want it to become rundown like the cement buildings that became abandoned
- Summary report back:
 - Building and height
 - Access for public winter activities for all ages
 - How is affordable defined – what residents are able to use it
 - Concern around funding – province building the parking lot to be used by Therme
- Transport –
 - [Aveatle not cone binfostam]
 - Congestion and numbers of visitors
- Q – how long is the lease and what happens to the building at end of lease

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #2

- Size is massive
- Don't want it in the first place
- Why on the waterfront

- Uses up a lot of public space
- Large space for people with tickets looking out at the rest of people
- Feels pushed to the margins for the public
- Front door feels like entering a ticketed building to enter a park. Agree with the City's note in the report about the lobby
- Who is paying? Unclear, don't agree with taxpayer subsidizing. E.g., Parking lot. No specific benefit to Torontonians
- Looking at province – will it take customers from the other water park? Why on the waterfront?
- Heritage – how is it a public spa our heritage? Why not use an Ontario business?
- Not clear how this really celebrates heritage
- Brookfield comparison – doesn't feel like a public space to hang out. Feels like a business lobby
- Scale is too large – could be okay if maybe 1/3 the size
- Beach – existing beach is beautiful. Would be nice
- Scale is totally out of proportion
- Sense of disconnect between who can afford to be inside vs those on the outside
- "Celebration of water" is claimed but the building has no access to the water. Seems disconnected. The building cuts off the water
- My family are lucky to have backyards but their friends in Parkdale and Liberty Village all rely on Ontario Place park. There are no other parks and public space for those condo neighbourhoods. Should always be an outdoor space here for public. Where else are people supposed to go? This is our backyard.
- Everyone is being considered except for the people who actually live nearby
- We use the entire park. Just the East Park are full on weekends - not enough. We need the whole space. Outdoor space needs to have peaceful calm areas too.
- There should be more footbridge access to the islands. E.g., on west edge of the west island
- Instead of spending on a parking lot, better to renovate at Sunnyside or something people can actually swim too
- Upgrades to Trillium Park should happen with or without Therme
- The beach existing location is much better than the proposed one. More possibility of it stagnating.
- What's the oldest Therme site? How do we trust them to run it in perpetuity? When we don't know the details of the lease? How do we know the business will be sustainable, what happens if it fails, we're stuck with this building? Doesn't make sense to shrink the public space and use this waterfront space for the business?
- Lobby entrance – Don't like any of the design for the west island
- This is the backyard for all people who live in condos and have no backyard
- We use the existing west island with my kids now, hiking, hide and seek, and playing
- We agree west island needs some upgrades and servicing. But Therme is not the answer
- Summary report back:
 - Size of building is too massive. Users of public space, especially Waterfront which has limited availability.
 - Entrance pavilion – doesn't feel public and welcoming. Like entering ticket building. Brookfield building lobby companion as negative.
 - Heritage not reflected – don't agree that a private spa from a non-Ontario company reflects or creates satisfactory heritage
 - Existing beach location preferred
 - More pedestrian bridges for access
 - Fundamentally – this is our backyard, should be public

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Session #1

- Climate emergency
 - IPCC report
 - Materials glass is energy intensive
 - Sustainability
 - Waste – re-use and materials
- Scale of building – balance of public and private
 - Out of context in existing iconic buildings
 - Traffic is too much
 - Worried about construction management
 - Too much parking
 - Bring streetcar to site – better last mile transit options
 - Size impacts at environmental concerns
- Therme – Outdated theme and palm trees?? Why
 - Cookie cutter and doesn't reflect Ontario. Doesn't respect what's there
 - Where is ice rink?
 - Not a restaurant business model
 - What happens if Therme goes out of business
 - [Suarandes] public access through Therme site – which taken up a lot of space
- Process – Not enough time in presentation on contentious sites. More time should be spent on Therme. Better use of technology. Use VR to show scale of building and 3D vs heritage
 - Where can we provide feedback regarding land use plans that have already been decided?
 - Consulted too late in the process

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #2

- Climate emergency – ensure EA is accessible in plain language
 - Concerns with materials glass -> heating/cooling/maintenance
 - Water required to maintain tropical climate
 - How is water treated and sewage managed?
 - Should be self supporting in services e.g., food – grow food on site as business back up
- Therme – supports for use
 - Split – some supported locals at lakefront, others did not
 - West Island should remain an open space
 - Any redevelopment should require space outside feel
 - Should reflect on local flora and fauna – no invasive species
 - Should include food productions (farm) – grow what they serve
- More information on children's area
- Safety of facility – should the City be training enough lifeguards -> guarantee free public programs
- More connection to year long aquatic life
- Universal design – critical AODA is not enough
- Ensure litter is managed in adequate waste receptacles - Incorporate innovative ways to reduce waste

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #1

- No Therme – scale, style, views
- Repetitive
- Public access through
- Whole place
- Throw a back on the west island, be active, more public space inside
- Village like
- Indigenous ideas
- Birds
- Energy required
- Trees
- Island public parks %
- Last mile connection

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #2

- Conditions of present businesses / water slide
- Giant glass structure is out of place considering history of waterfront
- River bank – what happens
- Access
- Background business deal
- Energy
- Size – have to be big
- Parking
- We don't need a water park
- Remediation / promote investment
- Percentage travel % - includes what
- Nature
- Too big and does not respect the concept of what OP was initially designed by Zeidler, no pods, village clusters and space around them
- Elitist – at a time of great inequality.
- Looks like the public are invited in to watch the rich play
- Traffic
- How did Therme get the contract? Frustrated with the process and is not transparent. Lack of public consultation
- Too big – not in keeping with OP as we have it – pods/ small masses and lots of open space
- Not compatible and not paying homage to Ontario Place
- Not want Therme – not want this facility on the waterfront
- Does not respect Zeidler design
- Connections to water is impacted – already a beach acts as a spa because its beautiful and supports health. Don't touch west island and improve nature here
- Preserve heritage, improve accessibility and improve [intmshe]lve]
- Large beautiful green area – runs a log flume in centre of west island
- Too much parking – likely a casino here
- Spa fails
- Not sustainable
- Existing landscaping is fabulous at the moment but it can be improved
- Spa is too big and is disproportionate

- Not a private wellness spa on public land. Should not be so big
- Traffic study on environmental impact and more traffic already very busy and even worse – already too congested
- What happens if spa fails? Not transparent and what does the public get for this public investment?
- Does building give public access? How?
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Want an alternative approach to change the west island
- Need nature for apartment dwellers
- Elitist –affordability concerns
- Cultural heritage landscape includes pods and spaces around, huge bridge that blocks views – obliterates views of pods and Cinesphere and how you move around the west island
- Changes grow experience of the entire Ontario Place and 2 islands.
- Ontario Place was affordable and was educational, diversity, interesting experiences
- Ontario Place was not fancy in the past and it was for everyone
- Not entire children to the public realm is left
- Too flashy and not in keeping with the lake and will block views to entire people to Therme
- Poor can come in and elitist watch the uses. Play exacerbates inequality and manipulate inequality
- Increased traffic and safety concerns about right turns into Ontario Place will lead to more accidents
- Ecological impact – rare specific will be lost through construction
- Bird migration – redefine in way of birds, for many species with bird migration will rest on the island.
- Money – not clear in terms of the lease and clauses if Therme leaves. Is it 75-90 years?
- Parking too much – underground parking should not be allowed
- Pods – what will happen there? Should be creative with what can go there
- Marina – want more
- Entrance to building is huge, Therme is too tall.
- Will you have to pay to rent a towel?
- Is there bike parking?
- Spirit of Ontario Place will be lost
- What is a welcome pavilion? This is not Disney world. This is excessive and it is a ticketed gate not a welcoming gate
- Want to keep pods - not in the welcome pavilion
- Science pavilion – not in pods, want more impact
- Why does Live Nation need so much land?
- What is given public on Ontario Place through revitalization
- Likes Science Centre there – could work well with Cinesphere
- Energy inputs carbon footprint, waste use facility – not energy efficient
- More parking is not sustainable and polluting
- Outdoor education about the lake in the pods. Children need place as an education resource including lake programs
- Swimming – new rocks will make it unsafe. More information on this and example of somewhere where this could work
- People who live in condos need to be able to come here. But it has to be affordable for families. Family passes for food and activities for children. Is \$40 per person good for a family?
- Area is densifying so there is more need to have green space
- Impact on Toronto Islands, that is accessible and affordable. Not planning enough to make green spaces
- Cinesphere needs more programming that is free for children

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #1

- Size, location – public oriented
- Spa-sauna-swim-interconnected
- Public swimming pool
- Scale 14,000/p
- Smooth forms with nature
- Contained
- Michael H Beach -> south view to lake
 - Location of beach – area small
 - Easy to get in water
 - What do they mean by engage w/water? Does it mean allowed to go in?
- Infill lake – algae buildup
- Glass materials
- Divide between public/private
- Important to get right into lake – not in west canal/break wall/where pollution collects
- Dangerous to climb rocks to go in
- Access at west island
- Heritage Michael pebble beach – cleanest water
- Windy at new beach
- Environmental cost of moving beach
- Spa -> Ontario? Tropical is \$ How is building design environmentally? Gentler and beautiful
- Why here and how – where it's situated
- None are in city centre
- Where are we?
- Cinesphere revitalization – details more
- 9 storeys are too tall
- Like wetlands, walks, are good
- Water on water – chlorine + treatment?
- Parking lot rationale and numbers clarification
- Pebble beach – throwing stones
- Ownership – long term maintenance of parking garage by lane. Who pays for it?
- Trees on top of parking lot is it feasible?
- Conceptual – value engineering – glass -> rendering accuracy
- Architect – interesting and scaled property then it can be positive
- Mass timber – more Ontario specific trust and transparency in process and in what's being built
- Therme control over west island
- Toronto green building standard? Are they meeting that?
- Interesting design – appropriate scale
- Tropical plants interior -> raised temperature and humidity levels
- Ontario has winter and summer -> more related to Ontario
- Height and footprint – terracing context
- Min 20m from edge of building to water
- Out of context – views from water/land
- Glass in a park – context

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #2

- Overall appropriateness of this use on this land
 - Most valuable land in our city
 - Congestion and parking lot

- Need dedicated parkland for nearby density
- Equity of use on public land
- Design is terrible – glass hard to heat and cool + birds
- Parking
- Sustainable design scale
 - Keeping with environment and little glass as possible
 - Geothermal heating – meeting Toronto green standards
- Everyone should have a good time – adventure playground
- Concrete issues with sustainability
- Environmental cost of heating – huge footprint
- No building – tear down current buildings and just park space
- Ontario Place feel out of city
 - Less than 2 storey buildings are suitable
 - Scale – pathway around corporate building doesn't feel like you're at a park and out of the city. Not everyone has a cottage
 - Removing the value of public
 - Slanted green roof that public can access. Solar panels?
 - Average person could go there
 - Deliberate thought about AODA and lived experience. Restful spaces
 - Public outdoor – warmer places
 - 365 season access – think about lived experience, especially those with limited abilities (physically and mentally)
 - Thoughtful design
 - 13% of what? How is it calculated?
 - Why does it have to be so big – ribbon effect around it
 - Waterfront is out most valuable land. Example of Chicago park and sculptures, amphitheater free to hear symphony
 - Great cities promote waterfront as public open, green space
 - [Vibban] -> danger of just becoming fast bike paths. Mixed use trails dangerous with bikes racing route.
 - Thru-route consideration – separated paths – wooden boards for slow traffic
 - Footprint must be smaller
 - Inappropriateness examples i.e., sugar beach
 - Look to other major world class cities
 - Maintenance over time commitment
 - Corridor around the outside
 - Setback behind beach all same level -> southern beach pushed back as much as the west beach. Buildings to go in winter – whose maintaining it? So, it won't be neglected as it is now? Is there a commitment to maintain?
 - Adding new structures with same form maybe don't work – token representation
- Introduce different forms low scale – re-wildings, concessions, local businesses
 - Prefer different buildings and forms that differ from what's there but want to see more nature – re-wilding
- Users
 - Lots of students, renters, new Canadians need this space – what does this give to them? Clients aren't here
 - Walmart-model
 - Misrepresenting panic
 - Cafes across Ontario Place – local businesses in those concessions – affordable
 - Parking lot that's [extg] – can't use that? Put the spa there?
 - Lots of dead zone – trekking out to Ontario Place through spaces and parking lots. Accessibility is a consideration
 - 4000 visitors per day is a lot can they accommodate that growth

City Notetaker: N/A

Built Form, Heritage, Character Breakout Session #1

- Basic, nothing, passage, interest, heritage, activity, slow down, busy, too busy, more over! Over-capacity, frustration -> better to be a pedestrian, back to calm, breathe in -> trees! Stop -> lovely building

Public Spaces and Activities Table Notes

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- What are the obligations around the proposal?
- Budgetary commitments to delivery the project?
- When will each of the proposed elements come to fruition?
- Lacking clarity around public ownership and private development; who will own, operate, and maintain facilities? How is the public money used in this respect?
- Spa out a use is not “Canadian” on appropriate.
- How was the spa use determine?
- Use is mis-aligned with cultural heritage of Ontario Place and Toronto. E.g. doesn't reflect intangible cultural heritage, women's contributions.
- Spa more for higher classes (economic; unacceptable)
- Unclear what will remain fully publicly accessible with no fees.
- Risk in having spa as an anchor tenant framing proposal for Ontario Place -> what will happen if Therme's out?
- Needs more built structures in Ontario Place that are public and free! Live Nation, Therme, and Cinesphere are all paid. E.g. Harbourfront Centre. Helps with public use during Winter and accessibility.
- Concern that science programming will take away from Flemingdon Park Community.

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- Built form - public access to Therme's spa green roof.
- Why is beach proposed to west island? Whereas existing location is functioning better
- Conflict vehicular traffic to Ontario Place with expressway. Active transportation is better
- Who is funding the construction and maintenance of the proposal?
- No spa on the waterfront
- Visualization and presentation – renderings always need to be better and honestly represent the first-person perspective
- How will First Nations benefit from this proposal?

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

1. Ticketed access – where will Therme require people to pay to access?
2. What happens if there is an overwhelming opposition to this spa? What role can the city actually play. What is the overall point
3. Question about the lease and timeline for when people will actually have access to this space. If so, how long? What is the extent of the lease for both Live Nation/Therme

4. Affordability - \$40 is too much and should be reduced
5. Once we do this we lose public space for good/ We need to ensure to enhance public access particularly in context with a huge increase in condos and population. A spa takes up a close a third of public space. This is too much + should be reduced
6. Should be focused on the needs of Torontonians/Ontarians -> additional park space is needed not a space
7. All year programming – how can we enhance this space for the winter?

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- Who's profiting?
- Underground parking
- Public vs private
- How everything is interconnected
- Science Centre initially
- Flood protection -> what is the height the land is being elevated? Concerns with coast on west side of the west island.
- Discussed public realm areas, particularly the pathways and boating infrastructure, especially how flooding may impact these areas.
- Discussed Trillium Park and how overall development may or may not impact the site
- Discussed details about the bridge connecting Therme to mainland and how it is being improved to allow for better emergency vehicle access, while maintaining pedestrian mobility needs/uses.
- Discussed the importance of a backup plan or some sort of contingency plan if Therme or other aspects of the proposal fails.

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

1. Affordability of amenities/fees (\$40)
2. Majority of space to Therme, public space is after thought/left over
3. Climate (winter use)
4. Foreign company

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- Regarding the money being spent on the Parking garage, why is this in the public interest? What does this contribute to the public good?
- We are losing public land and is leading to the degradation of City spaces.
- We can't afford to give up this public space.
- What is the carbon footprint of this project?
- There's too much concrete.
- There's too much secrecy around this project.
- This needs to be designed with spaces to dwell and relax.
- Trillium Park is very intentional with its Design This is a great aspect and should be brought forward.
- What are the impacts going to be of so many new people entering the space?

- The space needs to be designed to prioritize the public.
- The current design of the public realm seems to want to create movement between the spaces rather than relaxation and Stillness.
- There needs to be less focus on award-winning design and rather The Human Experience of the space.
- More attention needs to be paid on how people are going to use the space rather than the aesthetic value.
- What are the features of world-class public spaces? 100% public green spaces that are open and give the ability to get lost.
- The space needs to be more free and open.
- Trillium park has nooks and crannies that help it to feel private which is a great attribute of the space.
- The West Island currently feels very open, and we don't want to lose that characteristic.
- If there is going to be a building constructed it needs to feel private and separate from the park.
- The park needs to embody the aspects of Prospect and refuge where you feel alone but have an outlook on the city.
- Ontario Place is the cottage of Ontario a private place separates from the city where you can connect with nature in the water. This sense needs to be maintained as the site redevelops.
- The developer and the city need to truly consider the role of Ontario Place in its natural value it's one of one and the only thing like it in the province.
- The underground parking garage is going to be wildly more expensive than it would be to just maintain the existing parking area. How does this make sense?
- Park capacity in the downtown is already very limited and there's not enough Green Space and opportunities to relax.
- Where are the winter uses for the public?
- What are the options for the developer if people oppose the idea of a private Enterprise on public space and they decide to boycott the space?

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #2

- Who's going to run the kayak and canoe rentals? I would like to see the profits from these rentals be reinvested into the Ontario Place or the broader community
- Will there be safety measures incorporated into the recreational water activities? What are the protocols that are going to be in place? Who's going to manage this? Who's going to be paying for the construction of the new project?
- Will there be a plan in place to ensure that these waters are monitored and that there will be safe access points to get down to the water?
- Will there be winter activities available in the space?
- What kind of landscaping is planned for the waterways?
- What will the development phasing look like?
- Can there be creation of new wildlife habitats prior to the demolition of the existing ones so that there isn't an intermediary period where the wildlife has nowhere to go?
- How is the development being designed to incorporate climate resiliency?
- If you considered how the expansion of the new brake wall will impact the proposal?
- It will be good to see a local Partnerships and some of the restaurant's cafes and Concession spaces so that local businesses have an opportunity to provide their goods to the visitors.
- Please explore any public art opportunities and prioritize local artists when designing the spaces

City Notetaker: N/A

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- People want the nature and not walk around the building
- Don't want the Therme/spa

- Parking spaces- why so many? Doesn't seem like transit is prioritized
- Whitby – Thermea spa – numbers not reached here, why come to the city?
- Concerned about the cost of the spa
- Close down the space to contrast a marina
- Winter access:
 - Washrooms year-round
 - Skating rink – Ex., Bentway skating trail
 - More flexible space with different activities
- Concern about if spa fails – no plan B and only one option
- Who wants a spa there – not on the waterfront
- Size of the building deters public access. Ex. Public sweat location on the Harbourfront – not hugely popular. Ex. Pebble beach preferred
- New beach concern about the combined sewer – doesn't face lake and is next to Lakeshore
- Would like to include slacklining between pods or between trees
- Should be discussion about what the use should be (not spa)
- Not transparent how Therme got contracted
- Not clear about money – dollar value - on improving public space. What is the cost of maintenance?
- How does the proposal measure to the City's climate goals?
- How many jobs will be created?
- Phased construction

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #1

- Phasing – how soon would East Island public land be determined, West Island perimeter
- Is total width of public realm sufficient? (~100m)
- Science programming – what about the arts, history and culture? Ex. Pods as science topic
- City parcels - can we say no?
- Do it anyway
- What are the demographics, for Therme? Family destination, especially for folks without cottages, would families come to the spa? Winter activities? And will it be affordable?
- One person/couple are pro-spa
- Longevity of the spa?
- For everyone
- Too much paving? More grass
- Too much of emphasis of active uses? More passive use? Why not just a park, existing but better
- What will draw people across town? Wide draw than just neighbourhood, province-wide – for people who can't afford to go to Florida in the winter
- If water park is a big part of Therme, why not public?
- What about rope courses?
- Old programming had broad appeal
- How to ensure 365 use?
- Some of the existing programming does a good job of drawing folks, even in the winter
- Don't move Science Centre
- Recap:
 - Who is the target demographic, and how will the various proposed activities draw people in?
 - How effective will the winter activations be?
 - How well does the existing state of the park draw people in?

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #2

- 27,000 or 2,700? Numbers seem to be different?
- How does the user profile / travel demand vary between seasons?
- Why not focus more on the pods and science pavilion, start with them
- Are the rest of the improvements initiated due to the Therme proposal, or vice-versa?
- Is there a funding relationship for capital? Who is responsible for operations and management of public space?
- Will the bathrooms be open year-round?
- Which areas will be built by Therme, which by IO?
- How long is the Therme lease? How does this impact maintenance? Is this a done deal?
- How was Therme selected? Which others were proposed?
- Was just a public park as an option considered?
- Leave Ontario Science Centre where it is, including the programming
- Maybe leave things as is

City Notetaker: N/A

Public Spaces & Activities Breakout Session #2

- Public real, uses: time of day for users? Forecasted by Therme? 6pm to 2am – no amenities go spa?
- What is Science pavilion / mainland and pods?
- Demand peak 100% - Does not include demand for other events? Indy and Marathons and CNE cause congestion during summer with ongoing Therme users.
- Public space, boat island, picnics
- West island multipurpose
- m wide min up to 10m = boardwalk
- Landscape programmed
- Fish cleaners / amphitheatres / pow wows
- Landscape element edge varies 20 m – 98 m wide overland
- Promenade permeable
- Overlay landscape – LandInc Trillium Park extension
- Mimic play soft areas
- 10% causes 2,700 parking spaces
 - Overlap Therme:
 - 1600 civic nation
 - 1276 Therme
 - 204 Science Centre
 - Is 20,000 peak demand?
- Traffic congestion = Concerned about surface congestion with other events
- Use water year-round (open water swimming) would like lake side sauna 1,000's
- Would be great to have a place for public community sauna
- Swimming
- Connection to nature
- Repave pebble beach and locks west ideal
- Grew up on Ontario Place, being eclipsed with proposal
- Only walkway proposed – want active recreation / opportunity to enjoy
- Playground / zipline for adults
- Open grassy picnic space e.g., High Park
- Skating rink

- Winter activities – flexible play space / dance parties
- Users defined play spaces
- People are discovering existing Ontario Place
- Proposal doesn't show scale
- Project misleading / concerned with white elephant
- Looks like open space
- Obscenity on waterfront – what is the need for wellness? Need open free access to waterfront
- 2 bird routes. Natural has evolved and has become Waterfront water sanctuary
- Palm trees have no place there
- Bigger is not better. Need better washrooms saunas, swimming pools, community, Indigenous, satellite science centre
- Sauna = sweat lodge
- Mississauga of Credit
- Missed opportunity
- Big cities are not building private spaces on waterfront/park space
- Brought family here, kids still use it
- People come every week and came for walks/picnics. Niagara neighbourhood community areas needs this green space
- Love ramshackle Ontario Place
- Very undulated terrain
- Touched up / public facade should be used to update
- Purchase at gate
- Free/mini golf
- Public uses = public lands
- Funds should be spent to update. Area has evolved into a waterfront nature sanctuary
- Recreational groups/spaces
- Lack of public greenspace in area

City Notetaker: N/A

Public Spaces & Activities Session #1

- Uses/what's missing - public realm and activities
- What winter activities would be available for the public realm?
- Why foreign uses?
- Trillium Park
- 100% public, enjoy for the public
- West island should be fully public (not Therme)
- Maintain original vision. No grade massing
- Lack to draw local uses here
- Public aspect doesn't need a spa
- Openness for people to enjoy
- Quiet space
- City to lease and program – need a quiet backyard and doesn't need to be overtly programmed – not pay to play
- Greenspace free and open
- Spiritual element, healing circles, more Indigenous involvement – need access to nature
- Need to emphasis water
- Indigenous people should have greater role – are they really partners?
- Worried other Indigenous communities are opposed

- Compare to Trinity Bellwood is correct – location and context
- Want to see large quiet and sound protected
- Mature trees along Lakeshore to provide buffer from traffic noise
- Waterfront entrance – algae moves
- Want to see Ontario Place as an Indigenous cultural space i.e. Cinesphere for need cultural totem poles around pathways
- Arts and crafts for Indigenous groups
- Purpose of Ontario Place is to celebrate Ontario with Indigenous culture
- Spa doesn't celebrate Ontario Place
- How much \$ is Therme putting into financing?
- How much \$ is going into public realm vs province \$ going to Therme site
- Only invest provincial \$ in public realm
- Therme serves as a trojan horse – will this allow year-round use? Therme indoor use?
- Food hall – open to the public (Indigenous food?) Mix of paid and free to be accessible?
- Feels isolating when
- Food stands around Therme? Feels cut off from public space
- Therme especially not located on public waterfront
- Weather – City parks typically note used in summer. Lots of creativity
- Montreal has clear community vision to balance activities with some paid events
- Be inspired by existing examples
- People need more involvement – haven't received much notice to the public. Heard from twitter yesterday
- Lack of transparency from the province
- Who came up with the spa?
- To be idea from spa – focus on health and wellness but don't need the spa for that
- Vancouver Olympics stadium – uses to programming for inspiration
- Investigate Therme lobbyist registering as lobbyist in 2018 but hearing about plans several years later

Environment and Sustainability Table Notes

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Environment & Sustainability Session #2

1. Complete public land (Why Therme) e.g., Stanley Park
2. Active transportation (eliminate/reduce vehicular traffic and parking garages)
3. Safety
4. Construction
5. Direct infrastructure activities instead of inward
6. Ecological system will be lost
7. Bike lanes to be public at all times (Leisure & commute)
8. Heritage
9. Height

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Environment & Sustainability Session #1

- Bird-friendly design
 - Concerns about amount of glass and the overall size of the building given the migratory pathway
 - What about the existing swallow colony, which is already in decline?

- Has the applicant consulted with FLAP?
- Generally, a spa is incompatible with healthy bird habitat
- Where can people find out more info on birds? Link to EA and development application on City website?
- Accessibility
 - Free access to West Island incompatible with a luxury spa
 - Ontario Place is already expensive, but will now be more so
- Transportation/Parking
 - GO + TTC at Ex Place, so why are taxpayers paying for parking, which is contradictory to TransformTO active transportation goals?
 - Why isn't Therme paying for the parking garage?
 - There is already surface parking at Ex Place
 - How much parking will there actually be?
 - How many annual visitors are expected?
- Ecology/Habitat
 - Plans for wetlands, trees and promenades are great
 - What happens with private maintenance over the long-term, especially if ownership changes?
 - Armored shoreline is not a long-term solution compared to a naturalized shoreline
 - Parkland is cheaper than a spa
- Venues
 - Not the right location for a spa – too big, takes up too much West Island space, not enough public space
 - Live Nation, although it's also private, is fine because it fits well in the space and aligns with public goals
 - Spa doesn't align with public vision and isn't compatible with the natural environment
 - Spa should at least be reduced in size and there should be more connectivity through the site
 - Large entrance to the spa is overwhelming
 - What happens to the building over time if materials need to be repaired and/or disposed of?
- Water quality
 - Water quality is already an issue due to point source pollution, in particular the existing wastewater discharge (combined sewer overflow)
 - Swim-Drink-Fish (environmental non-profit) does monitoring here
 - Swimming and recreation require clean water
 - What is the function of the reef?
- Trees
 - Palm trees are not native
 - How many trees will actually be removed?
 - Irrelevant that most are immature
 - Public isn't aware of the difference between mature and immature trees
- Other
 - Are there similar projects like this elsewhere?
 - Where can people find out more about the EA process and results?
 - Why isn't there going to be an EA for the West Island?
 - Not enough transparency overall in the consultation process
 - General questions regarding status of Science Centre relocation
 - Concerns regarding different levels of care between the two islands

Environment & Sustainability Session #2

- Beach/aquatic habitat
 - Wind and waves already push debris onto the existing beach, so what will happen with the proposed

design?

- What will be done about the sewer outflow? Will the City remove it?
- Will Therme be responsible for cleaning the beach? What does the lease say about this?
- What will happen to the canal surrounding the Budweiser Stage? There are beavers that live there.
- What happens to the water used by the spa? Is it discharged to the lake?
- What will happen to relocated wildlife, especially if they return?
- Therme Building
 - Needs secure bike parking, including for e-bikes
 - Needs EV charging spaces
 - Building needs to consider climate emergency and GHG emissions
- Transit/Transportation
 - Difficult to get to – too long of a walk and no last-mile solutions
 - Will the proposal be better for cyclists?
- Salting
 - How will pathways near the water be maintained in the winter? Can heat from low carbon energy sources be used for snow-melting?
- Other
 - Social environment needs to be considered (recreation for families)

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Environment & Sustainability Session #1

- Outdoor education/day camps
- Japan Bell – what is happening?
- More public use not private
- Energy consumption
 - Whitby and Horseshow Valley fill needs
- City Place needs more green
- Traffic intersecting Martin Goodman Trail and Lakeshore Blvd
- Tending tree and guarantee – who looks after operating costs
- How long is the lease?
- Carbon inputs
- Insurance from Therme re: insurance clean-up responsible for the mess
- White elephant/clean up. Security to prevent white elephant
- Like pods as extension of science
- Parking \$ and # - who gets it/north shore Heat Island affect?
- Birds/trees

Environment & Sustainability Session #2 (Noted not as productive as first session)

- Climate change – 100-year floods. Canals designed originally but they blocked. Need naturally regenerating
- Transit station needs to be accessible
- What is Therme paying for?
- Reducing parking!!!
- Construction impacting lake water?
- Communication about OZ vs SA – how much of the island?
- Where is the power coming from?
- Glass construction
- All hard surfaces permeable
- Are the studies finished? Who is conducting the studies? Transparency?

- One person in large meeting says existing conditions (i.e., water pollution, stagnant water, transplanted trees) – Are all untrue – please elaborate from your point of view:
- Rocks = broken bones
- Importance of natural algae
- How do you remove old mature trees? What kind of care is being taken?
- Why is Live Nation not properly shown on map? Transparency issue?
- Had percentage of people driving to Ontario Place and ride share – but no percentages of bike rides, 3320 walk and bike
- Massive glass building -> impact on bird migration
- Public realm spaces
 - Is this entirely funded by government or is Therme (and other private interests) contributing financially to this?
 - Cost? Investment in public spaces vs subsidizing private interests (e.g. parking lot)
- How much is cost of non-Therme improvements?
- # Of surface level parking removed vs # added underground?
- Can the \$ that would be spent on parking/site prep for Therme be used to create something better (Public, not a massive building that eliminates trees)
- Who will be responsible for funding of trees on Therme and other public parts of site?
- What \$ are committed for ongoing maintenance of tree cover, replacement of dead trees, insect management, watering, etc.
- City report alludes to making glass safe for birds -> no detail on what might be done
- We need to push them for less glass reducing less bird hazard and light pollution
- Heat island mitigation, needed for every remaining parking area and roadways – surface application like pilot project with Arizona.
- Should not just be “native trees” as per the past. Need to focus on heat and climate change resistance plus mix of fast growth
- Extending flora of Trillium Park is good
- I am concerned about the long-term environmental effects to water quality and wildlife due to a large spa facility
- How much of the landscaping, infill is really needed and how much is to support the spa building structure?
- The comment made that Ontario Place is only home to a small number of species, that we also find in our background, which not completely correct. A huge number of bird species migrate and stop at the site. There are many other species that make the site their home.
- From [Name Removed] Ongoing environmental impacts and costs... will taxpayers pay for clean up after lease
- Is Therme insured? Taxpayers are paying \$750 million to clean up the giant mine, Alberta residents paying to clean up the oil sands
- Japanese Temple Bell from 1977?
- From [Name Removed]:
 - Energy inputs and carbon outputs
 - Lots of glazing vs Lake Ontario winds and winters
 - Expansion of Trillium Park is good on East Island. Increased right and left turn traffic creating Lakeshore congestion and environmental impacts
 - Increased traffic interaction with cyclists and pedestrians at Lakeshore/MGT turn/crossing
 - Control and maintenance of public realm by private interests and misalignment of those interests
 - Love the idea of Great Lakes Science Centre extension in Zeidler pods and to operate the Cinesphere
 - Quantity of parking spots 2700! Will this be pay parking – how does that impact access to public realm elements
 - If the project fails will Therme maintain funds in trust to re-naturalize the site back to public use?

City Notetaker: N/A

Environment & Sustainability Session #N/A

- Natural forest regeneration – don't remove maturing forest and don't move grass under the trees!!
- Canals? – in original MH design, but now blocked off. Intended to allow lake water to circulate and prevent stagnation
- 100-year flood – So I understand the necessity for reusing island protecting the shoreline
- "Last mile" – Still a problem, from GO train and Ontario Line
- Underground parking – environmental impact of digging down below lake surface below and pouring concrete into the whole

City Notetaker: N/A

Environment & Sustainability Session #1

- [Name Removed], Liberty Village
 - Flooding with rain concerns -> building impacts on this
 - Microclimate -> buildings could make it worse with wind
- [Name Removed], Parkdale
 - Whole area should be public -> naturalization and rewilding of all space
- [Name Removed], Liberty Village (TV)
 - West island spa should not happen
 - Likes children's play areas
 - Wildlife protection is critical -> migratory birds
- [Name Removed], walker in area
 - Human use, flow, access and active transportation are most important to assess
- [Name Removed] – here to listen/no comments
- [Name Removed]- should all be a park and no private spa -> local users vs. tourism
- [Name Removed] – rowing club, more boats = impacts, and Reith -> course restrictions to rowers. Parking lot -> more green transportation wanted
- [Name Removed], rowing, High Park
 - Construction impacts are a concern
 - Water quality isn't good enough for swimming
- Comments
 - City sewer outflow needs to be improved/addressed
 - Fish habitat and lake fill
 - Bird habitat and relationship with buildings
 - Ethos – what is the guiding design for the project?
- Questions
 - Want smaller buildings and more naturalization on west island – can this be done?
 - TransformTO – does application support/align?
 - Idea -> local farming as urban rooftop farms. Use rooftops are farming green space, planting, bee farms for honey, etc.
 - Want to see site design for reducing/addressing flooding
 - [Name Removed] -> media
 - Can you leave it as it is just improving the park space?
 - Construction period – when is it? How long?
 - Construction period -> site won't be accessible during construction
 - Transportation -> access limited

- Public-private partnership need? Yes
- MGT access to remain during construction
- Active waterway/use is a concern as it could be too much
- Summary
 - Concerned about water quality that needs to be improved
 - Concerned about wildlife impacts of buildings and construction impacts
 - Want to see more naturalization on west island -> use Therme rooftops for urban farm for plantings, crops, bees, etc.
 - Concerned about impacts on existing water activities -> rowing teams won't be able to do time trials with a bunch of new boat activity especially water taxis
 - More focus on active transportation needed and less parking

Environment & Sustainability Session #2

- [Name Removed]
 - Concern about parking lot and wants active transportation and transit
 - Climate affect of cars are concern
- [Name Removed]
 - Concern to lakefill impacts down along waterfront and how far it is to study
 - How is spa water treated/addressed?
 - Building effects and carbon impacts
 - Cycling and pedestrians
- [Name Removed]
 - Shoreline is addressed
 - Concern is that winter is problem for homeless of parks and may get security/gates to stop homeless
 - Parking should be less and not under Therme building
 - Concern about reality of relocating mature trees
 - Microclimate impacts due to more activity and heat
- [Name Removed], cycling
 - Concerned as potential failure of wetlands – how to make healthy and real given Mimico is an example of failure
 - Concern about glass structure – should be focused on CO2 emission reduction
 - Concerned about financial viability of Therme and what happens if they fail?
- [Name Removed]
 - What influence does Therme have on the landscape?
 - Will there be no trees planted that would affect the views?
 - Planting strategy should not reflect what Therme needs
- Want City to review parking facility site, capacity, facility site, capacity and charging needs for green vehicles
- Need to have loss for cars
- Where will revenue from parking go?
- Concern that relying on “science” is actually to say we should not lake fill
- What will the material be for lake fill and for soil topping?
- Can trees be reused for lumber and materials for the buildings
- Need more shade for public in public spaces
- Will the beach be a blue flag beach that is swimmable?
- Concerned about water quality for the beach and garbage, outlets, run-off
- What's impacted by raising land on the depth of water and water flow, habitat and aquatic life
- Summary
 - Concerns about too much parking and car focus. Want more focus on transit connections, last mile, and active transportation
 - Lake fill concerns

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Environment & Sustainability Session #1

- Question – why is rehabilitation dependent on PPP?
- Support development and use - Like expanded greenspace access of course and like approach to upgrade of access/restoration
- Ontario Place need ambition – large space can accommodate more people
- Lot of support for protection/preservation of:
 - Mature trees – concerns that it is really possible
 - Suspicious that large trees can be planted, costs – many trees don't tree. Include long-term plan for maintenance and rehabilitation
- Question – can development/buildings be reduced to maximize the preservation?
- Include lupins in landscape, part of original Ontario Place gardens and they didn't survive
- Shoreline cleanup on April 23, 2023 – opportunity to see current status
- Status of understanding of shoreline, concern about health
- From frequent visitors, concerns about organic habitat migration vs habitat for current animal population – manage transition
- Birds habitat transition already starting – resting birds protected by migratory birds early April -late July
- Future habitat is intended to be an environment to allow animals to thrive
- Site quality can also impact affected by the spa /live nation
- Insects one approach is to enlarge green buildings
- Missing info: green buildings, carbon footprint not just open space, LEED certification
- Question – what is involvement in TRCA and Waterfront Toronto?
 - DFO and MC
- Concern again on tree removal, how is it justified? More density in the rationale (missing info)
- We head to raise/fill the lake, trees will not be survivable in this future condition
- Question on rights/access/ base details on private
- Missing info: more clarity on timing
- Concern: what is the interim access to the land, is it staged/phased?
- Construction to start in 2026 and will take minimum 3 years and more until completion
- Like: swimming platform
- How are reefs built?
- Concern: about implication of using public land for private use, lack of transparency and lack of details. Additional water vehicle access to this area over capacity. Environmental impact of a large underground parking lot
- Built form:
 - Part of the environment, glass materials, size, underground, energy efficiency, heating/cooling, water use, towel, chemical for pod maintenance, contribute to urban heat island
- Birds flying into building
- Does it align with climate goals?
- Can we renovate surface waterfront? Might was well bury it all add more permeable. Trees is an improvement/ can even put better trees
- Bike parking provide more bike repair
- Could use opportunity to showcase gold tier cycling standards
- Commercial/single use – food use stand
- How to reduce waste in the concession -> green packaging, food operators that are independent
- Support for picnics
- Water taxi increase access to provide relief for access only from land
- Focus primarily on trees planting but also include shrub landscaping for good
- More info about winter use
- Focus on using spa

- What about the outdoor programming? We have hot summers, what about ice rink and trail?
- Paths: concerned about mixed use pedestrian and cyclist

Environment & Sustainability Session #2

- Leasing opportunity for even more public land
- Added private use still represents a loss to public
- Questions about future mode since targets, especially active transportation and vehicle access use based on site use
- Strong concern of the removal of trees especially mature trees. Questions of tree survival for new replacements
- Concern around the imbalance of benefits for the public vs private operation when using public land
- Desire for more transparency on the dollar cost and bid to access this land
- Lots of support for added space, park land that is not the issue
- Water quality: how to improve?
- Outflow leading to the beach, concerns include need more information earlier and more detailed about the WQ near the beach
- Extension: Who build longer outflow? Concerns if City would be required by city funds
- Concerned if this is an imposed cost
- Concerned about ensuring protection for water quality due to the nature of multi-agency organization to coordinate
- Support WQ to be clean enough to swim in
- WQ w/ horticultural soil, support proper management to insure it does not further deteriorate the water
- Concern about the disruption of soil from tree removal to affect water quality
- Concern about soil removal (contaminated soil) affecting structural integrity of the shoreline
- What about the maintenance requirement of the public realm and parklands
- Concern over lack of transparency of governance for park maintenance
- What about self-maintenance? Will the lands degrade quickly if there are other managing body goes away?
- Like and replicate the mix of different tree species as done in Trillium Park -> why can't we replicate same dense forest created -> can we put a forest along the shoreline?
- Desire for more detail on site layout, benches and tree layout

City Notetaker: N/A

Environment and Sustainability Session #2

- Concerns about amount of control. Where is the data coming from? Not secure is it accurate?
- Is the project data and unbiased?
- Really want to emphasize car traffic
- 10% of traffic should be reduced. High number of vehicle parking should be reduced not percentage
- Environmental issues to impact issues – is the City undertaking its own study and recommendation of how the land is to be remediated
- The city should be driving environmental assessment and solution
- Who is getting the bill?
- Water infiltration to connect to big system
- Tree removal around Therme. Therme is problematic element. Tree removal wouldn't be an issue with out Therme. Tree replacement takes 50 years to come back
- Space age artifacts
- West island should be naturalized. Reimagined to restore for outdoor and public events
- What happens after 20 years if Therme shuts down?
- Natural habitat – fish, birds, animals

- Naturalized and welcoming like High Park and Leslie spit with habitat spots
- Therme greenhouse – HVAC should be avoided – too much energy
- Trees for climate control – more shade outdoor cooling spaces
- Winter uses for natural outdoor recreation
- Tree removal
- Vision of waterfront – who is footing the bill
- How is soil treated to flows? Who does water remediation
- Population of every land – too much pressure on nature
- Ever ambitious to strain on land
- Building looks like a heat frying pan
- Want heated open spaces
- Expense of tree transplants too much. World class cities have heritage mature trees
- New trees will take forever to grow
- Concerned transplanting will not be viable
- Torontonians will be paying for this
- People need access to the lake
- Remove impediments to the lake. West end is what we have left of a jewel that is a huge opportunity to get it right
- Something in harmony with nature
- Increase greenspace and food vendors and sweat lodges
- Return to original vision of the islands
- Turn wilderness into a downtown with a centre
- Educational outdoor movies might
- World class cities don't have a private spa
- Public pool – recreate a water park here
- Expand 1970s vision to 21st century context
- Skating and swimming
- Like aspects of the redevelopment but Therme is not wanted
- Create local culture
- Therme exists elsewhere, what do these projects apply to this model
- Reiterate hard number of vehicles comment to and should be reduced
- Traffic levels – influx of travellers will have congestion issues to strain environment
- Ecology and environment will be stressed
- Redevelopment must be controlled and strategic

City Notetaker: N/A

- What other waterfront buildings in Toronto or elsewhere that might inform the approach to Ontario Place? A: Vien Pond foundation and Farsi World Abu Dhabi
- What principles could help guide a revised application? A: Be active
- What are the specific elements of the building that we should be thinking about? A: too large
- What are the positive ideas that could be further developed? A: Remediation (proximity)
- How is heritage reflected in the design? How should it be? A: price point

City Notetaker: [Name Removed]

Environment & Sustainability Session #1

- Mature trees uprooted – very hard surface
 - \$ Cost to remove trees
 - Wetland conversion will absorb storm water
- Consultation
 - Have the swimmers been consulted?
 - Cancel sewer outlet at beach
- Shoreline
 - Existing beach better for swimming? Needs approval from experience of users
 - Create west side retaining wall
 - Keep it the same no change
- Access
 - Better access points for swimmers? Walkway with clear entry
 - Mark protect land from
 - West beach access / keep the existing beach access to allow swimming
 - Should just have sauna / more people in water
 - Redevelopment sixteen miles – what is status of rocks?
 - West side wall watershed -> retrofit
 - Revitalizing spa is not necessary
- Environmental assessment?
- Wetlands on east island and west island why there?
- More bioengineering - build a new cove will help filter pollutants
- Water quality
 - Sewage outflow on east side will pollute
 - Quality = redesign
- Therme – where does water come from? Where does it go?
- Parking garage – we don't need more? Looks like going underground; concern were cars
- Sauna – what about a community sauna on the water's edge?
- Swim Ontario Place Facebook everyday 1-2x week
- Plan for 2 beaches?
- Concerned about quality of materials used for lakefill – demolition materials?
- Uprooting mature trees will kill the interdependencies of trees
- Themes:
 - Keep the swimming access where it is – gradual public slope
 - Remove pollution from outflows
 - Don't need more parking
 - Community sauna on waters edge

Environment & Sustainability Session #2

- What happens to birds resting stop over where trees are removed?
- Light pollution – Lights on all hours? Consider north side space for less lights
- Aesthetic uses outside
- Public beach – better where it is – water quality is better Why different choice? Was there a reason? (Shelter or seasonality reasons?). A: Beach was moved because of exposure, there will be an underwater reef from new beach (west facing)
- Where is fishing located?
- Move parking off-site to encourage transit for less vehicles in? Further away, would that be more appropriate transition?

- Trees – 3000 planted inside spa?
- Wetland / water treatment (like further west)
- Water treatment? How does treatment work? A: Collect all water then treat/use before return to lake. All surfaces are permeable
- Therme water chlorine risk – what happens to water leaving the facility?
- Winter landscaping? A: Use all seasons
- How do costs play into provision of recreational materials?
- How will winter facilities such as skating rink? What is plan to paths clear during winter? Would salt be used?
- Summary:
 1. Concern about light pollution and bird collision
 2. Could parking be moved off-site
 3. Removal of habitat resting spot for migratory birds while under construction and other creatures.
 4. Beach

City Notetaker: N/A

Environmental & Sustainability Session #1

- % of spa vs wildlife space -> paved %
- Province's plan for climate change – Therme conflicts with City's climate action plan
- Issues with Therme:
 - Doesn't fit with Ontario Place
 - Should rebuild the space instead
 - Disbelief in there not being an alternative plan
- Is shoreline being properly fixed? (Southern portion of western island)
 - It's eroding and in terrible condition
 - Regular maintenance?
- Bring back the old Ontario Place children attractions
- Concern about aquatic habitat
- Parking concerns
- Climate change - tolerance of flooding
- Tree removal
- Proportionality of Therme building to green space
- Bike facilities / bike share and rentals
- Importation of wild space / rewilding
- Climate change / environment / parking

Appendix C:

April 18 Q&A Box Transcript

Engagement Summary:

Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

Appendix C: April 18 Q&A Box Transcript

1. Has this application already been approved? How has it already been decided that all that parkland/green space of the former OSC will be sold off for development (per Fords announcement)? There are so many areas DT that could be developed beforehand.
2. Is there any opportunity to actually stop the construction plans for the spa and ensure the city/community get something without massive construction/underground parking etc. Ontario place just needs basic maintenance and opportunity for locals to enjoy a park/museum etc.
3. Why did the city corporate real estate management staff recommend a land swap with the provincial government when it is one of the few pieces of leverage that the city has in this negotiation with the provincial government? Two, why was this decision-making process to “swap” land not transparent?
4. No land sale? If there are no discussions on leasing terms for the spa, I could be dead by the end of an... oh I am just guessing...99-year lease....
5. The premier today implied that his plan is to press on despite any opposition Toronto residents have to some aspects of this redevelopment. Given that what assurances can you give the public that this engagement is worthwhile and our feedback won't just be ignored by a premier hostile to Toronto?
6. You walk all the way around the spa to get to “public” land....
7. You say it will be free and open to the public, however the majority of the West Island will be consumed by a spa that is ticketed. The public only gets a small portion of the West Island site. How can you say it is a public site?
8. What kind of deal have you made to increase the land that Therme controls? May the people see a copy of the agreement with the province and City?
9. Please address the noise level from the stage planned. I live in High Park. There was a Live Nation week end last summer, and the noise travelled 5k away to our tower. 3 unbearable evenings of noise.
10. Could the current challenges be solved without an underground parking garage and “mega-spa”?
11. If their ecological concerns, why is a thorough and fulsome EA not required or mandated by IO?
12. Can you share an example of other “amazing public park” from anywhere else on earth with a private spa/waterpark that is larger than a football stadium?
13. 50 acres for the public, how much for the spa?
14. If the spa will take up the full west island (current size), what is the environmental impact of creating 100% new shoreline? Will any studies that have been completed be released to the public?
15. How will vehicles entering the new underground parking structure impact users of the MGT? How will safety be ensured?
16. Why label New public beach? While there is already a public beach currently?
17. If there is transit access for “so many people”, why is an underground parking garage needed? The Ex has over 5K spaces currently available.
18. The waters edge improvements are welcome, however why is that contingent upon placing a spa in the middle of the West Island. The forested West Island should be preserved as a network of nature trails.

19. I am concerned with the privatization of West Island. Do we have any calculations of what percentage of the currently public space on West Island will no-longer be accessible to the public?
20. What risks (environmental, safety) are there when building an underground parking facility next to a lake?
21. How does adding a "mega spa" embrace the sites heritage? Especially with 100% of current West Island landscaping will be removed?
22. Was it ever considered to build the Therme spa just north of Ontario Place where the parking lots are?
23. Can you share the reports, recordings and other work-product from Indigenous consultations? Please includes dates, times, locations and details about attendees.
24. How will the project (specifically construction) impact current wildlife habitat? While it may create something for the future, it looks like it will kill everything there today.
25. I think that this presentation completely glosses over loss of public space for a private spa. Can you please confirm what % of land on the West Island will no longer be free and publicly accessible to the public? Not just the shoreline, the entire land.
26. The entrance to Ontario Place with the sign above has too much concrete. Those triangles are a bit much. Can there be more greenery and even water features like fountains to reflect the Nature of the islands?
27. Can renderings be shared from proposed public realm spaces looking towards the Therme facility? Best if this can be from eye level (1-2M high).
28. I am concerned that ttc go access is far from Ontario place. without a stop on the site will make it inaccessible for families and the disabled.
29. Sorry I'm late to this and this question may have been answered - is there an engagement portion of this webinar or is it just an info sharing session?
30. If the OSC move has been considered for the past 1-3 years, why is it missing from all renderings shown today?
31. Will public spaces be accessible 24/7/365? Always free? Who will provide security (private or public)?
32. I am concerned that the westerly beach will have high e coli like the Sunnyside beaches
33. West island - Why put a skating rink in the windiest area - not ideal for winter
34. A view of the pods? Can you point out the pods in the rendering? I don't think I saw them.
35. Are there cycling trails running alongside the pedestrian ones around the full perimeter?
36. spend more time and \$\$\$\$\$\$\$
37. Who will maintain the public washrooms? Who will fund this maintenance? Will they be season or open all year?
38. Can there be more washrooms, not just the proposed 7? Seniors like my Mother has medical condition as a senior and looking at these drawings looks like she would have a distance to the nearest washroom.
39. Will the washrooms and fountains be operational year-round?
40. Diamond just wants \$\$\$\$\$
41. How does the Therma site proposed for Toronto differ from other Therma sites? Will we have 100% original design, or is this just building from a template that can be found elsewhere?
42. Why do they call it a welcome pavilion?

43. Why hasn't Therme considered an alternate place for their spa given the strong opposition that exists for placing it at Ontario Place?
44. The concepts of redeveloping the water line, wetlands and open parking spaces are interesting and tasteful. But the idea to put the Therme dome almost over the entire west island is HORRIBLE! It does not belong in this area. What do I need to do to help blocking that Therme nightmare?
45. It's not Johnson Wax buildinglacking
46. What is the actual height of the building from ground level for Therme and the Cinesphere?
47. I'm interested in the order of events for this project. Shouldn't
48. Why the avoidance of the word "spa" with Therme? "Wellness""water-based recreation"... lots of euphemisms. How is Therme supportive of "botanical""nature" when dozens of mature trees will be razed to build it? How is this an appropriate choice in a climate crisis?
49. Is the public input being the first step?
50. the new views created is the first to show the relative heights
51. an underground parking lot will require so much digging and not meet net zero targets by promoting increased car usage.
52. Bikes, where do they ride? Conflict with pedestrians. Will there be a bike trail?
53. How were potential guest totals derived? What inputs were used?
54. How long will it take to build this?
55. How does this location compare to other Therme sites? From what I've seen, other sites are in suburban or more rural areas. Why is Toronto the only place Therme is locating downtown?
56. Is there a hotel attached? Are you connected to hotel X?
57. you are not near Corus
58. 45M is 50% higher than the Cinesphere. Not quite the same scale, no?
59. I worked at that Corus building for years ... not a very welcoming waterfront area.
60. but that is an office tower
61. So many concerns about this project. But question: why would ONTARIO Place feature a spa that pretends to tropical flora? This is meant to celebrate this province.
62. why are you stealing any public space?
63. This looks great, can you elaborate on what additional value the Therme spa brings to the site? It would be a beautiful spot for a large public park (similar to Hyde Park or Central Park).
64. The scale of the Therme Canada building looks humongous at 45 m height but also extremely wide - and blocking all the view of the lake from the mainland, both the entrance pavilion on the mainland and on the West island structures.
65. Are you saying this will house BOTH the you AND the Science Center? Or one or the other? News has been saying one idea or the other.
66. The projected 6 million visitors a year is larger than the CN tower (~2 million), AGO (~1 million), ROM

(~1.34million), Evergreen Brickworks (~0.5 million), and Wonderland (~0.5 million) combined. How do you justify these numbers?

67. where is the science centre to be located?
68. What is the volume of the Cinesphere compared to the Spa? How does that ration compare to the height ratio?
69. Where does the Ontario Science Centre go?
70. I am not impressed with all the paved areas, and I do not believe Therme should be located at Ontario Place.
71. Talk about the cost of Therme
72. How are we really going to cope with 14,000 visitors to just the Spa each weekend? It already takes me 30 minutes to drive 1.5Km from Uni Spadina to just the Gardiner????
73. I haven't heard any mention of accessibility considerations and the property is very expensive and not necessarily easy to get around. What is the team doing to make the site accessible for everyone?
74. Could the spokesperson for Therme please let us know the details of their company's lease arrangement with the province, including the length of its lease? If not, when will that information be made public?
75. Is there a plan in place for the redevelopment of the marina, and if not, what is the timeline for designing this facility?
76. Can you please explain why Ontario Science Centre needs to be closed in order to open up a children's museum in Ontario Place instead of having two locations?
77. Also, what rent are Therma paying on a 99-year lease? I presume it's not \$1 kind of a deal?
78. How is the commercial Therme facility consistent with the City's stated priorities for Ontario Place redevelopment?
79. How does the city plan to manage and coordinate the traffic on Lakeshore Blvd during construction and after the structures are built? The current traffic is already impeding east/west and north/south routes in the city after the removal of some ramps to the Gardiner and we aren't even back to pre-pandemic traffic levels in the city yet.
80. How will money made by Therme be reinvested back into the city and how does this compare to the economic model of the original Ontario Place
81. [Name Removed], will there be restaurants and will the park space on the West Island be as beautifully landscaped as Trillium Park which is a real gem!
82. Q1. The City of Toronto has limited funding for their parks system. How will the City of Toronto fund the maintenance of parkland that is more complex than the existing park and will have more visitor volume than now?
83. What does "affordable" mean when referring to the cost of average Torontonians & Ontarians accessing the facilities?
84. Also, what impact will development have on existing trees, vegetation, bird and wildlife habitats, etc.
85. In my view Therme should locate at Woodbine, not on the downtown waterfront.
86. Why are we avoiding an environmental assessment in such a sensitive space?
87. In the context of equity of the development of the space, how do you define equity? – [Name Removed]

88. How large is Therme? How much lakefill is proposed? What is the environmental impact (emissions, ecological impact, transportation, heat island effects, energy consumption, emissions, etc. of the proposed application (Therme in particular) and what are the mitigation measures?
89. What does that mean? 'there is a lease in hand?'
90. Is the Science Pavilion shown on the "proposed uses" slide the Ontario Science Centre? If not, where is the Science Centre going?
91. [Name Removed] Cost Questions: What will parking cost in addition to the Therme ticket for someone using public areas; and can there be a simple breakdown of who's paying for what between Therme, Province and Toronto to build and maintain. Please try to not evade the answers, a range or estimate is okay.
92. Is the Science Pavilion the new Science Centre? This seems very small.
93. Therme looks like a very expensive facility to run, what do they anticipate the cost for entry will be.
94. How did you approve a Lease you are not Privy to?
95. Q2. With more food vendors on the islands, how will the City limit or prevent plastics and trash entering the lake, especially single use packaging, including paper.
96. Why would we move the Science Centre?
97. How do you justify proceeding with a project that has bypassed the normal process of public consultation?
98. Will ALL glass surfaces be treated with bird friendly glazing? Including above the 16m Toronto Green Standard minimum? Will glazing be on the first surface?
99. Who is going to pay to maintain all the public area at Ontario Place?
100. How would adding the Science Centre change what was showed today?
101. Have the Indigenous groups that have been consulted formally consented to the development? Where can I read the comments from Indigenous groups?
102. Can our roadways even accommodate 2700 cars trying to get into the parking garage? Why 30 percent car access, but only 5% biking?
103. When do you anticipate construction will begin? Will Trillium Park, the East and West Islands be inaccessible to the public all at once and for years? I'd hate to lose this entire space for an extended period of time. Thank you!
104. How far along was the process of developing these plans before the province's plan to move the Science Centre to Ontario Place was made known? Will these plans need to be significantly revised as a result, and will the public be given more opportunity to provide input on the revised plans?
105. So much of the "revitalization of Ontario Place" is most interesting and exciting. HOWEVER, the need for Therme confuses me. If that element was removed and allowed to exist somewhere else (NOT ON ONTARIO PLACE) this would make many of us much happier. There is no need for a PRIVATE SPA to be located on Ontario Place.
106. I heard its a 99-year lease, is this true and if it falls can Toronto get back the site?
107. any concerns or considerations to traffic on lakeshore during peak time especially with events at live nation?
108. How can this application proceed, given that Ontario Science Centre is now planned to relocate here?
109. Is there the slightest chance of the Therme proposal being denied?

110. What is the rationale for introducing new parking spaces? Underground parking particularly is so expensive. This is money that would be better used to serve transit, walking and biking (especially considering the plethora of parking that already exists, and the need for transit from BMO, Live Nation nearby)
111. what is known about the environmental impact of the below grade parking and what is the nature of City concerns, if any?
112. How likely is it that the city does not approve this rezoning What mechanisms can the public still utilize to prevent the west island from going to a private corporation?
113. What were the results of the engagement survey back in summer 2021? Specifically related to current use and how people access the land? I was quite disappointed the scale was reversed (i.e. 1 was most likely, 5 least likely) so I am wondering if people ranked transit and cars are higher access than walking biking
114. I assume there is an environmental assessment that will address issues of below level parking in an area subject to flooding
115. Can the city change or modify Ford's plan or is it a done deal that what the province wants, the province gets?
116. As we have recently seen with private LTC, when private interests don't make money they close their business. If Therme doesn't meet their attendance numbers and therefore their financial targets and decide that it is not good business to keep the spa open, then what happens to all the infrastructure that the public has paid for through our tax dollars?
117. don't bring in public housing!
118. Or if the City refused to approve the application, would it simply be overruled by the OMB?
119. How can a full public discussion about the merits of this proposal take place without knowing what the funding involves? What part of this development will Ontario taxpayers be responsible for?
120. Hello good evening to everyone. I apologize in advance if I've missed the answer to my questions. 1) These businesses ex: spa, food etc. will these businesses be run by the city or will these be private enterprises? 2) Where will Ontario place go?
121. How much will the price of admission be to Therme spa? How much of that admission will go back to directly to the city of Toronto?
122. So that's Ford's plan to 'swap' with the city land needed to make this plan work? (Moving Science Centre?) This would block, for example, the idea that the city could withhold its land at Ontario place.
123. The Science Centre move is quite a dastardly blindsiding move.
124. This is a densely inhabited area, about to become vastly more densely inhabited because of planned developments. How do you justify building a private spa in a place that requires more park space? How do you justify limiting access to the waterfront?
125. I would like to object to Ontario Science Centre. I object to a private spa.
126. I'm part of a group of rollerblades who frequented Ontario Place for several of years. The West Island Village/ Commons area is a great space to learn the basics of how to skate. The waterpark lands are a perfect step up for the stronger skaters to really "stretch their legs". So, I'm wondering if there is a way to incorporate a large flat and paved area that would be less traversed than the multi-use paths to accommodate activities like rollerblading?
127. How will the surrounding area (i.e. Parkdale, liberty village and even up to Queen Street) be impacted by the increased traffic and people

128. Existing skate parks are used by extreme enthusiasts and are comprised of intense terrain, which makes it difficult to learn for adults or children interested in the sport.
129. This is not the use of land for this or our future generations.
130. Q3. How long will Therme manage their spa/water park facility? What is the expected capital life and how will it be decommissioned?
131. I'm really concerned the architectural importance of this site and how with What's the justification for the size of this spa and how its going to cover up the view of a Canadian cultural heritage site?
132. Why did Infrastructure Ontario rep not answer Science Centre question?
133. I see an image of palm trees planted outside. what kind of trees will be planted? Will they be native/ mature trees? let's save the mature trees at Ontario Place.
134. How is the proposed spa going to impact water quality?
135. Where and how large is the piece that the City may consider "swapping" with the province, and is this in play?
136. The applicants mentioned they wanted to aggressively reduce the share of people coming to Ontario Place by car but this is not consistent with their application. If you want to aggressively reduce the amount of people who come by car why are you building 2700 parking spots?
137. Why is the Budweiser Stage being handed over to a company like Live Nation? We all know about this company's anti-competitive practices, ticket scalping involvement and live event industry monopoly.
138. How far would one have to portage a canoe from the parking lot, over the bridge to the canoe launch point north west of the Therme spa?
139. Will the programming for the public space be free as well?
140. As a public space, how does the City/lessee/province expect to keep it a healthy space for all e.g. the unhoused? What does social equity look like?
141. This is not true. Public can walk around the West Island now. Therme is not an amenity.
142. How do we expect the increased traffic and parking to affect the MGT? (How to keep pedestrians, runners, cyclists safe?)
143. With respect to the spa - I anticipate this will result in a tremendous amount of chlorine / chemical water waste. What is the plan to both supply and manage the discharge? FWIW West Island is open for swimming, cycling, running year-round currently
144. will any of the plans re-enable access to OP for summer camps
145. How much power does the city actually hold in this process? Is the city able to outright reject proposals that are publicly unpopular?
146. I'm really concerned the architectural importance of this site. What's the architectural justification for the size of this spa, and why is it going to cover up the view of a Canadian cultural heritage site? What is the architectural justification for using a building that looks like 10 other locations throughout the world? Why and how is their design unique to Ontario?
147. One of the panelists said he expected most visitors to arrive by public transportation, so why the insistence on a huge underground parking lot paid for by people who are not going to the spa? Who will be getting the revenue from that parking lot? Who will be responsible for paying for its maintenance?

148. Comment: on West Island, I think there is not enough publicly accessible open space. I think it should be 100% publicly accessible open space, and with all current trees and landscape. thank you
149. No talk about what Toronto losing
150. How much would this cost our city?
151. Was there an environmental scan for the area around exhibition place - events draw large crowds and the area will become overpopulated at peak times
152. Question from [Name Removed]. Traffic access to Lakeshore Avenue, Gardiner Highway, and roads are already overloaded currently when there are major events. How does the city propose to improve the traffic flows
153. What happens to the land when the spa fails? Because There is vast opposition to a spa that only a very few people will use, and that most people want kept for a family area.
154. Therme projects 14 000 people per day on peak days. ROM is 5500 per day, the Empire State Building is 11 000 per day and the Eiffel Tower is 19 000 per day. Where are they basing this numbers?
155. would there be space for building a Hotel for out of town visitors that looking for an overnight stay.
156. How many entry level jobs would Therme provide for new immigrants and the youth of Toronto?
157. Why can't more space be added for science programming? With today's announcement about the Ontario Science Centre, we will need more space unless the province wants less science education for our kids
158. Did I hear correctly that the expected traffic to Ontario Place would be only 10% car traffic.... If that was stated how will that possibly happen with our car centric city, especially along the lakeshore. Thank you
159. What's the rationale for Therme Spa inclusion? What was ruled out as a result of this decision?
160. Why do we "need" a foreign spa company to "help
161. The Therme plan assumes a huge number of daily visitors - more than visit the CN Tower on a daily basis. If the Therme facility fails commercially because the numbers are unattainable, what happens?
162. Perhaps this was already discussed earlier - apologies if so - but how can you ensure that any potential or proposed use conforms to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report call for informed, respectful, and meaningful consultation with Indigenous peoples over economic development?
163. One of the wonderful aspects of the current design of Ontario Place is the ability to leave the built form of the city. How does the proposed design facilitate this when it mimics the built form of the city in height and massing?
164. The ~50% of the west island footprint doesn't account for its skyprint - are there shorter alternatives
165. related to the current speaker - will locals actually be using this land? I personally would not want to use the park as frequently if it is overtaken by tourists
166. When the site was being laid out why it put near the pods why not put it at the back behind trillium park and live nation
167. The Science Centre will necessitate another building being built onto this land. Where would it go? How will it not turn into a cluster of buildings, that you have to pay to enter rather than public green space?
168. Additionally, will there be recreational rental canoes and or kayaks from the canoe launch point?
169. Many slides implied a lot of hard surface with fringes of green. For the entire site (incl. spa, science ctr, Live

- Nation, parking, etc.) what will be overall footprint i.e. ratio of permeable surface to hard?
170. Therme belongs at Woodbine - hotels, casino, highways, not on our waterfront. Lots of places they could build and be successful.
 171. Would the taxes paid by Therme go towards the betterment of the city?
 172. What happens to the west island when Therme doesn't see the revenue it's forecasted and wants out? What are there lease obligations?
 173. Science centre site should not be moved as the area an area is already densely populated already and 1000s of new condos being built on the old Celestica site. What would be more appropriate for the government to mandate low income rentals within each new condo built or something like a co-op living geared to income.
 174. Why is Therme sidestepping a full environmental assessment?
 175. What were the considerations around added traffic for the area? The increase in traffic in Parkdale this year has been staggering, and there are new condos being built as we speak. Already Lakeshore is impossible to navigate on nights with a concert at Budweiser Stage. With the addition of a massive parking space and the spa attraction, what is the city planning for road infrastructure in the area?
 176. How much is Therme paying for the land and will any of that revenue go towards the costs of redeveloping the rest of the land for public use?
 177. Casino
 178. How does the proposed science programming space compare to the science centre?
 179. Why do we "need" a foreign spa company to "help" revitalize our public land and waterfront area at Ontario Place instead of investing in it ourselves with public funds and public support? Have Therme "invest" in the Gardiner rebuild if they want to "help".
 180. I've heard that a 2000 underground parking garage will be built, why is the province paying for this and not Therme?
 181. The drop-off zone should be redesigned. It currently looks like the drop-off/pick-up like at Pearson and that's always a nightmare to get through.
 182. The number of expected visitors was thrown out as 5 million per year for Ontario Place. The CN Tower gets about 2 million per year, Ripley's Aquarium took five years to get reach total attendance of 10,000,000 visitors. It seems that the potential revenue from the financial projections for Ontario Place are grossly overestimated?
 183. How do we access the planning applications?
 184. Can we have access to the slideshow to look at later?
 185. How wide is the accessible space (excluding non-walkable breakwater areas between the spa and the water)?
 186. Can you show where public swimming areas are? Both in the lake and within park?
 187. What % of the publicly accessible space does the area surrounding the science pavilion/parking lot/Therme welcome pavilion represent? It seems disingenuous to include that portion in the count, given it appears to be decorative trees surrounding parking lots and buildings as opposed to proper park space that people would find value in.
 188. Can someone explain how they arrived at the estimates for number of visitors per day expected at this spa that no one wants? The numbers seem inflated.

189. Can you detail more specifically the plans for the Live Nation amphitheatre? What are their lease obligations?
190. I am wondering whether the panelists could share a reference point among any of the great urban parks of the world -- that includes a built (commercial) structure even a fraction of the size of the Therma pavilion...?
191. There are a lot of good things proposed, however I am completely opposed to a massive suburban style private spa with underground parking at the waterfront. I would like to know how long it will take me to walk from the closest transit station.
192. One of the slides mentioned that Therme would be affordable. What measure of affordability is being used? In other words, what portion of the public will be able to afford to come and spend the day at Therme?
193. [Name Removed] - Is there a plan for Traffic Congestion on Lakeshore and Strachan Ave. I live in the area and accessibility to get home is a nightmare especially during the summer when events are happening. Thank you.
194. q4. There are chimney swifts living in the existing structures. These are threatened species - How will they be protected and how will their habitat be replaced?
195. Who is paying for the improvement to the site? Is the public is paying half a billion dollars for the parking garage? What is Therma paying for rehabilitation of the site? How does the cost sharing work?
196. Trying to unite
197. Since you are projecting 5 million visitors to visit the site annually, implying the spa will be a big factor for this, how many visitors does Therme receive on their other worldwide locations and how does Toronto compare?
198. What's going to happen to the stages/ amphitheater that are already there? Budweiser stage etc.
199. If the public is going to be charged to access 50% of the West island, wouldn't it be better for the city to build something for themselves so that they can collect the money and use it to benefit the city directly?
200. I regularly swim at Ontario Place, year around. I love it. I hope we can reconsider these plans and rewild Ontario Place in favor redevelopment. What is being done to protect birds and other species? What is being done to repair CSOs in the area?
201. How does a ticketed spa, with profits going to a foreign owned corporation, selling services that consume resources and selling prepackaged "healthy foods" fit in with the original vision? How will families afford a trip to this spa? How does this spa connect families with the natural beauty of Lake Ontario? Why not an indigenous sweat lodge for example? Why a corporate vision of "wellness"?
202. traffic reports are missing and the effects on congestion already
203. Are there any plans to replace the two bridges connecting Ontario Place to Exhibition Place? When large events are held at OP the bridges reach pedestrian capacity quickly resulting in pedestrians not using the bridges and opting to cross six lanes of live traffic on lakeshore which is a public safety issue. Are there plans to replace the pedestrian bridges to Exhibition Place in order to address capacity issues?
204. [Name Removed] - it was mentioned targeting LEED Platinum certification, can you expand on what design elements are supporting this and are there any other sustainability targets i.e. carbon neutral certification (CaGBC)?
205. you say you have consulted. Did any of them ask to have a spa there? Whom in the public has requested a spa?
206. hopefully I'll get chance to have opportunity to speak to point question on road infrastructure which is absent
207. Amazed and concerned that Indigenous groups so "extensively consulted" have agreed to a private spa on a rare waterfront space. Shame.

208. It's great to say 'we've consulted with Indigenous groups' - have you actually listened to what they said? Were any of them asking for a giant private spa to be built on public land?
209. What is the financial deal with Therme? Are they providing funding to help make all the other improvements happen or are they being subsidized?
210. So... while the public realm may be considering indigenous voices, it does not sound like anyone asked if a spa was wanted? How does a spa contribute to reconciliation?
211. Moriyama was selected for Canada's centennial to build the world-famous Ontario Science Centre, known for its effective interactive space. why would you wish to replace this renowned space? With what planning will it be built?
212. why aren't they part of the presentations / speaking to all of us this evening?? we would like to hear their perspectives "live"!
213. What input and ideas have been provided by Indigenous communities and what are Therme's responsibilities to comply with the input? Input doesn't sound like Therme or Live Nations has to act and they should.
214. If you plan to replant mature trees, how will you ensure that they don't die? What new trees will be planted? Are they native species?
215. Does Therme or IO have a business relationship with any First Nations groups? Has Therme or any of its partners etc... provided any funds, financial considerations or other offers of value to any First Nations groups?
216. The Therme structure totally overwhelms the space!!!! It is too high and fills too much space. Please move it to another site maybe into the Exhibition grounds. This would be a much more appropriate location.
217. Proposed plan looks really good! how many accessible free washrooms, change rooms, showers, bike rentals, canoe rentals, charging stations, other rentals will be in the public domain on the site.
218. If the City doesn't give the Province the response it wants would the Province issue an MZO and override the City of Toronto?
219. The \$450 million it will cost taxpayers to prepare the West Island for construction seems irresponsible and extravagant. Why doesn't the Ontario Government consider other locations for the Therme attraction?
220. What the community has to say is that the community does not want a private spa on the Ontario Place site.
221. How can the people of Toronto and Ontario be expected to endorse this project the terms of the lease being secret? If the Province and Therme actually care about winning "hearts and minds", they should be completely transparent about these terms.
222. It takes many(!) young trees to equal canopy lost by removing a single mature tree. 1. How will new growth be accelerated & protected? For example, will boulevard trees be in Silva Cell-type trenches as seen between Sugar Beach and Sherbourne Common? 2. Will all plant materials be native, as at Corktown Common?
223. How much is the public investment on the site, in particular on the West island and to support Therme's application?
224. Can you confirm the total land use in acres? How many acres will be public and free access and how many acres make up the whole Therme development? Thanks
225. According to the applicant, what features of this plan make it meaningful to all Ontarians, why do you think so, how do you know you got it right?
226. What is the approximate capacity size of the new public beach, and how does that compare to the capacity of

the Therme facility?

227. I was with the consulting firm that worked for the siting/marketing projections for Canada's Wonderland. Many sites were considered before Vaughan was chosen. Like the other Therme locations, such a facility requires a lot of space for parking - as well as public transit access. People are there for a longer visit time - and that means less turnover and more parking spots are needed. With five million visitors a year - say 20% come by car, average of 3 per car - 450,000 car visits - average stay time
228. Since Ontario Place's inception, the surrounding areas of waterfront had a MASSIVE increase in population density. this is no longer just a park for Ontarians, but is one of the only backyard spaces for families and people living here. We do not need a Spa here (in this location), we need a public, open, park/nature space. Spa is great, but it can go elsewhere. Five floors of underground parking, massive glass structures, years of closed space does not sound sustainable to me.
229. Please respond to this statement from Swim Drink Fish: <https://www.swimdrinkfish.ca/blog/statement-on-ontario-place>
230. Can you please clarify what is The Forum?
231. stay time of five hours - well you can see there parking needs seem much greater than being shown?
232. what would access to Ontario place look like during construction
233. City report***While there is no sense in considering this option, it does demonstrate that there are no feasible options for increasing road network capacity for vehicular travel in the vicinity of the Airport. Based on this finding, transportation consultant's BA Group recommend that the Airport be restricted to an hourly limit of 1,100 or 1,200 passengers, from a purely traffic management perspective***** can this be sent to council showing with A group and urban strategies "https://www.toronto.ca/leg
234. A thoughtful pedestrian experience from the Exhibition Go and TTC is appreciated.
235. Okay with spa, really against location and visual impact on our waterfront
236. Anything that takes us back to the accessible fun of the 70's and 80's is a good thing.
237. Are any of Therme's services going to offer scaled pricing so that it is more equitably accessible?
238. What is the outcome of the consultation with the indigenous people - do they like and approve the huge lakefill, the removal of the trees, the impacts on the environment and ecology, the huge "amusement" spa facility proposed?
239. Has there been any thought to the amount of garbage from food vendors who sell food & drinks in single use containers?
240. The City of Toronto has limited funding for their parks system. How will the City of Toronto fund the maintenance of parkland that is more complex than the existing park and will have more visitor volume than now?
241. For Ross Burnett - What happens if Therme gets in financial trouble and cannot build and/or operate the proposed facility? Why is a private, for-profit foreign owned company involved with public lands?
242. Given that a subway line is being planned to end at this location, why does the plan include what seems to be an excessively large underground parking facility?
243. Can someone also review the "year-round" features that are available at no cost to the public? Is there any part of the public realm that would be covered, winterized, or otherwise available past the peak summer months?
244. With more food vendors on the islands, how will the City limit or prevent plastics and trash entering the lake,

especially single use packaging, including paper.

245. How long will Therme manage their spa/water park facility? What is the expected capital life and how will it be decommissioned?
246. Ross just mentioned other residential development on the waterfront. I'm not aware of any of that, please provide more information?
247. There are chimney swifts living in the existing structures. These are threatened species - How will they be protected and how will their habitat be replaced?
248. If the City doesn't give the Province the response it wants would the Province issue an MZO and override the City of Toronto?
249. amen! build a subway to science centre to tear it down= not inclusive, I guess connecting that to transit never mattered
250. How will Lakeshore Blvd. possibly handle the car traffic this facility imagines will fill five levels of parking? This traffic artery is already impossible during rush hour, hockey, soccer and baseball games.
251. [Name Removed] - there are 2 transit lines that will serve the OSC. How does moving it make it more accessible?
252. The mass and scale of the Therme buildings seem to overwhelm the landmass of the West Island - so the public has to walk around the whole complex. Can the Therme buildings be separated down the middle (I visualize like lungs) so that the public can stream down through the complex to access the elements of the public island space? The height and size of the complex appear as barriers.
253. Will there still be room for larger festivals for the public to attend, such as electric island, etc. With it seeming unlikely that these things will be possible on the Toronto islands, we are running out of potential spaces.
254. What is the expected impact of the construction, if any, on the Martin Goodman trail?
255. I am not able to see anyone else's comments or questions.
256. Aside from better transit, how does the relocation make the science centre's future more sustainable? What issues are known about its questionable sustainability?
257. Microclimate and blocking views then if blocking wind?
258. have any indigenous communities been consulted? FPIC anyone?
259. What negative and unintended consequences were identified of moving the science centre?
260. What's the plan to get people from the TTC and GO stations to Ontario Place. It's currently a walk of more than 1 km often in wind
261. Can we figure out how to have a more diverse panel? You're all white males driving this.
262. palm trees?
263. What is the plan if Therme fails? Their projected numbers are much higher than other well-known Toronto landmarks
264. Let's be clear...this has nothing to do with the neighbourhoods around Ontario place. There is zero consideration (or even acknowledgment of) for these neighbourhoods in this development, so even to refute the transplantation of the science centre from one neighbourhood for the use of another...is moot. Bucharest Therme has been described as a ridiculous, drunken, loud bachelor party...we are all bracing.

265. So, if look at pricing of other Therme Spa sites, we'll know what usage fees we'll be charged?
266. Y'all keep talking about feedback driving the conversation and further development of the design yet the biggest and loudest point of feedback is that we don't want our crown land used this way. Why are you not acting on that feedback and walking away?
267. [Name removed] I would like to see the car access designed as people first. Keep at sidewalk level and continue as MUP landscape, not black asphalt. Clear to cars to be careful, innovative and current access during summer events is conflict ridden.
268. Will there be any sports fields, basketball courts, skateboard park for youth?
269. Traffic on lakeshore is already a nightmare, what is the plan to ensure the influx of people going to the spa or using this area does not exacerbate this congestion - particularly local people on their daily commute?
270. Is the city going to check the volume / cars/ parking projections - the numbers we are being given do not make sense for 5M visitors per year?
271. How were the visitor's numbers determined? How does seasonality impact these numbers? If these numbers are not met; how does this impact overall viability of Therme on prime waterfront real estate?
272. <https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-66833.pdf> (send this to council) study already done yet isn't being included. why isn't city of Toronto speaking up for us on its own website traffic already studied in area yet add 2000 more cars? this is not a real consultation
273. How is our City going to cope with all that traffic!!!! We are already on our knees...
274. How does a glass roofed building comply with Toronto up lighting, dark sky and birding requirements? Remember night light is a major disruption of bird migration
275. how will you get from the transit stop to Ontario place?
276. A parking lot of this size is ridiculous in light of planning for transit.
277. How does this plan and the gateways fit in with Lakeshore Blvd and the properties north of it? Are there plans to better connect Ontario Place to these areas and transit given that most of this land currently serves cars (as roads and parking lots) and the Northernmost parts of Ontario Place are planned to be car-centric. This seems to make accessing Ontario place as pedestrians or transit users difficult and unappealing unless you're already walking along the waterfront.
278. Many people have complained that the Therme building dwarfs and blocks the cinesphere and pods. Imagine building a giant spa in the park next to the Sydney opera house? Diamond Schmidt and ERA...how is this scheme optimal from a heritage point of view?
279. What is the timeline of this development?
280. murders on transit yet people aren't taking cars? I find that hard to believe esp. those with money to pay for a "spa" yeah right
281. Have any members of the team ever walked from the "go station" to Ontario place (an 800m walk), especially hard in the cold windy winter
282. Thank you to City of Toronto staff for all of your work. The amenity planning for Ontario Place looks great. The huge spa is not needed/wanted by people of Ontario (in that location). But we are being bulldozed by the Premier and Therme. The order of events should be: Public input, THEN invite partners to the table if necessary. This was done the wrong way around. And to echo the current speaker, the estimate of number of visits is very inflated. Everyone knows this, but the Province doesn't hold

283. public meetings.
284. Thank you to City Planners and reps for doing due diligence in engaging with the perspectives of the public on these very precious public lands, which need to be protected; an area on which the province and its partners continue to offend. Emphasis today has been on the West Island's public realm aspect of the development - an area which will be under Therme's care under terms of a lease that are currently unknown to the public. The enhancement of public space on these lands can be done much more...[cont.]
285. What's the economic benefit anticipated to the City/province by the new Ontario Place?
286. Is a big assumption ...
287. How long has the Science Centre been part of the plans (we have estimated visitor numbers), yet only revealed today?
288. Lake Shore Blvd already becomes a parking lot every time there is a concert at Ontario Place - how is that ever going to work with all the additional projected visitors?
289. Who pays for the cost of building, developing, the infrastructure (water, electricity, utilities) required to support the Therme facilities?
290. It seems like this spa is a done deal, too much money has already changed hands. Shame on all of you for letting this happen without looking at other sites. So ironic to make a "water spa" indoors - it could be ANYWHERE. Our waterfront belongs to the people of this city, and you're selling us short. Shame. I will remember this and vote accordingly.
291. How will the design prevent conflicts between users if the Martin Goodman Trail and the many cars, buses, taxis and service vehicles crossing the trail to enter Ontario Place? Will there be an underpass for vulnerable road users?
292. why did EcoRecreo pull away? will you find another similar partner offering the water rec activities?
293. What is the composition of Species at Risk that use this area for foraging, nesting, breeding, migration, etc.? Are there plans to address the impact to these species, or proactive plans if SAR begin to use this new modified space? (i.e. Piping Plovers)
294. ...[cont.] effectively without the presence of private foreign business (Austrian Theme) interests; claiming and altering the site in great detail. What do the people of Ontario stand to gain from this private commercial partnership?
295. How do you sleep at night?
296. How do you justify the numbers suggested for visitors? Apart from aspirations. If you compare to other sites like the CN Tower or...the Louvre, you seem to be way off base.
297. What considerations for the increased volume of car traffic in/out of the underground parking garages are being made at the level of Transportation services, i.e. the impact to traffic flow both along Lakeshore Blvd. and to users on the MGT?
298. I heard conversation around inclusion - and I'm not sure of the context of the use of the word, but I'm wondering what the plans are for the RFP process for businesses in the new space, and how marginalized and systemically excluded members of the business community, and not just big corporations will be prioritized to reflect the populace, both in the ownership, but content. 2. Doesn't moving the Science Ctr into downtown further marginalize racialized and inner-city kids?
299. 3 million visitors for Therme is still equal to the number of visitors to the CN tower. How is this justified?

300. Public transit access is shown at Exhibition Place station. What is the distance and walking time between the station and Ontario Place.? Has anybody on the panel actually done the walk in August and in January?
301. If the project goes ahead as planned, how long would the disruption for construction last? I assume most of the area would be unusable for the duration
302. I agree with [Name Removed] and other members of the public who commented that the strategies for the revitalization of Ontario Place are great and long overdue but the Therme Spa should be and could be located in a more accessible and suitable location elsewhere in line with their European locations. All the lovely sustainable shoreline measures, tweaking the design in response to public consultation etc. are not going to fix this fundamental issue.
303. How have indigenous perspectives been engaged in conversations regarding the Therme spa building, welcome pavilion, and proposed paid/private access part of the site? What modes of accountability for your so called "indigenous engagement" are in place? What have your "45" consultations been like? I want accountability, and holistic engagement of indigenous perspectives across the site. Not just engagement regarding native flora....
304. Was a spa ever part of the desired features of a new Ontario Place and if not, why is it there? If it is, to what extent does what's planned meet what was articulated?
305. Why are we leasing public land for such a long period - and to a foreign company? Why are taxpayers paying to provide infrastructure? Why isn't the Province being transparent about the details of the lease? Why are we constructing buildings on our public waterfront for indoor use? Aren't there more appropriate places? Why are we ignoring the incredible opportunities to set an environmental example for public use? (landscape plans look great, skip the elitist spa inside a city that can't afford groceries)
306. I agree with the respondent asking about transparency re the lease on public lands. The answer about it can't be released is bogus - it's public land and the Government of Ontario sets the rules. Extremely disappointing.
307. The Ex station is one very long walk away from Ontario Place. How would the elderly and those with young children manage the walk, especially in all four seasons?
308. Why is preference for use of this precious resource being given to a private firm as opposed to protecting natural environment for families and children? Also, how many acres is Children's Village?
309. I have no objection to a spa, I have an objection to losing public land and park land. We need as much park land as we can get especially downtown.
310. WHY do we need Therme to be part of this revitalization? What is the NEED.
311. Safety features on the site?
312. Why is the East parking lot along Lakeshore ignored in the plan and there is so much development focus on the West Island?
313. Given that this is a lease of public land resulting from a competitive process, what is the rationale for not disclosing the financial terms?
314. For [Name Removed] - Why is a private, for profit foreign company involved with 6 acres of prime public park land?
315. Public realm: barrier free access to water, beach, swimming: positive / is welcome!
316. Why is the Swimming Pier on the west side by Mimico WWTP? Sunnyside Beach to the west already has terrible water quality, why would the swimming be put there?
317. Agree. Making this inviting to all Ontarians is great, but the rest of Ontario is less populated and we have many

great provincial parks. Downtown Toronto is densely populated and has limited access to natural spaces and limited opportunities for new park land. Ontario Place is already a public park, it's already serving the urban population, and we should refurbish it as planned but without building a commercial spa facility. It would be more fiscally responsible, and better for the population.

318. Who has produced the user forecasts on which Therme are relying? Will you release them to the public to allow us to understand your assumptions?
319. Thank you all for taking the time tonight however, it seems that a lot of the important questions are not being answered. You say that this has been discussed for years and over 7000 people responded... Did they say that we needed a spa? More parking? What's the length of the lease, let's see the studies and who stands to make money from these current plans that no one agreed to? Quite a few people have expressed that these plans don't make sense so we need to follow the money trail to understand.
320. I appreciated the questions about the parking spaces being inconsistent with daily demand. If you're trying to manage the ebb and flow of traffic, manage it by providing enough parking with what's environmentally desired, not the hourly demand you've sited. Traffic after a concert is already ridiculous!!
321. How come we can't see the questions? Will you be able to get a full list of the questions? Also, will you be able to make these questions public (with names anonymously)?
322. How was it decided that a spa would be a tourist destination? There any many tourist destinations that are beautiful parks such as Stanley Park and Central Park.
323. The proposal contains lake filling to enlarge the West Island to support the size of the Therme Spa. 36,000 square metres of lake filling above water plus approximately 25,200 square metres of lake filling below water on the West Island. This will irreversibly be damaging surrounding landscape, animal habitats and the existing West Island pebble beach which is used by swimmers year-round. Why has there been no environmental impact study on the lake filling activity? Will the City of Toronto demand an EA?
324. The large Therme spas are located in warmer places. Looking at Denmark, which has a climate similar to ours, they have multiple smaller outdoor swimming and spa structures in and around Copenhagen. Have you considered the Danish model?
325. Can shuttle buses be set up to bring people to and from the Metrolink/GO station to the Ontario Place facilities?
326. Wouldn't we truly be a leader if we committed to public and active modes of transportation only?
327. I think he means for public park space - like a federal public park like Algonquin
328. I have a feeling you won't get to me live. I wanted [Name Removed] to confirm what I think I heard. The City will be given a chance to review but must respond by a certain date. If the City rejects the proposal, the province will implement it anyway - in other words, the City's review is meaningless. [Name Removed], did I understand correctly?
329. [Name Removed] I think the questions may be addressed to "all co hosts" perhaps ^
330. Please do not hide the questions, that does not seem very transparent or inclusive.
331. How long is the lease? Please stop dodging the question. Everybody is noticing.
332. Patrick's answer re year-round planned usage and activities was weak. It seems the only truly year-round offerings are commercial.
333. Who will manage / operate the food & beverage outlets throughout the park? Will it be Therme / Live Nation or will the Province open these spaces to local small businesses?

334. Sorry I came a bit late. Now that it's been announced, do any of these presentation slides show where the Ontario Science Centre would be located?
335. So why are there no winter renderings aside from a skating rink that is bound to be too cold and windy to be enjoyable through a majority of the winter.
336. What assurances will there be that water quality will be safe enough for swimming? Part of the current popularity of the beach on the south side of the West Island is that it's consistently cleaner than other west-end city beaches, probably because it's that much further out?
337. Are these public?
338. Last comment, and to be clear about my thoughts about the Therme building on the West Island: I am 1000% opposed to it!!!
339. The City's Western Waterfront Master Plan includes a transformation of Lake Shore Blvd West from a 6-8 lane road which operates like a highway, into a complete street. How might this impact your travel projections to the site, and will you support this plan even if it makes it more difficult to drive to Ontario Place, given that you have an only 10% target of guests arriving by car?
340. It is essential for both the City of Toronto and the Province to meet the highest standard for bird collision mitigate. This can not be limited to Bird-Friendly under the TGS. Efforts must include significantly reducing the overall percentage of proposed glazing at each structure. The CSA A460-19 provincial standard encourages limiting the volume of glazing to as little as 25% relative to the entire building envelope. Is the City prepared to require this reduction in glazing?
341. What will be the cost to enter this Therma Building per person?
342. Who pays for the amenities, including parking facilitates and access roads, and who gets the revenues from parking and concession stand rentals?
343. [Name Removed] comment re all-season activation, I haven't heard anything that would draw people down there in the numbers indicated. Speaking of numbers, how do daily attendances for winter compare to other three seasons and to what parts of Ontario Place?
344. Can we designate Ontario Place as a historic place to stop some of the development?
345. adding my questions here in case written questions are recorded or addressed later. 1) why was this not done on the docklands? seems like a better location?
346. hey thanks to staff for making the time to do this public consultation
347. will the food beverage providers only be independent businesses opposed to franchised chains?
348. Totally legitimate and appreciated last oral question about racial equity and the move of the Science Centre in the context of diminishing access to attractions by racialized children and youth.
349. Who will monitor the firepit use? And who will provide the fuel? I'm also looking at the site map and see that most of the public space is not green but in fact hard surfaces - despite what we are being told about new tree planting there seems to be very little natural green space.
350. 2) the area that is being used to describe the public space on west island seems to be a lot of "edges" - i.e. very narrow tracts on the outside of buildings, paths, etc. Not sure what percentage of the area these narrow channels represent. I just wonder if we are including thoroughfares as public access space, when really, they are not anywhere anyone would actually stay or enjoy, but sort of "wasted space" (like a long hallway in a condo counting towards square footage).
351. I'm against this development. I like the idea of more naturalized area - but this should be taken to far greater

heights on the West Island. I'd like to speak up for those who don't have a say here: wildlife nature BIRDS INSECTS fish ... this spa will be devastating to migratory birds to monarchs. Dots on this monstrosity won't even begin to cut it. The entire West Island should be naturalized habitat w a botanical garden and arboretum. It can't only be about humans Save our greenspace! Protect our nature!!

352. Who are Therme's financiers, and is financing (debt and equity) arranged?
353. Thank you for this opportunity!
354. How do you imagine "affordable family fun" is accommodated by a ticketed spa? Shame.
355. Therme's answer re equity was inadequate. We need specifics, not generalities and not talk of engagement but actions from engagement.
356. Comment for the end: I like the landscaping updates, am opposed to the private spa and parking lot.
357. I want to echo the comments of others - Therme could find a better spot for the spa and more land for public use!
358. I wish to be on record as against the Therme involvement. Not enough value to Toronto or Ontario residents.
359. Thank you for the process. I hope it has some impact on the final decision making!
360. How was the private vs public ratio of lands decided? Does the public have to go through the Therme facility to access any of the public facilities?
361. What's going to happen with unanswered questions? I don't even have access to what I asked to follow up in the feedback forms.
362. thank you [Name Removed]
363. Does Therme still have partnerships with TIFF and SwimDrinkFish? I see that the names of those organizations are no longer on Therme's website list of partners
364. The space allocated to parking excessive and unsustainable.
365. Are all areas wheelchair accessible?
366. In this session, there was no single comment about positive sides of the Therme part of the project. Nobody likes it! Hope it makes clear to public servants and decision makers that people really dislike the idea of Therme.
367. Please invite all of us in the Grand Opening
368. Colin, you've been terrific - very impressive. Too bad not everyone else on the panel has been so candid and helpful.
369. THE BIG QUESTION NO ONE ASKED OR ANSWERED ... HOW DO WE STOP THIS!?
370. Correction: The space allocated to parking is excessive and in conflict with sustainability goals.
371. I hope the City gets this right and says no to the spa!!!
372. I am not going to be welcoming Therma. I already cannot afford physio in the city. Why do I have to go to somewhere beautiful to be reminded I am poor. Go somewhere else. The lack of transparency is offensive. You say you have had consultations, but it does not feel true. Ford will get his way, is all I am left with.
373. Thanks everyone. Please hear us. :)
374. what is the cost to the taxpayer for all of the changes and development of Ontario Place

375. Please invite all of us at the Grand Opening Party [Name Removed]
376. If there is no CNE parking - what happens to Ontario Place?
377. Why can't the Ontario centre be located at another Provincial land in the GTA?
378. go leaf's
379. This is a great Family idea. As a single Father, I take my daughter to Great Wolf Lodge so travelling to Niagara Falls.
Thanks
380. Ontario Science Centre should be easily accessible by school buses. This Ontario place design is not
381. This proposal disenfranchises the other areas of GTA. Science Centre should be located outside the downtown core so even other Ontario citizens can easily access. This should not be an entertainment complex for a private facility
382. Thanks

Appendix D: Feedback Form Response Transcript

Engagement Summary:

Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

Table of Contents

Appendix D:	52
Feedback Form Response Transcript	52
Built Form, Character, and Heritage Responses	52
Environment and Sustainability Responses	67
Public Spaces and Activities Responses	86
Additional General Comments, Feedback, or Questions.....	112

Transcription Index

- Bolding used when the original was underlined
- Capitals maintained when used for emphasis
- [Square brackets] indicate instances where the word is unclear so a guess has been made
- [?] indicates complete illegibility
- {Curly brackets} contain the description of a picture/image

Please note, paper feedback forms were transcribed by GPA. Due to the illegibility of some comments, some of the comments have been edited for clarity

Appendix D:

Feedback Form Response Transcript

Built Form, Character, and Heritage Responses

1. I do not want that massive spa, that will be more than I can afford.
2. The WORL-CLASS projects have specific standard and criteria that need to follow and the designed project doesn't have the enough standard to attract tourists! How this project can respond to the fast culture change in 21st century and survive for 100 years!
3. The architect's renderings placed great focus on the gardens (yes!) and pedestrian walkways (yay!) BUT not enough on the size, material, or scale of their design. The site plans completely washed out the buildings, in an extremely problematic way. How is the public to UNDERSTAND the built form if we can't see it? NO to building on the heritage site.
4. I appreciate they mentioned they'll be working on decreasing the size of some buildings, or I think they'll allow people to public-access the roof?
5. Protecting the pods and the cinesphere as "heritage sites" is ridiculous. They are falling apart + huge ugly structures.
6. No spa
7. If it's a heritage asset of the province, putting a spa on it is ridiculous.
8. I don't have the same love for the spheres as other people so no comment here.
9. Thanks for a great event. I appreciate being informed. RS
10. We own this land. Once it is gone we won't have access to this kind of space again. A mall and spa are going in everywhere. This place to stand and grow is important. Wetland zone -> will there be benches? disabled folks? Can a family picnic at the south shoreline and look at their faces? Benches at the "Brigantine Cove"?
11. New buildings - Gateway building is huge - Bridge looks like a solid wall - Too big. Too much private commercial space in proportion to the public spaces around the edges. Why a spa? Couldn't we have something with more focus on active recreation and play.
12. LEED certifications for Canadian environment and considerations. Accessibility for accessibility programming for [bridges] the public space. Contingency of a private sector withdrawing a provincial space - who will cover costs of maintenance/upkeep and use of space.
13. Ontario Place should be fully accessible by the public. Ontario Place is more than just the waterfront.
14. Construction on West Island does not feel in keeping with the heritage structures in the rest of Ontario Place. Scale of new construction appears to dwarf existing heritage buildings (scale of new construction would dominate the active space)
15. Sizes of Therme building completely overwhelms the small west island. Amount of public space on the actual island is greatly reduced. How will the glass impact birds? Building is not consistent w/ existing heritage structures. Pathways are not big enough for multi-use. Views of heritage structure are blocked. Does the city have standards for building size on islands?

16. Scale/height of the space is greater than it should be.
17. A welcome pavilion and giant expansive spa change one's experience of the space. Ontario Place is a special place that needs a bit of care and love, these new buildings will negatively impact the heritage & character aspects of the place - where is the Ontario in Ontario Place redesign? Keep it all free 4 public - not just 2/3 of it.
18. Therme Spa not in scale or character with existing buildings or land forms.
19. Upset it is a "DONE DEAL" and that FORD CAN DO WHAT HE WANTS. ALSO, WHO CHOSE THERME? Who were the other submissions? Were there other submissions? ARE THERE ANY ALTERNATIVE PLANS? Where is city owned land? 1670 but no one at our table know where these areas were located. DO NOT BUILD A SPA!!!
20. Too tall + large. Could be palatable if less dominating of the west island. Need net zero carbon targets. More walls + insulation --> not just glass box. Need to design buildings for flexibility + reuse. Need backup plan if project isn't successful. Should have much stronger Indigenous elements in design + programming.
21. The presentation was really pushing a narrative of creating a "world class" destination in a place, and community, and existing architecture that needs to be preserved, revitalized, and kept for public use. Even though it seems largely futile, I think that the whole process and vision behind the development be re-thought. [?] with the existing Cinesphere and Pods, the program and tenants there should be thought about first, as it will take the least amount of time and disruption. The creation of a science portion is a good idea; however, it should be a satellite program, or a company tied to the Ontario Science Centre, and not "moving" the Science Centre from Don Mills & Eglinton. The current Ontario Science Centre is in itself an architectural landmark built in the 60s, specifically into the radical ravine slope, and functions fantastically as an attraction that brings people to the area. Community consultation should be focused on this removal of existing buildings, in both the communities near Ontario Place and Don Mills & Eglinton.
22. The scale of the proposed Therme building is gigantic, gargantuan. This is not in keeping with the historic existing configurations, which involves smaller buildings and clusters surrounded by open space. This site is recognized for its heritage value and as a cultural heritage landscape, which means it should be in keeping or compatible with its heritage character. Instead of being compatible, the proposed building competes with the existing fabric. Ontario Place is/was a special and rich place in terms of its use, design and experience. There is so much of quality that can serve as inspiration moving forward, none of which I can see in the proposal.
23. The site now, decommissioned since 2012, has a derelict plastic waterslide dressed to look like stone, how does the Therme design respect the Toronto waterfront?
24. The loss of public space to a private corporation is unacceptable - the land is free to access today, and needs to remain that way! A public park is **way more valuable** to the city on this site than a spa.
25. Why does the public need to pay for the parking facilities? If it is for use of Therme, then they should pay
26. No to the spa. Keep Hough's landscape do not raze it keep all 800+ trees enhance the space so it's 100% public park + free/ no charge
27. The Therme proposal is not the built form we want. It disrespects what has been there and adds nothing.
28. Protecting architecture involves not just the existing pods, cinesphere etc. but also the sightlines landscape architecture, general geography. Focus on flexible space should be prioritized over large scaled fixed buildings.
29. A 9-storey spa, that will be priced toward rich people, is a slap in the face to the average person who will never use the spa & will be denied the parkland.
30. Again, the built form of the Therme Spa isn't sustainable or environmentally progressive. An underground parking lot on land that is landfill will require an unnecessary amount of remediation. A publicly accessible park will cost a fraction of the cost and will be equitable and sustainable.

31. Therme building is too large. Walkway around it is too narrow and single use (circulation only). Building design does not have architectural merit - too much glass and zero formal relationship to Zeidler buildings. The building is a disaster in terms of the environment - it is excessive and unnecessarily large.
32. As a child, how are "Therme" doing anything for people who can't afford a "world class spa" and this is a complete tirade of a presentation. Please don't make this a spa. P.S I'm 12 and when a child is not aloud to have a public opinion you know the plan is words I can't say on this paper.
33. I'm urging the city to request the development to include wood instead of glass to connect more with the forestry of Ontario. Also, the buildings should be split up like a village, have a shorter height restriction, perhaps they build more underground to keep more public green space, connect more with Ontario heritage.
34. The "Therme" proposal was presented as a "fait accompli" which is not what the people at the meeting expected or were in favour of. The built form of the facility - which is huge - was continually underplayed.
35. Cinesphere should not just program science IMAX films, it should keep programming wide release films
36. {Drawing of two people looking happy walking dogs on leashes}
37. Get ROM, AGO, MOCA and Science Centre involved in pods programming, not just Science Centre - should reflect multiple aspects of Ontario. Local restaurants not chains.
38. Will it block views to Cinesphere? What is the heritage of private company? Why are all of Therme spas not in downtown cores. Put a hockey rink. Go with heritage. Other hockey rinks outdoors is full in the winter.
39. I would like the area kept as natural as possible. A lot of the people like the upgrades that will be done except the spa area.
40. My understanding is that the City of Toronto has declared Ontario Place, both the architecture * the landscape, **heritage**. A glass "monster house" does not respect this.
41. I would like to see design modified to mitigate the impacts on migratory birds. I want to see a smaller building footprint. I do not understand why this needs to be so big. Montreal's Old Port has a small spa. Why can't there be a smaller building proposed in Ontario Place? Ontario Place is a heritage site as is Montreal's Old Port.
42. More open spaces for playing games, gathering in small groups, busking & basking. Children's playgrounds seem small. Apart from walking & admiring the water views what would a family or individual be able to do?! (maybe lots but it's not clear from the presentations & Therme takes up almost all of the West Island - the circumference is open to all - but again, apart from walking there, why would I come here?)
43. In other cities Bucharest, two near Munich etc... are there ANY Therme projects within a city centre? In those 2 places the projects are 40 min, at least, outside the city centre. Why in our city do we house this project on our only downtown beach? (Hough Beach) In Parkland.
44. The Therme is far too big relative to the pods and Cinesphere - completely dwarfs it. Architectural expression of the Therme is banal and mediocre by any contemporary architectural standards and does nothing to honour or build on the avant-garde heritage of the pods and cinesphere.
45. Accessibility of underprivileged to partake in public owned and paid space. Ecology - mature trees cannot be replaced and not in the space they will be removed (West Island - +800 trees). Toronto specific elements in a "year-round" environment - will Therme be proportionately empty from November through February as most Ontario locations [an] Toronto is a winterscape. People families fly to Mexico, etc. for warmth. People skate, ski and partake in winter activities. When business model fails will the buildings [deteriorate] and what will the process of reclamation be. The "PATH" system is a prime example of "year-round" indoor space remaining empty. Therme spa does not address the "year-round" enjoyment of Ontario Place if it is proportionately empty in winter.

46. Therme building is massive - crowds out other uses of West Island (given that many people coming will not be willing or able to go inside, they are just going to feel like the poor relations walking around the outside, seeing the luxuriant vegetation + spa-goers inside, but with very little space for them to settle + enjoy their day at the lake). This is not the spirit of the original Ontario Place. I'm sure Therme build lovely spas, is there a more suitable location? Could it be smaller if it has to be here? Design does not look Ontarian in any way. The figure of 13% of the site for the Therme project is accurate but misleading in terms of how the space can be used - it completely dominates the W. Island. 44 m is pretty high, the thing is going to loom over Ontario Place site. The rendering was very deceptive, greying out the highest mass so that it was almost imperceptible.
47. The proposed private buildings are too large & the design is not in keeping with heritage aspects of the site. As a regular user of Ontario Place, I would prefer zero private buildings. If this is not going to happen, there should be fewer private buildings which are smaller than proposed. I do not believe that the Therme building is only 13% of Ontario space. 45 m is too high relative to the surrounding area. The [comparables] (eg. AGO & Corus building) are all in urban areas, so this is not actually comparable. The footprint for a private spa/waterpark should NOT exceed a stadium!! The welcome building should be smaller than the Cinesphere. I do not support the presence of a private entity that dominates the space, "13%" is gaming the numbers. A community centre with multiple pools and is accessible for day use would be preferable.
48. The spa is HUGE and overshadows the park - this goes against the public spirit of Ontario place! What was the assessment process for leasing? The public hasn't been consulted until after the fact? Traffic is already bad enough! We don't need any more!
49. Therme way too large in footprint & brutality of height above slim. I host international visitors many times per year they only want Toronto Islands except the ferry slows them down. More open space, sheltered skating & more child focused matters. Low income family is huge grp in need. Make 18 million [?] hot dog at a time not on spa which would work better in Vaughan.
50. I would love things like learning centres/[farming] options to be used in and on top of the pods
51. The spa takes too much space away from public space. The symbolism of a glassed-in area for those who can pay.
52. Trillium Park is beautiful - more of that. The spa? - no heritage, no character aspects.
53. It's too big and ugly, not needed.
54. Will there be someone on site who will be monitoring the construction for species at risk? Can the public make comments? All of the comments and development application notes are mitigating for wildlife that doesn't need to happen if we weren't building a giant spa.
55. The Cinesphere should be a central element of Ontario Place, it's good that it will be maintained but how can we make embrace this iconic architecture? Perhaps there could be lighting to light it up in a flattering way. A small installation (could be a sort of seating area) that contains historical elements of the Cinesphere. Only beach in downtown Toronto. Truly engage with the water --> touch, dip toes in, swim. Don't move beach. Riverdale park gym/public, community pool. Footprint - dimensions.
56. I'm concerned the mega spa will overwhelm the pods + Cinesphere. I'm concerned about the drastic increase in car traffic on Lakeshore + the Gardiner. I'm concerned about the size of the spa. I think the massive size will deter public access to the site.
57. Therme Spa does not belong on our Waterfront. Keep the space as parkland/green space - sorely needed. Why not put the spa in a spot in Toronto that is not environmentally precious, and where it could provide employment for the local population?
58. Don't consider only access the periphery of the west island. We only get to walk around the outside. Not across the site (west island).

59. This is not a unique design --> check the other Therme Spas in the world --> none of which are on a waterfront! "Vast majority taking transit" --> 10-minute walk - This doesn't make sense in bad weather.
60. Why 6 stories?
61. These are opportunities for construction companies to make serious money. The parking is a \$ business.
62. Lack of transparency, inclusion, genuine engagement and authenticity with how the decision was made to build a single, private anchor amenity that is not reflective of the local pop. and cultural identity of the area. Economically, culturally + environmentally inappropriate.
63. 6. The presentation/answers are lacking in substance. Numbers the Therme representative was unable or unwilling to discuss how numbers re traffic attendance to spa, cost beyond entrance fees were generated, prognosticated and what those numbers were specifically.
64. Need public use buildings for shelter in winter etc. This is important also for accessibility (people w/ sensitivities to weather --> ex. cold/heat can impact mobility or cognitive). Considering the diversity of Toronto & if it's reflected (much different from when Ontario Place originally developed)
65. Nothing of heritage --> a foreign company is getting to design. Huge misalignment! The focus is NOT about individual people but way TOO commercial! Parking is totally excessive! We need nature in Toronto.
66. How will you disincentivize car traffic? How will you minimize traffic impacts to the Gardiner?
67. New construction should accommodate space for slacklining and other low-impact sports.
68. The slide show mentioned this project being "accessible, affordable and green" --> the spa/live nation & science pavilion **doesn't fit that bracket/conditions**; the public **green** space does! but not the pricey & unsustainable buildings (live nation/spa/science pavilion)
69. Reject the entire "redevelopment proposal". Let us finally overturn our entire economic paradigm before it's too late. And notice how easy it is to say, "this is too radical." What is **radically** impractical is to allow the status quo to continue.
70. The city is desperate for public parkland in the downtown area. Giving up public parkland to a private company is the wrong direction for Toronto and will be seen as a multi-generational mistake.
71. Build a PUBLIC sauna/sweat lodge facility next to the water for year-round use. There is already a large community of swimmer/cold plungers and divers (see the FB group OP Swimmers with thousands of followers).
72. A **private for-profit corporation should not be allowed to build on public lands**. In addition, the building plan is **way too big, physically imposing, and dominates the space**. It creates a sense of public sidewalks/paths around massive glassy private buildings for the privileged --> not a park. I am pleased with aspects of the plan for the Cinesphere + science programming spaces. I think the old buildings on the west island should be re-landscaped with trees, hills, native plants and picnic areas. --> any buildings built should be less than two standard storeys high --> like 10 m high, limit visual and sensory impact on public users. FOR THE PUBLIC.
73. Incorporate Indigenous knowledge in Ontario Place.
74. Nice to hear that the pods and cinesphere will be preserved. The pods need something in them - like the science centre - they aren't doing anyone any good by just sitting there and they don't look that remarkable.
75. The existing heritage architecture elements would be dwarfed by the spa. The spa design itself looks like all the other Therme sites from Europe, and does not take into consideration the iconic architectural history of Ontario place in its design.
76. The spa is wildly oversized, aesthetically hostile, outright dangerous to wildlife, blocks views to the existing heritage buildings, and is entirely out of character with the existing spaces

77. Indigenous consultation and story telling should be integrated into waterfront and shoreline.
78. The Therme proposal dwarfs the original built form and creates a competing vision for the place. Revitalize the original form and maintain the heritage.
79. The site will be ruined by the addition of this spa complex. Why not have the courage to just level the whole thing and not pretend that the heritage aspect is being protected.
80. The proposed "spa" is grotesquely large and not appropriate for the site. The parking garage must not be constructed on the site. The character is completely dissonant with the extant waterfront in Toronto.
81. Ontario Place was founded on the idea that it should be freely accessible to anyone in the province. A private spa takes this legacy and shits all over it.
82. The proposed building makes no effort to conform to the natural environment and will overpower the waterfront.
83. The Michael Hough landscape is a treasure and should be preserved.
84. The proposed spa will take up way too much space. With the density of the population in Toronto and in the west end we need more public space not less that is free and green.
85. Fixing the pods and cinesphere is important
86. No buildings of height or underground parking should be allowed in a public space or park. The sewage, energy waste, car pollution etc. and clearing of precious trees is an environmental disaster. No building should ruin the view to the water and certainly no fee to enter such a building should be permitted. The trees are vital for shade and wildlife. The context of a Spa for the wealthy is fine somewhere else but not on a waterfront green public space!
87. Oversizing of building vs surrounding publicly accessible property. Concern over size and use of Therme entrance - what is intended use of this space? Is there consideration to make this space green space rather than enclosed? It appears the primary purpose of this space was essentially escalation to their bridge. How can this space be effectively used by the public? A majority of the space seems focused on derivative visual appeal rather than public use.
88. How do you access heritage pods and bridge? Theme bridge is good public space.
89. Building looks great. Does the CNE bridge get replaced, bigger or moved?
90. The built form is ugly. The heritage of the site, as a place for all Ontarians, is completely ignored by handing most of it over to a private company. The idea that would be building a massive parking lot runs counter to both the PPS and the City's Official Plan. Especially in a city that has been eliminating parking minimums. Overall it's just a disgrace.
91. They are insufficient. The construction of the spa will eradicate the heritage and character aspects present due to size of the building.
92. The pods and sphere are very interesting elements of built heritage, part of what makes Ontario Place a unique and special environment. Dwarfing them with the massive spa complex would be a huge mistake.
93. How is the spa affordable? How would a family on low income afford to use this spa so it's truly an Ontario place for everyone?
94. The Therme spa building seems totally out of touch with the iconic pods, cinesphere or village pavilions which have immense architectural value and should be foregrounded rather than dwarfed by what is ultimately a generic and superficially style motivated contemporary building. Little to do with the context of the site or

"Ontario" so I would question why such a key piece of waterfront real estate would be handed over to a project which could be sited anywhere. The villages, and especially the village on the West Island deemed as not having preservation merit, struck a good balance between open public spaces, like a forum, with much smaller enclosed pavilions supporting these shared spaces. The idea of community.

95. Destroyed by the private spa
96. You are all utterly insane for allowing this
97. 1-No giant spa, 2. Don't move the Science Centre here what a daft idea. 3. While heritage is often used to mean "never change anything" I am not opposed to new building on the site. I would like to see new building connect the water to the city rather than blocking it off, and invite public access and participation.
98. The current infrastructure -including the boat, the sphere, the ramps, the quirkiness of it- is excellent and beautiful and tells a story of our city. There is no need for big construction. I visit the area often for picnics, bike rides, walks. It's gorgeous and in a world class city like Berlin or London it would remain as-is. Add some public art and a few cafes and voila... the perfect use of the waterfront! To repeat myself from above- It is important to me that Ontario Place remain for people, and the public, and free to access. And we don't need a private spa or anything else ticketed. It's precious potential green-space. It's an area that doesn't need more people driving to it; it's TTC and bike and walking accessible for so many people, and we should be discouraging driving to that area. A private spa is a destination business that would be a great idea for Etobicoke or Scarborough- bring some \$\$ to those areas, we don't need more busyness downtown.
99. This plan is wholly inappropriate to maintaining the heritage and character aspects of this public space. It is the private use of public lands- private appropriation of the common wealth. This is morally wrong and a design nightmare.
100. The proposed building has no connection to the heritage architecture in its design. Worse, due to its gargantuan size, it dwarfs the heritage buildings. The building is much too large for the site and I question whether any building is needed on the West Island. It closes in an area which should be left open to nature and outdoor use. It aims to create a completely artificial indoor environment for recreational purposes when the existing outdoor environment provides bountiful recreational potential.
101. What protected views are being impacted by the proposed development?
102. Again, what character or heritage? A giant mega spa is not character. The whole plan should be thrown in the garbage
103. The built form being proposed is going to dwarf the existing waterfront skyline and dominate the view. Beyond that, it's going to get rid of many established trees and ruin habitat for many birds, and no doubt the enormous sheets of glass will kill many more birds over time. The development lacks any character - it looks exactly the same as their spas in Europe and has no personality. Put that in a suburb.
104. Oversized spa building dwarfs the heritage site
105. You're destroying the views of the existing pods and cone sphere. You are privatizing public space. And trying to ram this garbage down the throat of a public who is not interested in having this here. An absolute gong show of poor urban development policy. Tough for me to conclude that it isn't an idiot in charge of the province at present.
106. Just keep it simple, green and accessible. Waterfront should be appreciated just as it is.
107. Free space for the public
108. The most obvious comment about the built form is that the spa is huge, and the entrance hall looks like an airport. I can't see anywhere in it that takes location into account. It could be plunked down anywhere in the

world that wants a giant spa. There is nothing (certainly not the palm trees) that indicates this is in Ontario, on the shores of a beautiful lake. The slides were not really clear and went by quickly so it was difficult to figure out what the rest of the spa building will look like, other than having large pools on every level. This leads to the question of what happens if the spa is not a success. We have no idea what the lease contract says, but I would hope there is something in there about what happens if Therme goes broke or closes the business. Who is responsible for the upkeep and/or possible demolition of the building? Who decides on what happens to the space? As to the other elements, I found it difficult to figure out where what looked like tall orange structures would go. I couldn't understand how they respected the heritage of the property as they looked tall, random and ugly -- the orange certainly does not respect the nature of the site.

109. The built form dwarfs the existing heritage structures and destroys the landscape design that has made Ontario Place so beautifully connected to the lake and naturalized features of these islands.
110. Green space and trees.
111. The spa will be way too big. It will dominate the heritage structures (Cinesphere and the pods) and block some of the views of them.
112. The Ontario Place complex is located on grounds traditionally occupied by the indigenous people of the area. Redevelopment should focus on the rights of those people.
113. This plan does not retain the heritage of the site
114. There is not a single redeeming quality to the redevelopment plans, as someone who frequents/frequented Ontario Place.
115. I do not feel that Therme's glass and metal gigantic spa building reflects anything about Ontario. Currently Ontario Place is an iconic heritage site. The designs proposed by Therme do nothing to celebrate our beautiful province and doesn't align at all with the heritage of Ontario Place and overshadows/visually obliterates any views of the pods and Cinesphere. The planned massive and barrier like entranceway will block any views of the heritage buildings from the city side and from the west. This revitalization plan does nothing to celebrate and incorporate the brilliant Michael Hough landscape. From my perspective this new plan does nothing but desecrate and tear down all the trees and moves that beach from the south to the west, basically ignoring the Hough landscape. Its disingenuous for the presenters to say that they are honouring the Hough landscape. The West Island needs to be protected as invaluable public green space. The spa dominates the entire West Island, requiring massive infilling out to accommodate the public realm is an environmentally bad idea.
116. It may be attractive to some, but their glaring equity disparity. Those with resources have access. Those without are automatically excluded. Heritage and character must be including all.
117. The proposed spa is far too large for the area and would destroy the environmental character of Ontario Place and the lakefront.
118. Keep the Cinesphere and salvageable aspects on the original Ontario place walkways, bridges and spaces.
119. Open. Arts facilities. Fun things not using electricity.
120. New York City would never sell off Central Park as they value it as a social good and as a tourist attraction. We should see Ontario place similarly
121. The development itself does not take over a disproportionate space on the grounds. As someone who was not born during the "hey day" of Ontario Place, heritage components are not top of mind when looking at the proposal. What is more exciting is potential future use. However, I appreciate that infrastructure like the pods will remain.
122. Table stacks. It's the least we can do!

123. These proposals to privatize the park have no place as a waterfront park world class public space. Private amenities do nothing to acknowledge the existing built form of the space, it's place in our heritage as a gathering space for all ages, public park in our most urbanized city.
124. PEOPLE
125. There are no heritage and character aspects of the proposal.
126. I have a tempered view of how important it is to honour the architectural heritage of the Ontario Place site. I have nostalgic recall of receiving hand-me-down bell-bottoms, as a child. But I have no reason to commit my self to that dated and impractical period of design for my current wardrobe. The structures and kiosks in the original architectural style are visually-appealing as sculpture but have never, ever, been particularly effective as public-use spaces. If things do not work, are run down and unsafe, it is okay to remove them. Do NOT add additional structures in the whoever architectural style. That is plagiarism or at minimum only stylistic appropriation, anyway. ONLY build structures in a current design approach where the structures are pleasant, useful, and cohesive to water and open-space esthetic and sustainable. The only hardscape structures really needed are those to extend the use of the park to 3 and 4 seasons. Minimal structures can reduce harsh winds to extend park and exercise spaces into the spring and fall. Wind-shelter and appropriate facilities for winter skating are useful if the do double duty as small market and food kiosks all year. - Look at what has been successful for actual public use and this is the Toronto Islands, Trillium Park model. Listen, the visual image of Ontario place that we need to preserve is characterized by pine trees, picnic tables, splash pad, geese, a view of the lake and smiling happy children. The stupid white architecture was just also-present while the real magic happened on the grass and on the water.
127. The spa proposal is simply too huge and out of place as a showcase for Ontario! It does nothing to preserve heritage and would be a big drain on energy and serve only a small portion of the population who could afford this. This is not what the majority of Torontonians are looking for. If people in the province want to access this type of facility why would they want to face the traffic of entering downtown Toronto when I expect they would prefer to have this facility out of the downtown core?
128. As I mentioned above, the proposed spa does nothing to celebrate Ontario. It is jarring and unattractive. It does not complement the Cinesphere and pods, which are architecturally interesting and unique. It dominates the West Island, leaving very little space as publicly accessible. What is needed is more public parkland, wider pedestrian and biking trails, playgrounds, outdoor pools and skating rinks, as well as a range of smaller scale amenities.
129. No to the spa and Doug ford corruption. He want a casino!
130. This is a cherished area of the waterfront and this project severely damages this area from being accessible. So much of the waterfront area in Toronto is not dedicated to public space. The building itself will dominate the landscape.
131. Hard-core brutalism. Money talks.
132. The forms have no connection that I can see to Canadian, Ontarian, Torontonian or aboriginal heritage. This place looks more like Great Wolf Lodge with palm trees. How can that be said to be reflecting our heritage? Don't take my opinion for that...read the City's Planning report. It highlights the lack of a heritage connection as well. The high glass walls will never be anything but an energy drain and a killer location for birds. And the architects kept on talking about a height of only 45 metres. Doesn't sound like much until you convert it. Then it becomes 146' or 13-14 stories. That's very high for this stand-alone location. The architect's comeback is that BMO Field is the same height or higher. Perhaps the most pathetic comparison of the day!!!
133. Keeping in line with the Trillium park design in how we incorporate indigenous designs and landscapes. Pity the Elder couldn't join on April 15 but I will have my eyes peeled - you better engage the Indigenous groups and knowledge keepers in this process.

134. The waterfront should be entirely dedicated to increasing accessible green spaces to the residents of Toronto. The proposed development is deplorable. It lacks an understanding of the geography, habitat, and urban design of the southwestern area of the city, and is blind to the needs of city residents at large. The proposal is for an overpriced theme park that nobody wants.
135. The built form of the proposal is ludicrous, as is the entire concept. As for the heritage and character aspects of the proposal---well, as per your own staff report its main contribution is to remove heritage and character aspects: the proposed building "requires removal of the majority of the Michael Hough designed landscape heritage attributes on the West Island, including removing original water features and their shoreline typologies, removing all mature trees and naturalized surroundings ..."
136. I have not seen the full development proposal.
137. Redevelopment and revitalization is important for now and future generations. It must have a current reflection of the now. The environment and recognition of the original peoples of this land must be reflected in the design. For the most part the drawing I saw did. The only issue I have is with the private corporation that is being given a valuable chunk of land, with a lease already signed before the public had any say. This is so wrong anyway you cut it. The build is way oversized for the plot and is totally tone deaf about parameters set by the city i.e. footprint, height. It says nothing at all about Ontario. It's like trying to transport a poor rendition of a tropical country in a non-tropical place. No, it's not nice. Think of the heritage/location of it?? It has a total lack of creativity and respect for where it is - ONTARIO PLACE for gosh sakes. This oversized behemoth of a glass structure will not be transparent (unlike this process) it will dominate a multitude of views of the lake. No at all like a jewel it is trying to emulate. Whatever goes there should be a 'jewel' of the province, respected and be something we can be proud of. It's a hard no to Therme. The people didn't ask for it nor do we want it.
138. We don't want the mega spa
139. I don't know enough to address this
140. Character ???? this looks like a more expensive Canada Wonder ...
141. I'm fine with the built form. It would be a waste to not have an attraction there in addition to the park. A private use brings variety and helps attract visitors. Plus, I like the option of being able to grab food and have access to a washroom. The lack of access to food water and washrooms is a major barrier to people who might otherwise be interested in visiting Ontario place. I look forward to visiting Therme and enjoying the pools water slides and spa. As an aside, when NIMBYism is so rampant in the city, it's disappointing to see the city itself using NIMBY terminology in its own surveys (e.g. character aspects). Please do better.
142. It looks like a stunning addition to our waterfront that will provide additional amenities in an underused part of the city. It incorporates the natural environment well and would be a signature addition to the waterfront.
143. I hope Indigenous people will have a say. My concern is that they are not used in by the Ford government or Therme but have a real impact on the site.
144. keep it public! no spa!
145. This huge proposed facility is an absolute eyesore and will not add any visual, environmental or cultural value to our important public shore zone.
146. Indifferent
147. It needs to not look monstrous. It needs to blend in with nature. It should not look like an amusement park. It should not block the view of the water from the city and vice versa.
148. The scale of the Therme Canada welcome building on the mainland looks humongous at 45 m height and is not comparable to anything even the Cinesphere which has a very small footprint - while the Therme Canada

building is extremely wide with a large footprint and blocking all the view of the lake from the mainland - likewise the West Island Therme Canada structure, cutting view to the lake as they turn their back to the city + taking up a lot of the public green space.

149. Indigenous reconciliation should be the forefront of anything for our heritage. I loved the mention of space for Pow-wows, and the Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is so great! I'd like to see even more of this. It says so much more than just a plaque or a sculpture.
150. Looks great!
151. The Cinesphere and pods are heritage to our city. The proposed monstrosity of the Waterpark (50 m high! and larger than the BMO Field) is energy inefficient and takes away desperately needed public space with all the condo developments been built in the past decade.
152. This is fine.
153. The updated park looks nice. The spa is ugly, and takes up too much of the West Island.
154. Ontario Place is a part of my childhood and the proposed redevelopment takes something that many Ontarians are connected to for it to become something exclusive and elite. That is not my Ontario.
155. Making the amphitheatre indoors will eliminate most of its magic. As a nearby resident I don't mind the concert noise - it ends early enough.
156. The landscaping of the land has done a good job preserving its cultural identity. Again, it goes back to the spa, its built form is not suitable in its current state and needs to be scaled back as repeated by many people.
157. While I'm not here to comment on the commercial development of Therme - it's building design is tacky and in poor taste considering the juxtaposition against the backdrop of Lake Ontario. We have the opportunity to create a gorgeous park that reflects the history of Ontario and yet we're building a tasteless spa? The Provincial Park system is popular - why can't we have a Provincial Park in Toronto at Ontario Place?
158. Yes, preserve and make necessary upgrades to the iconic heritage structures that are there and let nothing impact the public's ability to access or view and enjoy the heritage structures. The Therme Spa will do exactly the opposite. We don't want that building in Ontario Place, because it does not fit into any of the needs or desires of proper built form and interferes with sight lines to the heritage structures which we value and treasure. No one can see through a glass building!
159. I love the look of the shoreline, trails, children's village. I do not like the space and height of the spa. No spa or underground parking lot.
160. The Therme spa proposal is not in keeping with the built form, heritage and character of the original vision of Ontario place, nor does it represent an appropriate forward-thinking new vision for the future of this important public space. The glass towers are like ed by Therme to Kew Gardens and Crystal palace, two Victorian era structures in the UK. Why would Ontario Place, or anywhere in Toronto, wish to emulate those? There should not be a spa built there at all, but if that does proceed, it needs to be scaled WAY down in size and footprint.
161. This is a giant glass mess that will be an eyesore on the lake.
162. The built form is a disaster in terms of bird-friendly architecture - the huge glass enclosure will kill so many birds via window collisions. It'll also be destroying beautiful art installations as well as architecturally significant buildings. None of this is a good idea.
163. It was sat to hear the historic swan boats have been sold already. The spa that shouldn't be there, is too large by far. The ads being run by the developers in the papers don't even show the spa! They show areas available to enjoy today, and the architecture that is already there. Why? Because if they showed the spa even more people would be against it.

164. The redevelopment proposal will fundamentally alter an existing site with significant heritage value and character for the worse. It should be scrapped.
165. Use of these lands should maximize the public benefits of its situation in a park space on the shores of Lake Ontario. The province's plans do not do this - these amenities could be successfully offered in any number of other locations.
166. It's a huge glass abomination that has nothing to do with anything meaningful to Ontario or Toronto. There's a complete lack of understanding of reconciliation with Indigenous people. It has nothing to offer that is innovative or interesting.
167. Aside from the Therme spa building, which looked huge and out of place, the rest looks promising.
168. - I am indifferent towards these aspects.
169. Awful. Seriously. Blocks views of the lake. Completely contrary to the spirit of Ontario Place. PLUS, they are planning to demolish the Moriyma Science Centre? What are they thinking. The city should have no part of this.
170. The Therme proposal for the West Island destroys an acclaimed provincial cultural landscape, the glass building / bridge pavilion dominates the entire landscape and does not belong at Ontario Place or anywhere on the waterfront. There is no way to modify this proposal to fit within the landscape of Ontario Place.
171. We do not want the science centre moved. It is fine where it currently is. It's so ridiculous to move it all the way to Ontario place.
172. Under no circumstances should there be a private spa at Ontario place.
173. The scale of the proposed development is massively out of scale with the surrounding environs and will displace/destroy significant landscape architecture.
174. Proposal is damaging the natural heritage of the site and not taking advantage of the existing assets.
175. I saw that the new science centre will be smaller. That makes no sense. Rather invest the insane amounts of money the move will cost and expand the current Science centre.
176. Where are the actual plans? Why is everything being held from the public.
177. The redevelopment proposal of the giant spa--larger than BMO field! --is an eyesore and an affront. We do not need palm trees and indoor playgrounds for well-to-do families on the waterfront. That spa could go anywhere people want to be inside. It should not sit like a hulk on the shore, obstructing sightlines and blotting the waterfront. The proposed walkway to OP site restricts access to paying customers. This, too, is an affront. The character is completely out of keeping with Ontario. The place should celebrate Ontario, not palm trees and German entrepreneurs out to make money.
178. The spa is completely out of touch with the area
179. I am vehemently opposed to building a spa, a giant parking garage, and a new science centre. A science centre at Ontario place will be smaller than the current one, which also happens to be beautiful architectural specimen. Why not just add another new science facility instead of demolishing a wonderful one and cramming it into a new smaller space?
180. The pods and Cinesphere need to be protected and I'm glad that that is happening, but at the same time Ford wants to build a huge domed spa right beside them. That building will overwhelm everything else around it. It looks MASSIVE!!! It doesn't fit in with the current built form at all.
181. 1) It is vitally important that the Therme facility not take up so much space — either in footprint, or in height, in order for it to fit harmoniously on both the West Island, and also the entry building at Lakeshore Blvd. 2) The

original Pods and Cinesphere must absolutely be preserved and refurbished to maintain this iconic architectural heritage.

182. I believe that our public spaces should NOT be monetized, especially in a secret agreement with a private enterprise. I do not believe that public-private partnerships give the most value to the public. The Therme building is too large and imposing for the site. For me, that addition becomes a reason NOT to visit Ontario Place. Why is it a goal to have families spend a day here?
183. I value the pods and Cinesphere. Hope the Science Centre programming can use them.
184. The private Therme spa “wellness centre” is far too large and actually does not belong at all on this valuable natural public land. Ontario Place and its lakefront should offer wellness to all. This proposed private building sets up an us (inside) and them (outside) model. It overwhelms the site and obscures the lake. There is no public benefit in it at all. The Live Nation venue is also too large.
185. I am happy that the original built forms will be maintained. The renderings put forward by Therme are misleading. This structure and character of the Therme spa is out of place in a public park.
186. Do we really want the legacy of Ontario Place, a “landmark destination” as quoted from the presentation, to be a spa? How does a foreign company come in and know the needs, desires, beliefs and values of a city and province without having lived through the history of Ontario Place and all the treasured memories it elicits from people. While this is provincially owned land, the city of Toronto is directly affected by the development and locals, I believe, will not be able to enjoy the property to the full extent, if there are thousands of tourists around.
187. Glad the pods and geo dome are being fixed up finally. Sorry we had to sell the farm to do it. Specifically, what is the plan for the Japanese bell and structure and two small towers? Moriyama architecture is sure taking a hit these days. The spa is a weird Jetson design: perhaps the Therme spa could be more in tune with the landscape and more rustic like Japanese mountain spas. and like other Therme spas. The fat opaque bridge building is horrible. (more greedy grabbing by Therme) Bridges should be light and soar and give you views and light.
188. Bring back nature for the public
189. Looks great, unique but still in the essence of the original OP
190. Ontario Place is only 50 years old and, in that time, has been allowed to deteriorate through a lack of funding for general maintenance and shoreline amelioration. The province of Ontario has not shown it is prepared to provide ongoing funding to maintain the existing built forms and instead has shifted responsibility to Toronto for the major infrastructure proposed projects such as the underground parking garage and bridges. As such, will the redevelopment proposal be sustainable over time? I don't believe the 6,000,000 attendance projections are in the realm of possibility.
191. I think it is a mistake to demolish the current Science Centre. It is designed to fit in the ravine. The new site will not have enough space for the exhibits.
192. Too large for the island, obscures the pods, cinesphere, flattens the West Island. Better placed in Rexdale at Woodbine.
193. I like the continuity of bike trails, and the year-round access. I don't like the “wellness” or the water spa - it could be located anywhere. Our waterfront is precious to us.
194. Unfortunately, I was unable to see the slide show (I think there were some problems with screen sharing by the development team); but I think it would be very unfortunate if the original historical design of Ontario Place was compromised by what is being proposed. I like the way Ontario Place looks now. It has a lot of charm.
195. Moving Ontario place is a terrible idea. Selling Ontario place for foreign investors is a terrible poorly thought out idea. Don't pave the greenbelt.

196. Disaster. Underground parking? Removing 800 trees? Expensive spa that most cannot afford?
197. Love that we will refurbish the Pods and Cinesphere and are considering a children's play area. Fabulous nod to what was and keeping some of our architectural history alive (Toronto has lost so many eras of our building history). But not keen on constructing any more buildings aside from public washroom facilities and small restaurants.
198. Creating a spa is a heinous waste of a location that represents all the history of this city. It's elitist and egregious.
199. The redevelopment proposal is geared to make a profit and does not enhance our values of a caring considerate and climate awareness group. Cutting down trees, encouraging thousands to drive down to the lake is not what's needed in 2023 or going forward
200. I'm glad to see plans to honour and keep the built form, heritage, and character aspects. More of those please; any "private/paid" areas, especially ones that will enrich developers and "business interests" is not what we the public want or need. Trillium Park is wonderful. The wild beach at Ontario Place (where I swim) is wonderful. Expand those character aspects.
201. This is our green space! The past 18 years so many condo buildings went up with no additional green space. During covid OP was a saving grace for many families and pet owners to get a mental break. The proposed 60m high (!) and larger than the BMO Field stadium will ruin the island forever. For the sake of mental health, we need a park we can relax. Budweiser Stage is proposing a larger stadium. What will be left for the public to enjoy for free? Think of work class cities that have large parks, Central Park, Millennium Park. People from outside of Toronto will come to Toronto for a weekend to see a really cool park. Outside art could be permanently installed, young chefs from. George Brown College can cook. So many opportunities.
202. Ontario Place's modern utopian architecture should be treated as any city of Toronto historic property and maintained and preserved. Building a giant glass structure with non-pedestrian friendly roads and parking garages is the antithesis of preserving the iconic features of the site.
203. I love seeing aspects of the old rides on the west end of Ontario place as reminds me of my childhood. It would be nice to incorporate some elements of those structures' spaces into the revised plan. There are so many hidden nooks around Ontario place making it fun to explore for kids and a great running walking trail. It adds to the character of the space. Love the twinkle lights throughout Ontario place, and on the trees, it really adds to the character.
204. The Therme structure is huge and overly tall, overwhelming the rest of the structures on Ontario Place. It cuts visitors off from the lake, rather than inviting them in.
205. The city should keep this redevelopment plan from happening. This is prime real estate that should not be given over to corrupt private interests. Ontario place is an institution.
206. There is no character when a government gives a corporation OUR land and expects taxpayers to subsidize it.
207. Ontario Place should remain largely free to use. It's a travesty that a spa for the rich (that could be placed elsewhere) is taking up beautiful waterfront land in Canada's largest city. It will be a real black-eye on the city for the next century and beyond. A true embarrassment for the province. Regressive in every way.
208. A Monte-Carlo-style mega waterpark does not belong on the site. An educational facility and/or mini-lake-research facility showcasing Ontario's lake ecosystem knowledge and research would be much more appropriate. Also - how is it possible to build five storeys underground on a site that is right beside the lake? That is a multi-million-dollar invitation to a flooding disaster.
209. The proposed Therme mega spa is far too tall, far too sprawling and takes up far too much public land. Its looming structure will be an inescapable eyesore on the waterfront whether you're in the city looking out at the lake or on the water looking back at the Toronto skyline. This hulking behemoth of a spa will dwarf and visually

negate the remarkable Cinesphere and fabulous pods that are the beloved hallmarks of the Ontario Place site. I can't see any connection between the proposed Therme building to the heritage of Ontario or to the purpose of Ontario Place. That said, I'd be interested to know the feedback of Indigenous organizations on this subject as I understand they were consulted regarding the redevelopment plans. I can't help but think that a private spa facility is the opposite of what Ontario Place was created to be.

210. There is no benefit to the public for building a spa at Ontario place.
211. The scale is too large and I don't like that mature trees will be cut down for buildings.
212. We need to keep the original vision of OP as being free and accessible for everyone. Ontario Place is a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significant. The Cinesphere and the pods are elements that we must fix up and keep in any plans for the site.
213. The built form of the proposal, in particular the Therme component is very massive and impactful on the site and waterfront skyline and will trigger a very significant change from the current situation dominated by nature, vegetation and with a well-established character and image including the beautiful view from the West. Based on my visual assessment of the materials presented the Therme proposed building will be 2-3 times the Forum while the "pavilion will be 3-4 times the cinesphere. The "bridge" is also very massive and the entire complex will be so dominant and out of scale with Ontario Place and the surrounding area. The design, borrowing poorly from the "swooshy" style of starchitects like Zaha Hadid is in very stark contrast, overpowering the elegant modernism of Zeidler buildings and will become very quickly obsolete and out of fashion. The careful restoration, revitalization and reuse of the pods and Cinesphere could be done by bringing them in 21st century, focused on sustainability, resilience, eco-design and would result in a reinvigorated, attractive demonstration project for the City and province in face of Climate Change, loss of environment and equity/diversity challenges of our times. In spite of being largely eluded from the sleek renderings the buildings complex will be out of scale for the spaces and people around it, largely inaccessible and hugely unsustainable "in your face" landmark. The impact on the heritage of the site, in particular Hough's wonderful landscape will be huge, triggering a complete change of the site and area character and of the city's identity. What could be an attraction in Dubai will be a huge eyesore in Toronto, completely outside of the spirit of place dominated by nature, people friendly amenities and a certain level of modesty and reserve that characterized Toronto since its inception.
214. The Cinesphere and Pods are beautiful and should be restored. The Therme renderings (which are bound to change substantially, just look at their European facilities) offer a building completely out of character with Zeidler's designs.
215. The Therme building's foot print may be only 50% of the west island area but its impact is much larger. Its footprint is too large and it is too tall. As a result, the public realm space is residual and will feel like leftover space. The perspective drawing shows that the building is an inelegant blight on the waterfront. Ontario Place lands needs a complete master plan. All development applications including The Live Nation Development application and the Science Centre should be reviewed at the same time and none approved until there is a clear and binding design for all.
216. Any construction of new facilities should blend in with the waterfront and the natural features of the shoreline - with trees, grass and water.
217. Ontario Place and the legacy of Michael Hough's design will be endangered by this proposal. Although the plan says it recognizes the cultural value of the Cinesphere and Pods, if realized, Therme's plan will only serve to rapidly gentrify those aspects, rather than revitalize and reanimate them as desirable public attractions. Although Therme's plan cites a line of sight that is still consistent with other immediate landmarks, it cannot be understated that the spa further privatizes all access views of Lake Ontario, by making the most panoramic available only to their clientele. It is also inconsistent with natural heritage goals to have an indoor space with palm trees and other tropical, non-native plants.

218. The built form is too big, not in keeping with environmentally sound construction fit for this space. Keeping the Cinesphere and repurposed pods makes sense. Otherwise let's consider what is needed for now and the future. I do find many people and comments have come out of nostalgia. We should consider our diverse population and the needs of today and the future. The current proposed development does not offer improvements on getting from transit by foot, a problem that is not new. Walking through large parking lots is unpleasant and dangerous at times. Designated walkways with trees and proper signage would help.
219. The height and massing of the Therme buildings are too big for the site. Views to the original Ontario place buildings and Cinesphere are not maintained as they should be and will be dwarfed by both the Therme facility and the enlarged Amphitheatre.

Environment and Sustainability Responses

220. They seem to be disingenuous in their presentation as far as tree relocation and shoreline development.
221. The best environmental strategy, without question, is to BUILD NOTHING. All construction (resource extraction; embodied energy) is problematic if we're being honest. However, I get that the City Planners, I.O. and landscape designers placed great focus and attention on sustainability goals. NO ONE ELSE IS AGAINST "wetland innovation," green roofs or ducks and rowboats in renderings! GREENWASHING does not justify those two large buildings that have NO place on Toronto's waterfront.
222. Fake consultation
223. The Waterfront provides a place of peace for all citizens. There is the opportunity to make it a park that can also absorb extra water during times of flooding or be used to clean the extra stormwater (example a part [of] wetlands, [?] [?] is being built = Jim Tovey lake view conservation area. Also, there are parks in China, [Bangkok] that can be used for recreation + floods. Why do we have to have more concrete on the Waterfront or? Why can't we have a multi use massive park for recreation, concerts + tranquility. Why does Vancouver get Stanley Park and we get a spa?
224. Over all impression is too "groomed" and not enough of natural landscape.
225. Since Therme and LIVE nation are For Profit companies that will make a lot of profit from our public land they should be asked to make free or cheap events for the public IN PERPETUITY. Therme can put their mall and spa anywhere. They have no business being here. In all the slides I haven't seen much for families with various abilities. That's what Ontario Place was.
226. It makes a lot more sense to keep Ontario Place green. Tearing it apart and putting up huge buildings makes no sense. This part of Toronto hasn't got enough access to parks and green space. We need to be able to run around more than we need a spa, condos, shopping mall. That stuff can go anywhere. We do not need it here. With all the slides. They say accessible but I see no wheelchairs or picnic tables. This all looks very inaccessible.
227. There should be NO commercial enterprise other than food + drink concessions in Ontario Place! The spa should be replaced by a bird sanctuary + other natural recreational activities that don't require concrete roads throughout the islands - too much concrete! more parkland!
228. This space should be open to all for free. It should be a green space since we have already lost much of ours in place of condos. BASICALLY; turn this whole Ontario Place project into an Indigenous HISTORICAL Site. Leave it to them to reintroduce their natural
229. Why greenhouse? It will cost so much to heat and cool. Why palm trees? Not very contextually relevant. The spa is huge. Is that necessary? Could it be broken up?

230. Phase the construction of wetlands so that the construction does not destroy habitats. Designate a wetland that will remain untouched while other wetlands are constructed. Once a wetland is destroyed it takes over 10 years for native species to return/rehabilitate the wetland. It is important that existing wetlands are protected.
231. Concern about removal of trees (nature) with replacements that are much younger (canopy?) Concerns about winterization; how might salt affect the local environment? Habitat impact of construction on local species. Light pollution concerns with large glass buildings
232. Impact of glass on birds? Impact of additional car traffic? Noise pollution from spa? Light pollution from glass building - what is the impact? Removing mature trees + replacing with young trees. Should parking be offsite except for those w/ accessibility needs - could reduce congestion + local pollution. Impact of reduction of permeable surfaces.
233. What actions are being taken to ensure the water meets the Toronto recreational water quality standards at the site. How will point source pollution from combined sewer overflow events and sewage bypasses be monitored and mitigated to ensure that public health is protected.
234. The spa is huge and not sustainable and creates a very large environmental footprint (e.g. palm trees, water use, parking garage, cutting down trees). I am for rehabilitation and some landscape design in consultation w/ Indigenous communities. I am strongly against having a spa on the Waterfront in this day and age of climate crisis - even with some of the environmental consultancy that is being done. No spa on the Waterfront! Build it in Rexdale or elsewhere in the city.
235. The environmental sustainability aspects of the Therme Spa are extremely questionable! Costs of heating & cooling & water circulation. New trees do not replace existing forest.
236. DO NOT REMOVE OLD, MATURE TREES (37) - NO SPA. Bird impact. Keep natural environment. Parking garage. Water quality.
237. Require Therme to commit to a long-term landscape management plan to replant any plants that aren't thriving. Focus on infrastructure for active transportation including a cycle hub w bike repair service. Remove the surface parking lot!! Disassemble current buildings and salvage materials --> reuse in new buildings.
238. Concerns about the imbalance of green spaces between the two islands, especially the apparent prevalence of large paved walkways on the west island compared to the current forested areas. How much of the green space on the east island is planned to be public park area (i.e. picnic tables & lawns for lounging) vs viewing only green spaces to allow undisturbed space for wildlife. How will invasive species be managed?
239. Proposed Therme building does not at all seem to be in keeping with sustainable approaches to construction (amount of glass, size and massing, proposed use, etc.). Proposal should adaptively reuse existing buildings where at all possible. Why waste so many resources to build and operate what will be a private use on public land. We are in a climate emergency - we do not need tropical trees in Toronto.
240. Bell from Japanese Canadians 1977... Parking lot & the Gardiner Expy. Ontario Place decommissioned in 2012, why no homeless shelter? Tree replanting? Google Maps Local Guide 6,578 contributions, 68 million
241. Like to [add?] acres underwater habitat. Like that the space is being cleaned up re: contaminated water + landfill
242. Therme expects 10% of users to not drive in. It's a 15-minute walk on a good day from exhibition GO & Ontario line stop. Do you actually believe that? PS: How many Therme and project team folks took public transit/walked/ biked here today?
243. Is there an Environmental Assessment done on the site for the West Island? Re: the areas for wild spaces, naturalized space: how does the water quality affect these sites? Who is cleaning the water? Does the use of the spa support Toronto's green standards? What is the long-term plan for maintenance? How do we protect the site during construction?

244. The public realm must include 100% of West Island. No to Therme, no to spa. Do not destroy Hough's area to build Therme project --> this area must remain public, as public park. Enhance the current landscape. Please go back to drawing board.
245. The spa (Therme proposal) is a giant blob being plopped into the middle of public space. We don't want it. What happens when the private companies built white elephants with public money and then fail?
246. Current proposals involve too much fixed architecture infrastructure not reflective or responsive to natural environment. Parking lot - is terrible idea --> Does not reflect appropriate direction in terms of leadership re: private vehicle. Ontario Line will go here --> No need for cars
247. Nothing really replaces mature trees & all their many benefits. There's a very low success rate for transplants of mature trees. Planting trees is not effective without major funding for tending/replacement of dead trees/insect management/disease prevention etc. Who is going to do this/pay for it? Therme says they will tend they're for 2 years??? And the public area? Birds a concern. Animals driven out by construction. No real belief Therme as planned will meet LEED Platinum standard! Too many parking spaces - traffic safety concerns. Tree selection should not just focus on native plants but prioritize heat resistance and fast growth. Also need conifer for birds in [shoulder] seasons especially. Glass spa - light effect a concern even with glazing to deter bird collisions. Heat island concerns - still too much pavement - need heat mitigation surface treatments such as in Arizona pilot project.
248. 1. I am concerned about the environmental effect on the West Island of building 2,700 parking spots underground. Will it affect the stability of the West Island? 2. Is a 9-storey spa a feasible investment or will it end up being unsustainable economically and going bankrupt and all that will be left is environmental damage.
249. Public funds should not be used to build an underground parking lot on public land for a for profit spa. This is not environmentally sound or sustainable. 800 mature trees will be removed to build a 9-storey private spa. I cannot see how this fulfills the provincial or municipal plan to address environmental challenges that we face. The environmental footprint of an indoor spa, the energy requirements, the upkeep of this structure will be immense.
250. Too much built up space - not enough greenspace on the West Island.
251. Not sustainable and the amount of energy is ridiculous and unrealistic
252. More contiguous green space, too broken up.
253. {Drawing of a sun and two people - 1 taller, 1 shorter - labelled [Name Removed] and [Name Removed] on the left of a vertical line; on the right, two people - 1 taller, 1 shorter, labelled [Name Removed] and [Name Removed]}
254. Year-round access is obviously important. What do the Indigenous groups want to see happen with the space? That should be a key consideration because it's really their land. Public access to upper [?]? How will that work?
255. Sumach's and snake grass & other native flora & fauna instead of non-native plants. Recycled dishes - only 3 access points - you could easily have a dish recycle and redistribution program at Ontario Place. Creative solution for pods - get ROM, AGO, MOCA involved (as well as Science Centre) --> should be a preview of Ontario but ALL of it!
256. [?] **natural** environment - keep trees. Make more beaches - a [serenity] spot in L. Ont. Keep the trees.
257. No removal of mature tree. More public space. More kayak/canoe access.
258. I would like to see the pebble beach at spot #33 and 35 preserved. I use to area in the summer for bonfires & music. I use my bike as my main method of transportation.
259. The rehabilitation of the shoreline is great. We need more wetlands. The spa is a terrible idea. This land should

not be used for the rich & famous. We don't know how much it will cost. Too much for me to go to. Also, the city has a climate plan to {arrow pointing down} car traffic - the building of a over 2100 underground parking does not fit with that plan. Also, my kids grew up using the playground at Ontario Place. It was great. It should be rebuilt.

260. The very idea that a privately owned gigantic 45 m high GLASS building, needing huge energy to heat in winter and cool in summer, not to mention pumping all that spa water in & out, is allowed to be built in a public park, and hundreds of trees removed to do it, is anathema to anyone who cares about the environment.
261. I'm concerned about the amount of trees being proposed to be cut down as part of the redevelopment proposal. Many birds use the West Island. How will as many trees as possible be protected? There are also foxes that make it here. I would still like to see them in the future. I would like to see edible trees and shrubs planted. Thus, I'm concerned about the spa's footprint. Make the spa smaller. That would mitigate the impact on the trees. In Montreal's old port, there is a spa and it is small. It is located with the Expo 67 apartments across the river. Why can't this Therme spa proposal be smaller?
262. Are considerations being given to the inevitability of major storms floods, heavy rains, etc. and how the shorelines especially will withstand that? Geothermal??
263. What is the lease length to Therme? What are the energy costs for heating & cooling such glass buildings? Here in Toronto we have giant buildings that have NOT been built to the specs of the architects (ROM). I wonder what it will ACTUALLY look like that. What the heck does 'engage' with the water mean? It doesn't mean a person can walk into the water.
264. Building a giant glass building full of palm trees in a climate crisis seems foolish and old fashioned.
265. How does the spa - in its grandeur fit in its current environment? Where is Ontario portrayed in this Therme site? It's like a large castle with the [?] commoners to walk around it. Where is the Indigenous component? Is there a sweat lodge? Parking? Why? - Climate change congestion. Too high of a building on the shoreline. How are the current heritage buildings going to be revived?
266. It's a big risk to allocate such a large proportion of the site, + a building of this size, to an unproven concept (spa use in Toronto on this scale, in this place, during the winter, by this demographic). (This isn't Great Wolf Lodge...) -- > what will become of the facility if it isn't economically feasible? What will the province's financial obligation be? Lots of concrete on the west island, + building - not much green - very hard landscape
267. As many mature trees should be maintained as possible. These should only be removed if determined to be in poor health by an arborist (from the City of Toronto). The trees that are being removed because they are "in the way" should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. I would prefer the entire area be left to be renaturalized. I understand that remediation must be necessary due to concerns with flooding, contaminated soil, etc but it is a shame that the Province is not willing to do this without a large-scale private enterprise. The amount of traffic does not seem to promote reaching climate goals. These cars will come, they will create traffic, they will pollute, they will park outside within our neighbourhoods. Ensure adequate recycling facilities around the park. Waste generated by the private facility should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
268. What are the environmental assessment plans for West Island? Having a 2700 parking garage funded by taxpayer money during a climate crisis will take away from the space and move us further from our climate goals. How will you manage sewage for all these people? Who is footing the bill? The bridge is also huge and could take away from feeling public.
269. Accessibility should not be an issue. For those who choose to drive or ride electric charging stations hopefully will be provided. A shuttle system from the GO Train or Transit hubs. No private ownership to be involved! or we will repeat the 407 & Sky Dome experience. More trees. Family exercise stations. Maximize solar & other sustainable energy. Parking to include E.V. charging - 2035 no sale of ICE vehicle. E.V. bike parking secure.

270. Therme & the provinces are bullying the city. Business model is fiction - that spa would be successful in burbs not at O.P. Trillium Park & Toronto Islands another target - hot dogs price-point, not spa this
271. How are people going to be able to access Ontario Place without a car? For decades this has not been addressed. It's supposed to be accessible to all, but unless one drives to the location, it's very tricky to get to, whether by bicycle or transit. Accessible to all solutions: extend Queens Quay streetcar, or have shuttle buses from existing TTC transit lines. Safe place to park bicycles and charging stations for electric bicycles & cars. We heard that Metrolinx will be responsible for last mile transit connections. Their reputation with current projects sucks. The Eglinton [St] project does not bode well for this project.
272. I live in Liberty Village and when there is a heavy rainfall, some areas/condos have some flooding. How will this be addressed in terms of having a huge indoor facility directly on the lake? We already have gridlock in the City during games at Rogers Centre etc., how are you going to prevent gridlock on Lakeshore West, i.e. in my area, LV? The weather is always much colder by the lake - how will you reduce the impact to the environment considering this building will need to be
273. The spa will require the removal of many trees - planting new trees or transplanting. This does not maintain the ecological integrity of the area. The glass will be a hazard to birds. Underground parking undermines our TransformTO climate goals. We need to deprioritize cars.
274. The Therme building seems totally unsustainable - one of the greatest fresh water lakes and we hear buildup + turn people's backs on the lake. The beach seems unsustainable - every small bay facing that direction + isolated on the Toronto waterfront is filled with algae and smelly. The Therme building requires the demolition of animal habitat and trees. Basically, everything about a giant spa is just wrong.
275. Grave concern that the proposal is doesn't include a nature reserve and is instead largely concrete. The proposed underwater 5 storey parking garage is neither sustainable or environmental. It will create traffic entering and leaving the site which cuts across the busy martin Goodman trail - pedestrians, people on bike + other users of this popular trail will be endangered by turning traffic. 2,100 underground parking + 600 surface spaces! [?] entry
276. The spa building is a large green house that needs to be cooled in summer and heated in winter. How does this spend of energy correlate with the city's climate goals
277. I find the tree replacement hard to believe. There are countless studies about the frequent deaths of new tree plantings in urban environments, putting in hundreds of saplings will not necessarily be able to replace mature trees.
278. I believe the West Island development & construction of a parking is environmentally regressive and does not meet our climate goals. Why is soil remediation & shoreline improvement only going to be fixed by Therme? Why wouldn't the government commit to an EA when it's public land?
279. The plan to build to encourage aquatic habitats is exciting. How will Therme be sustainable
280. Take the [louse] for-profit elements out. Therme & Live Nation will make profit at the expense of the public. Why can't everything be done for free? I liked this place better when we could enjoy free.
281. I'm concerned about the removal of many mature trees. The province contends some trees will be transplanted + new ones will be planted. However, newly planted saplings are very different from healthy, mature trees. I'm skeptical that mature transplanted trees would survive.
282. I think the application represents a wonderful synthesis of environmental and sustainability goals in a context of financial responsibility. My heartfelt congratulations to all (private and public) participants who have contributed to date!! I sincerely look forward to the vision becoming a reality. Very exciting!!
283. Sewage - Why is Therme not involved in renewal. Size of the spa relative to the public space. Digging below grade on the waterfront *flooding *climate change *Having the parking lot below grade is a huge potential disaster in the making

284. We are facing a fresh water crisis, I have concerns regarding how much public water a thermal spa will be using. There is often mention of Therme “cleaning the water” without explanation of how and no allotment on the renderings of where that “cleaning” process will happen
285. Public walkways in the winter - how are the snow + ice to be address.? SALT. Lifeguards around the water edge? 24-hour public access will need some form of policing? Washroom security + cleaning! Intimate spaces...? Overnight camping?
286. WE DO NOT WANT THE SPA!
287. FEEDBACK & SUGGESTIONS ISN'T COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
288. Not appropriate. Not feasible. Not accurate.
289. Significant concerns regarding public space. 1. Increasing density of private vehicles which will increase congestion 2. Development of spa which [forms], reflects a European heritage and not reflective of Toronto's multicultural population. Exclusionary by finances, tradition (many groups would not due to cultural/religious traditions) access this space 3. What guarantee are that the public space will be developed as [advertised] and not a mirage to mollify opposition to Therme.
290. Please make it sustainable? I don't know enough about this area.
291. Nothing sustainable about 2000 parking spots - congestion on Lakeshore and Gardiner. It goes against the Exhibition Line & the Green Plan of Ontario. The spa is against **saving** money - building a greenhouse is against our sustainability plan. Why is the only beach for downtown Toronto being moved? The current works well for us all year round.
292. What is the city doing to min. the cost of maintenance and future planning for [avge] flooding/other climate change impacts?
293. The environmental impact of whatever OP becomes should not exceed that of what it was in its heyday. The space should foster activities and recreation that have a low environmental footprint e.g. **slacklining**, rock-climbing, paddling/kayaking. Locations for slacklining over water (“waterlining”) should be created which should not compete with wetland.
294. Changes to the west island & water ways affecting the course --> how will kayak and canoe rentals as well as opening up to water taxis affect water traffic (safety issue) to **already water-users**. Water quality (currently) & **sewage** leaching into a beach --> shouldn't this sewage issue be dealt with **prior** to building? Rooftop sustainability gardens/moss roofs for the **Therme/Science buildings**. Parking lot not in align with city's green effort --> not encouraging green transport (GO/TTC/walking & biking)
295. The current proposal* is a disaster. It should be thrown out & start again with a genuine concern for the environment. *Therme, etc.
296. What happens to the site if the business model fails? Who would be responsible for site demolition + clean-up + remediation if the business fails?
297. We need more of a connection to the natural water. Instead of Therme Spa, why have we not considered a public community centre with public sauna like many Scandinavian countries offer? A public sauna with **beach access** would be a draw for tourism and for local people like myself, being a member of a growing movement of year-round cold plungers and open water swimmers.
298. I want to know how the City is considering the amount of electricity power Therme is going to need to heat these huge glass buildings all winter, if they've assessed the emissions of the massive facility and the vehicular traffic. I love the increased wetlands. I deeply resent the sacrificing of **ANY** public lands to private, for-profit corporations. This is **WRONG**. Let them buy an existing site in the private market. Leave public lands public. Plant more trees, tear out decrepit buildings if needed, but create **more green space**, NOT private Therme massive buildings.

Proposed plan looked more like sidewalks around buildings, not a sense of public park.

299. Shoreline: - Upgraded to be resistant to erosion & flooding & resilient to environmental change - Enabling a high-quality public realm exp. along the shoreline. Water quality - {down arrow} stagnation & {up arrow} circulation include thru opening Trillium Park entrance bridge. Trees: - loss of ~320 mature trees in construction, planting 3,000+ trees. Aquatic Habitat: - short term impacts during construction w/ new habitat added and existing habitat enhanced for the long term. Animal + fish; 113 species. Erosion + flood. Poor water quality. Mature tree canopy. Parking space + accommodation at waterfront promenade. Trees preservation - Trees must be moved (not cut) from west side of Ont. Place (i.e. Trillium Park) - cannot add more trees and saplings; concern tree mortality & cost \$. Birds + trees are conducive. Who is invasive species? e.g. insects - animal habitat. Leave an Ont. Place? --> //Accessibility for Disabilities Ont. Act? - glass walls w/ holes & coating to prevent bird collisions {therefore} bird design - under layered parking. - need for water taxis? - healthy ecosystem (native species, planting of both mature & young trees, habitat diversity) - {therefore} {does not equal} climate goals, when building constructions & energy infrastructure interferes Ont. Place habitat.
300. The people living in Toronto NEED access to natural settings on waterfront and the West Island presently offers that! Its natural beauty will be destroyed with the proposed spa ... leave the beach where it is! STOP THE PROPOSED ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER.
301. Much of the redesign is awesome. The big issues are the size of the spa. Why is it so BIG? What marketing evidence is there that this spa will be what Toronto citizens (+Ontario) want? This is public land, what is the nature of the Therme lease? For how long, how much are they paying to lease the land? What if it fails? Traffic is a huge issue. Lakeshore Ave is already a parking lot. With increased activity at the lakeshore in general (Exhibition) how will this new spa + concert venue affect traffic in the area? As a local resident, it's already horrendous. Plus - Pollution - Air Quality issues. Physical manifestations of Haves vs Have Nots? Where is the environmental assessment? Is it climate friendly?
302. April 15, 2023 the proposed construction of a large building and underground parking on Toronto's waterfront is short-sighted, unimaginative, and reckless. As a licensed architect in the province, I say stop building huge structures on the urban shores of Lake Ontario! Toronto is the most populous city upon the Great Lakes, the largest group of freshwater lakes on Earth. Privatizing Ontario Place is unconscionable. What's more, we Torontonians share this land and water with many others: visitors and new-comers; local and migratory birds and insects; fish, amphibians, and reptiles; wild and domesticated mammals; plants and fungi, etc. We need to protect what is right in front of us from capitalism's blind spots. Not just for the sake of other species and environmental tokenism, but as a way of becoming truly innovative in our approach to sharing and enjoying open space. Exceptional places are not made even better by adding more and more stuff. [Name removed]
303. I think that there needs to be more acknowledgment of how much the land is crumbling around Ontario Place. I remember concerts being cancelled because the site has flooded so badly. I liked that Therme's plans talk about reinforcing the shoreline
304. The consult did not share how the Therme spa would impact the environment. The implication today was that the sliver of public space landscaping would be sustainable, but never mentioned how a massive spa with chlorinated pools would impact Ontario Place and the surrounding waterfront.
305. The lack of an EA for the West Island is beyond negligence, it's an outright sham. Get real.
306. Lake Ontario water quality must be protected and restored at Ontario Place shoreline. The CSO location in Humber Bay must be monitored and reported on in real time. Maybe big red light can be installed and go off when sewage discharged into Lake. Infrastructure work should be planned and funded to fix combined sewer overflows in area. West Island connections to lake must be improved to ensure accessibility for all users and not just good swimmers. Accessible design and structure should be planned for waterfront
307. I have serious concerns about the proposed Therme project (bird migration, sustaining an underground garage, the energy need to keep the spa going)

308. I don't see a for profit enterprise and an increase in parking as part of any credible sustainability plan.
309. We need a complete environmental assessment of the project the proposal does not respect the site or its history.
310. Mega Spa on the waterfront is a horrible idea. Bad for migratory birds, and lets be real where is all of the chemicals and runoff going to end up? Therme is also trying to weasel their way out of an Environmental Assessment of the west island.
311. The city should protect unique environment at Ontario place as province has no intention of doing so.
312. Why would the City ever think of allowing this project to go forward? It is not sustainable (the Therme proposal has unrealistic attendance projections) and the parking garage is an environmental travesty.
313. I am happy the trees will be replanted
314. Ontario Place needs to be kept as a park and free waterfront and beach access for old trees, birds, wildlife and people to enjoy outdoor space next to water with no buildings and absolutely no cars or parking that will pollute and ruin a natural habitat.
315. What are the sustainable initiatives being taken for site maintenance of public spaces? Are uses of recycled materials for construction. Are initiatives being taken to reduce carbon footprint generation on site, such as concession stand compostable/reusable materials. What are the real-world expectations of foliage restructuring? Replanting of existing rooted foliage is volatile and
316. LEED Platinum is a good target
317. More reef and wetlands. Fish habitat is good tell us more about this please. I did not know that the original beach was on the west. Tell me more about that.
318. There is nothing sustainable about a government spending \$400 million to build a parking lot. Not only is driving absolutely not sustainable but that is money that could go towards green initiatives. This whole consultation process has been a joke and somehow, I have even less confidence than when it started.
319. They are insufficient. If this is to go through there should be a full environmental assessment. Anything less is an attempt to sweep the consequences under the rug.
320. There is so much potential for the West Island to provide valuable habitat for migratory birds and other wildlife. This potential will be squandered if the space is surrendered to build a mega spa.
321. How much pollution will the spa create? How is the glass ceiling of the spa going to be energy efficient?
322. My primary concerns are with the scale of the Therme development, the excess glazing, the microclimates, out of place with the Ontario context, and the huge underground parking allowance allocated for a projected 10% of visitors arriving by car. Please prioritize visitors coming on foot, by bike, or by public transit.
323. No sustainability in a 500million concrete parking garage and a natural gas sucking heater for a pool. No spa. No private company takeover.
324. Y'all are wasting a historic opportunity to provide public green space in a city devoid of it. It's demoralizing
325. Redevelopment should prioritize re-naturalizing, and should place sustainability at the forefront. This includes minimizing impact on the local wildlife, maintaining or increasing the tree canopy, and not building large buildings, parking lots, or giant spas.
326. We don't need a car park. It's an accessible TTC and biking area. It's my local area and the traffic is already bananas around here, it's terrible for the air quality. We need fewer cars on the road.

327. I do not want a private corporation being responsible for the maintenance of this public space. This is not proprietor for ensuring environmental integrity of the space or its sustainability.
328. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the West Island development. There are many unknowns: what is the impact of the proposed lake filling activities on the water quality? On the wildlife, on the soil quality, on the currents, etc? Does a pay for use spa justify lake filling? I am also concerned about the environmental impact of construction of such a massive structure and the potential destruction of many mature trees. I am very concerned about the energy that will be required to run such a massive building which is intended to have tropical temperatures. I am also very concerned about the massive parking structure which prioritizes car traffic over other climate friendly means of transportation.
329. Who is conducting the environmental impact study of the project
330. This is an absolutely horrible idea. Removing the natural waterfront and environment for a mega spa, which will be used mostly by people outside Toronto. So, cars driving in and parking. There is zero concern for environmental sustainability on behalf of these plans. It is just all about what Ford wants.
331. Would love to know why a large, underwater parking lot is proposed to be built (using tax dollars for a private business) when that site is allegedly going to have good transit access? If we're serious about climate change we need to make it less about car storage. Also, seems like having enormous glass buildings won't be as good for the environment as a park with mature trees and birds.
332. A disaster - more parking, more traffic, destruction of public naturalized recreational space
333. This proposal completely destroys what is, frankly, a public asset. To change public space into a park there should be meaningful public consultation FIRST, as opposed to some opaque arrangement/lease between the province and a developer. This is prime land and a PUBLIC asset, not an asset that two-bit politicians should feel entitled to trade on. The city clearly doesn't want a spa on the lake. This is a waste of space. And in no event should this sweetheart deal, which I believe should be thoroughly scrutinized given the fiduciary relationship politicians have towards the public insofar as they are stewards of public assets, be publicly funded.
334. I am not confident in the ability of new replacement trees to survive and thrive in an urban environment. Countless studies have shown that replacement trees are not successful at truly replacing older mature trees in urban environments and new developments. I would like to see a greater effort to protect more of the existing trees.
335. No private development, keep the trees, make the whole park green and accessible to the public. Leave the ecosystem alone.
336. No spa on public land
337. Environmental and sustainability issues relate to all three of the break-out discussions yesterday. The presentation mentioned flood concerns more than once, yet the plan also includes a 5-storey underground garage. This is on the shore of the lake! We know that the condos by the lake in Toronto have had trouble with flooding in underground garages, and Harbourfront garage, which is only 2 levels underground, often has some flooding (as told to me by people who have experienced this). What of the environmental impact of the construction and materials necessary to build such a large garage and make it waterproof? A failure of any component during and after construction would be catastrophic to the lake.
338. The proposal does not encourage an equitable, sustainable and environmentally progressive use of Toronto's public waterfront lands. The proposal encourages automobile use instead of environmentally sound and sustainable transit options and pedestrian friendly urban design. The energy consumption of this proposed facility is of concern.
339. I'm opposed to my tax dollars building a parking lot for a private company

340. No spa, no 5-level parking garage thank you.
341. The artist's renderings of the spa show a large glass box with a huge volume. In the summer, the glass will probably act like a greenhouse. In the winter, my understanding is that glass isn't the best insulator. I imagine it will require a tremendous amount of energy to cool and heat it. Couple that with the chopping down of hundreds of trees to make way for it, and, while I have no expertise in the area, so I might be wrong, it sounds like it has an atrocious carbon footprint. There is also the question of what the structure will do to migrating birds that pass through the area and other species that currently make a home there. All in all, the project probably is a huge mistake environmentally.
342. The most environmentally sustainable development on the Ontario Place lands is dense, affordable, transit-oriented housing that offers alternatives to car-oriented sprawl.
343. This is bad for the environment. It should be built elsewhere. Cutting trees and losing habitat will be devastating to wildlife. The garage is a huge waste of money and will create traffic issues.
344. We don't need a new spa to suck up more freshwater.
345. The presenters mention the views to the island from the Lakeshore trail but I can't see how that will be possible with the gigantic Entrance building and spa building blocking the view of the island as well as the Heritage pods and cinesphere. The presenters say that the 800 + trees will be transplanted - I am deeply concerned as the success rate is very limited for mature trees with extensive root systems and they are likely to suffer fatal shock so this is not a viable solution. Its difficult to justify the removal of these 800+ trees for the sake of a commercial building on public parkland. There will be a huge environmental impact on potential erosion, carbon release and other greenhouse gases not to mention the tragic loss of habitat for many species. Also, the planned botanical flora and fauna building does not belong on a Great Lake in Ontario. There is nothing that celebrates our province with those plants. The massive glass structure will impact on light pollution, ice build up, risk to migratory birds and will have a huge carbon impact. The underground parking will have a huge environmental impact - there is the incredible cost to build it, potential for flooding will require a special pumping system operating all the time - what will the energy costs associated with that be? Just trying to keep water our is likely to overload our stormwater and sewer system, there will be the added environmental costs of transporting a disposing of excess soil. The massive number of cars coming and going from this parking lot will create a negative traffic effect contributing to an already over capacity Lakeshore Blvd during the many events that occur in the city as well as just the regular rush hour traffic - think of the extra air pollution and who will pay for the ongoing maintenance of the underground parking? This parking lot also defies the city and provincial planning policy that stresses public transport over private vehicles.
346. Removal of 850 trees alone makes the project a non-starter. Added to the expansive parking in the plan which would bring too many cars and the net effect is a carbon big foot. The changing lake levels of recent years call into question the below ground parking plans. What if there's a flood?
347. The proposal will harm the environment. It requires the removal of dozens of decades old trees, and involves an ill-advised public subsidy for hundreds of underground parking spots. This is fiscally and environmentally reckless and makes a mockery of the city's supposed commitment to fighting climate change.
348. The redevelopment focus should be on developments that do not remove any parkland or natural spaces but rather increase the amount of parkland and natural spaces with a focus on protecting the waterways.
349. Sewage; traffic on Lakeshore measurements current & projected
350. Transforming Ontario place into the private commercial enterprise is counter to its origins as a public space for all, environmentally disastrous as it is. Grounded on car access and most importantly a short-sighted pillaging of a public social asset of all to transfer its value to the social sphere. It reeks of political insider dealings with political supporters

351. The redevelopment proposal will provide positive environmental benefits to the area. Ontario Place's grounds, especially the West Island are in need of revitalization. I like the proposed bridge to on the east side that will help with the flow of water and the creation of new wet lands on the grounds. Increased landscaping and park space will also support the built environment and provide more green spaces. While the amount of parking may seem like a large number, it is a reasonable number given that it accounts for overlapping use of facilities across the grounds.
352. \$400 million would be better spent on affordable housing, education, and better waste management in the city. NOT a "spa" for those that can't afford it or tourists.
353. This proposal to privatize one of the premier parks in a dense and greenspace-deprived areas, helping to blunt the impact of being next to countless lanes of soot-spewing roadway, is beyond irresponsible. No parts of the park should be further privatized, and the hundreds of millions being offered to private no-tender corporations should be used to perform actual sustainable renewal of the park.
354. 1.) It's FOR PEOPLE. NO admission fees, no spas, FOR PEOPLE (not rich ones, though they can come too of course). 2.) improve TTC access to it. 3.) No, of course do not take the Science Centre away, pretend you are going to build affordable housing instead, and wreck the city even further than you and your predecessors have done. Build the housing ANYWAY and open the wretched subway station. Open them AS THEY'RE BUILT, not waiting for the last one. You can have a mini-outdoor science centre at Ontario Place. 4.) FOR THE PEOPLE 5.) FOR THE PEOPLE
355. My concern in this regard is the destruction of existing trees and the ecological disaster of building a huge building/parking lot for a business that looks like a ridiculous fad.
356. In terms of environmental impact and sustainability, the proposal is a disaster and a non-starter. It wipes out a huge chunk of natural space with hard structure that requires a massive amount of support from parking to materials loading etc. Terrible plan for energy costs, harm from bird strikes. It is just unending. Even the publicly-accessible spaces are being over-developed to require a ton of ongoing support - supposedly from the profits off the spa (really a casino). Creation of the new beach is a terrible idea because - as pointed out at the meeting - it is windward and will require constant garbage removal, etc. The private operation is not sustainable. As a spa it will fail and then it is an economic disaster. If built, the damned thing will have to end up a casino, and a casino can be on any land-locked parking lot or brownfield with a hundred floors of affordable housing in the air space above.
357. The property is on the lake and with the increasing density of high-rise apartment/condo dwellers in the City there is a greater need for open green spaces. Ontario Place is an ideal spot. This should be free and accessible to all people who live in Toronto as well as in the province. It is important to preserve as many trees as possible and to decrease the amount of hard surface paved areas on the site. There needs to be lots of plantings and increasing habitats for birds and wildlife. The "sustainability" of the proposed spa is very bad as it is all glass so would take a lot of energy to heat and cool. It also would need huge supplies of water to function (pools, cleaning, flushing etc) even if there is plan to recirculate this also requires energy. It also does not reflect the province of Ontario or showcase our province with palm trees instead of the many native mature trees that are in that spot now. The idea of storeys of underground parking goes against all the recent principles of trying to decrease private car use and use public transit. Eventually this will be close to the Ontario Line as well as it is now served by GO and TTC close by. A better solution would be to run some type of shuttle from the station in the CNE and not increase parking.
358. Thanks to City and other staff who worked to gather public input on the redevelopment proposal. I have read in the media (CBC) that over 800 trees are to be destroyed through this proposal. I was therefore surprised to hear the provincial representatives and consultants working for Therme state that only 370 mature trees will be removed. When we dug a little deeper into this statement during the breakout session, it was explained by City reps that many more than 370 trees will be removed, but that these additional trees are not considered "mature". In the interests of clarity and transparency I believe that the provincial representatives and consultants should have provided the total number of trees to be removed (e.g. "800 trees, 370 of which are mature trees") otherwise their statement risks seeming disingenuous. I do understand that new trees will be planted, but there will not be much space for tree coverage on the West Island which will be dominated by the spa. Clearer figures on tree

coverage specific to the West Island are needed. Also, I was unable to get any specifics at the breakout session on how the Therme spa will protect migratory birds, other than the very general statement that they will meet City of Toronto bird friendly guidelines.

359. No to the spa and Doug ford corruption. He want a casino!
360. Seems backwards that in the face of environmental issues this plan includes a 5-level underground parking garage.
361. I am a human, and thus part of the environment. This whole process is a snow job! Public consultation my — The province will do whatever it wants, no matter what the public thinks or says.
362. The City of Toronto Planning Report is very clear on this point. Although some modest assessments have been done, much more significant testing of this proposal needs to be done. The report also raises many other questions including water and wind flow and inadequate water and sewage supply to the planned structure on the west island. I support the Report on these issues.
363. I had concerns around the moving of the beach location from where it is -> West Promenade side. And would like transparency around where we source quarry material to put in fillings (provincial environmental standards?). Moving of mature trees is especially detrimental to the trees themselves and the tree ecosystem that they used to belong to - please reconsider
364. I am absolutely opposed to the development of the waterfront for tourist, recreational, corporate, or building projects that compromise the land, water, and habitat in this ecologically significant area of Toronto. As far as I can tell, there are no measures of environmental sustainability in the proposed project.
365. The fact that no environmental assessment is being conducted since the lands are being leased to a private corporation is outrageous. In any case, the proposal is obviously disastrous from the viewpoint of environment and sustainability, insofar as (as per the staff report) the “proposed building requires removal of the majority of the Michael Hough designed landscape heritage attributes on the West Island, including removing original water features and their shoreline typologies, removing all mature trees and naturalized surroundings”. On top of all this environmental destruction, the 5-storey underground parking garage (installed in landfill... seriously?) can be anticipated to eat huge amounts of money and energy to prevent flooding and/or collapse; the ginormous glass-enclosed building will take huge amounts of energy to heat, not to mention being a bird death-trap , and no doubt there will be serious impacts from treating massive quantities of chlorinated water and pumping it on out into Lake Ontario. Those are my comments. My question to the City is: what are you doing to stop this insane project from happening?
366. The development is not in keeping with the current focus of residents of Toronto and Ontario for water ways, wetlands, lakes to be free of development and curated to protect species whose habitat would be jeopardized by this development. The City of Toronto is obligated because of its position on Lake Ontario and role as capital city to be a model of environmental stewardship.
367. The city’s approach to the public realm I trust. I’m confident that staff will due diligence and consult with environmental professionals and qualified city staff to do it right and incorporate native and indigenous aspects for a truly wonderful public place. Sustainability is paramount for future generations and maintenance. It should represent Toronto and Ontario all in one. Be a jewel of the city and province. The elephant in the room is the Therme proposal - it does not belong.
368. We don’t want the mega spa
369. This initiative does nothing to serve the residents of Toronto. Its a terrible idea
370. The proposal did not tell me anything about the environment or its sustainability, by digging into Google I was further distressed.... a huge pavilion with multiple activities and many restaurants should require sophisticated

sewage disposal (proximity to “swimming “beaches....and who are the signatories of the lease. [Name Removed] or [Name Removed] or Diamond Schmitt or team [Name Removed] or [Name Removed] , or ,or ,or..who are they how do they survive where is their income or do they subsist on pray and water vapor..on the Ontario government side who are the signatories ????

371. I like that they are creating a wetland and aquatic habitat. I also like that they will be planting so many trees and plants and that they will be native to the island. The current species are invasive and overgrown.
372. The spa seems to have taken all reasonable steps to protect the sustainability of the local environment. No concerns.
373. I am concerned about the loss of trees with the proposed development as I understand it. We need more nature given that we are losing green belt lands.
374. No spa! keep it public! reinvest in what is there from a PUBLIC perspective. access to the lake and this land is so finite, we can't have it become private for only rich people to attend. the people of Toronto don't want this!!!
375. How are animal and bird populations going to be impacted. Where are Torontonians supposed to go for natural space. Will the post public environmental space be reallocated elsewhere?
376. This plan is environmentally awful for light pollution and bird migration. Sustainability issues are extremely concerning, as added traffic, waste generated, energy used and the green space lost by this development will be costly for many decades to come. This is a very disappointing direction for our city to take during the climate crisis.
377. There is too much parking in this proposal. The correct amount of parking should be 0. The only vehicle access should be for delivery or maintenance vehicles.
378. Have species who currently call this land home been considered? How will emissions of construction and facilities be limited? How will surfaces be considered in flood management and watershed protection (i.e. adding more hard surfaces rather than natural surfaces)?
379. How does this support Toronto's climate goals? How does this all glass building not pose a threat to migratory birds?
380. my main concern and interest is the benefit of nature for human health, be it physical, mental, social and spiritual and for improved general urban health. As Toronto built density, especially more residential units, the amount of green open space to counterbalance the higher density, needs to be the key design element. So, the proposed increased built density is simply counter productive to improving the overall urban health of our waterfront. Last, the Science Centre could actually include an experiential exhibit on the benefits of nature for health and stress management with a restored green open space on the West island vs. increased built-form and reduced public access. The additional mainland park space is just a direct benefit of building a subway and therefore reducing the need for car-based transportation and infrastructure. Specific questions: 1.) City vs. Provincial land? - is there any map of the City owned land vs. Province owned land? - What is the % of city land vs. provincial land? 2.) Green space on the Islands? - Currently what is the coverage % of green space vs. built space? - With the current application, what will be the ratio open public land vs. built? 3.) Transportation: - why do we need 500 parking spots underground if a subway station is there? - is there a by-law about this - i.e. reducing car-based traffic esp. when major public transit? 4.) West island? - What is the current built coverage vs. green space? - What will be the new built coverage? The tree removal? reduction of public access?
381. Excited to see marshland restoration and creation of a beach. What will be done to ensure the water is safe to swim in?
382. I think the environmental and sustainability proposals. But I'd like to see MORE of that on the west island. Half

of the island is not enough. Less private building/spa - that building size should be reduced. Also - are we considering noise levels coming from LiveNation for the environment's sake? Noise mitigation was noted in the meeting but I hope there is heavy consideration for this to be taken seriously.

383. This project should also target CO2 neutral certification
384. How is flora and fauna affected by the large-scale construction. The announcement today also referred to science centre and Budweiser stage being built. There is no respite for years to come!
385. Leaving as much of the west island as possible as green land is ideal. A large glass tower will confuse birds. We want a space that does not require tremendous maintenance efforts to keep in tact.
386. The Swimming pier is on the west side of the park, by the Mimico WWTP. The water quality of Sunnyside Beach is already terrible because of the treatment plant, why is there a whole swimming pier on that side?
387. I am concerned that the redevelopment will cause harm to the waterfront. It is essential that developments do not disrupt the habitat of species that occupy these spaces. If anything, Ontario Place should have more parkland than it currently does.
388. A spa, especially of that size, is not necessary. Make all the lane public.
389. They failed to address how you can consider an indoor waterpark with palm trees a sustainable development. As well any underground parking next to a lake (one of the largest in the world) is not something that can be sustainably done not to mention the plethora of other parking lots in the area including the surface lot in the east.
390. The new park design shared in the session were lovely; however, maintaining the refreshed parkland with an increased visitor volume is going to be expensive. Parks, Forestry and Recreation is already underfunding. How will the City maintain the parkland? Will they receive help from the Province? With the amount of food vendors suggested for the Ontario Place what will the City do to prevent single use packaging from entering the Lake? Will the food vendors be required to serve their food in reusable containers? How will the City and the Province protect the Chimney Swifts and Swallows nesting in the buildings and structures? These are threatened birds - will their habitat be replaced on the islands?
391. So much of the proposed redevelopment is interesting, exciting and impressive,,, however the presence (inserting) in Therme is utterly confusing. Environmental impact,,, this structure makes no sense. This Spa does not add to the sustainable needs in the long term. We don't need a HUGE SPA on this park land! The building is so totally not fitting into this park which is a public park . A private facility taking up 50% of the West Island is just so wrong!
392. What environmental assessments are required and who has done them to date? The large underground parking lot and number of people coming with cars will add more pollution, smog, highways. How is this moving Toronto to a more sustainable future?
393. Increased amount of naturalized landscape on the east island sounds good. On the West Island however, the proposed towering glass buildings filled with palm trees year-round really represents the opposite of a proposal that demonstrates sound environmental principals and sustainable land use. The redevelopment should keep more open space for passive recreation outdoors.
394. The giant parking lot will induce unnecessary driving and generate unneeded concrete waste.
395. Putting in the Therme spa will be a detriment to the local environment - the waterline there is currently home to a variety of bird species, some that are fairly rare! I counted 15 different bird species living there, utilizing the habitat, and they will all be out of a home if the redevelopment proposal goes ahead. The tall glass walls of the spa do not take into account bird-friendly architecture, and will result in fatal window collisions killing many birds passing through the area. Not to mention that the demolition and building of a large spa and a gas-

powered parking garage will be horribly unsustainable, given we're in the middle of a climate crisis.

396. The Therme development proposal on the west island is unnecessary and not in line with environmental or sustainability goals of the city. There are many improvements that can be made that would align with environmental and sustainability goals without adding any a large spa to the area. There could be a much more creative use of this space that is informed by actual citizens of the city of Toronto.
397. The size of the spa complex and concrete underground parking is anti-environmental. The location of the spa doesn't seem optimal for getting to by the majority of people in Toronto & GTA. It should be further north for more access. And a private company is not guaranteed to continue in the future, where a publicly-funded complex can be secure in the future.
398. The West Island should remain a public park, with regular programming such as the InFutures exhibit held in 2016. I have deep concerns about the loss of open space in our increasingly dense city, the carbon footprint of the proposed parking lot, and the environmental impact of the proposed spa itself.
399. The spa and other buildings are not respectful of the shoreline park situation and rather than complementing the environment they will create an artificial environment divorced from the natural context.
400. This proposal has outsized environmental impacts and is not sustainable. The carbon involved in just building the parking garage is outrageous, not to mention encouraging driving on already clogged roadways. It should be rejected on these grounds alone.
401. From photos I've seen online of the Therme Spas elsewhere in the world, most of the time it looks like total chaos with their large pools looking like cavernous airport terminals masquerading as natural environments packed with people... and many reviews point to a lack of sanitation at the various facilities. Is this what we really need at Ontario Place? It appears that you can't even bring in your own water into these Therme facilities nor do they have water stations. Bottled water seems the norm. Really environmentally friendly? I don't think so. And how much energy will the spa use, to heat their waters and saunas if they expect 3,000,000 visitors a year? Alternate energy was never mentioned. This would be a great opportunity to utilize new construction tech and carbon capture initiatives. I didn't hear anything about this.
402. I like the investments into the park, shoreline, trails and vegetation. I like investments into extending the Martin Goodman trail. I like the development of a public beach. I like added connections and improving existing connections from the mainland to the island. This will help pedestrians access the park. I like removing existing surface parking lot. I strongly disagree with the introduction of 3000 new underground parking spaces. This would be extremely expensive to build in an area that already has far too many surface parking lots already. We should be investing in walking, biking and transit instead (especially considering proximity to GO and other spaces like BMO, Budweiser Stage, Exhibition)
403. I think this is a terrible idea--a spa is a huge waste of energy and paving over parkland to build parking lots is just insane.
404. The Therme proposal + 2700+ car space parking garage do not represent contemporary practices of sustainability / low-impact development. A gigantic enclosed glass structure with tropical plants at a year-round temperate of 32+ degrees do not reflect sustainable practices.
405. We do not want the science centre moved. It is fine where it currently is. It's so ridiculous to move it all the way to Ontario place.
406. Under no circumstances should there be a private spa at Ontario place.
407. Building a mega-spa and associated massive concrete parking structure - at a location where rapid transit is being developed to no less - is contrary to the environmental goals of the city. Needed ecological improvements to the area could be made without this massive white elephant.

408. I would like to see a stronger focus on natural parkland and not the additional construction.
409. My biggest problem is with moving the science centre. In terms of environments impact, the constriction of the new space will surely impact the environment.
410. We know this has a terrible environmental impact, why can't we stop it? Why are most details of spa private? This is our public land.
411. I am concerned about the loss of old growth trees on the OP site, the restricted access to public space, the dangers to the shoreline, wetlands, and ecosystems. I would like to know that a full environmental sustainability has been launched for the OP plan. I would also like to know if there has been any meaningful Indigenous Consultation about land use and "development," following Indigenous-led principles and celebrating millennia of land use on the waterfront. Indigenous-led collaboration for vision and planning is essential.
412. The spa causes unacceptable environmental damage to the existing park, and will be a disaster for the wildlife e.g. birds in the area
413. Building a gigantic parking garage is totally at odds with supporting the environment and sustainability. What a joke! That will encourage people to drive to Ontario Place from near and far, just adding to the vehicle pollution and traffic congestion to and from and within the city. Also, the slide on the Tues meeting that showed what the new Ontario Place would look like seemed to have a very big area dedicated to "ride share" drop off. The city's cowardice to regulate or limit things like Uber and Lyft has resulted in years of extra clogged roads and excess car pollution, and now there's a proposal for a large space the cater to them, which will again encourage that use instead of public transit, which needs ridership. Demolishing the current science centre and building condos in that ravine will have a harmful environment impact in the Thorncliffe area. Also, you wouldn't need to do a green roof on the spa building if there was no spa building! It could be park space, urban gardens, etc!
414. That huge ass spa is going to take over most of the West Island, ruining many trees in the process. The glass domes will kill birds that migrate over the lake. That's not very environmentally friendly. Also, how sustainable is this place in the long run? What if nobody goes to it, and it shuts down because it doesn't make money? Then what? Why don't you turn the West Island into a full park, free for the public? Our waterfront should not be sold off to private developers.
415. What assurances will there be that water quality will be safe enough for swimming? Part of the current popularity of the beach on the south side of the West Island is that it's consistently cleaner than other west-end city beaches, probably because it's that much further out and away from sewer outflows, etc?
416. This site is located near several transit options. There should not be that many parking spaces. It is excessive given that we need to reduce our reliance on vehicles.
417. It was clear that a sufficient EA has not been done, particularly given that many large trees full of stored carbon would be replaced by saplings. Nor was there any regency to the ecosystem impact of the Therme building and activities.
418. This project will have a huge negative environmental impact. The construction of a spa building which will require huge amounts of energy to construct and maintain, never mind the huge amount of greenhouse gases emitted during construction. Little thought has been given to the environmental costs of this project. An entirely outdoor themed park would solve this problem.
419. If the West Island will be completely dedicated to a spa, where will that green space be displaced to in the city? What will the impact on animals and birds be? What has the research and surveys shown with respect to the short- and long-term environmental impacts (increase in carbon emissions from additional traffic, loss of habitat). The proposed allotted parking spaces is not in line with local, provincial, nation and international efforts to reduce carbon emissions and promote alternative methods of transportation. While the proposed green space redevelopment is very beautiful, how can this still be achieved without the influence of private companies? What

were the other options and proposals on the table?

420. The spa building and all the ancillary buildings it has greedily grabbed is way too big. If you want to design a building that is ridiculous in a time when we are supposedly committed to reducing our carbon footprint then this is it: Huge glass structure on landfill with massive water and energy needs. And it is an excellent migrating bird killer as well; bonus points for that. And every time a developer says they will replace mature trees with many better trees I see the little spindly saplings that barely last 2 years.
421. There are exactly zero sustainable aspects. This is a natural space owned by all of us that needs to be protected not destroyed by parking lots and restricted to only the rich friends of Ford
422. I think it's great that you're anticipating only 10% of visitors would be using cars as mode of transportation. Just want to mention that for this to be true there will be a need for incentives for people to use public transit (i.e. reliable ttc service and convenient stops at OP), bike (wide, smooth bike lanes), and walk (widen lanes on lakeshore, efficient crossings). Not just inside OP but in the areas feeding into it.
423. The landscape design and shoreline redevelopment are well thought out and appear to meet environmental and sustainability standards required to revitalize this valuable waterfront site.
424. I am concerned about both the environmental impact of demolishing the current Science Centre and also the increased congestion of having it moved downtown to the Ontario Place site
425. The design seems thoughtful
426. Not very thoughtful approach to having a large spa on an island on a lake in the centre of the city.
427. I feel that the spa building is much too large. It will obstruct the path of bird migration.
428. I am concerned about the scale of the proposed development and the anticipation of 6 000 000 visitors (which was the figure quoted in last night's presentation). What will the implications be for migratory birds and for wildlife? As well, what are the environmental implications of having a spa and all sorts of other amenities on the waterfront? I am concerned about pollution, garbage, traffic congestion and increased carbon emissions in that area.
429. Moving Ontario place is a terrible idea. Selling Ontario place for foreign investors is a terrible poorly thought out idea. Don't pave the greenbelt.
430. The site should be a park with natural and local plants and trees. This will contribute to climate resilience. There should not be much parking since it will be next to transit.
431. Not eco or sustainable. Focus on cars and commercialism. Embarrassed to see these ideas from 1950s
432. We should be setting the example of environmental standards at this point in time. We have an opportunity to be a leader here. Our waterfront should be protected for future generations. It does not need a gigantic glass building that requires a tonne of infrastructure - from energy requirements to parking to the amount of chemicals required to treat the pools, etc. No matter how the glass is treated, it is still an impediment and danger to migrating birds. In the presentation, a lot of time was spent talking about the landscape architecture around the building (which has a lot of potential), and about the new trees that will be planted - all to off-set the building's impact. But the time is over for talking about off-setting damage. We don't need to build it in the first place. The attendance targets are astronomical - and really, completely unrealistic - what is going to happen to this building when it sits empty?
433. Moving in the right direction
434. The waterfront is being overdeveloped as it is. Leaving a small plot for public use is unacceptable for both the people and the wildlife of the area.

435. Please do not give up the land which the City owns. It is regrettable that a massive underground parking lot is scheduled by the Province when our climate will suffer.
436. Some of the landscaping and revitalization of the park areas look nice, but it seems like there is a true environmental assessment lacking for the project as a whole. I don't see how a huge glassed-in spa building and 5-storey underground parking garage do anything but undermine environmental and sustainability goals.
437. My concern is the threat the proposed buildings at Ontario Place pose to migratory birds and birds that call the park home. The Therme buildings are uniquely dangerous to birds by way of their design and location. These massive greenhouse-like structures situated on the north shore of Lake Ontario requires additional measures beyond the minimum requirements set in the Toronto Green Standard to keep birds safe. The Standard only mandates that 85% of the first 16m of glass is treated with bird friendly glazing. This is inadequate for the Therme buildings that are proposed to be 45m in height, more than double the height of the minimum standard. The minimum standard could translate to less than one third of the glass walls treated with bird friendly glazing which will be inadequate at protecting birds and will result in countless bird deaths each and every year for the life of these buildings. For this reason, I urge that the structures at Ontario place are required to go beyond the minimum and incorporate bird-friendly glazing to ALL glass surfaces. This is the only way to prevent this development from adding to the already 1 million birds dying in Toronto from window collisions every year.
438. The entire world is looking into energy conservation and the waterpark with a glass dome is incredibly energy inefficient. A glass dome may work in Europe where it doesn't get as hot/humid in the summer and Bitterly cold in the winter. Also, the air pollution from all the traffic for the water park will bring the Lakeshore to a stand still. People in North America will not use public transport to go to a waterpark. Different story in Europe where infrastructure is excellent.
439. I am devastated by the prospect of losing hundreds of mature trees at the base of the city. Such wonton and costly destruction of established, publicly accessible green habitat seems ill informed.
440. What's being done to prevent the cormorants from taking over the revised Ontario place park space like they have on other parts of Toronto waterfront. Ontario place can get quite cold and windy as it is right along the water esp. in the winter. What is being done to protect the area once completed from harsh weather.
441. Regarding the parking spaces and the tax payer dollars paying for it - where will the revenue generated from the parking fees go - hopefully not to the private partners - Austrian developer Therme and live nation. Increased traffic will be a burden on the nearby roads in Toronto.
442. How can the new Therme facility and parking garage handle waste and still keep the proposed beach clean enough to swim in? Also, the proposal has minimal trees and green space. It is mostly building and concrete walkways. The proposed facility destroys trees and brings increased car traffic and pollution to the lakefront.
443. Make this a waterfront green space and not a spa. Removing 800 trees is not appropriate in this context.
444. The spa proposal should not be proposed
445. Where is the sustainability in cutting down trees, building 5 stories of parking for a off shore private corporation?
446. It is not sustainable to allocate the such a large percentage of prime land to a private spa that only a small percentage of the richer Ontarians will even consider utilizing. Public land should remain public.
447. I like the water access and naturalizing of the shoreline - especially the creation of a wetland. But too much of the site is covered by a large commercial building. Not appropriate. I am also concerned that Swim Drink Fish has withdrawn their support from the proposal. That does not augur well for the environmental outcomes of the proposal. We need to do better!

448. I strongly oppose the Ontario government's plan for the installation of the Therme mega spa and expanded Live Nation venue at Ontario Place. I cannot support any proposal that calls for the clearcutting of mature trees and destruction of existing natural habitat. I also oppose the installation of any facility that requires the significant ongoing use of carbon-based energy. I believe that Ontario Place should feature activities that are carbon-neutral or very close to it, and activities that contribute to nurturing the city's tree canopy and greening of the waterfront. It would be a much better idea to leave the Ontario Place grounds in its current state rather than proceed with a mega spa and expanded concert amphitheatre just so politicians can claim they're "revitalizing" this heritage site. Please let the trees live, leave the habitat in peace, let people continue to enjoy Trillium Park. I understand that various Indigenous organizations were consulted regarding Ontario Place redevelopment plans - I would be very interested to learn their comments on this subject.
449. Building a spa makes more sense in cottage country
450. I'm very concerned about the impact on the waterfront from construction through to ultimate use.
451. This plan does not conform to the city's Transform TO's goals, or the Vision Zero road safety plan. So many reasons why this plan is bad for sustainability- cutting down 850 trees, building a 7-story glassed in spa, and a 5-story underground parking garage for 2100 car parking spaces, and 600 other parking spaces. We need to be encouraging more active transportation not building underground parking on the Waterfront. We will also have good transit there- TTC, GO and the Ontario Line, and we need to encourage people to use transit. Ontario Place should be park land and similar to Trillium Park and the William G Davis Trail.
452. Based on the information provided at the meeting and my professional experience this development application will have a huge environmental impact in particular on the West Island. This will include impacts on the lake ecology, water movement and marine habitat through the extensive lake fill proposed to accommodate the Therme component; significant impacts on the current site through the very extensive removal of vegetation, including 60-year-old trees, habitat destruction (birds, mammals, insects) and the removal of the "hill; extensive impact on birds movement with the location on the Lake Ontario shore and within significant migratory birds paths. In spite of the assurances that the Therme building will comply with the TGS bird friendly provisions with so much glazing in the path of predominant south winds and at nighttime this proposal will have a very destructive impact on birds inclusive on endangered species like swallows. The development will also result in a lot of gas emissions from the traffic generated, the loss through extensive glazing, the high interior temperature, the vast amount of water to be heated. Huge water consumption will also require a lot of energy while the treatment of used water could generate water quality loss and environmental degradation and have large ecological impacts in particular in case of systems failure. The large demolition proposed will generate gas emissions and waste from the concrete of the "silos" to the loss of trees with their emissions sequestration. The extensive paved/hard finish areas will generate increased heat island effects and the large mass of the building. The construction will result in huge emissions and the mitigation will require a hugely expensive effort (if truly envisioned). In my opinion the mitigation measures mentioned but not truly committed will not address the impacts. The climate change triggered events and disaster adaptation (storms, tornadoes, rain, heat, cold, ice storms is very questionable. Such impactful, sustainable building will be an energy hog, will result in very large amount of emissions - in particular the Therme component is not sustainable, will require huge public resources to be viable with a very high risk of failure. The lack of commitment for an intensive environmental assessment of all the aspects and impacts is extremely worrisome. The province committed to the lease for Therme years before the completion of the partial environmental assessments and the current proposal for a "quasi" environmental assessment, without the mandatory public process is unacceptable.
453. The waterfront is not an appropriate location for the Therme building. It is an indoor space that requires a large amount of parking that could be located virtually anywhere. It should locate elsewhere and the precious water front reserved for public and uses. The Therme building's foot print may be only 50% of the west island area but it's impact is much larger. It is too big and too and result the public realm space is will feel and is residual space. The presentation was vague and disjointed, instead telling us what will be in the public realm the applicant needs to show us by improving the quality of the design with greater sensitivity to

454. The waterfront is not an appropriate location for the Therme building. It is an indoor space that requires a large amount of parking that could be located virtually anywhere. It should locate elsewhere and the precious water front reserved for public and uses. The Therme building's foot print may be only 50% of the west island area but it's impact is much larger. It is too big and too and result the public realm space is will feel and is residual space. The presentation was vague and disjointed, instead telling us what will be in the public realm the applicant needs to show us by improving the quality of the design with greater sensitivity to
455. I like the tree planting and greening aspects of the East Island plans. I do not like plans to fill in more lake area to increase the area beyond the existing Ontario Place. Ontario Place has a unique and interesting aquatic ecosystem in the various channels and bays and I like the idea of a small amount of science study and programming at this site.
456. Barring Therme's proposed project, the environmental and sustainability aspects of the proposal seem viable and are a welcome prospect to the Ontario Place fill environment. A "Copy & Paste" of the East portion, featuring Trillium Park and the Davis Trail is the most ideal and self-sustaining plan for redevelopment.
457. The Therma Spa is not appropriate development for this site. There should be an environmental assessment. It will add to traffic congestion and pollution and providing so many more parking spots and easy access by car and buses will discourage people from taking public transit. Surely a concrete underground parking lot is not environmentally sound given what we know in 2023.
458. They did not say how much it would cost to visit the spa. They were asked several different times.
459. This is very exciting. I am personally supportive. There are even more spaces and activities before today. Thank you for the excellent presentation.

Public Spaces and Activities Responses

460. The site has laid dormant for the last 10+ years and we need to take advantage of the fact that a private company is paying to develop it. This is a benefit to all Ontarians. I would like parts of the site to be park but am fine with parts to be private as long as it is affordable.
461. No spa
462. We are a low-income family. We have no car no backyard so we depend on public spaces for recreation, meeting with friends + enjoyment. This is especially important in summer as we don't own a cottage. I cycle my son often to the waterfront + Trillium Park. We love it there. It does not seem fair or equitable that we shall not have fair access to Ontario Place. It should be a public space.
463. I like the plan for [trees] and fountains and a children's village. (Hope its as good as the old one!!) I remember all the cool restaurants at the 1st version of ONT Place: would be nice to replicate. We need to see more winter friendly spaces. How about the FIRST FLOOR OF THERMA - FREE for all families - since it is the only winter friendly indoor play space.
464. I would love to see something like Central Park something that is free and accessible. There are people on ODSP who rely on their cars to get around. Wheel trans is difficult or impossible. Will there be free shuttle busses? It used to be that the streets of Exhibition Place were free to park on (except during the CNE) now that the buildings were quietly (opaque) sold - Having a picnic and parking nearby is impossible. "potential" "opportunity"
465. See previous comments
466. Where did the spa idea come from? It is a head-scratcher. I'm not convinced we need a spa on the waterfront. What is the proposed price-point of the family recreation level of the spa? What guarantees do we have that it will truly be affordable, as promised?

467. Major concern about giving over a large area of public land to private uses. Concern about traffic volumes on the Lakeshore Blvd. and proximity of other heavily trafficked spaces in Exhibition Place. Why is underground parking not placed on CNE grounds - cost of building parking - basically below water table
468. Timeline of public vs private construction schedule - how long is access restricted? How is Therme responsible for maintaining public space and how it interacts with the private realm? If public parking for public space is the least concern for peak occupancy, why is there disproportional funds allocated from the province to subsidize private sector parking? Env * Creating external wetlands environments to house displaced wildlife during construction periods?
469. Kayak, canoe rental \$ should go to public city programming. Food + beverage vendors should be local from Toronto/Ontario. Therme should partner with local businesses to drive the community aspect of the area and promote public programming. Consult with Lakeshore + Liberty + West Queen West communities to survey the impacts of transportation, recreation, accessibility for residents + visitors in the area.
470. Will there be zoning for safe recreational water usage - eg. No motorized boats zone. Will there be lifeguards at the beach and regular recreational water quality monitoring. Will this be a Blue Flag beach like many of the other well utilized beaches in Toronto? Accessibility.
471. Key word: Public is missing from this proposal.
472. Winter programming that is outdoor + free (skating trail?). Water taxi dock + ferry dock. Needs more of
473. The public space around Therme should take inspiration from the existing spirit of Ontario Place, where buildings are scattered around the island for 'discovery'. The renderings are very conceptual, and immaterial, and say nothing except that the architecture and 'spa'/'wellness' use can be plopped down anywhere in the world. You can't just call it 'Ontarian' or 'Canadian' by just saying you 'following natural cues' and cladding things in wood. My suggestion is a reimagining of the design from the root of it, with more emphasis on the study of the existing mass & architecture as seen by the public, and not just some conceptual "following nature" vagueness that really seems to mean that anything goes as long as there's curves. Also, the re-imagining of the polygons that are a theme throughout the park, is unfortunately weirdly scaled, and adapted to the current "architectural trends" of white, irregular shapes. The more [plutonium] forms of the Cinesphere and Pods are good starting points of a redesign.
474. [?] the pods & science pavilion to environmental information. How will they connect to Ontario Place? Show [crossing] Indigenous history, knowledge & reconciliation because it doesn't seem featured in other spaces in the city. Concerns about the size of the walkways compared to soft landscaping on the west island.
475. I do not feel that I have enough information to comment on the public spaces and activities in detail. The public space in square feet may be the same or even greater than existing, but the location of this space and how it is arranged around private uses changes their character and value in a significant way: the experience of this space will not be as rich, with a sense it is secondary to a private luxury use.
476. Costs after the lease ... who pays for remediation? What if Therme fails and goes bankrupt?
477. Love the connectivity of water around the entire west & east islands
478. OP is already a destination 365 days/year, why would anyone travel to OP to walk around a giant building? Leave Michael Hough beach (south facing) where it is, no beach at the CSO, next to Lake Shore (west facing), all the Therme facilities look the same + do not reflect Ontario, nobody wants the Therme spa!
479. What is the Science Pavilion? Is this the same as the Science Centre? How can the public access the park by public transit without a long walk from the Ontario Line?
480. Not enough to just [border] the West Island. Public space must be 100% of West Island.

481. Accessibility means that a single parent with four kids who lives a few blocks away can access all of Ontario Place at all times without payment.
482. West Island plan reduces public access in ways that are completely and utterly going to destroy current public uses that have developed naturally. Therme spa proposal is too big + inappropriate purpose
483. Affordability a key concern. Ensure continuation of popular no-cost activities: pick up basketball, beach volleyball, ping pong. Ensure west channel continues to provide for rowing & dragon boating uses. Keep movies at IMAX theatre in Cineplex! Very popular. Pods - art space.
484. Public space should not be turned over to a private company. I urge the city to recommend the proposal be turned down.
485. Ontario Place is a public waterfront land. No part of their public land should be leased (in perpetuity) to a private for-profit spa. How does the spa benefit the community? Trillium Park cost \$30 million to build. How much are taxpayers expected to pay to prepare their land for this for-profit spa? We have heard \$500 million to prepare this land for an underground parking lot. This is a huge waste of public funds for very little benefit to the community.
486. You should have public access to the pool but not just access but also use - how about public swimming pools?
487. {Drawing depicting three \$ signs above a box with circular arrows surrounding it}
488. I have been using Ontario Place for more than half my life doing: camps, bike rides, walks and no SPAS!!!
489. I like the permanent shade umbrellas (similar to Cherry Beach). Keep a very wide bike trail. The swimming beach is crucial & should be on the south side of the island.
490. There was so much emphasis on the revitalization of public spaces. The words "free" and "public" came up quite often. But a big slice of Ontario Place will be "private" and "exclusive".
491. How affordable will the spa be? Why the need for parking lot if forecasted transportation is mostly public transit? How will the park function in cold climates? Public lands are shrinking, why are we giving away this land for private enterprise? Is the design of the park truly in the public's interest? There needs to be more green space for relaxing and hanging out at the park. What's the backup plan if the Therme Spa falls through? Will the washrooms be open year-round?
492. More landfill to provide wider buffer. Waterfront sauna and cold plunge side (public).
493. {Drawing of a person looking sad on the left, walking a dog on a leash and looking happy on the right}
494. What about ways to reduce litter? I like how Yorkdale had a dishwash program for a while so that no disposables were used. Could do that at Ontario Place since there are only 3 access points (so you could have 3 dish collection points near the exits). You could make it so that all food venues use the same dishes & they get redistributed to be re-used again.
495. Too big. Live Nation is much too big.
496. What free activities will be run? What will Therme give back to the community. Can I access every part of Island as easily as before?
497. I use my bike as my main method of transportation and a member of "Toronto Cruisers" and "Neon Riders". We ride thru O.P. a lot and would like public access and good trail networks.
498. I am concerned about the projection of 10-20% of people driving in being too conservative. How is the city going to increase/respond to the substantially increased traffic on an already busy Lakeshore/Gardiner?
499. Not enough public space for active recreation.

500. I would like to see as much public access as possible. In Scandinavia, spas have a significant amount of public access. The City should negotiate as much public access as possible. BMO Field, I understand, has public access negotiated where each year there is community access. Why can't this be done here?
501. I worry about the spa & I know you have changed the language to wellness centre & therapy etc. but it still connotes the idea of elitism - this at a time when money for so many is very tight, or non-existent at all. Prices for basics are so high that low-middle income families would immediately perceive this as a non-accessible location for them. This is a real loss to so many in Toronto who already have so little access to recreational spaces.
502. Why is the parking lot so huge? No, really. What is the reason for fully glass buildings? It's not 'inspired by nature'. IF the buildings were incorporated into the environment, use of natural elements, it would be
503. The plans for the public space seem well intentioned but they should cover 100% of the site - why do we have to privatize any of it? The original Ontario Place child-focused play spaces were acknowledged as forward-thinking and exceptional for their time - why doesn't the current plan rise to a similar level.
504. Public realm design at present seems focused on bringing people in and shuttling them back out, rather than retaining people, keeping them there all day. Too much concrete that will be completely unused. Remove and put relaxation nooks, grass and shaded areas. Look at concept of "Audiorama" in Mexico City Park, the design of the nook is very private feeling and relaxing. Think about functionality in design, some well-designed, cool looking sculptures etc are of no use. They may win a design award, but serve no useful function for a pedestrian. "World class" parks in cities/top tourism destination around the world: Central Park, NYC Stanley Park, Vancouver Golden Gate Park, San Fran Hyde Park, London Yoyogi Park, Tokyo etc --> none have parking infrastructure, or private buildings outside of small cafes, museums, or education centres. To be world class is to be 100% public space. To not is to accept at best, Ontario Place can only ever be second class at best.
505. Public spaces will facilitate mental health. Grateful for the opportunity of Indigenous groups to be involved.
506. Space on west island is just the margin - more of a promenade than a park - too much space taken by Therme. Need year-round attractiveness to the private (Therme) building - waterpark (emphasis waterpark rather than spa in North American concept) + indoor vegetation (for winter, + more thought (not afterthought) to winter use - skate/ski rental + trails, cafe/chalet publicly accessible (for example, consider Trail Hub in Durham). Need to minimize sound spillover from Live Nation concerts. Renderings had no picnic tables! Need picnic tables!
507. I am a regular user of Ontario Place. I live in Parkdale and it is a frequent destination for my walks. I go in all seasons. I would appreciate updates to public space, but believe public space should be maximized to the greatest extent possible. This means minimizing privatized space to allow for public activities to occur. The public realm appears to be a promenade (i.e. you keep walking through & members are not welcome to stay for a day a half-day to eat, meet others, etc, unlike the users of the water park)
508. We're saying 2/3 will be publicly accessible but it seems, the public space snakes around - if there's truly about 8k-14k visitors a year, how will we fit comfortably + use the space? What happens if Therme decides to leave AFTER building the spa? - I asked this + no answer! How did you actually estimate the # of visitors? Only 5500 visitors to CN Tower a day! All pictures to the public show us on the outskirts of the private amenities. It's shameful.
- 509. Green roof must be freely open to public not pay to enter!! Hold out for completely different proposal.**
510. Need to remain a backyard for us condo dwellers. We make the city what it is and we don't have backyards
511. Please retain the pebble beach. There is currently NO beach on the west side of the west island because it is not a natural location for a beach.
512. This should be a park or somehow educational.

513. This should be a large public park that is green - like the [trontasland]. Most people don't have access to a backyard or cottage and deserve to have access to safe green spaces without traffic.
514. These seem nice but do not require a giant spa. No details on Therme's spending on the public space improvement.
515. I have significant concern about the public space being closed to the public for a significant amount of time while construction takes place. Humber Bay Park East was completely closed for TWO years during "rehabilitation" and this has been gutting for the community. I take issue with the general concept of always trying to activate space and bring "millions" of people to parks. Why can't the thousands of residents in Liberty Village and other high-rise communities in Toronto have access to peaceful, passive park space like people in other areas of the city do? They don't have their own backyard, they need green space benches, grass, just a quiet place to go by the water. The photo of the new beach area looks very busy and I can see it being difficult for people to bike through the park the way they do now and enjoy the space. And finally - Please keep the Muskoka chairs!!! They really make you feel like you're away on vacation by the lake.
516. The full waterfront trail is good, is there a way to create multiple trails throughout Ontario Place for different hiking trails. This would also encourage people to return to explore the different trails. Public beach should be expanded - beaches are very popular, it should not be ~1/4 of the size (from pictures) of Therme. It does not need to take up more waterfront space - it could just be deeper.
517. The public spaces are not the most important issue.
518. Pedestrian access experience. Sustainability + public realm experience on Lakeshore, especially on event days. Whether roads are closed (Indy) or open (concert). Comment from speaker that 10% of visitors will come by personal autos is a very aggressive mode share relative to other events even downtown. How does this differ from today? Will there be the same actual number of ppl coming by car to an event as today? Or more? My concern is to the impact of the public realm experience when all these cars are getting stuck on Lakeshore. My childhood memories are family days at O.P. playing cards on a blanket, waiting for the B & H fireworks (Symphony of Fire). Is there space for this? The little space at Trillium Park this way is often rented/reserved for activities, esp. on weekends.
519. There should be more consideration for winter activities like fire pits or skating rinks. I'm concerned about Ontario Place being closed + publicly inaccessible for several years during construction. Could construction be phased to allow for parts of the site to be accessible during construction. The current design seems to prioritize moving people through the space rather than rest + relaxation.
520. Community use at reduced/free price at Therme and Live Nation is an excellent idea
521. I was thrilled with the proposed public spaces.
522. Will entrepreneurs (small business + artists) have access to sell + show their wears
523. Why does Therme need so much public money if this is such a for profit spa? The huge spa will create a wall between the lake and the city
524. My strong preference is that Ontario Place remain 100% public. There needs to be transparent conversation regarding how long Therme will be leasing the space. Therme could donate free passes each month through the Toronto Public Library "MAP" program (Museum & Arts Pass) to allow access to people of all socioeconomic backgrounds
525. Will cars be allowed on the island - police - security - food etc? - garbage pickup? - ambulance + medical [events]
526. Not feasible. Not accurate.
527. 4. Concerns that "partnering" with Science Center is setting the stage for moving the Science Center to the

- detriment of the residents of the current community 5. Lack of public enclosed spaces to allow for all weather usage
528. Need more clarity on what public space design will be obliged if the proposal accepted. When will it be implemented? Need picnic benches etc
 529. For winter use [?] at least some ... washrooms should be open, versus current practice.
 530. We would like to bring back what Ontario Place used to be --> open for ALL! The spa can stay in Whitby! More food truck/taco/beer festivals. Reimagined space! Dynamic spaces like the use of the Bentway or Harbourfront! Trillium Park used to have concerts/festivals/yoga -- > more of that!! Slacklining + similar activities!
 531. What has the province considered for the whole space to public?
 532. The structure of the pods, bridges, etc. Should be opened for responsible access for slacklining with an access agreement between slackliners and landowners, property managers, other stakeholders. Any new construction should facilitate more slackline potential, not interfere with potential to rig slacklines on existing structure.
 533. The commercial parts - live nation/science pavilion/spa - don't cater to the socio-economic demographic of the surrounding neighbourhoods (Trinity Bellwood's/Parkdale/Liberty Village) --> should "public land" be "publicly" accessible & for the local public good (those neighbourhoods won't benefit from this/can't benefit due to low income). Has consideration gone into the increased water traffic & potential safety concerns that will come with the canoe & kayak rentals, swimming piers, as well as opening up for water taxis - specifically for pre-existing users --> the break wall is narrow enough already - traffic {arrow pointing up} will be dangerous & affect athletes on the waterways.
 534. Leave west Ontario Place alone and let it go back to nature: (putting in place only enough minimal infrastructure to keep people away from possible hazards). In short: we are nuts if we think we can go on "developing" (<-- a misnomer) and not continue destroying the environment for future generations (and even for our own!)
 535. Who is paying for the redevelopment of the public realm? When will it happen (as proposed) in relation to the build-out of the proposed spa? Who will maintain the public realm and how will that be funded. My concern is that the spa will be built and the pretty pictures of the public realm will mean nothing.
 536. Bring people back to nature to make use of existing pebble beaches, not huge stone blocks terraced into the water. This is slippery, uninviting and dangerous for children. The suggestion that families will use this for picnics is ridiculous.
 537. Public spaces must: have less concrete/paving than shown in the slides, have more trees and grass and planted spaces that allow shade + seating + picnic blanket space and privacy. Must not be dominated by the huge building planned. Must feel like a park, not a narrow pathway around large private corporate buildings. Need more spaces for quiet, the city noise broken by significant tree canopy + lower bushes + plants. Need spaces to settle + stay, not just to pass through. Do not need massive entrance gate/or buildings. Use more trees.
 538. --> Therme --> Live Nation ({{down arrow} parking space) > sharing of the amenities and services. Land Inc. Consideration of both Indigenous and Landscape e.g. Pow Wow ceremony at Canada Day. Trillium Park connect to Wetland Innovation. The greenspace around Forum full of picnics and live events. 20,000 acres summer (9,000 winter). Live Nation at Budweiser Concert with East port venue. Spring 2-year "servicing" construction process. No proposal plan revival yet. Turtle creation myth into Ontario Place, but is it cultural misappropriation?
 539. I like the idea of Therme's that there will be programming available outside the facility. Same with activities on the east island.
 540. A casino sized for profit spa should not be permitted on our waterfront. The city should not provide land to assist the Province in this corporate handout.

541. I for one would love it if we didn't sell off - sorry, "lease in perpetuity" - a vast swathe of public land to a luxury spa while leaving the minimal amount of waterfront you think you can get away with
542. Entire waterfront must remain public and accessible to Lake Ontario and recreational water use.
543. Ontario Place should be a place of recreation and respite that is accessible to all. It should be based on ecologically sound practices. It should have year-round recreational programming that is funded by government.
544. This project is a reduction of public space and a reduction in the amount of public activities that can occur on site. We need more green public space not less.
545. Toronto public space should be open to all without admission prices. The proposal will destroy a large portion of Toronto waterfront to provide income a non-Canadian corporation.
546. Entire west island should also be free open park. No spa that is destined to fail which will then conveniently be turned into a casino.
547. As the city fills up with sky scraping condos people need access to green public spaces. This development makes a mockery of public space by allotting such a tiny area for free public access.
548. The entire space should be public. Why would we give public space to a foreign company for a private spa?
549. One third of the space being taken over by a private enterprise, offering services - spa to only those who can afford it is reprehensible. We need parkland, other land to stay in public hands and ensure that changes are in keeping with protection of the space, keeping it green. This will be out of range of affordability for so many individuals and communities.
550. The public realm look's impressive
551. Public spaces must be free , accessible by TTC , with washrooms and fountains unkept and open all year round . No private company should be allowed to build on or own public space . Imagine this proposal being made about High Park ? Outrageous that it should even be considered .
552. How frequently maintained will the public spaces be during seasonal changes (i.e. winter snowfall/ice). Are independent studies being driven based on transportation needs for all facilities, outside of data provided by the private conglomerates
553. Separation of bikes and pedestrians will be critical
554. Again, beach is great. Will it have lifeguards? Will it be sand? The swimmer who commented on being clumsy and slipping on rock also commented on the sewage outflow. Will this be moved or closed?
555. Giving up public land that could be entirely used for a public park is a disgrace. No private company should be given a 99-year lease on anything. It comes across as being incredibly corrupt. We could have had a beautiful park and instead we get this corrupt eyesore.
556. They are not sufficient. Public spaces should be increased by a factor of 10 at the minimum; anything less is shutting out constituents that cannot afford a spa, as well as destroying one of the few natural areas accessible to all downtown.
557. I love spending time at Ontario Place on my bike and on foot, and think it would be phenomenal to adapt the West Island with more native plants and some updates to the open space, with Trillium Park as a great model. The proposal would abandon this potential and destroy much of what makes it special now. I can't imagine ever wanting to visit a narrow band around the spa complex.
558. Why can Ontario place not be a giant public space like a park or public meeting areas

559. Ontario Place has had interesting programming not just at its inception but over the years it has supposedly been under-utilized - kids camps including canoeing, skateboarding, basketball, drive-in cinemas, walk-in cinemas, art installations and festivals, music, lake swims, and so on. I would like to see a continued creative approach to programming public spaces for a diverse range of user groups. The public spaces of the redevelopment proposal seem far more sensitive to both environmental and heritage needs than the private spaces and at least nod to its history as a much-loved public space.
560. Good public space but nothing good about the private part.
561. It is insane how well corporate interests have captured Ontario Place. Would hate to explain to my grandkids how we could have had a park but instead got a dumb ass spa
562. Ontario Place was designed as a public space and should be kept in public hands. Parkland, swimming beach, and minimally invasive, low-cost public attractions such as outdoor concert spaces, interpretation centres, and trails would be most desirable. The flume ride would make an excellent cycle cross or parkour course.
563. It is important to me that Ontario Place remain for people, and the public, and free to access. It's currently a pretty decent public park without ANYTHING done to it. It's beautiful and we don't need a private spa or anything else ticketed. It's precious potential green-space. It's an area that doesn't need more people driving to it; it's TTC and bike and walking accessible for so many people, and we should be discouraging driving to that area. A private spa is a destination business that would be a great idea for Etobicoke or Scarborough- bring some \$\$ to those areas, we don't need more busyness downtown.
564. I do not want a private corporation controlling access to the public area through a "welcome pavilion". This is a wholly inappropriate manner to arrange public access to public spaces.
565. The public realm left on the West Island is grossly insufficient for any practical use, except as a pedestrian path. And as a path, it will be unpleasant. People will be walking next to a massive wall cutting them off from the rest of the city. There is no space for picnicking or other recreational activities. The public realm proposed has the feel of a moat around the castle wall.
566. What percentage of the proposed project will actually be available, free, for public use
567. What public spaces? The ones you have to pay for to access? Or the little strip of park land that remains. This whole plan is a monstrosity and should be scrapped for something actually useful.
568. The 'public space' Therme is proposing is a joke - a small perimeter around a massive private spa with high entry fees. We need Ontario Place to be kept as a park, and improved as a park and public space, not given over to a European spa company in perpetuity.
569. In a city where family activities continue to rise in price, Ontario Place should remain an affordable place for the public because it is public land. This feels like the 407 all over again.
570. Prohibitive costs for most people, public lands usurped for private profits
571. Completely insufficient. Currently the whole West Island is park space. This proposal looks to privatize what looks like at least 75% of the space with concessions for public that are frankly de minimis relative to the scale of this development and completely inadequate. The public is not getting value from this proposal. Therme has never had a lakefront spa in a central urban area because the idea is ludicrous. Put it in the bowels of Etobicoke, Vaughan, Mississauga, Markham - those would be more appropriate spots for something like this. And frankly, every other Therme spa facility is located in those types of places. Not downtown waterfront smack dab in the middle of what should continue to be a park.
572. I am greatly concerned about the impact of a large-scale development like this on public access DURING construction (regardless of the final outcome). The closure of Humber Bay Park East for two years during a much smaller restoration has been very detrimental to the community who relies on it for daily walks, runs, bike rides,

and meditative space. I would be very upset as would the thousands of residents of use the park daily if the park were to be closed to the public for a lengthy period during construction. The west island where Therme is proposed is already a very active space with lots of people using it daily for passive activities like picnicking, reading, walking, running, cycling, and simply enjoying the lake, as well as community events like yoga on the old water plume platform, free concerts, enjoying food from the existing food vendors, etc. It would be very hurtful to the community to lose this space for a private piece of property. Please remember that there are thousands and thousands of people who moved into Liberty Village and nearby condos with the expectation that they had this beautiful park as their backyard as a compromise for the density they live in. It is important to keep parkland like this available for this growing community, true PARKLAND not overrun by activities and businesses. In particular I urge you to keep the Muskoka chairs that line the shoreline, they truly make it feel like a getaway up north in the city.

573. No spa. No casino. Do not move the Science Centre. Keep it all publicly accessible. Do not add parking.
574. No spa on public spaces. Keep the science centre in Don Mills
575. While there was talk of making this a year-round destination, I didn't see any winter activities outside of the spa. Of course, walking down by the lake is a lovely 12-month activity, but what about skating? Will playgrounds and washrooms be maintained throughout the winter? We have zero information on any science activities, so it is hard to comment. The suggestion to move the Science Centre is frankly crazy as it is very large on its own. A satellite with programming around the natural environment of the lake might be appropriate.
576. The proposal is robbing Toronto of precious waterfront parkland. The facility turns its back on the lake and has no connection to the natural waterfront. It robs Toronto aquatic & boating communities of valued water channels. The activities planned for this facility are not broadly appealing and sound doomed for economic failure.
577. I use Ontario regularly for exercise and fresh air. I would like it to be more of a park than it is, not less.
578. This is a public park and it should remain that way, please get the cars out.
579. I've walked through Ontario Place (both Trillium Park and West Island) many times since it was "closed." (Closed is in quotes because it obviously isn't closed. It's freely enjoyed by many people.) West Island is already a great place that can be enjoyed by everyone. There are some areas that should be rehabilitated (e.g., where the log ride is). But the Therme proposal doesn't rehabilitate those public spaces. Instead, it obliterates all but a sliver of them.
580. I support a publicly owned and operated Ontario Place. I strongly oppose any transfer of publicly owned lands to the private sector. I support the public development of below market rate housing, supportive housing, mixed use development on the Ontario Place site and on all city-owned lands.
581. A private spa should not be built. This should remain a public waterfront park
582. Ontario Place is for Ontarians, not for corporations. It should (and must) remain a public place.
583. The public space on the West Island is having to be rebuilt out into the lake to accommodate enough 'public' space as this Therme spa seems to be using all the current West Island acreage. I am concerned as the 'messaging' coming from both IO and Therme is that the Hough beach and its shoreline is beyond its 50-year design life. Where does this information come from? Its not referenced anywhere and both IO and Therme state that beach erosion makes it necessary for them to rebuild the beach and boardwalk areas. I was sitting on the Hough beach today and comparing it to the City of Toronto archival photos and can see no discernible differences. I think its disingenuous for them to justify that they need to build out and 'repair' the shoreline when in fact they need to justify the adding of lake infill to create enough public spaces. It also appears from their sketches that the public spaces on the West Island are shunted to the perimeter of the island, they are 'below' the private walkways/buildings and the entranceway is segregated. Its not clear how wide these spaces really are. I am concerned

about losing the beautiful pebble beach that faces the south. Having that area replaced and built out with apparent slabs of concrete that will become slippery with algae making entry into the water on the south beach treacherous at best and nothing like we currently have or what Hough originally designed. There only appears to be one change room on the West Island and its nowhere near the south beach. Why does there appear to be only one beach on the whole of Ontario Place - especially when the presenters kept referring to providing spaces and places around the revitalized site where people could 'engage with' the lake. Not true. The planned beach is in a terrible location - with Lakeshore Blvd on the right as you look to the west. There are prevailing westerly winds, the footprint is much smaller than Hough beach even though the Baird engineers state in a video on Instagram and Facebook that the new beach will be 10 x larger than the south beach. They don't explain how this is possible or what their measuring consists of. I am concerned with many things regarding this beach - the location is less than desirable - with the westerly winds flotsam is bound to collect in this beach as there is nowhere else for it to go and the waves will be 2-4 ft+ high - and the additional costs and disturbances created by building wave attenuation devices or fake reefs further interferes with lake ecology. The south beach is a much more desirable location. This same engineer talks about how the existing CSO on the north west break wall will be dealt with. Amazingly he states that they will eliminate this by building a broad wide promenade. Is this within their scope? Are they promising us something that has been agreed with by the city? Please check this out. It would be great if it could be resolved but I always thought this was up to the City to deal with.

584. The project also does not appear to account for lakefront 'flow' from a walking, cycling standpoint. Why should the public be redirected or prevented from walking the full lakefront because a privately-owned business occupies the space? Encouraging citizens to be outdoors all year is not promoted by this project.
585. The City should reject the spa, it will reduce the amount of public park land in the downtown area. The spa itself will not be accessible owing to significant entry fees.
586. All redevelopment should be public and family friendly/focused on access for all ages. Natural parks, playground and gathering spaces using native plants as much as possible.
587. A place for all particularly for families. Green everywhere. Never a casino for tourists & the rich.
588. Public spaces in other countries are protected and enhanced not sold off for commercial pursuits. The loss of this space is criminal. Short term commercial redevelopment for political gain should be avoided at all costs. Social good should be guiding idea
589. What is most exciting about the redevelopment is the increased public space across Ontario place. Especially the additional 2.5km of trail space that will provide a continuous path. Something that will be appreciated by all users who love to walk through the waterfront. The increased public spaces open opportunities for public restaurants, cafes, art installations, and active tours. All of which can be open to the public. This will be a considerable improvement to the current public spaces.
590. Yes, to the public paths and open park space approach. No to exclusive and divisive ideas that really only benefit and interest the few -- that is, the developers, Doug Ford, and the Therme people.
591. Privatizing public space is almost never undone. Handing over the park to a private corporation with money is asinine. There should be an increase in public no-fee access to the park, which treats it as the natural landscape gem that it is, a waterfront island, and not the place to park what in every other place in the world is a suburban asphalt-scape public space destroying structure.
592. THEY ARE FOR PEOPLE. Improve TTC. NOW. Lower the fare. NOW. PEOPLE.
593. I will almost certainly guarantee that the business will not survive the term of the lease and we will be left with a huge mess to get rid of. I am highly skeptical that Infrastructure Ontario did sufficient due diligence on the long-term potential of the spa proposal. One only has to look at hoola-hoops and more recently Peloton to see how quickly these businesses lose favor and decline.

594. The proposal loses a ton of public space. The cost is way too high and the quality of what remains is grossly misrepresented in the proposal. The exterior ring around that behemoth on the West Island will be mostly unusable. The perimeter on the south side runs the risk of being nothing more than bicycle racetrack. The ideal south swimming beach is not supported by picnic or family lounging space inland of it. The city should hold off on any land-swap at all until a much-improved proposal is on the table - not "oh, we've already heard your comments and trust us we'll make changes". Full stop. No land swap until we have a plan we can consider as part of the deal.
595. The proposed continued free access to the site is good however the public space is going to feel uncomfortable I believe for people who cannot afford the private spa and yet will be overshadowed by its looming size (both in terms of the sun but also the feeling of the rich folks looking down from on high to those who choose to use the public walks and beach. Greening some of the parking lots is good --but why not make some underground parking on the mainland there and green its entirety. Re-establishing some children's playground and water play for the public would be great but also there should be attention paid to how this truly could be a 4 season attraction by embracing Ontario's winter season --perhaps some skating- places to warm up --
596. Thanks to City and other staff who worked to gather public input on the redevelopment proposal. There were some very impressive plans put forward for some areas of the park, however I remain deeply disturbed about the proposal for the West Island. The representatives from Infrastructure Ontario and other agencies stated that 60% of the space will be publicly accessible. They also stated that there will be more accessible space with the new development than there is currently or has been in the past. This statement might be true, but it deliberately obscures the fact that the West Island will have very little publicly accessible space in proportion to its size. When I saw the renderings for the West Island I noted that it is dominated by the Therme spa, with a small fringe of publicly accessible land in and around it. 45 metres is the equivalent of a 10-story building, so these scraps of remaining land will be diminished by the spa and its Welcome Centre. This is very disappointing and discouraging. The Therme spa is completely inappropriate in that it does nothing to celebrate the natural beauty of Ontario. It leaves only a very small proportion of land on the West Island open and accessible to the public and its architecture is jarring and dominating. The West Island is a beautiful and important piece of public land, and the public deserves better. One of the attendees at the breakout session that I attended brought up the issue of water quality at the new beach. She told us that she is a member of the organization "Swim, Drink, Fish". She stated that the issue of water quality at the proposed beach site through "point source pollution" (sewage entering the lake at spots nearby) has not been addressed by the City or Province. This will pose serious threats to water quality at the proposed beach. Another attendee stated that the rock surfaces (armorstone may be the technical term) at the shoreline will become covered in algae and very slippery. The renderings showed people and children sitting and climbing on these rocks. This too seems misleading. I would suggest that the issue of swimming at Ontario Place has not been given appropriate attention.
597. No to the spa and Doug ford corruption. He want a casino!
598. It's highly concerning that in prime waterfront area so much space will be given to a corporation and restricted to paying customers. This is such a mistake.
599. You are a pawn in the provincial government game of Monopoly.
600. I feel the space allocated as "public" on the West Island is very minimal. I think one of the attendees on Saturday referred to the public getting "only the crust of the bread" while Therme customers will get the rest of the loaf. The drawings presented clearly support that conclusion. While the Therme architects said they've already decided to expand the width of some parts of the walkway, the drawings don't reflect that. So, we just have to trust them on that??? The traffic consultant admitted they only used Therme's projections in completing their peak time parking estimates. No independent sourcing for projections. No sensitivity for the impact of 10% more or fewer vehicles...or 20%. That type of review wouldn't even get a pass on a first-year planning school test.
601. Echoing one of the participant's ask about having these for-profit corporations offer affordable (minimal cost) ticketed performances to public since they are leasing off OUR taxpayer property.

602. The city is responsible for doing everything possible to protect this land from any development that is focused on increasing traffic, paving green spaces, or erecting privately-owned recreation facilities.
603. Ontario Place is, right now, an awesome public space and park, containing almost a thousand mature trees and all kinds of wonderful nooks and crannies to explore. And for years it has been the locus for years of amazing arts, cultural, and recreational activities. Now we are being offered a proposal that razes the majority of this public space and hands it over in perpetuity to an Austrian corporation, at the further cost of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, and what we get back is a crummy sliver of land on the periphery which will be towered over and dominated by a hideous private spa. The 'activities' of the redevelopment proposal are for paying customers, and in any case in the day of Covid who in their right mind wants to pay \$40---or nothing at all, you couldn't pay me to go there---to share germs and (if kids are involved) bodily wastes with a bunch of strangers in a big class container?
604. The idea itself is elitist and discriminates against a large swath of the Toronto citizenship by excluding the less financially stable.
605. If the city listens and responds in a sincere way as to how the public is currently using Ontario Place it should all be good. Places to gather, picnic, sunbathe, performances, walking and eating do belong there. Again, the Therme proposal has no place. It makes no sense. It reflects nothing of Ontario/Place. It's quite tone deaf with respect to where it wants to be located.
606. We don't want the mega spa
607. How does it serve the Toronto taxpayer?
608. Ontario has very long winters, which Winter activities will the public places provide, all illustrations show green trees and people in Summer wear ..where could I go on a day like today April 18 (4 degree Celsius) ?
609. This is a huge improvement of what's already there. It's unfair that a small group of local residents are gatekeeping this beautiful waterfront location for themselves. As it currently sits I have no motivation to trek across the city on a slow streetcar to visit an abandoned park. With these planned improvements I could see myself visiting to go for walks along the water, swim at the beach and enjoy a break from the busyness of downtown.
610. Toronto needs more signature things to do - this would be one of them. Beautifying the nearby park land would be a significant improvement. The City should support projects like this.
611. I always want to ensure that people with disabilities physical and intellectual can enjoy the space as well.
612. the beach is amazing, the trees, the grass, the trail that lets you ride your bike or walk around. once this stupid spa is built it will not be public. too often they say public will have access but its required to go through a private space or just makes it so inaccessible. the cost of the parking lot is outrageous. what a stupid idea it is to put a private spa here.
613. How does a private company plan on making a site accessible to all without cost?
614. All spaces on public land should be open for all people, especially offering opportunities for our poorest families and children living in Toronto and Ontario. Being able to "walk through the open gates of the facility" is not an opportunity for our residents of Toronto that justifies this greedy private development.
615. Would be great to keep public spaces.
616. It doesn't make sense to move Ontario Science centre. Build something new LIKE it but we need the science centre where it is...close to schools with easy transit access. Getting down to Ontario place is already a nightmare. You're calling it family friendly. Which families will be able to afford getting down there let alone visit the attractions?

617. I want the West Beach to remain untouched. I don't think the public is being given adequate greenspace. I don't want private development on Ontario Place.
618. Why label New public beach? While there is already a public beach currently? West island - Why put a skating rink in the windiest area - not ideal for winter. The Therme Canada West island structures (half of the west island) taking up a lot of current green space and removing the green space from public access.
619. The entire park should be publicly accessible. The proposal allows a large portion of the redevelopment to be a ticketed attraction.
620. I loved what I saw and I'm glad I attended the meeting. However, like many voiced during the meeting, still not sold on the spa and how that's not a public space. It just seems like a luxury space rather than a family-friendly space.
621. Priority access should be provided for residents of Toronto
622. The 20m waterfront walk is dangerous with the amount of people already using Ontario Place as it is now. With the proposed 1 million visitors coming from all over Ontario and abroad cyclist won't be able to navigate safely through the pedestrians in such a small width on the West Island and lawsuits will be coming your way.
623. Please do not move the science centre. It's fine where it is! People in that area require it and there's no need to move it
624. I like the public spaces. I like the activities, especially the space for children.
625. The updated park looks nice. The redevelopment of half of the West Island public park into a private spa is shameful. Selling off valuable community space for a company to profit off of is cartoonish villainous.
626. I am concerned that the proposed redevelopment cuts off access to the natural space based on income. Access to natural spaces is essential to the health and mental health and wellbeing of Ontarians. There is no need for a spa that only a certain tier of clients will be able to access.
627. All space should be public. I sincerely hope the perimeter of Ontario place is kept open during all construction so nearby residents don't lose a major chunk of their green space as any project progresses
628. I strongly oppose to the proposed OSC move to Ontario Place. The current location of the OSC, with the Eglinton LRT stop about to be completed, will open up access to so many families without vehicles. This allows easy access for residents and tourists alike who would use Toronto's transit system to access this wonderful attraction. Not only does this support and encourage STEM interest for many families, but it's current location also makes the facility a viable option for many socioeconomically disadvantaged communities to visit as it would not require access to a vehicle, the ability to afford expensive parking (a guaranteed feature of Ontario Place) and/or school funds to pay for a school bus. The new proposed location would add more traffic to an area already prone to high traffic bottle neck points and not only increase risk to pedestrian safety and be damaging to the environment through increased fossil fuel/CO2 output in the area. I strongly hope the government will reconsider this costly and unnecessary decision.
629. Therme continues to push that it only cover 13% of the land however the publics concern is that it covers nearly 50% of the west island and dominates the landscape. Currently most of this land is accessible to the public and will not be after the development. And yes, we are aware that new land will be added. If the spa is not going to be moved than I think it should be scaled back substantially. There is a reason ever other Therme location is in the outskirts of their respective towns.
630. It seems like the Theme spa decision has already been made and no changes will be made (considering a secret lease has already been given), but it is baffling that someone thought residents need a spa equally as much as we would need green / public space (50/50 split on the west island). With respect to the parking, it's unclear to me if the existing number of spaces would be maintained or if there will be an increase to 2,700. Regardless, this

is an opportunity for the city to have it's said in developing what will become one of, if not the, biggest tourist attraction in Ontario. There is a new go station being built and a subway line that services this area as well. This is an opportunity to start down a path of sustainable choice and not develop one more car centric attraction. It would be a shame if the city allowed for this to happen, especially in a city with so many traffic issues already.

631. Moving the Science Centre to downtown is going to impact children in the North and East of the City. Getting downtown for a school trip will be difficult - how can we prevent the lost of science programming in our communities, especially as STEM is a focus of the ministry of education. The Therme Spa is not needed at Ontario Place. There are other areas of Toronto that are better suited for it (like North York or Scarborough) and would benefit from the jobs and increased visitors.
632. So much of the other improvements to the public spaces and suggestions about activities are fabulous, HOWEVER, that spa does not fit into this plan as an improvement, but simply robs us of that public space and makes it private!
633. Take the spa out and make these lands available for people to use. Many Ontarians do not have access to green spaces so more land for public use.
634. Public spaces should be bigger, and should include areas of lawn where people and families can picnic or toss a ball, not just walk on a path around or through the site.
635. The spa is not needed here and will block public access to currently accessible areas.
636. This redevelopment proposal is taking public land (and public funds) and giving it to a private company. It's shortchanging the public to benefit a small few. This area is currently being enjoyed by many people as a gathering place, a parkland, and a place to get active. We risk losing all this space by making the choice to redevelop this area into something that most Toronto locals won't benefit from at all.
637. The entire proposal on the west island is misplaced and does not address the urgent needs of the city in terms of housing, public spaces, natural spaces, and a reduction in car traffic. There are some positive aspects of the rest of the proposal that improve overall access and usability (e.g., improvements to beach area, bike paths, etc.). Investing in better bike infrastructure, connected bike lanes throughout the city (and into Ontario Place), and better TTC access in that part of the city would be a much better use of resources.
638. The public areas appear to shrink. But the presenters didn't acknowledge that. The before and after square metres of public areas don't appear to be available in the materials. Why is this simple comparison being hidden?
639. The entire plan proposed by Therme should be rejected. We are being asked to grant a private business hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies and existing space that could be put to better public use, in exchange for a smaller park *that we already have*.
640. The spa and other private sector developments turn what should be a public space into government subsidized private for-profit operations.
641. There is very little public space, few public activities. It's an almost wholesale takeover for private interests. It must be stopped. What else is there to say?
642. Listening to what's proposed for the public spaces was the highlight of the evening. I would add an inclusion of public art.
643. I like the focus on supporting a variety of activities, including marine activities and family-oriented activities. I strongly disagree with replacing the free, publicly accessible space on the West Island today with any event centre, let alone a private spa. We should revitalize the West Island first and foremost as a public park. Therme Spa should be built elsewhere in the city. Science Centre should remain where it is.

644. Shockingly bad. A private spa? What use is that to anyone. This is public land and it should be public. Also, giving massive amounts of funding to a private company to run a for profit business is a terrible idea.
645. The landscape design for the East/Central Island looks promising, but the West Island consists of too much paving/hardscape, lacks design excellence/any coherent vision, and is physically separated from the (privatized) core of the west island and does not respect Michael Hough's amazing vision. Keep the beach in its current location - it's the best swimming / open water beaches on the waterfront and shouldn't be moved closer to Lake Shore. The entire public realm should look to improve what's there today - not create a new strip of new lackluster public space around a private amenity through lakefilling. Lakefilling generally is not permitted elsewhere in the city and not for private development - why is being contemplated here to support Therme's spa/waterfront park? The existing trees/habitat on the west island are beautiful and should be preserved not clear cut. Replacing / replanting trees is not a substitute for mature healthy trees.
646. We do not want the science centre moved. It is fine where it currently is. It's so ridiculous to move it all the way to Ontario place.
647. Ontario Science Centre should not be moved to Ontario Place - it is not accessible and this is a great location and massive - literally no good reason to move it to somewhere smaller and harder to get to
648. Under no circumstances should there be a private spa at Ontario place.
649. The opaque privatization of critical public green space in Toronto, especially at a time when housing density is (rightly) increasing in downtown Toronto and demand for open public spaces is at an all time high, is a blunder of catastrophic proportions that will negatively impact the city for generations.
650. More public space, parks and playgrounds. No spa.
651. With respect for the science centre, it makes no sense. The science centre where it is now is very accessible to people living in Toronto. It's on the subway line, there is plenty of parking, and also, east end is Toronto, and we deserve some facilities in the east end.
652. No one wants a spa. We have limited waterfront access and everything proposed should be related to accessing the WATERFRONT. A spa can be built anywhere.
653. I use the William Davis trail regularly, and often walk on the west island as well. These are local treasures, as they are accessible public green spaces for diverse activities and participants. I urge the city to fight for every square inch of public space in its remit to protect the ecosystems that sustain people and wildlife. The vision of an interlinked shoreline, from Hamilton through GTA to the east, is one to applaud. Our waterfront should be our most prized possession, in terms of public space and green space. The focus should be on accessibility, not monetization.
654. Ontario place was one of my favourite public spaces in the 1980's. It was truly an inexpensive gathering place for all. Putting a Spa in this location will lock out the majority of the working poor.
655. All of the space at Ontario Place should be public space. Not luxury spas and parking garages!
656. I think that the spa is an insanely stupid idea, as is destroying the Science Centre and sticking bits of it into Ontario Place. All of this is just Doug Ford wanting to make money for his developer buddies. He doesn't care about the people of Toronto, and what we want. We've overwhelmingly stated that we want an open, public park space and not a giant spa. He's already cut off water access to Ontario Place, which saddens me greatly. I love rowing around the pods, and now I can't. I'll probably never get to go on the water in there ever again. Soon I won't be able to jog or bike around the islands. All of this is awful.
657. There is not nearly enough space being retained as public, and what is left is in an awkward inaccessible shape around the massive private development which from what I gather very few people want. If any amount of this space should be developed into a private water park (big if) it should be less than a quarter of its current size and

located so as not to interrupt the public space. Furthermore, the Ontario science centre should absolutely not be moved here. There would be no problem with adding an additional science centre site, but closing down the existing science centre is an absolute waste of a well loved and well used building in a community that needs jobs, which will have direct subway access. Please listen to the public rather than provincial politicians and leave the science centre where it is and minimize or eliminate private take over of Ontario place

658. Therme was all spin, it reduces public space - huge mistake.
659. I am encouraged by the public parkland development proposals, they are creative and attractive. However, I am quite concerned that 1) the size of the Therme facility will overwhelm the proposed parkland developments, 2) that the scale of the redevelopment will essentially take existing parkland out of service for several years while the Therme facility is built. 3) If the Therme plan were to not happen, the existing Ontario Place could be reimagined as all-public parkland with many of the ideas already developed and presented, with less disruption to public use.
660. Many of the park aspects are positive but we also know that Toronto can design and build great parks (i.e., Corktown) on their own. To me a significant aspect of a public park is its very existence - it doesn't need "activities" - it needs green nature, open space, environmental sustainability. Bathrooms & seating and not much more.
661. It is HIGHLY unlikely that the people of Toronto and Ontario will receive enough value in return for not only giving up important public land but also paying for all the infrastructure to make it happen. Insist on seeing the lease and make sure payments are not based on "profits". That is what was done for all those busy over-priced restaurants in the old Ontario Place and guess what? There never were any profits.
662. Good and thoughtful work has been planned for the public realm but it is a terrible mistake to privatize the use and benefit of so much of the public land i.e. through a lease to Therme for a massive indoor spa "wellness centre".
663. The landscaped areas look wonderful. The proposed spa should be located somewhere else.
664. The exhibition grounds throughout the summer brings lots of traffic and noise. Having previously lived in Parkdale, will the year-round activities contribute even more to the busy-ness of the area extending to Strachan? have scans for local infrastructure been conducted to ensure that the surrounding areas can handle the additional burden, especially during CNE times?
665. Trillium Park is lovely. On the rest of the site, I hope the left-over scraps that are left for public access after Therme and Live Nation take their cuts are indeed done as high quality as Trillium Park. The trail that is proposed at the edge of the monstrously tall and wide glass structure is way too narrow. And way too long with no ways to cut off it. Very unsafe. I also wish the outside "public" access land around the monster glass structure would be built by the Infra Ontario people and not be built and controlled by Therme.
666. This public space needs to be public not limited to people who can afford admission
667. Sounds like there will be a fair amount of public spaces and access even with the Therme development. As long as it's a seamless transition from public space to Therme area (i.e. not a big fence) then I think it would be more palatable for those concerned with the Therme development.
668. The landscape redesign has many kinds of accessible walkways and trails. On the other hand, not much thought has gone into how the site can be used in the winter months. Is the site accessible to someone launching a canoe or kayak? This would require the addition of a marine ramp or boat trollies from a parking lot. The Therme building and parking garage are too large and do not make sense in the provision of public spaces within the redevelopment proposal.
669. I do not think it's a good idea to move the Science Centre to Ontario Place. There is less space for exhibits and it

will be less accessible to school groups and GTA residents and visitors.

670. Ontario place should be for Ontarians, then tourists from other areas. Therme Bucharest looks expensive, I hope there is a preferred price for residents of Ontario, meaning cheaper and a more expensive price for vacationers from elsewhere.
671. The public space is around the periphery of the island. What about the middle of the island
672. I would prefer that everything at Ontario place was arranged for the benefit of city residents, not foreign investors or even Canadians coming from further away. The main priority should be local city folks.
673. The word "accessibility" was mentioned many times in last night's presentation. Members of the development team talked about having a destination for an "entire family" to enjoy, where a family could spend an "entire day". I would like to know the following: 1) who are the target consumers / clients for Therme, i.e. what sort of income bracket is needed to use such amenities? (when I think of "family activities", it includes such things as the zoo or the museum. Not a "wellness spa"). 2) If Therme truly wants to be community minded and make its facilities as accessible as possible, will it have discounts for those who could not otherwise afford its spa services? 3) Is there any way for the location of the spa to be elsewhere on the Ontario Place property, for example, further back, so that there is maximum public space on the waterfront? I think there might be less opposition to the development if it did not obstruct so much of the waterfront. Public space and activities which are free and accessible to everyone should be paramount. I like the idea of a waterpark or splash pad and walking trails.
674. Moving Ontario place is a terrible idea. Selling Ontario place for foreign investors is a terrible poorly thought out idea. Don't pave the greenbelt.
675. The site should be a park.
676. Failure. We need more park space for residents, not expensive tourist attractions for drivers.
677. The spa is the problem in my opinion. Why are we building an enormous structure on our waterfront so that people can spend time indoors? It could be anywhere - it does not need to be on the shores of Lake Ontario. Is this really what the local community wants? We're all paying a premium to live and work in Toronto and it's unaffordable as it is - I don't see many people paying to use this facility - it's for occasional tourists. Again, fine, attract the tourists, but build the spa elsewhere (and they can come and visit a beautiful waterfront park too). Don't rob the city of our public shores. And really the only substantial park space in the west downtown area. What a lost opportunity. Also - why relocate the science centre??? It should be kept where it is for the neighbourhood that has supported it from the beginning. Turn the pods into Science Centre South - focusing on ecology and environmental sustainability - with the evidence and examples of what that looks like in the beautiful accessible park space below. Let's educate our own about what it means to live in this country supporting the environment. Love the ideas of raising bridges for more opportunities to explore the water by kayak/canoe/etc, of the expanded shoreline rocks for sitting, of the beaches for swimming, of re-establishing habitats for what has always been here, etc. Great that there will be an open space for organized gatherings and celebrations (picturing heritage celebrations, farmers' markets, etc). We should be investing for the locals and the tourists can enjoy - not building for the tourists at the expense of the locals. Simple accessibility for our citizens and attractive for visitors.
678. Well thought out.
679. Do not touch public land. Do not develop over Ontario Place. It belongs to the people, and leaving a small plot for public use, and cannibalizing the majority of it is THEFT.
680. I hope that every City Councillor and Manager will actually visit the existing site to see how valuable that land is to the well being of its citizens and anytime who visits

681. Ontario Place is public land; it should be revitalized and revamped for the public, using public funding and public support. The idea of a big spa and parking garage via a secret private leasing agreement with an Austrian spa company is a stretch, as hard as it's been marketed as some kind of boon to the city and the province.
682. Ontario Place has been used by all the residents of Parkdale, Roncesvalles, Liberty Village and more for the past decade to cycle, hike, enjoy the views etc. the proposed 20m public space around the waterfront of the West island will call for accidents to happen between hikers, family strolling, cyclists, dog walker etc. Who can be sued for planning such a dangerously small public space?
683. In a democracy with vibrant civic culture, private for-profit development of public land is an assault on that culture and democratic principles
684. It is very important to me that the public washrooms, some of which are winterized, remain open and available to the public year-round. I was very glad to see those incorporated in the new plan. It is important to me that the path surrounding the outside of islands remains available to the public, which it appears it will be. Though I'm confused if this is 100% happening as a condition of the contract, or if it's something that Therme Group is offering. (Even knowing that public access to 100% of the waterfront of Ontario Place was a guiding principal of any accepted plan.) My fear is that there's a possibility it could be left out of the final plan, or changed due to budget constraints. The planned public beach on the West Island shows in the plans as being on Therme Group land, if I'm reading it correctly. If that's true, what are the risks? Will they eventually be able to claim it only for private use if it's on land they're leasing long-term? The additions of a public beach in the plans I saw is appreciated. The nearest beach, Sunnyside, is closed for what feels like 99% of the summer due to dangerously high e-coli levels so is essentially unusable. Has there been though put into the design and location of the beach to ensure it will be usable by the public and not just geese? Also last year there was an issue with the sewage overflow pipe in the wave break wall - I've been unable to find an update on the projects around that so am not sure if there's a long-term solution or not which would affect the quality of water at the beach. I would be interested to hear about that. I am incredibly upset that public green space is being taken away and turned into indoor space. I understand the provincial government's plan includes revitalisation of tourism, but I do not understand why it involves taking a fantastic public outdoor space and making it a private indoor space. I realise there is nothing I can say to change it, but I need to share I am extremely opposed to the land going to Therme Group. Not because of the business, but because it's being built in a place that will remove green space from public use. (Yes, we'll have access but it's all going to be paved in concrete according to the images shared) Having seen the current plan, it's clear the incorporation of the Science Centre was not planned for. Where is the space to put that? If the Ontario Government knew that was part of the plan, why not put the Science Centre building where the spa is going? If you must turn an outdoor space into an indoor one, at least make it a place that makes use of the location and surrounding trees and water. But why put even more buildings on a place known for being and used as an outdoor space? In the plans shown at the meeting there were images of a skating rink. Would that be private, or is it on public land? It would be great to replace the loss of the Harbourfront Rink. It was unclear to me if that's in the plan or if it was just a nice image shown to me by a company that had no actual plans to make one. An image of what the space could be, but not an actual plan.
685. There is a need for more public park space within the city. An argument being made by Doug Ford is to make Ontario place a public attraction like how it was back when it was an amusement park. What he is forgetting to recognize is that Toronto and the area surrounding Ontario place has changed significantly since when Ontario place was in amusement park. Liberty Village and CityPlace we're nonexistent back then and are now. Commercializing the land is not something that people want or need. Might have been great in the 90's but that's before all the development in the area happened and there was more green/park space readily available. People use Ontario place as a nice relaxing park to escape from the busy city. We do not want it to be a stressful mega attraction centre for tourists. We have other portions of waterfront that are like this. We simply need a nice park space with trails access to waterfront beaches, greenery. Making the space similar to trillium park and upgrading some of the food outlets and outdoor activities i.e. basketball ping-pong would be great. I disagree with the spa and commercialization aspects of the park as well as moving the science centre over to Ontario place. Having well lit areas in the evening and more fire pits to rent would be nice. Many city events take place

at Ontario Place. What will happen to those events/where will they be located with the revitalization plan? These events, foster the community. Will there be a place for them to host their event/festivals? Ex red bull fall fest, taco fest etc. Public Wi-Fi would be nice in the park. Suggestion - developers must add back the same amount (or more) of green space/nature they removed while building commercialized spaces. This is some thing Singapore does within its downtown core, and it also helps to reduce carbon footprint. Keeping the trees (forest part) on the west end. Addressing wind. If the expectation is for people to use the space year-round, there needs to be more sheltering. The beach and look out point is a key favourite of many. Maintaining multiple in and out routes and trails for people to run and walk through. Want the space to feel like you are still very much in nature. For it to have a calm, relaxing field to it and not a tourist destination.

686. According to the diagrams presented, the spa and live nation venues take up more than 50% of the space. More public access space is required given the lack of it along the lakeshore due to high rise development. I agree with a museum venue, however, not a reduced size Science Centre. Toronto and Ontario could use a museum dedicated to educating and celebrating First Nation, Inuit and Métis peoples. There are many artifacts in the ROM that are hidden away due to lack of space. Having a museum dedicated to First Nation, Inuit and Métis would go a long way towards reconciliation.
687. It would be wonderful if spaces for rollerblading were included in the design. Perhaps a large open space for those new to/learning to rollerblading, and a long stretch for those who are more skilled.
688. The 'public' space is mostly concrete, with little shade or greenery, making it uninviting. The children's "playground" is just a small green space. Children have a bigger playground at most urban parks, than at this "family-oriented" place. The beach is poorly positioned to keep it from receiving lake debris, which will make it unusable for its intended purpose.
689. The fact that this is a private spa means that general members of the public will not be able to enjoy any of this land. We need to keep this redevelopment from happening.
690. This whole deal is corrupt.
691. What evidence-based decision making went into the decision to provide Therme with such a sweetheart lease on the Ontario Place land?
692. The proposal seems to have some good public spaces and parkland. Canoeing, kayaking, walking, concerts, publicly-accessible events like festivals and markets are all appropriate and positive. But, again, I completely fail to understand why we are giving away so much public land (or any public land, for that matter) to a private for-profit company. There is no possible justification for this. It is a complete betrayal of the original spirit of Ontario Place.
693. I strongly oppose the give-away of public assets to private corporations. By give-away, I don't just mean the outright sale of assets. Give-aways also mean long-term leases and ceding control of public spaces to private business even if the spaces nominally remain Crown property. All three types of transactions essentially deprive the public of resources that belong to them. The gigantic Therme mega spa takes up far too much public land and will be a blight on Toronto's waterfront. There are countless alternate sites in the GTA that would be suitable for private spas. Mani/Pedi's, salt scrubs and seaweed body wraps have absolutely nothing to do with celebrating Ontario. I can't see how any activity carried out in a spa would align with the purpose of Ontario Place. Like the many people who support the Ontario Place for All campaign, I want Ontario Place to be a free, open and accessible waterfront park for the public. It's shameful that the provincial government seems determined to hand this jewel of a public asset over to a private corporation.
694. Using a 95-year lease for development of private spa seems like a complete waste of provincial land and resources. This seems like a repeat of the disaster that was the privatization of the 407. If we go on standard length of commercial leases, 20-year duration will be more inline. Along with the announcement to tear down Ontario Science Center and move it to Ontario place (if it happens), it looks like both the Ontario Science Center

land and Ontario Place land are being sold to private businesses at the cost of the taxpayer.

695. This proposal is closing the waterfront off further, not opening it up.
696. We do not want a luxury spa at Ontario Place. This is not a good use of public space and will not encourage families to come to Ontario Place. What will encourage people to come to OP is more green space, parkland, events like food festivals, multicultural events, movies at the Cinesphere, good concerts at the Budweiser stage. And more activities for children.
697. The public spaces and programming proposed is in general acceptable and could be made better through consultation and City comments with the exception of the West Island and the Therme component. The proposed building has a very large mass and footprint and requires extensive lake fill and public effort to be accommodated on a site that is too small for it. The much touted 12 acres of new public lands are in fact just this lake fill required to accommodate Therme and is created in detriment of the lake which is also public property at this point. In spite of the assurances the spa proposal, now transformed in an indoor water park is not responding to the what the public was asking – I have still to hear a truly public demand and support for such use and impactful facility. Ontario taxpayers will cover a large part of the costs and the public benefits for the large segments of the populations, in particular for those in need, for the local community are clearly missing. Some of the other public space elements of the proposal including those deriving from the very successful Trillium park, the water access on the channel are welcome. The new proposed beach is created through lake fill and not necessary, the current beach is a lovely and very popular spot and could be improved. The proposed feature at the West end is in the path of both dominant winds and should be relocated and redesigned. The last minute, small space proposed for the relocation of Ontario Science Centre should be moved to the pods as a satellite OSC annex focused on environment, ecology, water, sustainability, a demonstration of sustainable energy and eco design. This way OSC could stay where it is as major public amenity for the local area, the City and the province saving a lot of money and environmental impacts. In conclusion moving the large private Therme component to another, more appropriate site, more accessible and with far less impacts (e.g. South Etobicoke) and revitalizing the West Island by preserving the landscape and trees, improving the shore and the existing public realm would be a much better solution, avoid the huge impacts and public expenditures and provide a public space and amenity much more appropriate to Toronto and area needs, a key component of the City's new waterfront. Such solution could even accommodate a much smaller "Nordic" spa tucked in the hill East slope and reusing the "silos", result in very little tree and vegetation impact, far less ecological impacts and great views to and from the Downtown. Such amenity will not require expensive lake fill nor parking and contribute to the scale and success of the overall site and revitalize Ontario Place within the original vision and context.
698. If your idea of a public space is a doughnut of concrete around a giant spa that will cost a minimum of \$40 to enter, then I guess it's brilliant. The Therme designs offer only a paved path around the spa. No place for picnics, or lounging, or playing with your kids. No place for serendipity. But a lot of paving. I am one of the people who practically grew up in Children's Village, and I use Ontario Place all the time now -- to swim, bike and wander around with my kids. It's wild and full of wildlife. The Therme plans laminate the space.
699. Building a massive parking garage when the site will be served by a new subway line is wrong, not sustainable. There was no adequate explanation given by the applicant. The waterfront is not an appropriate location for the Therme building. The Therme building is an indoor space that requires a large amount of parking that could be located virtually anywhere. The water front should be preserved for public use. Why was the Science Centre shown on the drawings when it presumably is not part of this development application? Is there a process to integrate into the same development application?
700. Public waterfront space is scarce and valuable in Toronto. Ontario place should be focused on the Lake and lake-related activities. We need more park and public space for the public to enjoy for free particularly in the summer. I am strongly opposed to building a private spa on this location - such a private facility could be located anywhere and has nothing to do with the lake. I am strongly opposed to moving the Science Centre to this location - it is more accessible to people from Southern Ontario at its current location much further north, closer

to the population centre of the region.

701. Barring Therme's proposed project, the increase to public spaces does not seem to be as well thought out. Parking lots, for example, are not well placed for AODA needs; a public space is not accessible if someone with a mobility need had to travel 2 or 3 times farther to their desired destination if parking is only in 1 or 2 areas. Additionally, when that many numbers of parking spots is at issue, it creates more traffic and bottle necking in and out of the facility, rather than efficiency and revenue generation. Public play areas for children and activity hubs for seniors that are natural as well as entertaining are just as important to any redevelopment plan as facilities and amenities. The proposal around waterfront access, opening pathways to better cross the island, and increasing trees and other hardy vegetation are all promising. The parts of the proposal that are seemingly at odds with public spaces and activities, and may even hinder long-term attraction, are the Therme spa and Ontario Science Centre aspects. I echo what many people expressed during the virtual meeting, which is the Spa is poorly placed in this part of the city. It would be much better suited somewhere such as the Woodbine Centre. Furthermore, the idea of 25K+ individuals going to and from Ontario Place as proposed (~14K+ visitors/weekend to the spa, another ~11K+ to the Live Nation venue) sounds nightmarish to traffic infrastructure. It is not possible to funnel that many people in and out of that small area on a regular basis while not affecting traffic on Lakeshore Blvd. and public transit vehicles.
702. A small ribbon of pathways just isn't wide enough. Not enough land is being developed as green space throughout. This minimal area around the edges is not enough of a gain or justification for giving public space to a private enterprise. Free public spaces and much more green space that is more like a park would benefit the people who are not going for the Spa. They refer to Trillium Park. It works because it's well planted and much wider than what is being proposed for the water's edge. The west "island" needs that kind of green space with trees and winding paths, seating and picnic areas, amenities around a much-reduced Spa.
703. While I am happy to see a revitalization of the entire site, I think that there is an ultimate loss of public space due to the lease of space to private companies.

Additional General Comments, Feedback, or Questions

704. The whole process seemed disingenuous, seemed like a bait and switch almost, where you had to listen to what was not being said.
705. I am hopeful that all levels of government can work together on this and make it a great attraction again :)
706. No spa
707. While there are some interesting elements being proposed, my concerns pertain to the plans for the West Island. Specifically, the proposed footprint at the Therme Spa. As it stands, it [decimates] the public realm. This unacceptable as it represents a significant privatization of public space. From a conceptual perspective a spa + waterpark that will be exclusive (based on the business model presented) is a further affront to the public.
708. We need more large parks on the west side and on the waterfront. I do not believe we should have a spa and water slides on waterfront land. For shame. We don't need more parking - please don't approve.
709. In my neighbourhood there are people that have no idea that we live near a lake. There is no affordable way for them to get near the water. We live at Dundas & Dufferin.
710. No public space for private projects! Taxpayers' money for public realm & activities. Unfortunately, the province will have final say & can overrule City Council.
711. All the fun, pleasure, delight, play and flexibility of the original Ontario Place has been lost.
712. Is it true that Therme as a Romanian based company is financed by Russian oligarchs?

713. 4 pm - 7 pm is peak commuting time on Lakeshore. There are a number of construction initiatives the city has planned (Ont. Line, Therme) + events (CNE, TFC, marathons, Argos, live music events/festivals). It takes up to 1 hour to turn left onto Strachan Ave to get into residential areas during the weekdays. After spending 10 hours at the office/work, it can be frustrating that my usual 40 min commute turns into a 1.5 hour + commute due to Lakeshore to Strachan Ave traffic. The city needs to plan better access to residential designated areas north of Lakeshore.
714. Concerns about parking; presentation indicated only 10% of visitors would require parking, but how would this be allocated to park use? (i.e. would most public spaces be accessed via public transit/bicycles/walking) vs private spaces being mostly accessed by patrons arriving via cars? General concern about privatization use/space of business vs public areas in develop. This does not feel like the ideal spot for the proposed spa.
715. Is a spa appropriate? If there must be one, why does it need to be so large? How can we preserve the majority of the west island as park land? Why does there need to be so much onsite parking? Why can't parking be offsite with access to the site by transit? Is the multi-use path wide enough for that many uses?
716. Presenters commented on how passionate people are about this subject. It is no wonder, it is being said loud and clear that Torontonians do not want a spa on the Waterfront - please listen to us!
717. NO SPA!!!
718. Therme should create a plan for community engagement (with Ontario Place for all?) for maintenance of land, shore cleanup, etc.
719. The spa looks HUGE, especially in scale to the Cinesphere & the Live Nation space. The current parking space in the waterfront promenade is hell to walk through when trying to access Trillium Park, it would be great to see it broken up more, also perhaps also including greenery as a wind breaker.
720. I read about a study showing that passengers who had to walk by first class seats on their way to their more affordable seats in the plane were more dissatisfied with their flight. The public who would visit the proposed public spaces at Ontario Place will have a similar experience. How is it possible that a spa, a luxury use, is being proposed on public land when we live in a city with so many struggling for affordable housing to meet their basic needs. Shameful.
721. I bus from Bloor to the Esplanade down Sherbourne; walking is faster. The line of cars entering the Gardiner is 46 blocks... Therme proposes 4,000-12,000 users...
722. Strongly oppose the Therme spa! Please reduce the size, or ideally remove altogether.
723. 100% support the idea of the Science Centre being there so a family has lots to do there & can spend a day on the islands.
724. More transparency is necessary. Do we need a spa? Can we just have more park space, its cheaper.
725. The consultation Sat April 15, 2023 should've been much more widely advertised to have even more public participation. And should've had a significant consult much earlier than now.
726. Do what it takes to keep Ontario Place, every square inch, free and accessible.
727. This project has not specifically engaged local adjacent neighbourhood - for us this has local implications beyond those that impact the city.
728. General concerns: water use, electricity load, sewage system capacity.
729. Cutting down 861 trees for a private enterprise goes against the city's commitment to public access for a city population that is exploding.

730. The plan to privatize public land is not fiscally responsible or progressive. The City of Toronto & the province have a growing population. We need more publicly accessible space not less.
731. Public money should not be used to pay for parking --> Therme should cover all of these costs.
732. Intro was too long.
733. Is this a priority for public \$? I think not.
734. Why do we need a spa? Why do you think it will be popular? Destroy Wonderland
735. In the summertime during live nation events, there is always a large amount of people coming in on bike share, and no spaces to leave bikes.
736. I'm concerned about how secretive the Province is about this plan; it is a trend in their conduct. The scale of the proposal is a concern. This proposal feels rushed.
737. Unclear what is happening with: development of east island? Budweiser stage? What is the Forum supposed to be? Are consideration for geothermal installations being taken?
738. Why are we privatizing so much of the best land in Toronto? Such a prominent site should be free and open to all and still be built to a high standard - find another site to lease to private enterprise if you need money to pay for it.
739. Patrick from City is great!!!
740. If the Science Centre is relocated here, it should go on the parking lots of Exhibition Place, not on the waterfront, since it is fundamental hangar, its uses are largely interior. Small science + local Ontario context would be appropriate for the pods (+ should include arts, music, craft, other Ontario activities (also economic drivers!) not just science).
741. Thank you to City staff for your report to Community Council. I do think that the findings of the report should have been summarized in 2-3 slides. Then the applicant's presentation should focus on areas of concern identified in the report (rather than trying to control the narrative). It was unclear who would be financially responsible for upkeep of the public space. Is it the Province or the City? Will profits from Therme support this upkeep into perpetuity? (i.e. is this why it has to be so BIG?)
742. The City staff who have drafted a report about some of the issues w/ this plan - they should be open about it! Many people don't know!
743. Therme - "Why is it there?" Most importantly - why is it there on one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world? Therme's presence detracts from the natural connection to the [centre] and nature. "Wellness" is just that [connection] to nature & water. This is not wellness!
744. Therme is intentionally misleading regarding coverage & heights in West Island. Stop misleading statements about family use & also future - faking about possible [charger]. Start over with a much smaller % of area for private use only.
745. What are the details of the contract with the private company occupying such a large space? We heard they "should" comply with environmental regulations of the City, but does that mean the City will need to constantly monitor and issue fines when they don't comply? We heard the contract is over 50 years. This is a huge concern. What happens if it's a white elephant before the contract is up? Do the tax payers have protection in the contract?
746. I still don't understand the addition of a spa, except as a cash flow, but if \$650 mil is being spent and used, can it not be used in other ways?
747. Isn't it possible to build a beautiful public park which does not require tree and beach removal. Similar to

Millennium Park in Chicago.

748. This is just the worst idea. Also, Lakeshore Blvd **has** to be **redesigned**. It is already treacherous for pedestrians and cycling travelling on the Martin Goodman Trail.
749. Cancel the spa, improve the park.
750. My overall comment is that I believe (as an active, regular user of Ontario Place) Ontario Place already is a vibrant space, full of people using it as a park, picnic space, renting paddle boats and kayaks, evicting the existing food vendors, and exploring the old amusement park remnants. It doesn't need **revisoning, revival**. It is very much loved as a public park on our waterfront. I hope you will reject any proposal that doesn't keep it as a much-loved city park. Downtown residents deserve **PARKS** just like people in Scarborough and Etobicoke. P.S. Again - PLEASE KEEP THE MUSKOKA CHAIRS!
751. We need to empower the non-for-profit events.
752. The format was great, as planned, it's a shame so many attendees were so disrespectful. Thank you for your professionalism. The small group discussion on public realm w/ Patrick was great. :) Would have preferred more time in this mode as opposed to the wide group where ppl were often just grandstanding (loudest voice wins).
753. *not impressed with the format 12:30-2:00 - Talking at us with repetition 2:00-2:25 - Taking questions --> not all of which were answered 2:35-2:48 - Repetition of talking points with the same rendered drawings 2:48 - Questions
754. 7. Our taxes should not be used to support a private project but invested in revitalizing our public lands.
755. ON gov reps noted "accessible for all abilities" --> That's simply not true. There's no way some folks would be able to make it past Lakeshore, over those big pedestrian boulevards to enjoy the nature. Regardless of what the regulations say, it is not accessible for all based on lived reality.
756. Losing public space for Toronto. There are no public spaces for the locals just more condos. Currently Ontario Place is used at 100%. No back up plan to Therme! Seems ridiculous to put all your eggs into a spa that failed in Whitby! (hot tubs are high risk for diseases + death).
757. I don't feel like the province really cares about what the people of Ontario want, and want to only give the appearance of public consultation. Opening up OP for slackline access was discussed in the city meeting of May 2019. NOTHING in the proposal accommodates slacklines or other low impact sports like climbing.
758. Need full transparency around the deal with Therme - lease cost + term, property taxes - parking lot cost, maintenance, revenue - Therme other responsibilities + accountability for those responsibilities/obligations e.g. termination clauses
759. Please connect with those of us who use the beaches at OP regularly and consult with us about beach/water use. FB group Swim OP or contact me [Name removed]
760. Plan a large public skating area with winter skate rentals. Require that all planned buildings are much smaller, shorter. Focus on **public** experience at park - places of refuge, enjoyment of the environment. How is a massive glassy building that dominates the landscape "rethinking the natural environment"? Not.
761. Ontario Place should be accessible to people with disabilities or those who receive welfare like ODSP and OW, not just families and friends. In addition, there should be more acknowledgement to Indigenous people who resided Ontario Place, then and now {therefore} the City should consider "Accessibility for Disabilities Ontario Act" into Ontario Place.
762. This is a garbage plan and you know it. The city will be actively made worse by allowing the privatization of public space and the construction of gigantic parking lots. Facilitating this project is irresponsible, actively assisting it is outright evil.

763. Use development to fund improvements to water quality and sewage overflows in Humber Bay and western Lake Ontario shoreline
764. The lobbying that has been undertaken by Therme is absolutely ridiculous as has been the public's ability to inform the future of Ontario .
765. I have lived all my life in the west end of Toronto. I have never heard anybody say "I want a spa at Ontario Place" but I have heard many say they wanted more free equitable green space.
766. The proposal is completely wrong for the site. No one asked for this. Move it to another site and surround it with parking lots. It's complete urban vandalism as it is now presented.
767. NO SPA. NO SCIENCE CENTER. HANDS OFF OUR PUBLIC PARKS
768. Toronto does not need a gargantuan "spa" on prime waterfront or hundreds of parking spaces.
769. Please stop this appropriation of an important public space.
770. This was a fake consultation. The consultants we took up way too much time with their diagrams etc and the facilitator promised that everyone would be listened to, able to ask questions - then cut off the questions to move us into so called breakaway groups.
771. The development is important for businesses in the area. The improve of public realm makes it a perfect proposition
772. I am appalled by the campaign for this proposal which is obviously a money-making venture for certain companies and friends of the Ontario government. There is no transparency or honesty and how it could be considered is insulting to Torontonians . Most people now live in condos built by property developers and with little access to balconies , fresh air or green space . To make an indoor space for a private foreign company on Ontario Place rather than investing in improvements in infrastructure to the green space for the people of Toronto to enjoy is literally criminal and offensive .
773. I am concerned over the designation of public space to a private organization at this magnitude. Their investment only covers a portion of the western island development as essentially their own, with a public strip around. Parking is also a concern. It was stated that the primary patronage of the parking facility will be driven by the private corporations Therme and LiveNation, and to a lesser degree the Science pavilion. Why is the development burden of the parking facility then on the public?
774. Is there a spec sheet that details all the numbers provided?
775. I'm in support. Too many nimby negative voices don't see the bigger picture. Toronto needs bigger visions like this.
776. In case it's not apparent from my answers, I believe the only responsible choice is to halt this project immediately. As someone who uses the West Island weekly (along with hundreds to thousands I typically see there), I find it insulting how Therme is attempting to sell our land back to us after destroying what makes it special.
777. I am appalled that the provincial government is pursuing this proposal.
778. strongly against the Therme Spa
779. In its current form, the proposal is deeply flawed. I would like to see the process slowed down such that proper environmental audits, community consultation, and progressive planning can occur. Ontario Place is an incredibly special spot for so many, historically and currently.
780. Do not support

781. It's nuts
782. No giant spa.
783. Ford's plan is a huge mistake. This is my neighbourhood and its a major asset to the community. Don't replace it with a car park that brings way too much traffic into an already SUPER busy and dangerous high-traffic area. During the summer the Ex Grounds already make that whole area a total zoo- this is NOT a good place to put a destination business. Put a spa and adventure club in central Scarborough or Etobicoke, which deserve to have more \$\$ going to local business and more fun stuff to do. Preserve green space. Add some public art or a kid's playground. Don't destroy the interesting and unique leftover infrastructure that tells the story of the area. I have friends from the UK who visited me and they LOVED the current state of Ontario Place. They felt it was unique and beautiful. It embraces what Toronto has going for it- it's quirky, 20th century architecture that is unlike anywhere else, on the most beautiful lake.
784. We don't want Therme on the waterfront. This is not the place for a massive tourist attraction that has more in common with Canada's Wonderland than a sensitive, public minded and environmentally conscious preconception of an iconic park.
785. I strongly urge the city to preserve the outdoor space on the west island. The waterfront is precious. Toronto is lucky to have it and should not make the mistake of allowing it to be closed off from public use. Although there is public space planned for the west island it is little more than a walkway around a building, which is not an adequate public realm.
786. How much will this proposed development impact the Waterfront trail and cycling/pedestrian infrastructure, particularly for utilitarian cyclists connecting routes
787. Stop listening to Ford and talk to Torontonians about what we actually want. This plan is awful.
788. I'd like the city to grow a spine and stand up to the Ontario government, to stop them from taking valuable green space away from Torontonians. Also, why would we move the science centre when there's going to be a new transit line running there? Why use taxpayer monies on these things when we're told that there's no money for transit, or mental health services, or SAFE housing for our unhoused neighbours? Money for police and private business interests is all there seems to be, but I'd like to see a change wherein the city actually decides to invest in itself, and maybe try and take pride in itself again... maybe fill a pothole or empty a garbage can or open a park bathroom year-round.
789. The extremely small envelope for free public access is much, much too small. In the past Ontario Place was an affordable destination for young families to go to the water park, teenagers to see affordable concerts and adults to have food and a drink on the waterfront.
790. Appalled at the vision in traffic and greed
791. This initiative is complete garbage and I will not be visiting.
792. I frequent Ontario Place regularly and find the whole idea of needing to reinvent and revitalize it insulting. It is already a very much-loved park in the city and thousands of people use it happily every day. To remove parkland and cover it up with a private business of any kind is unfair to the thousands of residents who live downtown.
793. Do not privatize or charge admission or add parking.
794. Maintaining some of the unique features is essential for preserving what is a landmark. The Cinesphere, the pods etc. This land and area MUST 100% be kept publicly owned. DO NOT ALLOW it to become like 407ETR where we gave it away only to be ripped off by the operators. Access to Ontario place should be free of charge. Parking costs should be nominal and affordable. Eateries of varying price points. Boat dockage rights cannot be like Leaf's Season's ticket holders whereby only those on the inside get them and keep them. Day docking should be free or nominal cost. Other births costs based on boat size. If someone wants a really big boat there, they

need to pay a lot. Bike friendly. Secure bike storage (attended). Well lit. Safe. Secure. Monitored. Things to do for everyone. Large entertainment or convention venues to be easy to get in and out of. Should have purpose-built options for getting around like an EV train or monorail system? Support for EV charging in parking areas. Solar generation as part of architecture. Easy to get to and from - our roads in Toronto are horrible and full of gridlock. The gridlock is in part due to lost vehicle lanes for alternative transport types and it is not boding well overall as vehicle drivers are increasingly more frustrated and impatient, Ebikes and scooters all over sidewalks and darting dangerously in and out of gridlocked traffic. This project has to consider these issues before making it a better place to go - how to get there and get home.

795. It sucks
796. I think it has the makings of another Mistake by the Lake. We cannot trust that a private business will be there in 10-15-25 years. In five years, we may have an empty monstrosity. Should there be another pandemic, or even a bad flu season, I can't see enough people wanting to share a spa that size. Already there were hospitalizations related to bacterial infections in a newly opened spa in Eastern Ontario. Many people I know are not so keen on the experience.
797. I am very opposed to this development
798. I am firmly opposed to the size and scope of this project as well as the philosophy behind it. Ontario Place should be for everyone.
799. Ask Therme to leave.
800. It is a very opaque process (although that's the Province's doing, not the City's). How much will the land clearing and garage construction cost taxpayers? How long is the lease for? Are there any Plan Bs if the spa fails financially? What penalties are there if Therme doesn't live up to its commitments? What penalties are there if Therme cuts corners on construction and materials, resulting in a structure that doesn't even live up to the renderings? Etc.
801. The Ontario Place redevelopment should be community driven and shepherded. The fact that a private organization has been chosen without the consent of the people of Toronto, with no elected mandate from the people of the province is very upsetting.
802. Please do not build this
803. I have nothing against spas, only that they shouldn't be allowed to be built on public parkland, especially on the West Island. I understand pedestrian priority is fundamental to the revitalization but I feel that the spa on the West Island dominates the space and sadly to comply with creating the necessary pedestrian public space excessive infilling is needed. The spa is an inward focused structure with little if any connection to the outside. Therefore, of what value or purpose is it to be located on such a precious public park.
804. Public funds can and should be used to refurbish and make whole 'Ontario Place for All'
805. The City should not support the development of the spa in Ontario Place. It makes far more sense for the spa to be located near woodbine.
806. No casino, spa or underground parking! Keep in family friendly and natural!
807. STOP THE CASINO
808. This vision. Idea. Is simply wrong. It will be seen by future generations as a tragic ridiculously short-sighted decision
809. I believe that this proposal is a positive step towards the development of our waterfront. Despite some criticism, I believe it will serve to be a valuable walking connection on the western side of the waterfront. And the Therme development will provide another destination amenity for those looking for activities to do all year round.

810. It's not how I want to see my tax dollars spent. The "spa" will be an eye sore on our beautiful skyline. Build it north, if you must build it at all.
811. Do not go through with this travesty of a public park sell-off. Revitalize the public park, and do not hand over public land to such a travesty.
812. It sucks. Not terminology I generally use as a trained academic, but all the current provincial government merits.
813. The proposal to relocate the Science Centre to Ontario Place is a terrible idea, and will be a distraction from serious discussions about how to improve Ontario Place. It makes no sense to take the Science Centre from a location that is easily accessible to the entire city, and put it in a place that will be difficult for most people to get to, thanks to downtown's never-ending traffic congestion problems. Even worse, why waste money relocating something that already works, when the city is starving for funding to solve real problems, like homelessness, public transit, public safety, parks, etc. I just can't believe how stupid the Science Centre relocation idea is...
814. The city needs more green spaces as the housing density nearby increases
815. I have only become aware of the proposed land swap and stand firmly against allowing the province to have control of the city's lands that are being looked at.
816. No to the spa and Doug ford corruption. He want a casino!
817. This space is not the area for this development
818. I was very surprised by the nature and tone of the applicants and all of their consultants, architects and planners. Certainly, they can't be expected to be neutral in this process, but it seemed to a person their job was trying to convince us the existing plan was the best in every way. Most pointed questions were unanswered or otherwise deflected. I only heard one fellow admit his projections weren't based on any kind of independent assessment... only the numbers provided to him by the applicant. I can't help but think this meeting was held for only one reason. I believe Therme will tweak their proposal in tiny little ways. They will report they have completed their "community consultation" requirements and then proceed as they want. Ontario Place is public land...owned by all of us. We deserve a better plan for this priceless site.
819. Why have the April 15 event during lunchtime without offering any beverages and food - aside from water and coffee? Budget issues? Logistical challenges? Who are the groups of people that are coming to your in-person events? Citizen activists and ACTIVE VOTERS. Let that sink in.
820. The land that is proposed for development is not 'surplus land' in the city of Toronto! It has incredible value as a green space for non-motorized recreation, community events, Indigenous gatherings, and habitat for the many land- and aquatic-species that call the lakeshore area home.
821. That this ludicrous proposal is even on the table is a mark of a deeply dysfunctional state of governance and a complete failure of responsible governance of public goods.
822. I think it should be a green space like Leslie Spit.
823. The presentation was failing. It was not transparent nor clear. The city intertwined the entire Ontario Place redevelopment with the Therme as if we couldn't have one without the other. That was not fair nor does Therme have to be there. The city must have known very well that Therme is entering hostile waters. The build is so entirely inappropriate. I know for myself and several people I talked to, the presentation and request for feedback was confusing. I was very reluctant to give any feedback because it would have validated Therme. I wasn't going to do that. No way. It felt underhanded. I understand that the Premier made this back-door deal with no real public input and now we are stuck with it? And my hand is forced to try and morph/influence the Therme design into something to be happy with? No. I am not going to be happy because I don't want it. Never asked for it. I kept thinking, What the hell am I doing here? I shouldn't be here, this should not be happening. It's

a very, very bad situation. Nix the spa and 2500 underground parking lot (was there ANY plans to prioritize EV and bike locks/share?). The City has the power to stop this. Step up and be proud of our heritage.

824. We don't want the mega spa
825. This space is used by Toronto residents. Unfair to sell it off. Better to develop as parkland
826. I think the City should have been involved from day one, we will have to live with this monster if it ever gets built and suffer possible traffic congestion all along Queens Quay and at the Bathurst fleet street intersection
827. I'm in support of this proposal and can't wait to finally have an Ontario place that's worth visiting . Ontario place has sat abandoned for long enough and it should be an attraction with multiple uses.
828. The City needs more major attractions and amenities. This would be a great start. I can't wait to attend.
829. I question why we need a spa? What good is it and how often will it actually be used? I think it will be a money looser and then who will be on the hook for those losses. Do you think the spa will be named for the Ford family as his legacy to the city or a developer friend?
830. please do everything you can to keep this precious space public so everyone can enjoy it not just rich people driving downtown for a stupid spa. really, A SPA!
831. I was quite irritated with the format of the engagement survey from summer 2021. Three likely scale was reversed to typical, with most likely set as 1 and least likely was 5. The questions related specifically to access to Ontario place and, without thoroughly reading instructions, I am wondering how many people ranked bus and car as the most likely form of visiting the site. I alerted several people to this reversal and they were very grateful as they wouldn't have noticed the change. The results of this survey could lean heavily towards methods that Doug Ford is heavily invested and my wonder is it actually accurate to how the space is used
832. The indigenous communities do not support this plan. Those concerned about social justice and equity do not support this plan. I am deeply concerned about the environmental impact on migratory birds, vast garbage generation, catering to the pastimes of the rich over the pressing needs of our local communities, the added pollution and the strain this spa places on Toronto's public infrastructure. The optics of this plan are horrendous. No one wants this eyesore of a private spa and epic parking lot.
833. My biggest concern is the parking. We should be moving towards sustainable modes of transportation and cars are not this. Car infrastructure is inefficient and expensive. The entrance to Ontario place is a 10-minute walk from Exhibition Go and should be the main way of accessing this public space. Let's build this city for people not cars!
834. I'm concerned about traffic congestion, environmental conditions and how families who live far from the waterfront and don't drive will access and afford to visit.
835. I hate this plan. I don't want a spa. I don't want Ontario Science Centre to move here. I want a public park. What is the contingency plan if the spa fails? Why are we spending so much money on an underground parking lot?
836. Densification in the waterfront requires a lot of green open public space, such as the West Island of the Ontario Place. We need to use the unnecessary parking lots thanks to the subway line - to be turned into additional public open green space and we don't need more underground parking lot.
837. Don't take away the science centre as it currently is!! This is an extremely important attraction for families and schools that's currently easy to get to. Moving it downtown will drastically reduce the number of schools and families who will be able to go. Traffic to and around downtown is too heavy and stressful to go through to get to the new location at Ontario place.
838. I don't see the proposal reflecting the large community opposition. I do not support this proposal. Ontario Place

is a unique valuable part of the waterfront that should be enjoyed by all, not sold off to a private spa.

839. Concerned about traffic generated by this project
840. What are the terms of the lease?
841. Billy Bishop airport handles 3 million passengers per year. This is the same projection for the Therme spa. This is deeply unrealistic. The facility would be as busy as an airport? When larger, nearby structures (AGO, ROM, Wonderland) cannot draw that many people. There is no justification for this projection. The projections of use of the space by different types of traffic (pedestrians, bicycles, rideshares, buses, cars) is based on this unrealistic number. This means we expect this place to fill with cars. Moving the Science Centre is terrible. I love that building. I wanted to take my son there to share it with him. The parts of this proposal that aren't the Therme facility, the unrealistic projections and destroying the existing Science Centre are fine. It seems like the problem with these existing spaces is a lack of maintenance. We need to focus on making sure that whatever is there will be easy to maintain.
842. Give the land to the federal government
843. The land is not surplus. Your decision is significant. If a spa is to be built, make it smaller (in both height and footprint). Please have a backbone when it comes to the provincial government, if you don't protect the city from Ford and his corrupt, car-idolizing, out-of-touch development cronies we will lose everything that makes us great.
844. I strongly oppose to the proposed OSC move to Ontario Place. The current location of the OSC, with the Eglinton LRT stop about to be completed, will open up access to so many families without vehicles. This allows easy access for residents and tourists alike who would use Toronto's transit system to access this wonderful attraction. Not only does this support and encourage STEM interest for many families, but it's current location also makes the facility a viable option for many socioeconomically disadvantaged communities to visit as it would not require access to a vehicle, the ability to afford expensive parking (a guaranteed feature of Ontario Place) and/or school funds to pay for a school bus. The new proposed location would add more traffic to an area already prone to high traffic bottle neck points and not only increase risk to pedestrian safety and be damaging to the environment through increased fossil fuel/CO2 output in the area. I strongly hope the government will reconsider this costly and unnecessary decision.
845. The city should know that the along with all my previous comments about scaling back the spa, lowering the parking numbers I would also like to comment on the moving of the Science Center. It was mentioned that the Science Center is not easily accessible . This is false as it will have 2 MAJOR transit lines connected to it. The science center is so important to the locals and is architectural heritage piece. It is vital to educated the marginalized groups in that area as well as providing employment.
846. The proposal has a lot of great benefits to it is but the spa and parking are HUGE negatives that could have repercussions for decades.
847. Why are we returning to a water park at Ontario Place? Why aren't we thinking outside the box and creating a new, simple recreation space in the core to help not only Torontonians but others in the GTA who can't easily get to a Provincial Park enjoy and connect to nature. The City and the Province could create a beautiful space for not only people but threatened animals and rare plants.
848. I'm truly excited by so much of the proposals on all the other parts of the redevelopment plans, except for the presence of the Therme Spa! Remove that and I and many others will be so much happier.
849. Therme's the same company who had to close their operation temporarily in Whitby due to people getting rashes. Calling them Wellness Centres is a marketing term. There is already a private American firm at Ontario Place. Another private firm, taking up half of the public space is unacceptable. The process has not been transparent.
850. Waterfront Toronto's design review panel provided thoughtful and excellent comments recently to the applicant

and Therme. The comments of the expert members of that panel touched succinctly on everything that was discussed in a very unwieldy way at the beanfield consultation Saturday April 15. I am disappointed that the applicant, Therme and city staff have not even mentioned the comments of Waterfront Toronto and how those could inform the proposal.

851. Stop this idiotic spa.
852. This redevelopment proposal has the opportunity to blight our beautiful waterfront for years to come. It's taking publicly-owned, publicly-enjoyed greenspace that is so desperately needed by the folks living in the area, and selling it off to build a spa that few will enjoy. It will be destroying ecologically significant waterfront habitat. This proposal is betraying everyone who lives in, and loves Toronto. We need more public parkland. We need places to gather and get active, we need places for children to play. This redevelopment proposal prioritizes none of those things. It's an awful deal being shamefully forced upon Torontonians, both current and future.
853. It would be great if Ontario Place remained an entirely public space with no large commercial interests taking over significant parts of the land. Supporting local vendors, and improving access to the area via public transit, cycling, etc. would be a much better use of this space. Adding more green spaces, planting more trees (without interfering / disturbing existing vegetation) and focusing on maintaining a publicly accessible space or building affordable housing nearby should be a top priority for this space, rather than turning it into a tourist attraction that could very well end up being a junk yard in a few years.
854. This is promised as an affordable attraction. \$40-something to get in and hang out. More for any more activities. But I can't find anywhere what they are going to charge for parking. For a large number of people that would be included in spending time there. To park in that structure, how much will it be? \$20? \$30? \$40? More? That cost should be included if the term "affordable" is being used to sell the place.
855. I urge city staff and city council to use every policy lever and tool available to us to slow or stop this redevelopment. Ontario Place should be revitalized as a fully public space, extending and building on the success of Trillium Park.
856. This project is clearly unfit for this site. The city of Toronto must not cooperate with its construction in any way.
857. I would like to reiterate that I am excited about the investments into the park, shorelines, trails, and any investments to improve on transit, walking and biking. I am strongly opposed to using any of the West Island for any event centre, let alone a private spa.
858. Anyone who has any part of this should hang their heads in shame. It is awful. A complete travesty.
859. The Therme proposal for the West Island represents a poor land use for publicly owned waterfront site, blocks public views and access across the site, and privatizes key public space. This goes against 20+ years of the City and Waterfront Toronto's waterfront renewal, and dominates and destroys a Provincial cultural landscape. It represents bad planning and should not be supported by the City.
860. We do not want the science centre moved. It is fine where it currently is. It's so ridiculous to move it all the way to Ontario place.
861. Under no circumstances should there be a private spa at Ontario place.
862. The city should do whatever it is legally able to prevent the development of this monstrosity. It is of marginal benefit to residents of the city - and if its such an important development, build it somewhere else that doesn't displace much needed public green space. Moving forward with this proposal would be an absolute disgrace.
863. No spa. More parkland and playgrounds. Find a nice public use for the pods--museum or educational site.
864. Please don't move the science centre. It serves underprivileged communities and a large chunk of the east end.
865. What happens if the spa is built and fails as a business. We've destroyed the waterfront property and are left with a massive eyesore and environmental disaster.

866. Ontario Place should be a place where all Ontarians can come to enjoy the green public space and celebrate a mixed and diverse heritage.
867. Affordable housing, affordable housing, affordable housing. And public access to lots of green space & the lake. And free or affordable family activities. Thank you.
868. NO to the giant spa
869. The province's plan is shameful and full of contempt for the people and city of Toronto. The city must do whatever it can to resist this proposal. This is a generational opportunity that cannot be wasted. Our city has lost so much of what made it good, and so many bad decisions have been made (e.g. Gardiner, canceling transit city, etc.) that have made Toronto a worse and worse place to live. Why on earth should a fancy spa be built on our waterfront? It could go anywhere else! Look at the waterfronts of actually good cities around the world, and they don't have luxury spas, they have big and beautiful public spaces, parks, and beaches. And the science centre is a wonderful, iconic building set in a beautiful ravine, and there is no need to move it, especially when the province has not done costing. There has been zero relevant community consultation around that.
870. In general, this whole plan stinks.
871. This is a terrible proposal that prioritizes private and political interests over those of the public. The spa/water park should not take over so much space and interfere with public space so that it is awkward and inaccessible. This type of private business should be a small corner of the island (if allowed at all). Furthermore, it is wasteful and bad planning to move the Ontario science centre to Ontario place. Leave the existing science centre where it is and either add a second location or use the science space for a different public amenity. Please listen to the public rather than corporate and provincial political greed. Save Ontario place and the science centre for the PUBLIC
872. Horrible idea! Keep this outdoor space the way it is
873. It is vitally important that the terms of the lease and any other agreements with Therme be made public. The provincial government has shown time and again that they are not transparent enough, to the point where issues like the Greenbelt development (and now the Ontario Science Centre) don't "pass the smell test" and suggest the strong possibility of conflicts of interest and corruption. It would be very unfortunate if, after all this, a huge aquatic facility like this was built taking up precious public waterfront land, wasn't profitable, and then either scrapped, or seeking bailout money from the public. WE NEED TO KNOW ALL THE TERMS BEFORE THIS PROCEEDS.
874. What is included in the secret agreement about: increases in admission fees, how long is the lease for, Therme's relationship to Live Nation? What happens to the monstrosity if it closes? It is a terrible idea to move the Science Centre to Ontario Place and clearly this has been in the works for some time. The Science Centre is a great community asset and should remain where it is, an established neighbourhood that is already under-served. Why do we want to bring more people downtown? We want these gems scattered around the city.
875. 100% against putting a big private business on this land or anywhere else on our waterfront.
876. The privatization of the use of public land is a mistake. Allowing the Therme facility at Ontario Place is a mistake.
877. I am happy with most parts of the design proposal. I do not think the Therme project should be allowed to proceed. Instead of meaningless "land acknowledgments" by the city, I would like to see the Therme area instead given to the native people of Ontario. The mandate of this land would be for a native healing space. Perhaps a sweat lodge, native healing herbs. The allocation of this land to native cultural activities would be a huge step in acknowledging native land rights.
878. Firstly, I think the public opinion is not against the redevelopment of the parkland. The designs are beautiful and will greatly add character to the city, but private industry coming and influencing public land use and design

does not sit well. It feels like we are selling our soul for short term gain rather than thinking long term about how the land should be used. I find it quite uncomfortable that Therme is ALREADY advertising on their that they will be building on Ontario Place a landmark destination, as if the plans are already settled. This does not bode well for the public consultation hearings and leaves me feeling dejected that the plan is a done deal with only cursory amendments. While I do believe that the property has fallen into disrepair and requires management and redevelopment, that should not be at the cost of losing the property to a foreign company catering to tourists. There is a novelty factor for sure, but I doubt locals will use the space as intended. In terms of the lease agreement, how will profits made be re-invested back into Ontario? Who is the intended audience and who will profit, other than Therme. What if the spa does not perform as expected and fails - what then?

879. I am so opposed to giving public land over to private companies that I feel like discussing the details is like lying down with the enemy. But we have no choice. If it must be , it must be smaller. And all the big promises about public amenities must actually happen.
880. It is a slap in the face to everyone who pays taxes in Ontario.
881. I enjoyed the session and think it hit all of the major points needed at this time. There was a lot of assumptions and concern around the amount of public space vs Therme private areas but the session did a good job clarifying. Seems like a lot of the dissenters either didn't hear the clarification or doesn't want any private business in the area which is not realistic. As a resident in the area I would use and enjoy a nearby spa and wellness facility in addition to all the other public spaces. The proposal seems to strike a good balance.
882. In terms of heritage monuments, what has happened to the Japanese Canadian Centennial Temple Bell with its Goh Ohn Bell Shelter, designed by Raymond Moriyama, currently located on the West Island?
883. I think it should be reconsidered and the current Science Centre should be repaired and renovated, at its current site. It services the Don Mills community with jobs and educational experiences for an underserved community as well as being accessible by car and TTC for so many.
884. Public land needs to be accessible to all citizens not just with \$40 to get in.
885. We will remember what you do now, how you vote, where the money comes from and where it goes. Torontonians have long memories and will hold a deep resentful grudge if our city becomes an expensive playground for wealthy developers and people who don't live here.
886. It is troubling that the provincial government is intent on viewing Ontario Place as a business opportunity. Having a spa will benefit a select group of people - those who can afford to pay for such things; who own vehicles (and likely never think of taking public transit); who perhaps don't even live in the city. The City of Toronto is facing multiple crises including growing numbers of unhoused people, deepening poverty and mental distress, worsening traffic congestion, and unchecked development, especially in the downtown core. The need for more public space and more green space has never been higher. It is reprehensible for the government to use taxpayer funds for this kind of development which will enrich a select few. Further, this development will monopolize space on the waterfront which could otherwise be used to benefit EVERYONE, rich or poor.
887. Moving Ontario place is a terrible idea. Selling Ontario place for foreign investors is a terrible poorly thought out idea. Don't pave the greenbelt.
888. Better ideas include public park, public housing, pollinator gardens, skating rink, cycle racing track, beach, canoe launch. Let's make this a low carbon-emitting project! Let's make Toronto the greenest city in Canada, in North America!
889. I am offended and appalled by the process the Province has taken. This is public land that has been developed and supported by taxpayer dollars. Why are we leasing it to a foreign entity? And why are the lease agreements not shared with the public? And why are taxpayers paying to build the infrastructure? Provincial, or city land ... it is inside Toronto and our own hard-working population should be included and celebrated - not ignored and bullied. I feel like the Province is taking advantage of an overworked and under-informed population - relying

on apathy to push this through. This is an opportunity to develop/sustain something incredible and responsible. Lost on the Provincial leadership.

890. I am NOT in favour of redeveloping the entire landscape for anything OTHER than complete public use of a natural space with historic significance for Torontonians.
891. As a scientist, I often review grant proposals in which applicants are requesting public funds for projects that are meant to impact the public good in a positive way. When looking at the plans and available information so far for the Ontario Place project, what I see is a lot of vague plans, assurances, and hand waving over numbers (number of visitors, plans for traffic management in an already gridlocked area, and zero hard numbers on the terms of the lease with Therme). It's lacking real analysis and feels like a marketing effort to make the public accept what smells like a boondoggle. This proposal looks like a gift to private business, developers, investors, and insiders connected to the Ford government's ongoing effort to sell off public resources (healthcare, education, the Greenbelt, Ontario Place) to private interests.
892. We only have one shot to get it right. Ford clearly has no the interest in bringing Toronto on the world map with an amazing outdoor green space. OP is already a well lived park now. And can be world class and improve the lives of Torontonians as well as attract tourists to come.
893. The proposed development is a travesty. It squanders public resources; it is destructive. It lacks vision for living intelligently in an environmentally precarious world
894. After attending the meeting it's still unclear to me how Lakeshore West and the surrounding area will handle the amount of traffic created, as shown in the predicted number of visitors per days to the spa. Over the past 12 months King St W and Queen St W and Lakeshore W have become insanely busy with the volume of car traffic, making walking and biking around Parkdale and getting to the Martin Goodman Trail unpleasant and unsafe. How will adding an additional 2700 parking spots affect this traffic? While the parking lot is made for only 10% of predicted traffic, an addition of 2700 parking spots is still a significant invitation to drive to the area, and 2700 cars added to an already existing traffic problem. As a resident of Parkdale, and an almost daily user of the waterfront trails, Ontario Place, and Exhibition Place, it's heartbreaking to see trees and grass being replaced with more concrete, parking lots, and buildings.
895. Major concerns about traffic. And parking. Already as it stands when there is a concert happening, Ontario place is busy and traffic both by foot and car are significant. Even with the subway line, increasing the attractions at Ontario place will impact traffic on Lakeshore which is already a disaster. What is happening to the marina? Nobody asked for the commercialism of Ontario place. It makes more sense for them to put the spa and the science centre on the east and where they're already doing a ton of development of the waterfront area. General concerns about the predicted number of people they expect to use the spa/wellness centre and their belief that that will pay to maintain the rest of the park. Concerns about the timeline of when this will all be completed. If the goal is to be before FIFA it's doubtful, that will actually happen. I have been coming to this park and trillium park for several years now. Ontario place is heavily used by both myself and my friends. Living downtown Toronto there's so much development that's happening and very little space to go to feel like you are in nature. Ontario place is a close by place for many people living in condos. The proposal so far is very out of touch with how people use the space and the needs of those in Ontario. I want to reiterate that with all the development happening in the area around Ontario place there is a need for more park space especially peaceful waterfront park space that does not include tourist, hotspot, destinations.
896. These private venues - a spa and concert venue - are out of reach financially for many people in Ontario. Taxpayers monies used to subsidize a playground only the rich can afford.
897. This Therme proposal and the Ontario Science Centre relocation should be opposed with every means at the City's disposal. I have been living nearby, at Adelaide and Strachan, for almost 30 years. This proposal will ruin a park that my family has enjoyed for years. Bring back the outdoor children's water play park that used to be at Ontario Place. That was a great family destination.

898. Site should include a publicly run and not private attraction
899. I am so opposed to this. In fact, I am disgusted with the way that all governments, including Toronto, do not listen to its residents.
900. Why is it prioritizing rich spa-goers over the majority of city residents who will never be a patron of that company?
901. I would like to see this public site reserved for public uses and the promotion of sustainable lake ecology practices.
902. I don't know if this is the place to do this as this page appears to be about the actual changes to the site and I'm sure you're hearing about it a ton but a 95-year lease to a private corporation on public land in the heart of the city is an absolutely outrageous duration of time. 95 years ago, was 1928. How much has Toronto changed in that time? How much will change in the next 95? Whatever happens to the site I'm not happy with the lease duration and don't think it will benefit the city over its lifetime and I'm looking for a place to voice that opinion that will have some semblance of impact.
903. I am imploring, begging, pleading with the City of Toronto to reject the province's proposal to privatize Ontario Place with the installation of the Therme mega spa and expanded Live Nation venue. It will be the end of Ontario Place as a public space. As part of the application review process, I ask the City to thoroughly investigate the terms of the Province's secretive deal with Therme and to share that information with the public. For starters - how much money is the Province giving to Therme? How long is the lease? Who gets the profits? Who absorbs the losses? And so on. I also wish to register my deep opposition to the relocation of the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place grounds. The architecturally significant OSC was designed and built for its current site in North York. It is part of the Flemingdon Park and Thorncliffe Park communities and deserves to remain there as a landmark attraction, especially now that there'll be an Ontario Line subway stop to service that location. Downtown Toronto already has plenty of tourist attractions and doesn't need to steal one from North York.
904. If the Ontario Science Center has to be moved, its land should be used either for building a community space or public parkland. If the land is to be used for affordable housing, then any building there should fall under the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). And in such a move, the Ontario Science Center should be the main attraction of Ontario Place, and be given access the majority of the space, rather than some afterthought for placing a spa.
905. There has not been enough consultation with the community. The province does not seem to have a credible and thorough plan, and I'm concerned by the constant new developments that pop up (science centre relocation, then 95-year lease term?). Two private sector companies seems to be the main beneficiaries, not those living in Toronto. We can do better.
906. How long is the lease for the spa ? What happens if the spa fails ? With the large underground parking lot how can we guarantee the safety of pedestrians and people on bikes using the Martin Goodman Trail. The City of Toronto and its residents have a great interest in OP but there has been very little consultation.
907. Thanks for the consultation and the opportunity to provide my comments. I had a few questions I didn't have the chance to ask during the virtual session attended: 1.) How does this application fit within the Master Plan for the site, the Waterfront plans and the city vision? 2.) What is the environmental* impact of the application? Mitigation measures? (Impact on site (vegetation, water, soil/shoreline, ecology – terrestrial and water habitats, transportation impacts – pollution, traffic, and Emissions from demolition, construction and operation, heat island impacts) 3.) Heritage impact? 4.) Visual impact, waterfront skyline, views 5.) What are the public benefits? 6.) What is the public contribution to the project? As Toronto resident, Ontario citizen and tax payer I hope to be able to continue to provide comments and be listed to. I also wanted to thank the City for the recent decision regarding the City property in the area to ensure that the City's approval decision will not be discarded by the Province.

908. It is a truly terrible idea, and one that I think we'll look back on in ten years with great regret. It is cloaked in secrecy, which runs counter to the city and province's pledges of transparency. Every other major city in the world is leaning into their green spaces. Why are we so willing to give away one of the city's jewels just because of short-sighted provincial decision-making?
909. The meeting presentation was vague and disjointed. Instead of telling us what will be in the public realm the applicant needs to show us in the drawings what will be there.
910. The spa is a terrible idea. Moving the Science Centre here is a terrible idea. The park area should be open to the public for free all the time.
911. There is no question that Ontario Place is overdue for redevelopment. However, based on the information currently available, I have very little confidence that permitting Therme and Infrastructure Ontario to go forward with this proposal will yield a lasting, public, biodiverse, and resilient greenspace. Further to the point of making this a "365, 24/7" sort of destination; there is no point to offering habitat to plants and wildlife if they are only going to be trampled and out competed for space by "tens of thousands" of visitors regularly. A source of revenues is important, but a successful public space doesn't always mean that it's constantly full of people looking to purchase a product or service.
912. Retain as much control as possible. Do not give away the City owned land.
913. Too big, too much.