

Appendix A: Verbatim Feedback Form Responses

Engagement Summary:

Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

September 2023

Appendix A: Verbatim Feedback Form Response Transcript

Please note, feedback forms were available to the public in paper form at the in-person community consultation meeting and available digitally from September 7 to September 23. The paper feedback forms from the in-person community consultation meeting and digital feedback forms were transcribed by Gladki Planning Associates. Due to the illegibility of some paper or digital feedback form comments, some of the comments have been edited for clarity (See transcription index below). Verbatim responses containing harmful or offensive content have been edited or removed. All verbatim feedback form responses are included in this transcription and include responses to questions 6 and 7 in the feedback form:

6.) Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.

7.) Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.

The verbatim responses represent the respondents opinion and have not been fact-checked and may include information that may not be factually correct.

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

1. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. N/A*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Less parking, more active transit connections with the rest of the city. Needs to be part of the city not a destination for visitors. More public space, more mixed use. Waterpark does not seem like a use which benefits the city.

2. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Very against privatizing public lands, it sounds like a substantial amount of public money is being funneled into this space. There is no reason that this could not be a public pool. There is not enough green space. The "tenant" is encouraging parking (70% of visitors). This will further deaden the area with parking lots, traffic, further pressure to keep car access. The city has the ability to reject this proposal. I strongly believe the rezoning should not be approved. This is not consistent with climate goals, public space.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. There is no reason this could not be fully public. At minimum this development should be dramatically reduced. 80-100% range, not 5.8%

3. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. This version is an improvement but that is saying almost nothing. Far less space should be devoted to private buildings. The space that is private should be used for something more popular than a spa.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Our money would be better spent developing this into park land.

4. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. How is this environmentally responsible, it only meets the lowest level of the city's green standard? Where is the environmental assessment for Therme spa? A green roof is not sufficient for additional park space. These are all fancy sidewalks and bridges and narrow ribbons of public space. Does not look welcoming or friendly. All the "new and improved" public spaces are limited and multipurpose. How does "Live Nation" expensive loud concerts mix with "wellness" spas and a children's play area double as a concert space. Sidewalks are not parks.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. How does the 99 year lease work? Can we (the public) know the details of the deal w Therme. If this fails - does it return to public land or can it be resold by Therme? The underground parking garage will cost half a billion - we could use that money to make a real public space for less money. We pay for maintenance and infrastructure what does Therme pay for? Why is this a good financial deal for Ontario? The numbers don't add up - this is insulting - an attempt to manipulate the truth - e.g. driving vs transit use - e.g. using volume reductions to claim that there's a 25% reduction in overall space for Therme spa.

5. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Dishonest proposal, masking the fact an enormous piece and is being privatized. The word 'destination' was used dozens of times. We have a destination, and do not need a playground only accessible to the privileged.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please see above.

6. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. I do not feel the changes accurately reflect the volume of criticism coming from public. I feel a lot of info is being muddled by marketing materials and approach by applicant - ex. "25% reduction in building volume" but not footprint...*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Thank you! It is so important what you are doing - very grateful for all of your hard work. I am so worried about the loss of mature/heritage trees and damage to water ... no environmental assessment :(I am worried about how this project will negatively impact our city and waterfront and culture. Toronto is a thriving contemporary and diverse city with so much potential! It should not be so hard to be progressively thinking during the climate crisis... Therme please go somewhere else! Also looking for more indigenous engagement on behalf of city... I believe Therme has paid for their "partnership" with Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.

7. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It's still the wrong project in the wrong place. Toronto/ON will never forgive itself if this disaster moves forward.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* The Indigenous-washing that is being employed by Therme and partners is not acceptable.
8. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Why is this application proceeding without the zoning amendments for Live Nation and the Ontario Science Centre? The current amendment is for all of Ontario Place but two key parts are missing. This is not good or comprehensive planning.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* See previous section.
9. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has improved however it does not feel viable. The question "has a forensic accountant been engaged" to understand the cash flows that will support this project is very important. This was raised during the Q&A as the last question. The overall biomass question should also be answered. As if the claims about the design are true - this value should increase (over time) to be as good or better than before. Transportation to the site during the Indy, Caribbean Festival and the Ex is going to be very difficult to maintain for 14,000 people...
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* See previous section.
10. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am new to the Ontario Place forum. My information on Ontario Place comes from the media, my MPP (Bhutila Karpoche) and my City Councillor (Gord Perks). Most people here this evening seem to disagree with the Therme Spa concept. I do not understand why the Ontario Science Centre is being moved to Ontario Place. I understand that construction for Therme has begun. I understand that 800 trees are to be cut down to build Therme. I cannot agree to this. Thank you for this evening forum. I will continue to follow the developments with interest. I do not agree to the building of Therme here.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* N/A
11. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Positive outcomes from Indigenous input. Access to various water sport & activity. Tremendous increase of flora & fauna. [Heart image] Can't wait to experience the free & public spaces.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* N/A
12. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The plan still fails to address the main issue: Ontario Place should remain a public park and greenspace. There are THOUSANDS of residents in condos in the immediate area and growing all the time: they need and deserve PARKSPACE. Trillium Park is a renowned, very much loved and much used public park. It is active with concerts, yoga, art installations are more. The west side of Ontario Place should be an extension of Trillium, designated as a public park space.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know.* See previous page. Think of places like Mont Royal in Montreal, Central Park in NYC, even the Toronto islands. Parkspace CAN be a tourist attraction for all Ontarians to love and enjoy. We don't need to privatize it and add buildings in order to make it a "world class destination."
13. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The new entry area & signage of Ontario Place is more inviting & appealing. How is the City planning to address the sewage outlet right by the public beach on the West Island? Some areas like the Forum & Guest Entrance have empty paved areas in the renders. Green spaces that are soft areas for sitting. Would love to see more spaces for staying there for an extended period of time, rather than just walking or biking through! These areas get HOT in the summer. However, would love to see ample space for delineated biking & walking paths. Many spaces & parks don't have enough room &/or pedestrians are on the same path as cyclists. We want to see an environmental impact assessment for the West Island & the construction that will come with it.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Good to see the Indigenous perspective directly today - Indigenous communities need to be getting something from this economically. I like the concept of the pavilion where community members can host workshops & sell products. It may be nice to see an opportunity to see Indigenous cuisine featured in the food options on the east island. Good to see the parking area scaled down and highly support the introduction of a bus route that provides better access to Ontario Place. The current lack of TTC access and high traffic congestion currently makes the island unappealing for people to get to unless biking or walking from very close by. Relocating the Ontario Science Centre seems poorly planned - the area is congested enough currently and it is taking jobs & community spaces from Flemingdon Park. Currently, the Ontario Science Centre helps monitor the ravines in that area - who will do that when the Ontario Science Centre relocates? The height and overall scale of the spa still appear gratuitous, relying on stylish glass rather than a real function. This obstructs views & dwarfs the Cinesphere & Pods. Would like to see more soft surfaces because in the renders there still are a lot of paved areas. People love having somewhere to sit!

14. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Reduced parking will reduce the problematic subsidy. The visitor projections appear to be well-researched.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

15. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* City has not had financial experts look into Therme (sic) and their books. Public areas unclear. Traffic numbers admitted to be flawed... Omitting facts. Ontarians not asked if they would attend. 1000 random respondents not accurate. People don't want. This process while (?) seems facade.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Do not proceed until financially viable. Tell news media CP24 cost Ontario taxpayers ask their opinion! Give numbers and cost to enter spa.

16. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The usable pier on the West Island - that looks good! Status quo (I believe) from previous version, but increased transit access is a pro. How will the dark spots (for viewing night sky) be prioritized? How will sufficient sun cover/shade be provided?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The increased green space on entrance is an improvement, but there is not enough unstructured green space. Does not adequately replace natural greenspace - the beach, the old trees, the shade, the bird reserve. The Therme building, not to mention the private access, is overwhelming the natural space.

17. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There is no information on the claim that the revised design will reduce car traffic visits from 33% to 10%. How can that be when parking is being expanded with the underground garage. How can an elite spa be chosen as the development without speaking to the public? How can this be construction in good faith if it is only discussed after the decision is already made?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This building and its contents (palm trees & tropical plants) bear no connection to the City of Toronto and its connection to the Lake of Ontario. Though the land is province owned, the city has a responsibility to actively resist this process that seeks to privatize the land that should be accessible to all Ontarians. This building fails our city's climate goals. It sends a clear message that we will fail to meet our goals.

18. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* How old will the trees on the rooftop be able to grow out before they're cut down? Some of the trees currently are in their 70's. The new trees won't be able to sequester as much CO2 for decades. Will the glass all be bird-safe? How long is all the construction supposed to take? Are any of the trees going to be fruit bearing? What is going to happen to the Japanese peace bell? Are the trees going to be all male? What are the types of trees proposed for the roof? I

doubt we'll get willow trees like we already have. Why are we not using the paved areas that are already treeless for this spa? Are these nature roof top on top of Therme green spaces accessible 24-7? Why was there no Therme speaker on stage?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Scale down the buildings and place them on the paved areas. Save the trees that are there. We are losing so much green space in this province and city. Use and connect and rebuild the old buildings on the west end for the spas.

19. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ultimately making changes is just shifting deck chairs on the Titanic and they ultimately need to reject this plan. Wrong plan wrong place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Simple, share the details of the lease. However, ultimately stop this plan.

20. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Having listened to the discussion this evening I wondered if the City Council serves Therme or its people. Mental health is on the rise, and accessing the "wild" waters is the most effective, as more and more research has shown the benefits of "Wild Water Swimming." See BBC story for a quick reference. The West Island is the only accessible "wild swimming place" that has clean water. We do not need more artificial attempts to create well-being and spa water when the West Island pebbly beach offers this inexpensive cure for anybody who wishes to access it - especially in winter. Yes, it is a 4-season beach. We do not need more fake looking theme parks designed to bring the salubrious effects of nature when we already have them at Ontario Place. All it requires is more organization to pull the events together. For example, concerts, conferences, play, exhibitions, etc. If you must build a spa, put it elsewhere - cove beach or some other but leave West Island alone please. We need the waters to stay sane. We need you to show that you care for us by rejecting Therme's plan whose bottom line is PROFIT - not for Torontonians or Ontarians' well-being. By allowing Therme's plan to go through, the air quality would suffer further - especially with the number of cars expected to be there each day. If nothing, we should learn this from COVID - we need open spaces; we all left the swimming pools to swim in the wild. Please protect the wild - or what's left of it in Toronto. Do not let Therme destroy it.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

21. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* 1.) This spa building does NOT belong at this publicly owned space. I fundamentally disagree with the province's approach to revitalizing the Ontario Place property. Allowing a private company to overtake this public landscape is a lazy and unimaginative solution. 2.) Primarily, I oppose the destruction of the West Island pebble beach, described as "ad hoc rubble" (!) on one of the info boards. Many people, including myself, use this consistently clean water tested beach year round for swimming, leisure, and cold dipping in winter. Granted it is in need of maintenance after years of neglect, but changing the beach location to the less scenic and dirtier water flow on the west side of the island is a mistake. Encouraging the public to climb on and sit on a stack of slippery algae on rocks is frankly ridiculous and dangerous.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. 3.) Why is the proposed spa completely separated from the natural water environment? What's the logic in putting a water park beside a beautiful natural body of water but not connecting it to the lake? A Scandinavian style year round sauna complex with access to natural lake water would make more sense and would connect the public to the lake, hopefully instilling a sense of responsibility to maintain the lake's cleanliness. 4.) Historically the lake was used for bathing all along the shoreline. We need to encourage more people to interact with their natural environment, not box them up in a glass building. 5. KEEP ONTARIO PLACE PUBLIC!!! NO SPA REQUIRED!!! IF YOU MUST PUT A FACILITY HERE, MAKE IT A PUBLIC OWNED COMMUNITY CENTRE.

22. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application proposed by Therme is still inappropriate for the site. There is not enough public space, and publicly available space.

The footprint of the building has not been reduced enough, and should be reduced further. Adding 9 acres of public greenspace is not enough. More public greenspace should be added. The City of Toronto requires more greenspace to grow. This need is not met in the current application. In addition there is a total lack of transparency of the long-term lease agreement. In addition, it is not clear the impact that public consultation has in the process.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

23. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. N/A*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Transportation - ensure the dedicated new bus stops at all three entrances to the site, not just the central entrance. Those who have mobility issues will have difficulty walking between entrances. Children maybe also have difficulty. Landscaping/Biology/Shoreline - well done - planning in these areas looks good. General comment - I didn't know that the site needed to be saved (environmental degradation) regardless. I am glad to learn about the planning on that.

24. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am not satisfied. Unacceptable: 850 trees will be cut down, an underwater parking garage will destroy marine life, and a cherished public space will be privatized for the benefit of a corporation. The project needs to be scrapped. The Ontario Science Centre must be preserved where it is. The spa can be built at the Exhibition Place, as Ontario Place for All proposed.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I'd like the city to know that this project is a disservice to the people of Toronto. Scrap this project and allow Therme to build a spa elsewhere.

25. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I appreciate how the height of the built form has been minimized in response to citizens concerns over the visibility of adjacent heritage sites.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I'd still like a dedicated paved space for higher intensity activities that is separate from the main paths. Making room for rollerblading and skateboarding in a manner that does not share space is important, because those types of activities can be dangerous for others (especially children) if they are unaware of their surroundings or if someone learning the skills can't completely control their movements. These activities are often perceived as nuisances by pedestrians too. While the bentway is not too far away, it is often overcrowded - suggesting that more of these types of dedicated activity spaces would be welcomed in the community.

26. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Therme and the group haven't heard our one feedback. We don't want a mega spa on the lakefront, nor a 99 year lease with an international corporation. That's the one feedback that matters. We've also asked many times for a business plan, none have been provided.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please do [not] approve this. Essentially selling off once of the most beautiful parts of the city to an international corporation that provides no benefit to the city, as a whole, is a shame. Not only will tax payers will be on the hook for silly parking, but we'll have to deal with the consequences of traffic and loss of public space.

27. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Appalling proposal without any consultation or consideration for the people of Ontario. Shame.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Shame on the province and Premier Ford in particular for this corrupt proposal.

28. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There is no plan, that involves a privately owned spa chain, that will a) be financially viable and b) contribute anything to city-building.

It is egregious that the city cannot find a way to maintain free public access to this historic, charming, weird site that is one of the things that makes Toronto a place people want to live.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am appalled that the city continued to think this is a good idea, despite overwhelming public and expert disagreement.

29. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Build it elsewhere without destroying a public asset or requiring a publicly subsidized parking garage.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Build it elsewhere without destroying a public asset or requiring a publicly subsidized parking garage. [Repeated previous response]

30. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application proposed my Therme is still inappropriate for the Ontario Place site. We need more public space. The scale of the Therme building has not been reduced enough, and should be reduced further. There is still not enough public space, and adding 9 acres of public space is not enough. In addition, there is still too much space dedicated to cars, which should be further reduced. The city of Toronto requires more public green space as its population continues to grow. This need is not met in the current application, and more public green space should be added by either completely removing or dramatically reducing the size and scale of the Therme buildings.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The size and scale of the Therme buildings has not been reduced enough and must be further addressed. More publicly accessible greenspace is needed.

31. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Not enough public space, especially on the West Island. The theme building still dominates the site and destroys existing ecology that is Michael Hough landscape.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Reconsider placing the Therme spa building on the west island. Alternatively place it on the north side along lakeshore and integrate it into the existing Pods, combined with extension of the Ontario Science Centre. That would make west island a public park and open it up to ecological enhancements. It would then tie Ontario Place with the rest of the waterfront landscape that has been under development into a ribbon of parks and exemplary public space. This is what people of Toronto want, this is our backyard. Anything short of that would be a terrible mistake and a missed opportunity.

32. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Application changes have NOT changed my displeasure with the Therme proposal. It should not proceed.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. No to approving the Therme proposal.

33. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Better public entrance to free area, more green space, buildings volume smaller fits with the legacy buildings better.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

34. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Make the park public and build the spa at woodbine.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Build the spa at Woodbine.

35. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This project needs to be stopped and abandoned completely. As an Ontario taxpayer, i do not want a spa in place of a public park. Spend less money fixing it up. Do not privatize even 1% of it.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am depending on our City Council to stop this terrible project from ruining a lovely park. And we also need to keep Science Center where it is in Don Mills. Waste of money and not something any taxpayer wants!

36. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Wanted to ask about revenue generated from the parking garage. Will some of it be directed to the City of Toronto? Does it all go to the Province? Does any of it go to the private partners? What is projected profit after salaries and maintenance is paid? How long until it pays for its construction?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Information boards and the people attending to them were helpful and informative. I am very concerned about how we can handle the car traffic to Ontario Place if all 3 ventures go ahead, (Therme spa, Live Nation, Ontario Science Centre). How can we encourage more transit use? Maybe Therme could provide free parking in a lot at the northern station of the Ontario Line, or offer free parking at various city lots with a Therme admission ticket.

37. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I disagree with the Therme Spa completely. I believe that while Torontonians are struggling - no government official should be spending time considering a private spa. Rather, municipal and provincial representatives should focus on helping those who struggle; not those who can afford spas. Use the lands of Ontario place for community centres, libraries, tutoring centres, etc.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Improve education. Empower the youth through teaching ethics, humanity, and hard skills (language, math, and science. This will help ensure our future is strong.

38. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Wood construction of building to make it look more natural. Bioluminescence instead of real lights around the park and path area. Dark areas must be elevated or higher up so above light pollution and so view of night sky is best. Spa building if completely necessary for project must be even more blended into the landscape. Ship looking pier must have elevated area to view area around and above development especially at sunrise and sunset. Waterfront is it's own attraction so why do we need to do this much construction? Leave it mostly alone. Consultants with high class people and companies in charge of the project want to make their own kind of nature and attractions when nature is its own attraction. Walk through natural areas not only looking at the plants and trees areas from pathways. Will there be Security driving around the park and controlling people visiting the park. Please give all day night 24/7 access to park.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Even after the proposal changes the project is a huge change that will destroy the area. A building of that size on a waterfront island is a bad idea. Please stop or decline approval of this project and focus on helping the natural environment thrive that is already growing on most of the Island. Thank you.

39. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Despite attending the consultation session I still remain unclear on public access to what is a publicly owned property. The roof top garden feels no different than one of the many publicly accessible private spaces in the city that are often locked or you are shooed away by security guards. The redesign did not address the destruction of two important heritage components: what happens to Moriyama's bell shelter? And why is the destruction of all of Michael Hough's landscape being allowed? We save less significant Victorian houses all the time but we can't protect important work of two of our most important modernist architect and landscape architect? Last but not least, the redesign has not addressed the significant concerns on the environmental footprint of this structure. The embodied carbon of this project is criminal and the use of the building does not justify the environment impact of this project.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It's frustrating to attend sessions when you don't feel the consultant team and proponents are listening. Appreciate that the city is doing its job, but I'm concerned the consultation process is being manipulated to legitimize this project. They'll say

they held sessions and heard from 1000s, but that doesn't mean they listened and incorporated feedback onto the design.

40. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* A fundamental question remains unanswered: why is subsidizing a private-spa with a parking garage in the best interest of the Ontario public and a good use of tax dollars. This case has yet to be made and I've been to two consultations thus far. Furthermore, I feel bad for the individuals up there because they are mainly bureaucrats and consultants. It would be great if some representation from the Progressive Conservative government was offered so the public could voice concerns to the decision-makers of the province.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

41. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It's changed minimally. It hasn't addressed any of the major concerns. It is still reliant on a giant parking garage, it is still privatising public space, it is still destroying heritage elements, and it is still uprooting hundreds of trees. The updated application still isn't answering to the environmental impacts to sensitive ecosystems that it will cause, or the damage to wildlife. It is some minor cosmetic improvements, nothing more.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Why are they proposing to build a beach by a combined sewer overflow - are they intending to pay to remediate this, or are they expecting that the taxpayers will subsidize this for them? Why is it so far away from transit that they feel the need to run a shuttle (at whose expense?) This is the wrong building at the wrong place.

42. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* While the size of the Therme facility itself has undergone some helpful height reductions, the redesigned building is still much too large in size and obstructive in location. It simply not appropriate in size or scale for the essential, historical public waterfront location. It's planned central location on the west island restricts pedestrian and cycling access through and across the current parkland. Paved path renderings so that access to the west island space would be limited to lengthy and inconvenient circumnavigation of their massive facility. The revised designs also show no further integration between Therme's proposed facility and programming into the unique natural environment of the location. There is a fundamental disconnect between the spa purpose and its proposed location.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I appreciated the city-organized information & consultation session. It was helpful to have representatives from Infrastructure Ontario, the various design firms, and Therme there to answer question, even though I found many of their responses unsatisfactory. Based on all the information available to date I continue to feel strongly that a spa and Waterpark complex of this scale is a poor match for the unique Ontario Place waterfront. I'm not opposed to the idea of some private spa space incorporated into other public park and event space, I just think something in the range of 5 acres would be a more appropriate size. Thank You!

43. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ultimately, the design revisions are irrelevant, the proposal will never be acceptable until it doesn't include effectively handing over public land for private profit (and land with a long-term lease length does not count as still being publicly owned). It's unclear why the Therme building has to be so large, if it doesn't fit on the existing site, it should be built somewhere else.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city should endorse the Ontario Place for All proposal. I think it's also important the city does not approve this plan without a full environmental assessment, including for Therme land and the infilling of the lake.

44. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* They have made some changes that I like better the entrance and splitting up the buildings are a good choice. Walking on roof top gardens is nice. Year round free access to most of the park. Not quite sure how the hole therme deal worked out for Ontarians and what will be the cost to go to these water parks and fancy spas. Do people really want that or is it going to be just for tourists.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

45. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application addresses some citizen feedback, but ultimately fails to provide visibility on the terms of the lease, more dedicated public space, and bypassed concerns regarding traffic infrastructure.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Follow up to Jeff Craft about my questions about the rooftop. You may be excited about this innovation but my 30+ years of engineering and strategic planning says be skeptical about all the complexity if it hasn't been done. It will backfire \$\$\$

46. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The redesign still does not address the fundamental fact that this development is not appropriate for the space. This is a public space filled with nature and should remain as such, regardless of how much park space is included in the development. It will still be privately controlled space, and trees will be cut down. The basic idea of park space on top of the building is also infeasible. The planners should reject this development unequivocally.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City planners must reject this development on principles of city building, public space, climate goals, and water access. To be lenient to minor changes from the developers and let the development through would be a generational mistake.

47. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Putting grass and paths on the roof is a small improvement but a spa and huge parking lot are still the wrong choices for Ontario Place. The pools and swimming areas should all be free so all Ontarians can use them, not just the wealthy.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I appreciate all the hard work the City planners have put into this but this does not achieve the City's own goals from what I've seen tonight. Building a monstrous elitist spa and parking lot on some of the best and most accessible waterfront parkland in the city is wrong. There should be natural attractions only in this place with room for kids to play and everyone to enjoy the lake.

48. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I do not feel that the changes to the application sufficiently addressed the concerns raised by myself and others in the public consultation.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It is a fool's errand to try to make Ontario Place into a "world-class destination," and Ontario Place failed in the long run for the same kinds of reasons that Therme will fail. Firstly, there is nowhere near enough local demand for a facility of that size to cover its operating and maintenance costs, nor do its services represent the kind of "destination" that will attract additional thousands or millions of tourists to Toronto every year, particularly in the winter months.

Secondly, Toronto does not have the infrastructure to support Therme's visitorship projections. Therme predicts that it will see almost an entire Scotiabank Arena's worth of people every weekend; this will significantly worsen traffic in an area with very little space for relief, with 70% of Therme's visitors projected to come by car. This will not contribute to Therme's long-term success, nor will it make the spa an attractive destination for repeated visits. Third, the applicant is unable to answer crucial questions about the environmental impact of its proposal, and the construction process proposed appears highly invasive and destructive - essentially flattening the established ecosystem of the island, which will then require another several decades to establish itself again from scratch. Any and all construction carried out on the island must be minimally invasive.

The spa is going to fail. It is not a viable business proposal. All previous attempts to make Ontario Place anything more than a local park have failed. It would make far more sense for the City to buy the property from the province and "revitalize" it as a City park, rather than letting the Ford government try to auction it off for an unsustainable, non-viable business venture.

49. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am an avid birder and continue to be concerned that a glass building along the lake directly on a migratory route will kill many birds unnecessarily.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place exists now as a beautiful park and refuge from the city. It makes the most sense to keep it this way. We need more green space in this city and I hate to see this precious resource being wasted for so few people to actually enjoy.

50. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The concerns about loss of trees, moving the beach in proximity to a combined sewer overflow, parking lot have not been answered satisfactorily.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We do not want the spa on this sight, we do not want to lose our trees and beach and all the green space we have for a spa most won't be able to afford anyway. We don't want public lands to be effectively sold. Ontario Place is a treasured site, not abandoned wasteland Premier Doug Ford and MPP Kinga Surma are referring to. Nothing but complete withdrawal of this plan will satisfy. We need the City of Toronto to help fight this.

51. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Application does not address the fact that Ontario Place, and in particular the West Island should not be privatized (i.e. leased for 95 years) to a foreign company. Ontario Place is meant to be public lands for the people of Ontario, not for an Austrian company and just for rich people who can afford to go to a mega spa. What the hell was the province of Ontario thinking? This Therme proposal as well as the relocation of the Ontario Science Centre must not proceed. In addition the public has not seen any business case for either of these proposals not has the Therme lease been released to the public. Since there is no transparency here, the Government is hiding something. Likely corruption similar to the Ford governments Greenbelt fiasco (releasing 7,400 acres to its developer friends and donors).

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The Therme proposal and Ontario Place relocation must not proceed. The public has seen no business cases, has not seen the Therme lease, and there has been no transparency in these processes. For the City trying to complete its due diligence by the end of 2023 is absolutely insane. Also very little is known about just who backs Therme. Where is ownership coming from? Is it Russia? Is it the mob or underworld? You should not be proceeding on this application without having hard evidence to these questions.

52. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The whole thing now seems silly. They didn't substantially reduce the footprint of the building and the proposal of having public realm green space on the roof seems half baked and untested. The entrance building and bridge buildings always seemed disposable as though they were proposed for the sole reason of dropping them. The underwater parking lot remains untenable and now they want to build the spa under water as well.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Overall the consultation was much improved. I appreciated that the applicant presentations stayed on time however the roaming microphone holders didn't get to many people, including me. I was told i was "third" by the woman in my section but she never returned to me. I understand there were a lot of people but don't make promises you can't keep!

Here are the questions I didn't have a chance to ask: Indigenous programming-does this mean the Mississaugas will have control of this land? Will they be given this land? (I support this idea- the programming and nods to their needs seem tokenistic); What will happen to the beautiful mature trees currently on the West Island?; Can you swim laps for exercise or have kids in swim practice and lessons- a 50m actual swimming pool would be welcomed in the city!; You say that therme doesn't have access to the environmental assessment because they're a private company? What about mining projects in Ontario, private companies are doing an environmental assessment? Also as I understand it, if you were selling this land, would an environmental assessment be required?; Why isn't Infrastructure Ontario adjusting their timeline for the City since the resubmission was so

delayed? This is clearly a hot topic and shouldn't be rushed; My 14 year old son who also attended had two questions: How long will this take to build and when will they have to rebuild it?

53. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The Therme project [facility] has been reduced but still much too dominant.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Same as above. Apprehension that the site will fail & fall into disrepair. Concerns that dishonest business practices have been involved in view of other incidents going on in the provincial government. Lack of trust on what actually will be built & when. Many gaps in the proposed design plans such as Live Nation, the Ontario Science Centre & colossal parking garage.

54. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Notwithstanding that the spa would be better located elsewhere, the reduced volume and height is an improvement. More public access is good.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. While the design has improved with regard to public space, I am skeptical about maintaining substantial landscape on rooftops. Digging and maintaining a dry underground/water parking garage, for 95 years is crazy!

55. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The need for a break wall structure and elimination of the combine sewer outflow have not been addressed.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. There is an opportunity to address water quality, recreational access and shoreline resiliency issues as part of a project at Ontario Place, I hope that these elements become part of a more prominent part of the project going forward.

56. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The footprint of Therme is still far too large. It appears that Therme has not exactly compromised at all as its designs continue to depict the imposing building that is to be erected smack bang in the middle of West Island.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. As many others at the meeting have also commented, Ontario place is a destination with or without a spa. While yes, we would like Ontario place to be a place of recreation, that does not mean it necessitates a waterpark/spa, let alone a TICKETED and therefore gated year-round recreational experience.

Take Toronto Island for example. People adore visiting the island, why? Because it is a HUGE park with no cars. It's peaceful and quiet and proves to be a sanctuary for us torontonians that is also VERY affordable. Here, we have the opportunity to make a park that is much like Toronto island yet we're using it as a business opportunity for profits to fall into private hands. Why are we doing this? The city needs to make money and it can easily do that here, WITHOUT expropriating public land for private interest. As someone mentioned in the meeting, when Ontario place re-opened in 2017, various events leased space at Ontario place. I myself recall going to a music festival on the east island, as well as various food festivals that were happening on the west island. All of these events drew me to Ontario place because of the sheer diversity of events that would take place in that area. At the meeting, the applicants kept emphasizing how the public is actually now getting access to even more of Ontario place once Therme is built but imagine how much recreational space we would have access to if Therme wasn't even built. We could use all that money to carry out the expensive shoreline reinforcement projects and actually democratize recreation for a better park that is accessible year round - as it SHOULD be.

Additionally, the creation of underground parking/any additional park at all is frankly extremely antiquated. From the presentation, it estimates that around 30% of future Ontario place patrons will arrive by car. It is also to my understanding that this 30% also includes people being dropped off rather than requiring parking. So why, as a global city in the 21st century, are we consolidating plans on how to make it easier for the minority of patrons (those arriving in cars) to access the destination that is Ontario place rather than investing in making it all more accessible to the 65%+ of people arriving by transit. Are we trying to punish those who have a smaller

carbon footprint for using something other than a car? I am aware there are tentative plans to connect TTC and GO train users from Exhibition Place to Ontario Place but the fact that there are zero solid plans is frankly disturbing. How is it possible that we have a much better plan for the minority of individuals than the majority?? It was also mentioned that paid parking would be used to deter individuals from driving, but how much would you charge to deter people? \$50? \$100? Because currently it's \$35 and people have no qualms about paying that. And if your goal is to deter people from driving, why even construct an expensive underground parking lot in the first place? Don't build it and force people to use transit instead. And then use the funds that were allocated for the car park for something else. That to me sounds like a far more economical solution.

I am evidently strongly against this proposal and the leasing of this public land to a private company unfortunately reflects the sad state of Toronto today. Where public spaces are expropriated and placed into the hand of private stakeholders to do as they please.

57. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I appreciated the decreased parking spots and increased bike spots. However, the attempt to decrease the size of the building is laughable. A decrease of 5m on average in height is minimal, a building that size is absolutely not necessary if they want to build a spa. The increased "rooftop space" is also unlikely to be used during the winter months (can you imagine the winds!) and will unlikely be maintained. Transportation: the numbers still don't add up - in that majority will take public transit, yet they're coming from beyond Toronto and aren't connected to the city via transit? I was also told by [the applicant's transportation consultant] that school buses for field trips will have minimal impact on traffic which is contradictory to multiple sources that analyze traffic: "Due to the large vehicle structure and low dynamic performance, large vehicles in expressways show low speed, inflexible driving, and excessive occupation of road time and space, resulting in a bottleneck effect on traffic flow." Adding school buses and shuttle buses to an already packed Gardiner and Lakeshore (and think beyond given all the feeding highways) is inadvisable as the population continues to grow. The fact that the traffic analysis only looks at the intersections around Ontario Place is shortsighted and reflective of how the entire proposal disregards the well-being and future of Toronto and Ontario.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Decrease the size of both the spa and the entrance pavilion by another 50-80% (or get rid of it completely!). Release the business plan and contingency plan for the spa. Increase accessibility for lower income individuals and families (why can't it be a community centre?! Toronto is significantly lacking these compared to ratio of new condo builds). Let's discuss the science center proposal and spa proposal together (with a significantly reduced Ontario Science Centre floor plan, perhaps we can allocate spa space to the Ontario Science Centre or better yet! Don't move it!). The separate discussions don't look at the big picture.

58. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The spa should not be there! The garage should not be there! The Ontario Science Centre should remain where it was. Ontario Place should be free, family oriented and natural, with children's activities and music and festivals. Keep the pebble beach. Leave the trees there!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See above answer.

59. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ultimately, I do not think the changes proposed adequately address the issues raised about the size and scale of the buildings or the access to quality public spaces. As much as the resubmission attempts to hit the check marks of earlier feedback. For example, desire for more public green space and access points, less towering structures, proposed beach access, etc. The revised Infrastructure Ontario/Therme application and Diamond Schmitt Architects plans are not convincing as a viable, economical or sustainable use of this space, or worth the publicly funded infrastructure costs that underly all of the application's assumptions. The new rooftop public access design certainly looks pretty in pictures, but the grade would make it significantly inaccessible to many people, as well as the types of plantings suggested by the drawings. None of the rooftop parks cited as precedent in the open house are

as greatly exposed to harsh elements, particularly high winds, wave spray and punishing winter conditions. It's one thing to build a signature green roof over a parking garage (look at the beautiful, defining gardens of millennium park in Chicago, for example), but an afterthought to plant stuff atop a glass atrium of a private water park seems flimsy at best, as a public space.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It was hard to have anyone discuss questions on the business case for what is being called a spa, but is really a giant water park (hey, look, an aquarium for throngs of people!). The numbers cited in the presentation are worth questioning (14,000 peak daily visitors?!). More transparency around the terms of the lease would be appreciated ... failure of this Therme business would be an expensive blight on a premium waterfront site. What kind of assurance in any amendments to the official plan that another business couldn't takeover the site for something else entirely after the fact? (Cough, cough, casino?)

Disappointing that one of the most "waterfront" attractions of this site, the currently shuttered marina, seems to be barely a consideration in the proposed land use or potential tourism draw . Toronto is sorely lacking in infrastructure for boating... all those kayaks and canoes and sailboats the architects and developers like to include in the drawings need a home!

Thank you City Planning for the opportunity to provide feedback, as limited as this scope is.

60. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. The design didn't change much. The problem is the two big enclose and transparent building.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Why don't they make an arrangement to build in Canada Wonderland and have activities all year around.

61. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It appeared that [the main spa facility building] spread out into maybe 3 visible emerging glass structures instead of one behemoth and maybe a little lower in elevation. I should have taken a photo for reference. Increase of a lot of foliage/trees along the concrete details/paths and green roofs.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The overall attempt was to minimize the appearance of size of the [spa facility] structure, concrete elements to indicate there was increase of public & green space - quite fanciful and superficial. I'm sure the footprint was the same. Also, would the green roof foot paths be truly accessible as they say their facility will be? There's some serious elevation going on. The green roofs proposed raises many more new questions leaving many others not addressed. Green roofs, larger drawn trees does not negate that there has been no environment assessment. Full Stop. I see huge technical and engineering concerns. For example: weight bearing roofs, much deeper amount of soil is required to accommodate what they intend, what about proper drainage, appropriate zone horticulture, longterm seasonal (ice, snow, water) maintenance and what kind of material will be used to last 95 years (no matter what is used it will not last that long). The green roof/paths are a serious project in itself. Since it's supposedly public access, will it be accessible 24/7? Will the city own it? What happens if Therme goes bankrupt/closes? Would the lease be put on the block or any foreign corporation to buy? Or can Therme sell off the remainder of their lease? The Province and City of TO will be totally out of control of the situation. It's unprecedented and quite scary. The conditions of this lease need to be public. There is no way we can go forward without understanding the repercussions of the lease. Full Stop.

Oh, I'm sure the signage 'Ontario Place' was a place maker because there is no way that THERME name isn't going to be there - that's misleading. Their new entrance is weird - a private tunnel for their patrons.

Overall, not good enough revised application. They really are tone deaf and want this pushed through. Again, environment assessment has to be done on an agreed upon proposal. BUT, ultimately I don't want it. Nobody asked for this nobody wants it. I am continually frustrated because I shouldn't have to be doing this. It is ONLY because our Premier made a private deal with NO fulsome public involvement in the decision. Now we are all stuck with this horrendous battle. This is why the people are so angry and opposed. It makes absolutely no sense to have a tropical spa owned by a foreign private corporation on our beloved public land of Ontario Place.

I think that this could have been an amazing opportunity for Therme to think outside of the box, embrace Ontario and theme their glass box spa to highlight our Province. We have bodies of water, beautiful trees, water falls etc. It could be a win/win situation. But the extreme lack of transparency and integrity by them and Province only results in a lose/lose situation.

62. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The architectural style has changed but it is still privatization of Ontario Place and environmental destruction. The people of Toronto and Ontario are being ignored by their government. Taxation without representation.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We want a public consultation for the future of existing Ontario Science Centre, not a rubber stamp meeting next year for the premier's plan for a science centre at Ontario Place. City planners did not care about the Thorncliffe Park community for the Ontario Line. All of your attention was on preserving Leslieville. We were not treated properly or equally by you. Now you're doing it again to Flemingdon Park because City planners don't care about that neighbourhood and want the Ontario Science Centre to be downtown, just like you wanted the train yard in Thorncliffe Park.

63. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The most obvious way the plan has not changed is that the project area has only shrunk by 5.6% (gross floor) and not by the 25% (volume) the developer (Province and architects) are claiming. Also, the relatively clean south facing public beach will be replaced by a west facing public beach subject to sewage outflow. The biggest issue is that park space will be converted to private space without proper consultations ever having been held about potential uses and visions for Ontario Place. The proposed development would seem to have a negative environmental impact on so many fronts. If the Therme was developed the cost for most Toronto families would be prohibitive.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please oppose this development and help to steward this park land in to a healthy public space.

64. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Very little substantive change. The numbers shared regarding the anticipated daily attendance for Therme are out of line with Toronto realities. Who developed those numbers and how were they justified. And what happens when they only get 1,000 a day during the week? . Then the business model doesn't work, what happens to the spa idea. Without seeing the long-term lease details there is no protection for the city in terms of what might replace the spa.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city must consider how it will deal with the application regarding moving the Ontario Science Centre (OSC). It should not simply do a consultation on the "new" OSC - that would be accepting that the current location is no longer an option. There has been no justification for moving the OSC. The supposed Business Case has never been released and the statements to date from the Province are not supported by evidence. Moving the OSC to Ontario Place will be a huge mistake.

65. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am strongly opposed to MOVING the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place, when the resultant Centre will be HALF the SIZE of the original. I am very supportive of building a new SATELLITE location of the Ontario Science Centre at Ontario Place, as it expands the offerings for a city that has expanded twofold since the original Ontario Science Centre was built. Demolishing an architectural legacy, and building a new one at half the size makes NO SENSE, and is TERRIBLE CITY BUILDING.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

66. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Wrong use, wrong concept and eliminates public space for "publicly accessible space".

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It is totally unacceptable to gift a foreign owned private company public land. The relocation of the Ontario Science Centre is ridiculous

67. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The updates that Therme has done on the spa plans do not address the fundamental issue, which is [the spa facility] does not belong on our waterfront. Full stop. The spa is not utilizing the surrounding environment, so it should not BE in that environment. People who go there will be fully inside - you don't need to take up valuable waterfront land for that. The spa could go on a parking lot beside a mall and it would make absolutely no difference to anyone using it. It's like Great Wolf Lodge, essentially. Put it somewhere else and let Ontario Place be a park for all Ontarians. Also, leave the Ontario Science Centre where it is. Moving [the Ontario Science Centre] does not make sense and is a total waste of money. Same with the underground parking lot, scrap that please. Too expensive and not needed when there will be a transit line going in there.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please stop Premier Doug Ford from ruining Ontario Place. It's bad enough he's gifting the Greenbelt away.

68. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application seems to be superficial and is now using the excuse of revamping Ontario SCIENCE Centre as well, removing it from the neighbourhood that it has been in, for decades, for no reason.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The entire application needs to be junked.

69. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Seems a bit better but as I thought before, the public plans around the spa look amazing (except getting rid of our beach). The idea of the spa is amazing, but the spa should be somewhere else and not on our precious waterfront. These are two separate ideas!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I still do not agree that this spot on the waterfront should be cleared for a huge building. I think the wonderfully aged trees and beach should be adapted in any plans for this wonderful heritage site. I live in liberty village and while I understand this is public for all of Ontarians I feel that this plan is taking away our 'backyard'. This area is already beautiful and can be revitalized without a spa.

70. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Say no to a private water park and spa. Period. Say no to underground parking, to moving the Ontario Science Centre, and to destroying the West Island at Ontario Place. The revised plan is fundamentally unserious and misleading (e.g., claiming to have reduced volume by 25% while in fact only reducing gross floor area by 5.8%).

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We have an amazing opportunity to make this a PUBLIC and welcoming space where Torontonians from all walks of life can enjoy the outdoors. This is also a chance to invest in sustainability. Adding green space and native plants is a great start. Paving space for parking lots, wasting energy on water features and heated water parks, and building a concert venue are the antithesis of sustainable. Do not waste this chance to create an amazing park space in our city. There is also no reason to sign a 99 year lease (and certainly not without releasing the terms for public scrutiny and debate).

71. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I appreciate the City and the designers taking into account feedback from the community.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Instead of moving the Ontario Science Centre, I think that we need an alternative educational attraction at Ontario Place.

72. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I appreciate the direction and commend the City on their efforts to reduce hardscape and retain plantings. However more must be done. In order for spaces to be quiet and contemplative they must be large, and the hardscape areas (particularly at forum fountain) are clearly designer for tourists, not the enjoyment of locals. Permeable surfaces are better than asphalt, but they are still hardscaping! I still do not see any plan to retain the majestic trees currently on the site.

After years of Tory leadership nearly ever sapling planted in our neighbourhood has died. We need a solid tree canopy if we want these spaces to be usable in 10, 20 years when climate change worsens.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Repeated previous response] I appreciate the direction and commend the City on their efforts to reduce hardscape and retain plantings. However more must be done. In order for spaces to be quiet and contemplative they must be large, and the hardscape areas (particularly at forum fountain) are clearly designer for tourists, not the enjoyment of locals. Permeable surfaces are better than asphalt, but they are still hardscaping! I still do not see any plan to retain the majestic trees currently on the site. After years of Tory leadership nearly ever sapling planted in our neighbourhood has died. We need a solid tree canopy if we want these spaces to be usable in 10, 20 years when climate change worsens.

73. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This version is a bit more palatable. Looks very nice on paper but I still have a huge problem with our taxes paying for a parking garage.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

74. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The project hasn't changed enough. It remains oversized and continues to take up too much space that should be public. The simple beauty of the lake and nature that exists on the West Island now, the repair of the original Ontario Place buildings--would suffice.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The Therme Spa does not belong at Ontario Place. It's too large. It's blocks views to the lake and access to lakefront activities. The spa would be better situated elsewhere in the city, such as Woodbine or the Eaton Centre.

75. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The public and City staff mentioned to have concerns about the solution, especially regarding parking area/capacity, landscaping and tree preservation. I did not feel that the applicant is committed to review and meet the expectations of City staff and the public. I hope the political decision will consider impartial technical inputs and the public consultation. Ontario Place is absolutely well served by transit and should promote last mile Integration. There is no need for over thousands of parking spots. The proposal should tackle shuttle bus, bike share, a few electric vehicle charging stations. Ontario Place should promote innovation, sustainability, resilience. Investing public budget on private parking is not the smartest move.

76. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am still not convinced by the presentation and hope that the city will resist the plan. The relocation of the beach is still problematic. Furthermore, I don't feel like the added public space is truly public space. I don't really consider what they are building to be a park in the way that other city parks are. As someone said at the meeting, it will be like we are on the peripheries of a main attraction. It is also unacceptable that the Spa facility itself has been exempt from the environmental assessment and the city should ask the Federal Government to intercede with an assessment of it's own.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Among my many concerns is the relocation of the Science Centre. I work as a teacher in York Region and the current location for the Ontario Science Centre is about as geographically perfect as it can be for the GTA. Schools from as far away as Newmarket, Mississauga and Ajax can comfortably plan an itinerary that includes travel and a visit to the Ontario Science Centre within a school day. It is crucial when planning field trips that you return in time for dismissal so students can catch their buses and get home safely. The relocation of the Ontario Science Centre will ensure that fewer schools will have access to the Ontario Science Centre since it will no longer be at the confluence of major highways in a central area of the GTA. Ontario Place is the opposite of central since it's on the lake. I'd also like to know if the City will need to make any infrastructure improvements to accommodate the spa such as new or enhanced watermains or hydro infrastructure. If those improvements are necessary will the City be paying for that? If that's the case why is the City paying for that?

77. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has not fundamentally changed. It remains completely inappropriate for the site in all respects. It is a tax subsidized privatization of public waterfront and a desecration of a valuable public space. It is unacceptable. It would not be acceptable in any other city in the world - as demonstrated by all of its other current and planned locations being in exurban sites. The only individuals in favour of this project are the provincial government, Therme, and the individuals and professional corporations who will directly benefit from it financially. No one else.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City should deny the application. It should then, when the province seeks to force it through, oppose the project by all means available to it. Mayor Olivia Chow needs to fulfill her election promise in this regard and City staff, which knows the application has no planning, environmental, or City building merit, should support her in that regard.

78. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* While there are some improvements with this latest iteration I am deeply concerned with the duration of the long-term lease; the size of Therme buildings (roof walkway is a nice touch but does not mitigate against size) understanding scale is important for public consultations like this; and the lack of an environmental assessment - private environmental assessments are not sufficient and have zero accountability. I am happy to see the additional consideration of greening the roofs of the spa. It would be great to see this extension to all new buildings on the site. Additionally, I understand the need to offer different types of park but it would be ideal to continue prioritize greening of spaces, rather than just permeable spaces...

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I strongly disagree with the move of the Ontario Science Centre, the length of the lease, the lack of transparency around sharing the details of this deal and the lack of environmental assessment. These are pretty big hurdles to overcome that adding a green roof to a building won't just cover up.

79. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I do not feel that the plan, even the revised version of the Ontario Place redevelopment, is a positive one for the people of Ontario and the City of Toronto. Citizens demands for more transparency and information regarding the submission and selection process, as well as the specific details of the long-term lease for the private spa have yet to be released. This is a public asset so to hear that the lease is protected by privacy laws is bogus. Next, the environmental impact of this project has yet to be sufficiently reviewed. I want to see a proper, fulsome environmental assessment which takes into consideration the significant waterfront location and ecological importance of this site, including the impacts to water, mature trees on the property, migratory birds, etc. Next, I still have not heard a logical, intelligent response to why the Ontario Science Centre would be moved here. I am more inclined to believe the rationale is based solely on land and has nothing to do with invigorating the Ontario Place location. If you asked the people of Ontario what they want, I suspect the vast majority want the Ontario Science Centre to remain in it current location. Here's an idea - Why not ask them!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. In general, regardless of what I heard tonight, I still feel strongly that Ontario Place and the waterfront lands surrounding it, are being sold-out for a private spa that few seems to want. And truly, the movement of the Ontario Science Centre, a beloved attraction in north Toronto, it just makes no sense whatsoever, and is also not favored by most people! Since the current provincial government seems to be pushing both these projects forward without sufficient consultation and input from the public at large, a cost analysis (including wasting \$500 million for parking?!), Transparency about the lease (why are we giving away access to premium waterfront property to a foreign private spa) or a thorough analysis of the environmental considerations (maybe you have heard about the climate crisis?!), I suggest you open it up to a formal referendum. Ask Ontarians to vote on this contentious matter.

80. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The spa proposal is a bad idea. No amount of tweaking the details will turn it into a good idea. It should not be approved, period.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

81. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Although the applicant has made changes regarding issues raised at the first consultation; they are very minor and do not come close to addressing the concerns of the public in general.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We are facing grave consequences as a result of climate change and yet this project is doing little to address the extremely high embodied carbon that will be generated in the process of scraping the existing landscape, excessive land filling into the lake and building with high carbon generating materials. A more enlightened approach would be to preserve the landscape, reuse existing built form and reduce the use of construction materials, especially those with high up front carbon footprints. The project will never get that back, even if the use green energy systems are used in the design.

82. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Land should be used for green space not parking, spa, parking lots and Ontario Science Centre, etc. High Park is well used 400 acres of outdoor space. That's what downtown Toronto needs. Free public outdoor water features for children, ice skating, tennis, deep water swimming platform(s), walking, x-country skiing, tobogganing, fire pits, etc. Take a look at Stackt for additional interesting ideas to animate - curling/pickle ball, etc., And the use of Pods, Cinesphere, etc. It is quite disheartening to consider building a state of the art spa when our downtown roads are in disrepair, we have no housing for homeless people and public garbage bins are constantly overflowing.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Hopefully some sort of compromise can be found. My fear is Therme will become another white elephant for another generation to deal with. Green spaces last for generations.

83. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This is my first meeting on this topic. I appreciate staff efforts, but several major aspects of this project are still unacceptable.

1.)The Therme building STILL eats the west island, destroying mature trees for NO good reason. The west island "public realm" is reduced to a fringe of concrete and greenery on its edges. Claiming that the increase in acreage is an improvement is the same as a builder claiming that adding lots of narrow hallways to an apartment provides more usable space.

2.) Let's be honest: the underground parking is for Therme's customers, and the Ontario Place move to OP is meant to retroactively justify the garage. The garage will be a nightmare to design, build, and maintain given its location. The construction cost estimate is a pipe dream.

3.) The combine sewer overflow pipe will empty right next to the new Therme beach and they obviously want the city to pay to fix it.

4.) Permeable concrete is an improvement, and some paved surfaces are needed for foot traffic and accessibility, but once again, we are looking at a vast private building that will overshadow and crowd people out. The permeability of the concrete is not the point. The point is that much of the public land is being turned into bleak transport chutes for non-paying members of the public.

5.) The green roof. It will take at least 10 years to get the kind of greenery shown in the drawings. Assuming the roof holds, people will be staggering across a hot plain next to air conditioners, as noted by another attendee.

6.) There is no environmental assessment scheduled. We still can't see the long-term lease details. Many important factors and details are still not provided to us. This is a travesty.

7.) Here's an improvement: Therme can put its business on an outskirts of the city instead of prime lakefront, as they have done for EVERY other location they have built so far.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Regarding the non-Therme

changes. 8.) I'm OK with adding a satellite Ontario Science Centre location to the site, but moving the whole Ontario Science Centre from Don Mills instead of rehabbing it is a waste of money and time. Those poor kids will be stuck on buses in the traffic next to the lake, too.

84. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* 1.) I found the green roof on the building on the West Island to be an improvement on the previous application. However, it still gives the impression of the public being on the outside looking in to those who can afford the waterpark spa. The footprint of the building is still too big. 2.) It is concerning that the new beach is being built next to the combined sewer overflow with no consideration to change the location. The fact that early discussions have only just started with the City about remediation, as well as understanding that the has City budget constraints, keeping or upgrading the existing beach should be considered. 3.) Moving the Ontario Science Centre to this site does not seem like a good idea. Why is the public is being asked to accept this decision without Infrastructure Ontario providing the business case? In the meeting, the Infrastructure Ontario representative mentioned the move of the Ontario Science Centre to an 'accessible location'. No comment, and therefore it seems no regard, was given to the Ontario Line and the stop at the current Ontario Science Centre that was initially proposed to be named the 'Science Centre' stop. 4.) The plans for the eastern part of Ontario Place look great. More of this on the West Island would be appreciated!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

85. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The revised design has not addressed my core concerns. The overall scale and design of the Therme facility remain a serious issue, along with the privatization of such a vast amount of publicly-owned land for nearly a century. The space created will feel like walking around and on someone's castle, not what is what originally intended as: an inclusive place. I could possibly support a private facility that is 1/3 of the current revised size, provided its design was carefully considered and more in keeping with Ontario Place's original design (e.g.. small pavilions/pods within a generous public realm). If Therme requires such a large facility, they should look elsewhere in the City.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City of Toronto should take a firm stance against this proposal. Ontario Place is a rare gem - it would be such a shame to lose it, and to squander the opportunity to renew its legacy and maintain it as a place for all. As noted in a City staff report "Ontario Place was designed as an inclusive public entertainment, educational and recreational space and programmed to reflect the province's people, culture and geography, as well as a vision for the province's future". I was disappointed that for a project like Ontario Place that was programmed to reflect the province's people, 95% of the time speaking by those visible in the virtual consultation appeared to be well-to-do middle-aged white men. Is this who the redevelopment is being designed by and for?

86. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Rooftop "park" - in partial response to my question about where this had been done before and how practical and viable including in winter plus why couldn't we have at grade parkland Jeff Craft agreed that this was an extension of green roofs but then geeked out about how exciting this was and the huge team of people they have to work on the technical challenge. So basically this is unproven, costly and likely not reliable. So give us public park and space at grade - we know that works - and let the spa have the rooftop. This is an inadequate response to the lack of public green space. The Therme structure is still massive and out of place. Seems very complex and likely too complex.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The public lakeside swimming area is inadequate and unsafe due to sewer discharge. Keep and expand the existing swimming area. It was stated that Therme would return the structure back to the province if it was unsuccessful - I would like that confirmed. I would also like to know if the spa should be converted to a casino and how could that be prevented - we know the Premier would like one. Overall it was helpful but way too confusing to understand all the people involved and what all the details were. The overall project timeline is way too aggressive for no good reason - none of this is critical infrastructure so taking the time to do it properly is important. I appreciate that the city is

gathering input in parallel. An environmental assessment for the spa is imperative. The Ontario Science Centre should remain at the existing locations and the Ontario Pods for a satellite campus. Infrastructure Ontario should be representing the people of Ontario not promoting commercial private interests. I think it's foolish to proceed without understanding the details of the parking - worried about the taxpayer.

87. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Many thanks to the city for arranging for this public consultation and to the city planners for their great work to date. I support city required environmental assessment for the West island.

Michael Hough landscape issues: Only token gestures/words re landscape designer Michael Hough used in the redesign but complete obliteration of his original landscape and beach and insult to his design principles – nothing has been maintained. I'm devastated by the plans that call for the destruction of the heritage impact of the Michael Hough beach, which has stood the test of time and remains functional today.

The overall scale and size of the spa: The spa facility is only 5.8% footprint smaller and is minimally shorter but still stands proud of the cinesphere and the entrance way is still overwhelmingly huge. This design/structure will destroy and replace the whole West Island. This design is not in alignment at all with the original vision of Ontario Place. The spa doesn't achieve or demonstrate environmental sustainability and resilience at all. The entrance redesign still blocks views to the west island and pods and cinesphere – the viewpoint of renderings we have seen from the city side are from up above giving the allusion that its not that high up or that it won't block the view but reality is likely it will. There is no sense from the renderings of the height of the 'roof viewing deck and terraces. Are there railings to prevent people from falling off? What is the rise to run ratio – how easily can mobility impaired /cyclists, children access this elevation?

Environment / sustainability: Open space is removed by building the spa and parkland is reduced as well. The spa building does not fit or belong on the west island and does not identify a sustainable process– it will destroy existing trees and existing functioning ecosystems – existing marine, animal/ insect, bird, human, trees, plants as well as huge negative impact on existing water, rocks, sand and soil. I have great concern over significant added landfill into the lake required for this design and impact on the environment, water quality, marine life and swim access and that the existing, original Michael Hough beach will be destroyed. A botanical garden inside the spa does not in any way reflect Ontario. In the new design the planting on top of the roof of the spa will not come close to mitigating the impact of the removal of trees.

Parking garage: The amount of parking in the below ground parking garage is outrageous, not needed and doesn't fit with transportation/environmental/climate related needs and the cost to build and maintain this will fall to taxpayers who don't want it in first place. I can't imagine the gridlock all this parking will further create on the lakeshore. Bringing the Ontario Science Centre down to the waterfront will NOT make it more accessible. Building a parking garage, underwater, of this scale does not fit with any climate/environmental/transportation goals.

The beach: The new beach is beside the combined sewer overflow and the city has no plans to fix it and Infrastructure Ontario is sidestepping any responsibility – I have great concerns about the impact on water quality along with the landfill required to achieve their building goals. The new beach is west facing – this is not a friendly orientation, its not known how well the 'baffles' will protect the waves crashing on the beach from prevailing westerlies. The view from the west facing beach has the lakeshore and Gardiner to the right and to the west buildings and skyline of Etobicoke. The view from the current south beach provides an unobstructed view to an open lake and horizon. The current beach works really well and has not eroded as engineering consults have stated.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Final comments – respectfully request that the city planners reject the application for the West Island. As a taxpayer it is unclear what the benefits of this 'spa' Therme development is to the citizens of Ontario. I understand that we are going to bear the costs to prepare the site to be leased to Therme – numbers being thrown around range over \$650

million dollars but what monies will we the taxpayers see back in our coffers – and what business deal takes 95 years to break even.

88. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Changes to the design are an attempt at greenwashing the development, nothing more. The [spa facility] still massively restricts access to the space that is already available [on the West Island]. The proposal includes a massive private development on prime public land, and there is no transparency around the deal, and will remove one of the few easily accessible large public parks available to downtown residents. It truly is a scandal, and if I was a City employee I would want no part to play in it. Simply following orders comes to mind.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. As above. This is a disgrace. The Ontario Place site is an absolute gem that is in need of some TLC, not a massive spa. The ridiculous cost of an additional parking lot, next to a go station, TTC streetcar stop, site of the new Ontario line subway and an already existing 6000 car parking spaces is farcical. Shame on the province, shame on the city, shame on everyone involved

89. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am still disappointed with the amount of hardscape and parking.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I would like to see this land be prioritized for public use.

90. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.*

Therme Proposal: It is very difficult to comment on the Therme development as we are looking at rendered drawings that are not to scale, misleading and overly idealistic. There is no actual data or comparative data on size and scale in relation to the surrounding areas. The reduction of the Therme building by 5.8% is not sufficient. It is still far too large and dominant. In addition, the design, height and massing is out of keeping with the existing heritage buildings. The roof top park walk is at early concept stage and there is insufficient information to form an opinion. However, it is no substitute for the loss of a 50 year old ecosystem that is home to mature trees and an important location for many inward and outward migrating birds, some on the endangered list.

Car Park: There is no publicly available estimate cost for the proposed carpark, although a figure of £450m has been mentioned. Therme is paying nothing towards this, yet many families travelling to the site by car will be coming to visit the spa/water park. Why are tax payers funding the construction of parking that will benefit a private enterprise.

The Beach: As I understand it, the new beach will be located over or alongside a waste overflow pipe. Given that the climate emergency will mean more frequent heavier storms and the lack of a coherent plan (or budget) to address this, the water will be too dangerous to swim in.

The Ontario Science Centre: The plan to move the Ontario Science Centre makes no sense. Leaving it where it is (with necessary improvements to preserve this iconic and important building) will reduce traffic into Ontario Place, reducing the need for such a large and costly carpark. A Science Centre 'pod' providing an interactive, educational experience on a specific topic such as the climate emergency could be considered for Ontario Place alongside the regeneration of the original building and original position.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Toronto does not need another waterfront tourist attraction with a limited lifespan (and a 95 year lease) that will destroy a natural habitat that could have been protected and improved to play a greater role in mitigating the effects of climate change, mass species extinction and ecological breakdown. Over the past 50 years we have lost so much of our waterfront to commercial development. It has to stop. A biodiverse nature reserve serving nature and the public would be there for generations and bring far greater health and wellness benefits to the people of this city than a water park. This development is not about people, it is about developer profit and the theft of our Commons.

91. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes made to the design proposed by Therme are a tiny band-aid to the concerns raised by the citizens of Toronto about this ridiculous spa. Therme's plan is STILL overly large, will be too expensive to visit for most citizens, will add even more traffic congestion to an already gridlocked neighbourhood, will destroy wildlife habitats and cost Ontario taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. This plan is unwanted, unnecessary and unrealistic.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Torontonians and visitors to Toronto do not need this spa/waterpark. Please keep Ontario Place as parkland. Yes, Ontario Place needs a refurbishment of some sort but this is not the answer. Premier Doug Ford "sold" this land in a secretive 95 year lease agreement that stinks of corruption. Therme's attendance projection of 4000 visitors a day to the spa is unrealistic and this "attraction" will end in failure. Torontonians will be left with a giant building on the waterfront with few other uses. The proposal for the new Ontario Science Centre is also upsetting, in that it will only allow for a fraction of the exhibits that the current Ontario Science Centre holds. The Ontario Science Centre is a beloved place of learning and fun that I enjoyed so much as a kid and my kids now love too! I hope that those working at City Hall listen to your fellow Torontonians and how upset we are by this, and fight to stop Therme and Infrastructure Ontario's plan on behalf of all of us

92. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes made to the design proposed by Therme are a tiny band-aid to the concerns raised by the citizens of Toronto about this ridiculous spa. Therme's plan is STILL overly large, will be too expensive to visit for most citizens, will add even more traffic congestion to an already gridlocked neighbourhood, will destroy wildlife habitats and cost Ontario taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. This plan is unwanted, unnecessary and unrealistic.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Torontonians and visitors to Toronto do not need this spa/waterpark. Please keep Ontario Place as parkland. Yes, Ontario Place needs a refurbishment of some sort but this is not the answer. Premier Doug Ford "sold" this land in a secretive 95 year lease agreement that stinks of corruption. Therme's attendance projection of 4000 visitors a day to the spa is unrealistic and this "attraction" will end in failure. Torontonians will be left with a giant building on the waterfront with few other uses. The proposal for the new Ontario Science Centre is also upsetting, in that it will only allow for a fraction of the exhibits that the current Ontario Science Centre holds. The Ontario Science Centre is a beloved place of learning and fun that I enjoyed so much as a kid and my kids now love too!

93. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes in the application are insignificant enough to barely be considered changes.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The current Ontario Place redevelopment plan is a disgrace, and will take decades to undo. Shame on anyone who supports the Therme proposal.

94. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It still does not address the fact that this massive park is being destroyed for a private development and parking garage.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Do not destroy our waterfront with this private development and massive underground parking garage. It is for the public and the public should decide the future of Ontario Place. Moving forward with this proposal is nothing more than corruption.

95. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I agree with the overview of public feedback from April, and with the perspective of the city. I appreciate the design updates. I think the pavilion and bridge are great additions. I think the size of the spa is still too big and too much of the natural parkland is being paved over. I support more preservation of the current biomass landscape in exchange for a further reduction of the Therme expanse. I think it's misleading to call the proposed pathways and surrounding planters "parkland". It's also misleading to claim a reduction of 25% in size, when the actual reduction is 5.8%,

as revealed during the consultation. I was happy to hear the consideration by the city to conserve trees along the east side of the West Island. Just north of the current south shore pebble beach, and just west of there, is a mature tree forest and some grassy hills. Please also consider preserving this area. I think a lot of residents would appreciate the preservation of this natural parkland. Forested areas with mature trees and green grass parkland that you can sit on are extremely coveted by many residents and visitors alike, especially along the waterfront. I don't think it makes sense to move the Ontario Science Centre to this area for all the reasons presented. It really feels like an after thought, very rushed, and certainly not thought through. I'm also concerned with the overall traffic congestion impact that has already been flagged.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Thank you City of Toronto staff for standing firm on the environmental assessment requirement. I agree it must be completed and the applicant must adjust their plans to accommodate for any impactful findings. The proposed sand beach beside the combined sewer outflow needs to be followed-up on and re-considered as well. I don't think the taxpayers should have to pay for the parking garage. There are so many better ways that money could be spent while we endure an affordability crisis, a housing crisis, a healthcare crisis and a climate crisis. We must keep fighting for transparency from the Ford government. With the ongoing greenbelt and mandate letter scandals, they are becoming too well known with deals that are rushed, flawed, and corrupt with secret agendas. For the record, I'd prefer the entire West Island remain a public park as-is with some meaningful restoration of course. "A Better Idea" put forth by Ontario Place for all is worth consideration. Thank you for your hard work and dedication to this project. It means so much to those of us who grew up with Ontario Place and value this special place.

96. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has not changed in any material way. It still does not address the ongoing myriad concerns raised by thousands of Torontonians.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

97. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Where's the Premier? He needs to hear from his constituents about this.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The mega spa belongs in Woodbine, not the waterfront!

98. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This project is outrageous by stealing public land for a lease to advance an private commercial facility on public land. No amount of revision can make this acceptable. Please recommend that the city reject it.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

99. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Does not address substantial concerns. There's no evidence that the current partnership is capable of aligning the application with Torontonians' needs and desires, nor that they intend to.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Commenting on behalf of a friend who attended the September 12, 2023 virtual meeting. The public consultation process is an insult to citizens. It amounts to nothing more than the developers allowing citizens to talk at them, then giving boilerplate responses suggesting they'll do whatever they always wanted to anyway.

100. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* We don't like being lied to about the size of this project. The height has been lowered but the overall footage of the Spa is the same. There are a few less spaces for cars, but will this cost taxpayers less to build? The business plan is still not clear. Who is actually visiting the Mega Spa? How much will a day at the Spa cost? How affordable or inclusive is this entry fee? Where is the data on how these visitors will be arriving? Where is the traffic study? Where is the environmental impact study from Therme? The developers don't give the public a lot of confidence that they

will actually build the public spaces. The developers don't give the public confidence that they are capable of building a rooftop 'park'. There is too much secrecy for a mega project that will significantly impact public waterfront land.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Transparency has not been addressed. Too much secrecy. Too little information for a mega project that will significantly impact public waterfront land. The public wants to see the terms of the lease. We want to see the environmental impact from Therme. What plan has been put in place to fix the sewage overflow located at the proposed beach? Who will pay to fix this oversight? The public is already paying to prep the site and for an underground parking lot. Why should the public subsidize a foreign owned Mega Spa when we are in the middle of a severe housing crisis? How can the Ontario Government justify cutting down 800 trees in the midst of a climate crisis. This plan makes no sense and provides little value for ordinary Ontarians. The only people who will benefit from this plan are developers, architects and private interests.

101. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Moving the existing beach next to a combined sewer overflow is irresponsible. Building such a large and imposing private building on public land is a multi-generational mistake, especially in this city, where public space is already insufficient. Building 2000 parking spots cements more car dependence and goes the opposite direction of the city's stated climate goals.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This plan with its 2000 car parking garage will be dangerous for all Martin Goodman Trail users, as the number of drivers crossing the trail will inevitably lead to more collisions, injuries, and death. Estimated 14,000 visitors per day (while likely impossible), would easily translate to an average of 14 cars per minute turning into the site (calculated at 10000 visits per day over 12 hours of operation).

102. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The proposed beach relocation makes no sense. This parking lot is a waste of public money for private profits

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am disheartened that my community is losing our public space for a private spa.

103. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The only acceptable change would be ridding the application of the entirety of the Mega-spa. Ontario Place is Toronto's backyard. That it could be overrun by a giant glass building to replace the critical parklands and habitat is an embarrassment to good city planning and climate resilience. Adding more "greenery" to the top of the concrete "park" does not make for an enjoyable place to sit, reflect, spend time with friends, bike, roller blade, etc. And still removing the famous pebble stone beach to put one next to a sewer outflow is (quite literally) disgusting.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We are still waiting on the terms of the 95-year lease! How can a company that has been in existence for only a couple years be granted a lease that will span generations. The City should fight back against this with everything it has. This would be a huge loss for Toronto should these plans be allowed to go through.

104. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This Mega Spa does not belong on the waterfront no matter how its design changes. It is still a sea of concrete and glass that beautiful mature trees are being cut down for. The parking lot (on the taxpayer's dime!) is an environmental and safety nightmare. It will make the recreational trail dangerous for walking and cycling. The amount of "public space" remaining is pitifully small and an eyesore. It will impact the many species of migratory birds we are lucky to have in this city thanks to the abundance of green space (key word -- green!)

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Where is the environmental assessment?! Surely this can't be built without one. We can't pretend to care about the environment and climate change then let something this wasteful and destructive to be built on our waterfront!

105. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes contemplated in the updated application are mere window dressing and do not address the core problems:

- 1) Equity: Turning public waterfront land into a private business that will by definition exclude a meaningful portion of Toronto and Ontario's population is the antithesis to the principles of a healthy, modern, and inclusive city.
- 2) Risk: It's also an untested business model. If the business doesn't get the customer traffic (and the estimates vs other attractions appear wildly optimistic) and fails, what then? Things go in and out of fashion and this is purpose-built. In the 70s the equivalent proposal would have been for a roller disco and it would have been a white elephant within the decade. As the public, we are exposed to far too much risk yet the damage is irreversible.
- 3) Opaque contract: The public needs to see the details of the RFP and the evaluation criteria of all proposals received.
- 4) Ontario Science Centre: That's a non-starter. It is a strong attraction in its own right, has transit stops already designed around its current location, and needs the appropriate building (and space!) of its current facilities to undertake the important work it does.
- 5) Parking Garage: If the deal is a good one, it doesn't need our subsidy, especially for a mode of transit that is the exact opposite of what we need to do for climate change considerations.
- 6) Environmental Impacts: The loss of trees, a public beach, destruction of habitat supporting migratory birds and other species, and the newly revealed sewage issues - among many others - render this a non-starter.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City needs to do everything - absolutely EVERYTHING - within its power to decline, deny, and stall this project, including petitioning the Federal government and agencies. Perhaps offering Therme a different spot could encourage them to extricate themselves from a rapidly deteriorating situation

106. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Viewing this presentation through my scientific training, the application has not changed in any meaningful aspect (I also sat through the previous 2-hour presentation earlier this spring). What I noted in this "public consultation" is minor changes that seem designed/presented to obfuscate the main problems, which still remain:

- 1) a handover of valuable public waterfront land to a private company under lease, the terms of which remain hidden;
- 2) the building of an expensive underground/below grade/below the waterline parking garage at PUBLIC expense for the primary benefit of a private company;
- 3) the unreasonable attendance projections (30,000 visitors per day?!); and
- 4) the involvement of the Ford government, which at this point, has made its intentions of transfer of public assets for profit of connected private interests (e.g., Greenbelt) very clear. These are the overarching problems with this proposal. This revised application isn't fooling me, and frankly, it's insulting to assume that city/provincial residents would be taken in by empty words and pretty pictures.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please, City of Toronto, fight back against this appropriation of our waterfront land and public space by the provincial government interests. Ontario Place should be revitalized and redeveloped BY the public (via public funds) and FOR the public. This Therme/spa proposal is not what I want and not what many of the people who live here want.

107. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I strongly disagree with the current proposal and want no private spas, do not want a very large parking lot to be constructed, and do not want the Ontario Science Centre to move.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I strongly disagree with the current proposal and want no private spas, do not want a very large parking lot to be constructed, and do not want the Ontario Science Centre to move. [Previous response repeated]

108. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The Therme spa or water park still does not belong on Toronto waterfront, and the Ontario Science Centre is fine where it is. Updating the Ontario Place landscape and enhancing the existing public realm would cost very little comparatively and it would create a place for the people of Toronto and Ontario to enjoy without throwing away millions or billions of dollars. The naturally stunning Lake Ontario shoreline is a gift, we do not need to enhance it with a man-made glass box with a ridiculous "park" toupee that only impedes our access to the lake. Spend the money on fixing sewage treatment and make the water swimmable. Spend the money on making a skating rink on the lagoons if you want to make it all season.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It sounded to me like the city planners are doing a good job. Keep pushing for the environmental assessment. Keep raising the issues City staff summarized really well last night. Keep pushing for what is best for the city and it's residents. Thank you!

109. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This is a pillaging of public space and they expect us to eat it up.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. DO NOT APPROVE THIS MONSTROSITY.

110. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes to the application were presented as an artist's concept, not as architectural drawings, so are incomplete. It's more about what has NOT changed: private interests being given public assets; limited public access to the site without payment; clear-cutting trees and other environmental impacts; a huge glass structure for private use that is out of scale with its surroundings and unlikely to be environmentally-sustainable; a massive underground parking garage to be funded by Ontario taxpayers; the move and downsizing of the Ontario Science Centre - these all remain unacceptable, whatever the minor changes to the application.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place should be maintained as a public waterfront park and beach, aligned with waterfront goals and accessible to all. It should not be given over to foreign-controlled companies for generations. Why not use in-fill opportunities and existing parking at Exhibition Place for a spa and waterpark instead? As John Lorinc wrote in Spacing magazine (March 2023): "The Austrian company's proposal fails on every measure — it's the wrong project, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. We don't know where the money is coming from. We don't know what happens if the spa business fails. The proposal makes a mockery of the public space principles that have guided waterfront revitalization for a quarter of a century." I urge the City of Toronto to use every means available to prevent the redevelopment proposal from going ahead.

111. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* A spa would be nice in the GTA somewhere -- but in a prime piece of lakefront real estate with a prohibitive entry fee? Makes no sense at all. Ontario Place should be for everyone, not just the rich. The revised application barely shrinks the oversized building; continues to destroy the existing beaches; doesn't address the sewage outlet beside the proposed new beach; doesn't eliminate the pointless (and expensive) parking lot. The rooftop so-called parks will be privately owned 'public' space, always a recipe for disaster. The revised application continues to be unacceptable.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Rehabilitate the heritage landscape and build more connectivity to the city. We could have something iconic. Compare Little Island, part of Manhattan's Hudson River Park. It is already a huge draw, despite opening only in 2021. The application needs to be rejected and the government needs to start again -- and start listening to the people, not just rich companies.

112. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The proposed design appears ineffective in enhancing the space. The new pathways seem impractical. It doesn't appear conducive to any form of navigation aside from walking, and the overall design leaves much to be desired. Imagining the alternatives options to this blank canvas makes me ill.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I strongly urge the development of Ontario Place into a public park and the reconsideration of the private spa proposal. I would be fully supportive of relocating the spa north of Lakeshore on the Exhibition Grounds, as the current site is ill-suited for a large private spa. Furthermore, its accessibility is in question for the foreseeable future. It's important to remember the value of this space when it was accessible to the public, and I believe Therme should take this into account. If the province allocated some of its resources to create a world-class park in this location, it could become a true city gem. As it stands, the prospect of a private spa catering primarily to suburban motorists is not in the best interest of the city. We should follow in the footsteps of Jane Jacobs and oppose this development, much like she successfully stopped the Spadina Expressway.

113. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* [The spa facility] is still far too big and ridiculous. That parking garage is shameful and will likely cost taxpayers upwards of \$1b. Heating a huge glass building with palm trees in Ontario in February should be a crime. Nothing about the amendments make this an attractive project and it should be cancelled.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Our country is literally on fire and the province is breaking all the rules to push this environmentally disastrous monstrosity forward - it boggles my mind. Everything about it is wrong from the size to the parking lot to the razing of trees and bird habitat to the 95-year lease. No one wants this and certainly no one needs this. I'm begging the city to find a way to stop this mistake.

114. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes do not address the main issues: That public land should not be turned over to a private corporation for an expensive spa; that an enormous parking garage should not be built, particularly at public expense; that the west island should remain as parkland and could be renovated at a much lower cost.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city and public need to know the details of the lease. It is bizarre that public land could be turned over to a private company in a completely opaque process.

115. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Still too many trees to be taken down. Still too much hard surface.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Publicly release the lease agreement, and who is responsible for the final decision on plans going forward.

116. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I understand that the height of the Therme Spa has been reduced, the entrance has changed, and a rooftop park has been added. In terms of the height of the actual spa, in my view it is still quite tall. This not only does not fit in with the existing park land, but it interferes with the natural setting of Ontario Place. Can the building be two stories high instead? In addition, the building causes problems for migrating birds. Will the windows be bird-friendly windows? How will the building and its surrounding account for habitat loss?

In the presentation it was said that 4 acres has been added to the park by adding a roof top park. This change is not adequate. I have concerns with heat waves, severe weather etc. Given the recent climate report for Ontario. How much weight can the rooftop hold? Given that the expectation is to have 30,000 people attending the facility, will it accommodate more than 1,000 people at a time? Will there be trees for shade? How can this be used in the winter? It would be best to add 4 acres of park land on the ground. Who will have access, and how easily will the access be for those with accessibility issues? Will the general public have access and how will they

be able to enter the roof top? Will there be native plants and trees on the roof top? I do not believe this change is a good change. Adding a roof top garden does not address trees that will be cut down. It does not replace the environmental and mental health benefit of having green space with 850 trees. How can Therme make changes to allow for this?

The parking lot spaces have been reduced by 200 or so spaces. This is not enough. Public transportation should be encouraged. Public parking spots are available at the Exhibition. Reducing parking spaces by 200 does little to reduce an already heavy traffic area. The residents in the nearby community will find it even more difficult to access their homes and retail. In my view, the parking garage should be eliminated entirely. More public transportation infrastructure should be added instead. Having the parking garage will encourage driving and therefore will serve to increase pollution. How can Therme accommodate their clients without having a parking garage? How can they work with TTC and GO to encourage public transportation? Will Therme contribute financially to public transportation so that it is appealing to their clients? Will they advertise public transportation as the mode to reach their spa? The province does not have to build a parking garage. How will Infrastructure Ontario aggressively promote public transportation instead? This change was extremely minimal and lacks any significance in reducing drivers and reducing pollution being brought in to the city and to the local community. My expectation of Infrastructure Ontario is to be much more ambitious with reducing parking spaces and increasing public transportation.

If I understood correctly the entrance has also changed. In the drawings shown, the entrance seemed quite large and again not fitting in with the natural environment that already exists. It is too tall. There was a lot of concrete in the drawings. I do not see how the entrance, the actual spa, and the roof top garden fit in with the heritage of Ontario Place. It all seems very big and as though the new buildings, even with their minimal changes, will overtake the existing design of the buildings and of the green space. It is transforming the space in such a way that you cannot see any 'heritage' being represented.

The Japanese Bell and Moriyama Canopy as I understand from the discussion, will be protected but will be moved from its current location. No indication of where it will go was presented. The presenter said he was not sure where it would go. I would like to see it in a prominent area where people can continue to access it for New Year ceremonies. This has become a tradition for many in our city. How will this be accommodated? Will the general public be able to access it? Will there be green space with seating surrounding it? Will it be close to the waterfront? I do not know if the Japanese Bell and Moriyama Canopy was considered a change in the plan or not, but it does seem that there is no plan. This is of cultural significance and deserves respect and preservation as an heritage structure.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place is being stripped of everything it represents, a peaceful green space by the lake. A place where the community, from far and wide, can go for some relief from a busy city life. Where trees offer some shade and an outdoor experience by the lake, in a city. It is Toronto's gem, part of our history and culture. Let's repair the buildings and leave it as a park for all to enjoy.

1.) Environmental Assessment: Before any work continues an environmental assessment (EA) is essential. Ross Burnett from Infrastructure Ontario indicated that Therme is a private institution and therefore does not qualify for the Province's EA. Can the Province make a change to this rule? We know the Province can make changes as we have seen with the Greenbelt, so can it change the rule so that a private structure going on public land by the lakeshore, require an EA? In addition, Mr. Burnett indicated that Therme is doing its own EA. Can we have access and make comments on their EA? Who is conducting their EA? Have all parties who have a stake in the land and space been consulted for their EA? Local residents, Indigenous community, wildlife experts and species at risk experts? If the provincial government will not change the rules for an EA, can the Federal Government intervene and require a public EA? How are species at risk being considered and how much priority are bird migration patterns being given when building a tall and large glass building? Will Therme use bird friendly windows? What if any, EA is Therme doing in terms of the change in beach location and sewage? Can the beach be left where it is?? How will the sewage affect local residents and all residents of Toronto

given that the expectation is to have 30,000 visitors per day. That means that there will be 210,000 people using the washrooms in a week! Before anything is built, we need a solid plan to deal with our sewage. As a taxpayer in Toronto, I do not want to drink potentially contaminated water! Who will pay to update the sewage system? Toronto, Province, or Therme? I am guessing that if we had an EA, this would be looked at. If there's no assessment, how will the City deal with this problem?

2.) Loss of Green Space and of Trees: In light of our climate shifting over the years, and more severe weather our city needs to have green space and trees. The trees will help with car exhaust in the local area, they will help with the erosion, flooding, and provide cooling spaces and relief from the sun. How can we possibly justify removing them and putting in a glass structure that will take away these benefits and only serve to contribute to more heat? We know the benefits trees have environmentally, but trees and green space have also been proven to reduce stress and improve mental health. As our city grows, we need more green spaces for people who live in high density communities in our city. Many people do not have access to a cottage on a lake. Toronto is blessed with Ontario Place where the public can go to access the lake and green space with trees. This helps with the mental health of our communities. It gives people access to a 'backyard' setting right in the city. Those who do not have cars to escape out of the city can still have access via public transportation, to a green space with a forest-like setting. Taking away the green space and the trees does a disservice to our most vulnerable communities. Can Therme not find a way to build a subtle building that blends in with the natural setting? Or can the city offer Therme other locations where this type of business would do well? There is no need for the Spa to be located on our prime lakeshore space that offers city dwellers some forest bathing in an accessible location? What can the city do to protect this green space and trees for future generations of Torontonians and Ontarians in general? In addition to the green space and trees offering a space for humans, they also provide food and habitat for many species. How can we justify taking away this space? What is the environmental impact of removing 850 trees?

3.) Underground Parking: My concern is great with respect to underground parking. It should be eliminated entirely. The only exception I can see is to have 50 to 100 spaces for accessibility parking. All other parking should be eliminated. Public transportation should be encouraged whether TTC, GO, trains etc. If a parking lot is built, people will drive. What happens if more people drive than spots available? Yes, overflow can go to the Exhibition, but if those are full with the expected 30,000 people daily expected to go to Ontario Place, where will the cars go? Local streets with homes are already full with residents parking their vehicles. If we do not have a parking lot at Ontario Place, people will be discouraged to drive and this problem will be avoided. With climate change we need to aggressively encourage more public transportation. This is the only solution to traffic in the area. The local residents will face tremendous delays in reaching their homes, going out to do groceries, going out for leisure and so on. Pedestrian and cycling safety issues in the local neighbourhoods and speeding issues must be addressed with the increased number of cars should the parking lot be built? In addition, there is the issue of future costs to maintain a parking lot located so close to the water. Who will be responsible for maintenance costs? Will the Province or Therme or the City be expected to pick up future costs? What is the environmental impact of building this large underground parking garage?

4.) Ontario Science Centre: The current building and location of the Ontario Science Centre (OSC) is perfect! I speak as both a teacher and a parent. The location makes it convenient and stress free. Safety for the students/children/parents/caregivers/teachers/ECE workers/bus drivers at the Don Mills/Eglinton location is very good! In addition, public transportation is readily accessible. Less traffic makes it much safer for all attending. In addition, children attending the OSC do not have to compete with space for people going to a Spa or a concert. Most schools are not located near Ontario Place so it would make for a very long bus trip for students coming from different locations in the city or the province. This would create so much more traffic at Ontario Place. Depending on the drop off area for the students, they may have to walk quite a bit to reach the pods, again thinking of safety and competing with space being used by the other visitors. At the current OSC the space is dedicated solely for the use of OSC visitors. Safety is the biggest concern, but also the smaller size of the OSC at Ontario Place will take away many hands-on and exhibits and presentations that would support science and critical thinking. In addition, to tear down and build a new but smaller facility comes with environmental

impacts. Again, I would like to see both an environmental assessment of tearing down one building and building another. As well, as a tax payer I would like to demand to see the business plan for the move of the OSC to OP. How can the City help with this? How can we keep a world renowned building in a perfect location in the Thorncliffe Park neighbourhood? The local community of Thorncliffe Park stands to lose a tremendous amount of support should the OSC move. In addition, we have a gem in our city, the OSC is part of our history. Why take it away? How can the city take over the OSC and make the necessary repairs? The OSC does not belong with a Spa and an Entertainment venue.

5.) Japanese Bell and Moriyama Canopy: The Japanese Bell was a gift to the city. The canopy build by our famous Raymond Moriyama. This is part of our history, part of our culture. At the moment, it occupies a prominent location at Ontario Place. Every New Year people go to the site to participate in ceremonies. How can we justify moving it? And, if it needs to be moved where will it go? Therme Spa should not be allowed to take away part of Toronto's history by hiding this monument in an obscure location. At the presentation it seemed that not much thought had been given to it at all. How could such detailed drawings be presented and yet not incorporate the Bell and Canopy anywhere in the drawings? I do not trust Infrastructure Ontario to do the right thing and place it in a prominent area where all people have access to it and have view of the lake. It must be placed in a green and peaceful location where people can gather comfortably and easily. It must be in an accessible location. At the moment we do not know where it will go. How can the city stress the importance of this monument and facilitate where it is located? It is our history after all!

117. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Great to see that there have been some changes - decreased parking space, decreased height in some buildings, and increased public spaces. Concerns:

1) I had asked why there were no Accessibility/Disability consultants (and not just following AODA guidelines) as AODA guidelines are the BARE MINIMUM, and there needs to be people with actual disabilities to help design the interior and exterior of this site. (E.g., placing an accessible door button - most buildings place it flush against the door - BUT this DOES NOT WORK for us in wheelchairs because once we hit the button, we have to wheel backwards to avoid the door from hitting us!? AODA guideline, but NOT actual disabled-friendly. A good option is to use an accessible bar button a few feet away from the door - similar to the Toronto Western Hospital Bathurst entrance, to allow space for the door to open without hitting those in wheelchairs.) There was a design rendering on a flyer I received at the CNE of a proposed park at Ontario Place - it had sand and logs for children to climb on. This is NOT accessible for children in wheelchairs - they cannot access the park due to sand and cannot climb on logs. There has to be some other activities that can be included in a park for children with disabilities. I would highly advise people with disabilities to consult on this project instead of just able-bodied individuals who THINK they know how to provide access for those with disabilities. I would be happy to be able to review the designs and provide feedback on the proposed designs.

2) Parking lots - it is good that some parking has been moved underground, but there is still a big parking lot on the surface, which is an absolute waste of space that can be used for something else that can benefit Ontarians. Why not just have the parking lots (and bike lots) all underground (like Millennium Park in Chicago) and use the above space for more green space? The answer I received at the virtual meeting was very short-sighted - that they are keeping the parking lot for now, and if they want to develop it in the future, they can. Why waste more money when you can do everything properly from the beginning? Since the City is predicting people will use the Ontario Line and public transit more to get to Ontario Place, then just keep the number of parking lots that are already assigned to be underground the way it is and just remove the above parking lots and use that space more appropriately.

3) I Enjoyed seeing the various walking paths/bridge proposed designs - May I suggest adding more shade in the area as in the summertime, the ground will reflect a lot of heat, and there need to be more shady areas to decrease heat stroke and decrease overexposure to the sun that can cause cancer. Also, it would be good to have water refill stations around the park to keep people hydrated.

4) It is nice to see that there will be a beach to enjoy - but can we make sure that this is accessible for those in wheelchairs? Sand is not friendly to wheelchairs, but there are many examples of how to make beaches accessible in other countries (e.g., Sirens Resort in Loutraki, Greece - direct access to the water), or sand friendly wheelchairs, and umbrella stands for people with wheelchairs, etc.

5) I saw the design for the Land to Water Rock pier - just wondering how this is accessible to the water for those in wheelchairs. I only saw a person in a wheelchair at the top/beginning section of the rock pier, but I am not sure how one is able to access the water in this area.

6) I am pleased to see lots of open flat spaces where wheelchairs can roam without being overcrowded. However, in the presentation, they mentioned that Ontario Place is to be open all year round. My question/concern is how often will the entire flat spaces/paths/bridges be plowed from snow to allow for walkers/wheelchairs to be easily used? The reason is that even the sidewalks in the City do not even get plowed safely enough for wheelchairs/walkers to use. I just want to get people thinking of how this will actually work during the winter for wheelchair/walker access.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. If, in the future, there will be a pavilion similar to the one at the CNE that showcased the Ontario Place project with VR or whatever means - PLEASE make it ACCESSIBLE to EVERYONE, including those with wheelchairs. I was NOT able to climb up on a large platform to access the VR headsets - it shows that those with disabilities are not important to reach out to. However you decide on getting the word out to the general public, please remember people with disabilities (visible and invisible) - there are 2.6 million of us in Ontario alone. If you are able to get wetland consultations and indigenous consultations (with more than 406,000 Indigenous peoples in Ontario), the numbers alone should inform you that more emphasis needs to be placed on accessibility (not just the bare minimum just so we can say we did something, BUT actually involving peoples with disabilities to provide feedback to the designs). I suggest doing a call-out for everyone with disabilities to attend a few meetings to be able to provide feedback on the designs. Do not wait until all the designs are drawn, as it will waste a lot of money to redo them after the feedback session. Hold the session now and just provide us with what will be proposed - that way, we can provide suggestions on things to incorporate into the design that were not thought of before. I know the City of Toronto does feedback for accessibility designs for the road in the Kipling area that involved the TTC bus stop - this is great BUT it should have been done PRIOR during the design stage so money is not wasted in building something that does not work well for those with disabilities. An able-bodied engineer/designer did the planning/creation of the area following AODA guidelines - but clearly, it DID NOT work!! I beg of you, PLEASE involve people with disabilities in the design stages of whatever you are building - this will cost less in the long run. (This is what Singapore does for everything they build - they involve people with disabilities at multiple points in the planning/design stages. Once the project is completed, they are not able to open it to the general public until people with disabilities have physically assessed the project and provided approval). This is about future-proofing everything that is being built - the population is aging, and more people will need mobility aids - plan ahead for the future and do not be short-sighted just to save a small amount because it will cost significantly more to make renovations once it is built. If you would like me to be involved and provide feedback on whatever project you have going, I am more than happy to assist. Thank you to the City and the staff for all your hard work.

118. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* A major issue remains cars. Car traffic, which we are given only vague assurances about, when history has shown time and again that whatever studies are being done are wildly inadequate. Car parking prioritized over every other form of transport. Smog and pollution implications from the added traffic not being addressed anywhere. Another issue is the shuttle buses for moving people between the subway station and the venue - how many buses are we talking about? Have they been included in the traffic studies? Very happy with the increase in public space but remain very concerned with the operational implications - who is policing the area, who is maintaining the area, what is going to happen to these areas if Therme pulls out?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Other concerns that seem to have gone undressed in either iteration are the construction phases. How long will access to existing public

space be blocked for construction? How will existing traffic be managed during construction? What are the worst case estimates for construction timelines? What this area really needs is public space and amenities for people coming to enjoy the lake. Look at Santa Monica - they don't have a massive privately owned spa, they have a slew of restaurants, bike rentals, outdoor event space, restrooms, stores for clothing and swimwear. The waterfront is the attraction and the structure on land supports its enjoyment, even when it's too cold to swim. Not only does this proposal not do that, it also discourages that kind of development because the people coming down are fully catered to within this obelisk that benefits a foreign business at the expense of local ones.

119. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Did not change much, didn't address major issues of cost of underground parking, traffic congestion, destruction of natural park, removal of old trees and actual public access and beach by the sewer overflow. Changes in the application were minor and not presented impartially. And "park" on the roof is absurd as they said it will be native plants there and public space, but a few grasses and a few meters for people to squeeze is not a park with native plants and public access. And How they said that Sugar beach is popular even though it is paved - well, it is not popular, people who live near by in those tall buildings come down to use even though it is not a real beach and it is paved because people need some open space. Destroying the existing Ontario Place park will have negative effect on mental health of many people. Seeing destruction of their beloved trees and wildlife is very traumatizing, and then they will put these building to block the view of the lake and charge big money to go inside. And Migratory birds will die while colliding with the glass building. Then indoor air will be full of circulating viruses and water will be also subject to germs. People who will profit from this project don't live there nearby and don't come visit the park as they have their own cottages on private access lakes. But many people don't have that, we want more public park and less crowd and cars. Downtown waterfront is already very dense, traffic is intense and they want to bring more and more thousands of people? And Ontario Science Centre?? Why Move it? It is in perfect spot. It is expensive to move it, build new much smaller one. Aga Khan museum got over 235 Million free money and for what? And probably are getting more. Not many people go there, it is mostly empty all the time, such large building with no actual purpose. The Ontario Science Centre is very valuable and making it smaller, diminishing and eliminating its exhibits so the land can be used for more condos and more destruction of trees in that area. PLEASE, look into the quality of life of people. We need more open spaces, more parks, less density.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am deeply concerned that the proposed project is more harmful than useful. Much more. The cost of underground park, under the lake, will cost over a billion and the government will keep paying tax payers money for the ballooning costs. Then the destruction of the natural beautiful park that so many people use and enjoy is a tragedy in itself. Many bird species, animals, aquatic life around will be gone. The combined sewer overflow will make the proposed beach unusable most of the time in already hot summer. The paved surface is very depressing. They showed on the pictures in green the public spaces and called it a park, but it is not green in reality , it is a paved ground. It is horrifying to see no actual natural ground, no trees and just building and humming of motors. Planting small patches of native flowers and grasses will not make it a natural native environment. It is a sad and depressing project that will take many years to build and that will destroy the actual park, the trees, the birds, wildlife and space for people to come and feel the nature a bit. Our city is already extremely dense, the sewage alone is a big problem as the city cannot handle it , why give money and land to private people who will profit greatly and go enjoy their rich housing and cottages. We can make Ontario Place a park, and an education centre about Aboriginal people's history and their art, and native medicinal plants. And maybe a small planetarium with a telescope and education centre. Bottom line - seems like the money and land will be lost to private hands, who will be the only ones to benefit. Neither City nor people would have a benefit from this monstrous project. There should be federal environmental assessment and cost assessment and checking for possible corruption and backdoor deals. The [existing] park should be saved as a public park, we need it for mental health. Nature and trees are much better therapy than any spas can ever do. And lease for the whole century is also absurd, none of us will be here and who knows what will be then. Please, lets think what is now and do what aligns with natural and not artificial.

120. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It has changed minimally

to placate those who object, leaving the development and non-environmentally friendly proposed sprawl plan virtually intact (just like the Greenbelt).

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I'm so angry about this proposal. We are in a global climate crisis. There is no need to destroy all that land and habitat for a giant spa and parking structure. It makes even less sense than a Ferris wheel. My view is the spa idea would actually be good and inspiring - on a local and world class level - if designed and built as a fully sustainable structure . For example, a passive house, where the building runs off solar and thermal (water) energy and is virtually self sustaining. It would make the site aspirational from an environmental perspective. Having the Ontario Science Centre there (I'd rather an offshoot than totally relocated, but either way) would make that a more symbiotic partnership where it can leverage off passive house technology, run experiments etc. That would make sense! We have many architects certified in passive house design right here to draw from. Indigenous input would also be amazing, relevant, important and inspiring. Otherwise I would scrap the spa completely as a complete waste and destructive mega project, not solving any social or environmental issue, which should have been the starting point or at least a prerequisite. It's not too late for our City and Province to get it together and fix this disaster of a plan that completely misses the mark.

121. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The fundamental land use matter whether the Therme waterpark / spa is an appropriate land use for the West Island has not been addressed. The land use represents an inappropriate use of the site, and does not address environmental transportation and heritage matters. The size and scale of the Therme facility is inappropriate for the site and does not provide adequate public access to the site and waterfront.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. City Planning - please say no! It is your professional obligation to uphold the public interest on this important site.

122. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I have attended all the presentations by the Therme Spa group and still it is apparent that this proposal is not good for the Ontario Place Site and Toronto. This is Public Land, some of the most coveted real estate, and to hand over a long-term lease to a private company is so short sighted and a disaster to the environment , the local ecosystem, and the cultural history that is so valuable to the residents of Toronto. The Spa still remains to be a very large structure, even with the "reduction" at 5.8 % which is really not much at all. The building remains massive and tall.

The redesign of adding more "park" public space, now on some roofs, remains small and not wholly accessible. There is so much "white space" which Therme could only answer as being "permeable" when one questioner asked is this concrete? Yes, a lot of concrete and glass. After the redesign narrow paths have been added and designated as "public" park- narrow strips around this monolith glass building filled with palm trees - giving the feeling of looking in at those that can afford to go to the spa ? Why put a mammoth chlorinated pool /spa instead of preserving the beautiful beach for accessing the lake for swimming, skating and more? To allow a private company to build a spa and have a lease is a very cynical view to offer Toronto and all of Ontario. Here we are in a climate change era, and the vision is to build a spa and a parking lot in the lake? That is very sad indeed.

There is a little less parking now, but still a huge parking lot to be built in the lake and to be paid for by taxpayers makes no sense.

Why not instead upgrade the sewage treatment that can spill into Lake Ontario and revitalize Ontario Place making it a gorgeous public park? Maintain the heritage buildings and bring art and nature to this place for all people without Profit being the go to model and answer. The terms of this lease and the terms of the deal have never been made public.

Selling our public land, prime waterfront shoreline , a crown jewel in the city of Toronto, Canada's largest city, is a grave mistake that will haunt us for generations to come. Who will be looking after this spa once it starts to deteriorate, or run it should this company go under? This should never be built on this location. Ontario Place and our Great Lake Ontario is the attraction- repair it , maintain it and enhance it.

Put the spa inland away from this historical and highly valuable location in the downtown on the lake. All of the other Therme spa locations are located away from cities' downtown cores. No other city has ever allowed a Therme spa to be built in the prime downtown area of their city, as such spas were placed outside of a big metropolis. These places were smart to do so, and we should make sure this doesn't get built at Ontario Place. You don't put this kind of "attraction" spa business in your prime downtown, you keep it outside of your downtown and you don't destroy preexisting heritage sites and structures, destinations, for private interest profit. Instead, find a location away from downtown, make it like Yorkdale Mall- a place people can travel to away from the downtown core. Too much of what is happening down on our waterfront in this general location is for-profit business, owned by private corporations like Live Nation which charge a lot to even access their events, many times prohibitively so. Also, during COVID's pandemic so many people used Ontario Place as a place to get some fresh air and to get connected to some natural world as a means to find calm, health and a little piece of mind. We need Ontario Place for the residents of Toronto as the city is only increasing in size, and in density - We must maintain inspiring parks and green space. If it had been a private spa the whole location would have been closed during the pandemic. The environmental impact of this building is huge, and no full independent study has ever been completed. The energy required to run this spa, let alone the waste it generates are massive and anathema to current aspirations and ideas of "green" space, living and a greener future. The Spa sends the opposite message

Care for the old trees that have established themselves and plant more versus removing trees. This structure, this Spa, belongs in the suburbs, away from our downtown core and on this specific location. Ontario Science Centre too should remain where it is and not reduced and moved to Ontario Place. This is a bad idea and planning for so many reasons.

The Ontario Science Centre too should be restored, repaired and honoured as the special place it is, let alone its historical architecture. Importantly, we should not reduce and cram all of our cultural / heritage special "attractions" onto one site, one location. They need to be spread out throughout the city and communities of Toronto. They add value to the different neighbourhoods and areas of Toronto and the GTA. The traffic alone is already a huge problem for the city and to add more pressure on one particular area of our city is very bad city planning, total madness. Imagine where will all the school buses go when they visit the Ontario Science Centre? We need better Public transit, as there is now for the existing Ontario Science Centre in its original location.

We should not allow this Spa project here. If there must be a "kill" fee so be it. We can do much better than this, we must. Have the courage to say no and stand firm. We need a truly inspired and progressive urban design one taken from a page of other cities that have gotten it right. The Therme Spa is getting it wrong.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Places like NYC have been creating amazing and unique Free Public Parks that draw millions of tourists and provide enhanced quality space for the people that actually live and work in that city- The Highline is but one example. We need to get inspired and think big, restore and renew Ontario Place as a Public Park. Hold a design contest and make an amazing park. The taxpaying residents of Toronto need this space to remain free, public, open and beautiful year round and for it to be leading in environmental concerns and design. This private Spa is not in the Public interest and does not represent any of these values. Say no to this spa at Ontario Place and let's do something inspired. Look at other "World class" parks in great cities, we too can do something inspiring and be in sync with the times by leading the way for a greener future, with a long view vision for generations.

123. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I believe these lands should be preserved for public use.

124. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* How will a private water park at Ontario place be any different than the amusement park that just failed? The addition of "public" space on the roof of the building is inadequate to address concerns over the privatization of the island. A park on a roof will never be equivalent to a park on the ground. What about accessibility? What happens when therme fails

in 15 years and the building needs to be demolished for another use? How can enough soil depth be provided to grow 100 year trees? The design is still awkward and hulking. The building needs to be 1/3 of the height and footprint it currently is, and be moved next to the X hotel or somewhere on the outskirts of the city. There is too much glass to be meaningfully sustainable, and any claims to the contrary are greenwashing. The architecture is muddled and incoherent.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please stand up to Premier Doug Ford and stop this project.

125. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I don't think any changes can be taken at face value - we cannot let Ontario Place be sold off. This is our city. We don't need another spa. We need Ontario Place and the Ontario Science Centre as they are. No more disruptions to existing, beautiful spaces that benefit private interests. Public works for public good, or bust. Green space for the public - no Therme lease on public, STOLEN land!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Look, without complete transparency, this is just as bad as the Greenbelt fiasco. Therme and the Ontario government are going to find yet another red herring to shift blame on. It's unconscionable that this will likely be the transgender community. TORONTO is a historically queer place - with pockets of resistance everywhere. If Olivia Chows municipal government doesn't step in and protect our public spaces, then she's just as complicit in this. Use your strong mayor powers, and have Ford force his hand, and appeal to the Federal courts BEFORE they're stacked against us.

126. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* No change in this application makes it an appropriate place for a private spa on public land.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please stop this development. It is a wrong use proposal for greatly needed public space accessible to all.

127. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The size reduction of the Therme facility does not go far enough. It still uproots the trees, destroys the wildlife and wipes out the one-of-a-kind pebble beach. Any private vendors that operate on the West Island should operate in a way that preserves the landscape that currently exists. The new application is boastful about the "rooftop park" but the principle of the design remains the same - a public realm that serves commercial interests. I implore the city to listen to the clear messaging coming from the public: we don't want the spa. Toronto deserves a waterfront park on the site.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city should demand that the lease is made public.

128. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Lots of greenwashing

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. In a true participatory and democratic process, the How is just as (if not more), important than the What. This has been a process of secrecy and backroom dealings, so whatever it produces will necessarily be unfit for purpose. When was our opportunity to comment before the lease was agreed? Before the Ontario Science Centre was moved? If approved this would be a shameful reminder of our utterly failed planning processes (and by extension our democracy) for 95 years..

129. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Creating a spa, or any private business at this scale on a public park is an unacceptable use of public land. The surrounding neighbourhoods are high density and home to many lower income families who depend on Ontario Place as a space for recreation and to cool off in hot summer weather. The remaining greenspace around the facility is insufficient to meet the needs of the area. Additionally, a large facility in the center of the park will greatly reduce any enjoyment or tranquility that can be found at the park. I can understand the need to monetize

government assets but a spa or large private business is not an acceptable option in this space. Perhaps Ex-Space grounds would be a better location for a spa.

130. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It is still a behemoth of a structure in the wrong setting. The feeble rooftop landscape only reminds us of the trees Therme wants to destroy. The new proposal does not mention the parking garage nor the city sewage outlet. And what is the effect of warm water discharge? Rock slime here we come! This is a disaster of a proposal. Put it in Woodbine or the CNE.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city has to fight back on this. Otherwise it's a 99 year boondoggle. We do have some legal tools.

131. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It has not changed sufficiently. It really needs to be cancelled. Leave these lands free and open.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city has enough buildings and not enough open lands. This is a chance to preserve open space for all to enjoy in a number of ways.

132. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* What is the plan here if the spa does not ultimately succeed? Is there any potential for adaptive reuse? How can we make informed decisions without seeing the lease with Therme? Why did they place a new public beach next to the combined sewer overflow. This new application still has countless issues.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am all for updating Ontario Place, including with private uses, but this proposed spa is littered with problems and is not good value for taxpayer money. It also flies in the face of so many climate/environmental goals held by the city. I am extremely opposed to this proposal.

133. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* We like the smaller footprint and height of the spa and the new rooftop parkland. Also, the increase in free space is critical for the public's enjoyment of the waterfront.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We think the science centre in the pods will work if it focuses on areas related to the waterfront, Great Lakes and all wildlife in the area. We also believe that Toronto can support two Ontario Science Centre locations and that it is important to have the existing centre continue. The cost of the underground parking is going to be huge. Since the taxpayer is footing this expense, why can't we build an above ground parking lot near the train lines in the Exhibition grounds with a shuttle service. How are we protecting migrating birds from collisions with the spa windows?

134. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* While this is certainly an improvement in the design, it fails to address the fundamental issues: 1.) A lease of PUBLIC waterfront lands to operate a commercial spa facility/water park, and 2.) Spending half a billion dollars of public money to build a parking facility, when there is parking space at Exhibition Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

135. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application does not respond to the public and city requirements for providing a public realm for citizens that seek unfettered access to Lake Ontario and the park and facilities that currently exist.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. A spa of this size and nature is contrary to building a better city, or for providing recreation accessible to all. It is a glorified, exclusive, water club. There are many other more suitable areas for this type of project. It will cut people off from the water, create years of distress, stress and environmental impacts that may never recover. I fear Toronto will be saddled with the expense when the spa fails. There is a strong smell of corruption that can not be denied. Please, please

stop this insanity. We need a greener, more natural access to bring people and the planet into better alignment - not a 1% water spa. Thanks

136. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The inclusion of more public space is nice, but it doesn't fundamentally address the core issues that many people have with the plans, including myself. A huge chunk of the property is still going to be torn up and turned private, under lease terms that taxpayers are not allowed to see, for the privilege of being able to walk on Therme's roof? And all this under the assumption that it's a good idea to try to move over ten thousand non-Torontonians per day to one of the most difficult parts of the waterfront to get to on public transit? On top of the expected number of people attending the Ontario Science Centre (a move that is a whole other poorly planned kettle of fish)? Without an environmental assessment, actual transparency, and serious thought given to the site's longevity, this continues to be a terrible idea. As someone at the virtual meeting pointed out, if taxpayers are going to be on the hook for a half-billion-dollar parking garage anyway, why not use that money to turn the island into a truly excellent public park instead of wasting it on a parking garage that will benefit a private corporation?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. These plans are not nearly detailed enough or transparent enough to move forward with at this time.

137. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There is still evidence of provincial government non-transparency as the public has still not been given a detailed resubmission. Major fundamental issues still exist: a giant publicly funded parking garage has not been addressed, the spa-building footprint is actually only 5.8% smaller - not the 25% stat Therme is claiming, the proposed Therme beach is next to a combined sewer overflow. Therme and the provincial government are still not committing themselves to an environmental assessment for lakefilling.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Moving the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place will deprive a lower-income community of a valuable hub for education and engagement; a 2,400 car parking lot at Ontario Place will add to an already untenable situation in the area regarding traffic chaos and pollution, of which the financial burden to construct will be placed on the taxpayers; Therme and the provincial government's complete disregard of the environmental sensitivity, as well as health benefits of an already existing 850 tree-filled park with greater pedestrian access for all citizens, in a dense urban area, in the midst of an ever-increasing climate crisis and ignoring the legitimate call for environmental assessment of the site - for profit and mainly to cater to a small and wealthy demographic - is unconscionable. The entire project and its handling so far has appeared to be entirely undemocratic, dishonest and disrespectful to the citizens of Ontario and Toronto.

138. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This project should not be allowed to continue and the area should be left as parkland. Nothing positive will come out of the destruction of biologically important lands. Torontonians need accessible parks and wildlife needs a place to live.

139. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I still feel this proposal is SO FAR from respecting the both the ecology and heritage of this site. It still dominates the landscape, destroys the existing fabric, and has many unresolved issues - especially re: infilling the lake, the location of the public beach to a sewer outflow, stated goals about public transportation vs emphasis on cars, and so many other factors.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I can only hope the city is somehow able to stop this disgrace.

140. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The size of the Therme building has been reduced slightly, which is better than nothing, but it's still a terrible idea, totally inappropriate for the setting. The removal of 800 mature trees and the construction of a giant underground parking garage should be absolute non-starters.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The renders we were shown are simply not credible. Futuristic sweeping glass designs are never actually built that way. The applicants even admitted (more than once) that the renders are essentially meaningless, given the early state of the design. We will end up with a suburban mall-like structure, just like every other Therme building in the world. An unforgivable blight on our prime waterfront space. The restoration of Ontario Place should be focused primarily on the outdoors, starting with the protection of the 800 mature trees that, if razed, would take another 5 decades to replace. The public sentiment through these consultations (not to mention the intervening election) has been unmistakable. Enough with these monstrous plans. It's time for the city to say no, loud and clear, while there's still something left to protect.

141. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has shown no substantive change or improvement from the last presentation. The site plan, drawings and artists renderings do not show enough detail to assess what has changed. There are no floor plans from which the change in GFA can be calculated; there are not sufficient section drawings through the building and site. The artist's renderings and views are deceptive as they downplay the size of the Therme building. The massive glass roofs are kept in the distance of the drawings. Instead of verbal promises made by the consultant team, (for example that many areas of concrete won't be concrete) the applicant needs to present labeled drawings and make a written and binding commitment to what is shown on the drawings. Floor plans are essential to understanding the project and assessing the size. A reduction in volume means little. The applicant promises the roof garden will be designed as a seamless transition from the ground plane. This isn't at all convincing. The entrance perspective shows access to it by a stair. The applicant should not have to be making the verbal promise that the whole design will conform to the AODA. They need show it! The Therme roof above appears to be more concrete than vegetation and any large trees will require deep soil pits and there is nothing in the drawings that indicates the designers have considered how to include them. In short, not only did this application not improve from the last one, instead, it raised more questions. For example, where are the mechanical systems and infrastructure for the massive Therme building located. The presentation seemed to be more pretty pictures than a serious complete presentation. No one walked us through the site or even described how the Therme building functioned.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. While I applaud the city's attempt to review this application in a short time, it should not be approved at this time. The applicant's presentation lacked detail and I think was more obfuscation and selling the project than showing how it all works. I don't believe the project should proceed. The Therme building is too big. Too much land is given private interest. The latest Ontario Science Centre proposal isn't even considered in the design. It just shows up as a few lines on the drawings. Why would one approve a portion of the site without seeing the whole vision, In short, the applicant has not shown how this design improves the site or meets the City of Toronto's vision and guiding principle for the water front and Ontario place.

142. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Our family enjoys the beauty of Ontario Place (Trillium Park) as it exists. We used to head down on Sunday mornings to walk the trail, play on the shoreline and talk about all the plants and bugs we find along the way. As a kid in Toronto I spent weekends with my dad and brother playing at Ontario place and created memories that have lasted a lifetime and didn't cost my dad a ton of money. We need this space and we need our environment and ecosystem to be managed for the future and for our climate. This is precious space, please fight for it. We've seen that if we allow the province to control the process that it will not reflect the values of our democracy and be driven by private influence. Do we know the process by which Therme got this spa? Please stand up for us and for our city.

143. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The question is not whether Therme has adequately addressed people's concerns in its resubmission, but that Therme is getting a lease on public land in the first place for a private spa/"waterpark" that the province has convinced itself will attract thousands of people a day year round. The whole approach to renewing Ontario Place needs to be re-examined and should be in the Trillium park model: inexpensive, simple, pedestrian-based, oriented towards

the lake, preserving and enhancing the natural flora and fauna. It is blindingly obvious that the organizations abetting the Therme project are creating a distracting display of conceptual window dressing involving the "public" use of the land in order to make the Spa seem more palatable.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] The question is not whether Therme has adequately addressed people's concerns in its resubmission, but that Therme is getting a lease on public land in the first place for a private spa/"waterpark" that the province has convinced itself will attract thousands of people a day year round. The whole approach to renewing Ontario Place needs to be re-examined and should be in the Trillium park model: inexpensive, simple, pedestrian-based, oriented towards the lake, preserving and enhancing the natural flora and fauna. It is blindingly obvious that the organizations abetting the Therme project are creating a distracting display of conceptual window dressing involving the "public" use of the land in order to make the Spa seem more palatable.

144. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application is still completely unacceptable. It cuts off access to the safe beach. It creates a giant structure on our parkland which is an expensive private club for the well off in Toronto and cuts off most people from being able to use the space. The migrant birds will be killed by the glass structure. No proper environmental assessment. No planning for increased traffic except tax payers funding an unbelievably expensive parking structure. Taking away our world renowned Ontario Science Centre from its current location in an underserved area is terrible. And making the Ontario Science Centre so much smaller is a huge loss to Toronto.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please block this improperly researched private deal where Ontarians have no oversight or participation in what's happening to our land. I grew up going to Ontario Place and so did my kids. This is a very sad attempt to take away very important Ontario institutions to give them to a foreign corporation.

145. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The [spa facility] structure is essentially the same size as the previous version.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This is a nice space I used to frequent. While it clearly needs work, this plan is opportunistic and there is no upside to this for citizens, and taxpayers will be on the hook in perpetuity. This is a losing proposition for almost everyone. Stop this now.

146. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* [The revised proposal] has not addressed environmental or social impacts.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Cutting down an urban forest to build a carbon intensive concrete structure at the lakeshore in a climate crisis is insane.

147. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* We don't know. We haven't seen what the revised application looks like in any detail. My great concern right now is process. Nothing should be taking place on these lands without a full environmental assessment as well as addressing heritage laws of 1990. The agenda should be protection of these publicly owned lands, not development.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Bringing transparency and public consultation to any proposals is essential as well as protection of these environmentally sensitive heritage lands. Anything less is unacceptable.

148. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I do not agree with giving over this land to a private company. This is a public park and needs to remain public. This property is a heritage site and needs to be treated as such with respect. The buildings themselves are one of a kind, and revered in the architectural community. This site and its architecture are true assets to the city and our province and need to be preserved. I believe this proposal is terrible for the people of Ontario and Toronto. This entire deal and the way it has come about shows how corrupt our government really is and that the people that are supposed to be looking

out for the best interests of our province are not doing their jobs. This “proposal” should be rejected by our city and anyone in government that has the power to fix this. The people in Ontario have been cheated and lied to, all for the personal interests of a few people in government. It’s disgusting and disgraceful.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please do everything you can as leaders of this city and stop this from moving forward.

149. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I No environmental study have been completed. Resubmission has only changed the structures height. Ontario shouldn’t be footing the bill for a private companies benefit, especially as a for profit enterprise. If the project becomes unprofitable, Therme can leave, however, there are no public details regarding a contingency plan.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This project doesn’t have the interests Canadians in mind. In an economic crisis a paid for spa isn’t what Ontario or Toronto needs. A focus on local business and a place where people can gather throughout the seasons without the need to pay fee, a place that celebrates our diversity. Not a place that segments our communities based on what you pay to participate. Governments and social programs aren’t to be run like business, they do not need to be profitable on paper, their profits are in enriching people’s live, culture and education. That is what grows economy. Ironic that the conception of Ontario place was to embody those beliefs; the current provincial government only believes in cost cutting, the loss of cultural monuments, and reducing educational systems, we are weaker for it.

150. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This is an extremely disappointing project that Premier Doug Ford has decided to force upon us, as a resident of Toronto, and a resident of the city’s west end. This land deserves to be maintained and appreciated for all it has to offer. I’ve lived in Toronto my entire life and have never been more disappointed in our governments actions as of late. We deserve better, and so do the beautiful, mature trees and all the wildlife that resides there.

151. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am a lifelong resident of Toronto and I feel that the redesign of Ontario Place will be detrimental for the city of Toronto.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. There has not been enough consultation on the proposed changes to Ontario Place with the residents of Toronto. It will not be shared public space as it was in the past.

152. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The Therme Spa is still too big, but more importantly, it is inappropriate to build a private costly facility on Ontario Place. The focus should be on public waterfront green space. It would be tragic to destroy the landscape on the West Island by cutting down the trees there.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I believe that Toronto and Ontario residents need more green space, especially on our precious waterfront space. The project should focus on providing this public green space and NOT on building private spa facilities that are expensive, especially in this time of inflation and affordability crisis. I fully expect the 800 trees on the West Island to be preserved as part of our planted heritage.

153. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There is very little public benefit to the development of a private spa, and only benefits the few lobbyists in Ford's corner.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

154. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ontario Place is a public space and should remain a public space. Therme should move elsewhere in the city, and Ontario Place should be converted into a natural landscape & park for all to enjoy. In addition, a costly parking garage would increase congestion and encourage people to drive to Ontario Place, which contradicts the City of Toronto's goal of reducing congestion and making the city more liveable.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I urge city counselors to resist the provincial government's sale of public lands to a private entity for 95 years. Ontario Place is and should remain a public space, not a place for a spa for elitists to bathe.

155. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Although the proposed revisions make it marginally better, it does not change the basic situation of the overpowering of a public space.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We cannot afford to lose such precious lakeside public space, essentially forever, to a private corporation. It is the wrong location for a spa. It can be built almost anywhere as it is an inward facing facility. Its success does not depend on the removal of public space. Wherever it is built citizens should not be supporting Therme with \$600 million dollars of infrastructure.

156. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* My concerns begin with the proposal to long-lease Toronto's waterfront to private for-profit interests (for whatever purpose), which is completely unacceptable and short-sighted. They also include the uses of the privatized land (profit-making elite spa), the need for public spaces, especially parkland, as Toronto's population grows, the design (not consistent with other, more desirable uses of the waterfront), building a giant parking lot (increase car traffic in an already traffic-choked area), throwing in the still completely valuable and relevant Ontario Science Centre (shrinking it, abandoning iconic facility, removing from its long-time surrounding community, as well as new public transportation). This idea is overall an ill-conceived dinosaur - a throwback that ignores realities such as climate change and the value for downtown residents including children of natural public spaces - especially on a big body of water. When I say 'dinosaur' - world class cities are remaking their public spaces, including those with waterfront of any kind - think about Barcelona, Paris, New York, etc. How could Toronto be foolish enough to squander our resources in the proposed way? Personally- Ontario Place opened right before I immigrated to Canada from New York City in 1971, and we were thrilled to go to it on our first August long weekend. We used it a lot - the old Forum, the Children's Village and then the waterplay areas when they were built, the Cinesphere and just strolling around there at night in the summer (when there was no admission fee after 9:00). It kind of replaced Central Park (NY) for us (which remains public). I am, by the way, a serious spa user, and always love a good spa when I can get to it. But a big honking expensive private spa with a big parking garage belongs somewhere else, not on our too-small piece of Great Lakes waterfront. Redevelop/refurbish Ontario Place and refurbish the Ontario Science Centre. No spa at all - my view.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Hold out on this - it's important. Unfortunately, the residents of Toronto need protection against their own provincial government, so it's up to the City and the federal government to use whatever tools you can bring to bear.

157. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has changed very little and has not recognized changes requested at the last public consultations. More importantly, however, is that consultations, widespread public opinion expressed at the consultations, opinions by city politicians, and the wisdom in progressive environmental policy are completely ignored by the placement of a Mega-spa on a public green space. No major city in the world would permit such destruction of their waterfront for the benefit of a foreign company completely disconnected to local attitudes and culture. There is nothing in Therme that has anything to do with Ontario or Toronto, other than benefiting from a corrupt provincial government. Spending so much public money on a parking garage, gutting, downsizing and moving the Ontario Science centre and the destruction of a heritage forest and landscaping jewel are so completely against prevailing attitudes to the conservation of a green public realm that no end of shrinking the bubble of the spa, lowering the entrance pavilion or adding experimental green space to a rooftop can come near to meet the standards now being set for sustainability or accessibility. The province is seeking ticketed attractions when it has a budget surplus, and willing to have shuttle buses running across the CNE instead of making functioning transit links. Regarding waterfront access specifically, the supposed new beach still has no solution to the combined sewer overflow currently situated in the middle of that 'attraction', and the water flow of the lake will cause this area to be filled with debris, algae and detritus. Lakeshore Boulevard will make it noisy and polluted,

and it will be in the shade of the spa most of the day. The armored stone southern shore, where there is currently a perfect beach with excellent water quality, will be inaccessible due to the new rock shoreline, treacherous in winter (iced over) and slimy in the summer from algae on the rocks. This is obvious to anyone who uses the waterfront.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. When I look at the Guiding Principles for the Revitalization of Ontario Place, I see nothing in the application that meets the requirements of these principles. The entire Therme project destroys existing public space, filling it with inaccessible areas too expensive for current users of Ontario Place, who enjoy free green areas and water access year round. The spa will be for the elite, and in all likelihood will quickly go out of business. No business plan can predict the market for a product offered for 95 years, so the lease is highly suspect and must be made public. The current West Island can be gently renovated for public use and small events, as have taken place there earlier. Please consider the elements of A Better Idea, put forth by Ontario Place for All, as an example of a minor renovation that preserves the best of Ontario Place at a fraction of the cost and with very little environmental impact. The current users of Ontario Place are incredibly diverse and their interests could be met in the existing green environment with smaller settings and innovative ideas like small saunas, tailored food and beverage outlets, and rotating attractions that would bring a variety of groups down to the shoreline. The provincial process has completely lacked and continues to suffer from a lack of transparency, inclusiveness and openness. The applicants have lied blatantly in their assessments and continue to refuse a proper environmental assessment. With the current controversy of the Greenbelt land swap being far from resolved, and more questions than answers on what really has been going on with financing and private, developer interests, any decision on Ontario Place must be delayed until full in-depth answers to that controversy are provided. In the meantime, the answer of the City must be a resounding no to this project, until the City's Principles are met and preferably a new provincial government is installed. This one cannot be trusted.

158. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The proposed Therme spa, even clad with shrubbery, dominates public green space and dwarfs the original cinesphere and pods. It's massive. The project runs counter to the city's environmental goals. Mature trees will be felled, species at risk could be displaced and the carbon footprint of a year-round spa/waterpark will be huge. The below-water-level parking structure is costly and improbable. Moving the existing beach to where the city's effluent enters the lake has not been addressed. The notions of Ontario Place showcasing what this province has to offer and providing a backyard for Ontarians--don't fit with an Austrian spa that costs at least \$40 to enter. Just like municipal parks (Ex., High Park, The Beach, Bluffers Park) our tax dollars should maintain it, not admission or underground parking fees or rent paid by Therme. Why are we leasing the most valuable public lakefront land in Ontario to a private foreign company for long-term? My granddaughter due to arrive this November may have passed on by the time the lease expires. The triple-checked business case for moving the Ontario Science Centre to the lakefront hasn't yet been shared with the Legislature. The City, acting in good faith, hasn't had sufficient time to sign off on the latest design changes, yet the Ministry of Infrastructure is going to go ahead and bulldoze the land this Fall? What's the rush? Once the trees are cut, the damage will be irreversible. Or is that the idea Premier Ford?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. City of Toronto, please do what you can to delay the province. Habitats are at stake. Provincial environmental assessments are not going to occur until AFTER the West Island is bulldozed. Instead of on the most valuable waterfront land in the city, promised as a public trust by former Premier Doug Ford, the spa could be located elsewhere in the GTA, such as on the CNE grounds, at Woodbine, by the airport or the Eaton Centre. People seem to want Ontario Place to be a simpler, far less costly, park to connect to nature and make their own fun. Two architectural masterpieces, the Ontario Science Centre and the Cinesphere and the Pods of Ontario Place stand to be made worse. The 95-year lease for Therme and the, yet to appear, business case for relocating the Science Centre bear scrutiny. Torontonians and Ontarians deserve this much. Sell the strip of Ontario Place land owned by Toronto to the federal government if you have to. Help!

159. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place should be park land and should look like Central Park and be used like Central Park.

160. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I represent the Water Ski Wakeboard provincial sport organization. I was the TO2015 Sport Organizing Committee Chair for Water Ski and Wakeboard. TO2015 entered into a contract with the City of Toronto which established the Ontario Place West Channel as a legacy venue for Water Ski and Wakeboard and is all on City of Toronto property. BUT, the utilization of this facility is only possible with cooperation of Ontario Place since the Ontario Place Parking Lot 1 is the only access to the site. This legacy agreement has been mentioned at every stage of the redevelopment planning process but has never been incorporated. We would like confirmation that it will be included in the redevelopment plans.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

161. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I think the resubmitted design attempts to address concerns about destruction of habitat and loss of public greenspace by depicting a lot of green roofs and raised garden beds. But the vegetation depicted does not replace the mature trees and biodiversity that will be lost if this project goes ahead. The presentation drawings seem to show only deciduous trees. Diamond Schmitt and Studio TLA emphasized that the deciduous plants and trees would be 'native to the area.' While that is often a good objective, the change of landscape would reduce the biodiversity that currently exists. It would destroy the experience of an 'untended woodland' by the lake, integral to Michael Hough's design, and unique in Toronto, where most of our lakeshore is beach or pavement. Unfortunately, both the original and revised Therme application appear to separate visitors from nature. The rooftop pathways would require railings, and would be high above the lake. There does not appear to be lawn or wooded areas anywhere, which are valued features of the West Island today. The landscape design makes me think of an interior space, like a mall or airport, with raised beds and planters. Destroying wooded parkland to create a mall-like atmosphere is not an improvement. Many of us at the consultation were surprised by the large size and height of the Welcome Pavilion buildings. In the drawings they are very large, tall and empty. It seems strange to have such huge lobby spaces simply for purchasing tickets (the Diamond Schmitt architects insisted that's all they're meant for). I'd prefer a more open area at the West Entrance, with seating, to allow views of the island, the Pods & Cinesphere, and the lake. The welcome pavilion is 3 storeys (why?) - Maybe ticketing could be done on 2nd level, so that the tall glass 3rd level could be eliminated altogether. The spa itself is still too large, too glassy. Is this even possible to build by the windy lake? Or will another material be used, like the ROM?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The Therme spa should be relocated. It requires a parking garage, site preparation, and a new shoreline build that will cost Ontario millions and destroy valued parkland and heritage. The scale of the project is too big for the site, and would serve to separate people from the lake and from nature. The forest on the West Island is habitat for many migratory birds, including barn swallows (species of special concern in Ontario), as well as monarch butterflies (also of special concern), which are currently feeding on the West Island before beginning migration. I've seen beaver, mink, skunks, and foxes. The tall trees on West Island create an impressive treeline, admired by everyone stuck in traffic on Lakeshore Blvd, and restorative to everyone who sits underneath them, smelling pine and hearing waves on the lake. This experience of getting away from the city is too valuable to throw away. The pebble beach must be protected. Applicant's proposed beaches on west side and Brigantine Cove have inferior water quality and inferior views. Pebble beaches cleaner than sand. The applicant's presentation completely disregards the successful events and programming that have taken place on West Island since 2017 (Ontario Place winter programming with artificial ice rink and light sculptures, Craft Beer Fest, Taco Fest, TIFF screenings, Waterfront Night Market, Diner en Blanc, music fests, etc). These events prove that West Island can already attract and accommodate large crowds and revenue. With year-round food/beverage and event space, an improved West Entrance, accessible pedestrian bridge and improved pathways, West Island could meet the goals set out by the applicant's public realm proposal, without the expensive, lakefill-shorebuild. A redesign of the West Common

would create an attractive versatile gathering/event space. Innovative reimagining of the old log-ride area could integrate with mature trees to create unique year-round cafe/restaurant or other destination.

162. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I'd like to point out, the Therme building is supposed to cost \$350 million of Therme money, the underground parking lot \$650 million, and the combined sewer overflow pipe removal cost for their poorly placed west beach an undisclosed amount of money. So a billion dollars for us Ontarians to provide for a private company's profit. This redevelopment is preposterous.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] I'd like to point out, the Therme building is suppose to cost \$350 million of Therme money, the underground parking lot \$650 million, and the overflow sewer removal cost for their poorly placed west beach an undisclosed amount of money. So a billion dollars for us Ontarians to provide for a private company's profit. This redevelopment is preposterous.

163. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* In addition to the loss of public space my concern lies with the building design itself. We are in the middle of the largest migratory bird corridor in North America. Every year millions of birds collide with glass, hundreds of thousands of those in Toronto. Even if treated this design is a glass box on the edge of the lake, it will be a hotspot for bird strikes. Granted they plan on razing all the trees so perhaps there will be nothing left for them to fly to. We are destroying the habitat of hundreds of species, including species at risk documented in the area to make a few people rich. Birds, reptiles, amphibians and insects. I have yet to encounter a Torontonian excited about this project. It is our city and we are being ignored.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Unless the deal for the land is made public the city will never have enough information to stop it or let it proceed

164. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There are just too many unanswered questions to approve this so far: 1.) What is happening to the Ontario Science Centre and when will we see those Plans; 2.) When will the Province release the Business Case for moving the Ontario Science Centre; 3.) We need an Environment Assessment which includes the Therme and Live Nation buildings; 4.) We need full details on the long-term lease; 5.) The combined sewer overflow which dumps into the proposed west beach is not dealt with. Who will pay to upgrade it and when will it be done. What happens if it's not done before the because is built; 6.) What are the environmental risks for this underground parking and potential flooding Even if we were to say this is a good idea - until these things are addressed, this is not a complete plan and these issues must be addressed.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Thank you city staff for your hard work on this file.

165. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Our main focus as the Liberty Village BIA is ensuring thoughtful wayfinding and connectivity between Ontario Place and Liberty Village/Exhibition Station. Additionally, it would be great to get an idea of what the traffic management plan will look like considering all the major developments in the works for this end of Toronto. (E.g. Ontario Line, Infrastructure Ontario Transit-oriented Communities, King-Liberty Smart Track, Bridge Replacement on Dufferin, Exhibition Place Redevelopment and numerous other proposals for condo/commercial developments within the area). As a nearby BIA, we primarily want to ensure that there is connectivity and 'flow' between Ontario Place and Liberty Village. I.e., how can we attract visitors from Ontario Place to the neighbourhood businesses? Ensuring that there is consistent signage in their design strategy is helpful. Perhaps signage that directs people to Exhibition Place/Liberty Village or promotes the area.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] Our main focus as the Liberty Village BIA is ensuring thoughtful wayfinding and connectivity between Ontario Place and Liberty Village/Exhibition Station. Additionally, it would be great to get an idea of

what the traffic management plan will look like considering all the major developments in the works for this end of Toronto. (E.g. Ontario Line, Infrastructure Ontario Transit Oriented Communities, King-Liberty Smart Track, Bridge Replacement on Dufferin, Exhibition Place Redevelopment and numerous other proposals for condo/commercial developments within the area). · As a nearby BIA, we primarily want to ensure that there is connectivity and 'flow' between Ontario Place and Liberty Village. I.e., how can we attract visitors from Ontario Place to the neighbourhood businesses? Ensuring that there is consistent signage in their design strategy is helpful. Perhaps signage that directs people to Exhibition Place/Liberty Village or promotes the area.

166. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes still include the spa, the waterpark and too much parking space which are not environmentally sustainable. Also, the science centre should not be moved to Ontario Place. The spa won't be open to people who can't afford paying for it and is not a public interest. It should be built on private property, not on public owned land, especially not on prime real estate, and not by using public money. Both the spa and water park will use too much water and too much energy to operate them and will also be very expensive. Creating a big parking garage will create more traffic and in consequence more emissions. I'm very concerned about the 840, fifty year old trees who will be cut down. Planting a few new ones on a roof garden is not a substitute because the amount of earth on a roof garden is not enough to sustain big trees. Since we are in the midst of a climate crisis, we can't afford to cut any trees! Exporting sand for creating a beach is not environmentally sustainable. I use my bike to get around the city, but I couldn't see any bike lanes, which are extremely important for me.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] The changes still include the spa, the waterpark and too much parking space which are not environmentally sustainable. Also, the science centre should not be moved to Ontario Place. The spa won't be open to people who can't afford paying for it and is not a public interest. It should be built on private property, not on public owned land, especially not on prime real estate, and not by using public money. Both the spa and water park will use too much water and too much energy to operate them and will also be very expensive. Creating a big parking garage will create more traffic and in consequence more emissions. I'm very concerned about the 840, fifty year old trees who will be cut down. Planting a few new ones on a roof garden is not a substitute because the amount of earth on a roof garden is not enough to sustain big trees. Since we are in the midst of a climate crisis, we can't afford to cut any trees! Exporting sand for creating a beach is not environmentally sustainable. I use my bike to get around the city, but I couldn't see any bike lanes, which are extremely important for me.

167. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I support the City's Guiding Principles for the Revitalization of Ontario Place. The revised designs for the Therme Spa do not adequately address the concerns around this project:

- Size and scale: the current design reduces the scale only minimally and the project continues to be unfit for this site.
- Public access: a private for-profit enterprise of this scale is unnecessary and inappropriate. Ontario should be publicly accessible for all.
- Ecological significance: removing hundreds of mature trees is unnecessary and inappropriate in light of the worsening climate crisis. Moreover, the proposed design with extensive glass panels is a high threat feature for migratory and resident bird populations.
- Open and transparent process: I continue to be deeply concerned by the lack of public consultation on the part of the Province. Ontario Place must be preserved as a public amenity for the people of Ontario. Ontario Place is *already* a well-used public space and the impressive improvements to Trillium Park are a testament to its potential as a gem on Toronto's Waterfront. Thank you for your consideration.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place must be preserved as a public amenity for the people of Ontario. Ontario Place is *already* a well-used public space and

the impressive improvements to Trillium Park are a testament to its potential as a gem on Toronto's Waterfront. Thank you for your consideration.

168. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Not acceptable still. Still does not address the environmental and social equity issues.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Stop this development until a full environmental review and social equity issues are resolved.

169. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes are totally insufficient and against huge what the majority what the public wants. It also goes against our essential climate change initiatives.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City and Province must ensure that the wishes of the huge majority of the public are headed. This feels very much like we're moving towards a Trump-like situation.

170. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* As a faithful taxpaying resident, I do not believe the new Ontario Place Redevelopment submission has truly taken into consideration the needs/desires of our community to have a fully accessible public park realm. I think the Therme structure is still way too large and obstructive of the Zeidler heritage structures. Anywhere on the public realm of the west island will be towered by Therme's towering glass structures. Also, sustainability was mentioned heavily within the presentation, but I did not see any environmental impact assessment (i.e., cutting down mature trees, or infilling parts of the lake to grow the island to accommodate Therme), no data on the carbon emissions for this new Therme structure, energy intensity, water usage. I imagine a large glass structure will require lots of energy to heat and cool. I also use the current pebble beach on the West Island all the time to swim and paddleboard. The new Therme proposed beach which is aligned with our wastewater effluent likely means the use of the beach will no longer be viable. My belief is the most sustainable use of the land would be to redevelop the current area similar to how Trillium Park was done for continuity while maintaining the current tree canopy and densifying it. Mildly refurbish the current structures on the West Island and use them to convene special events and for 2 days a week rent spaces within the current Zeidler structures to create Canada's largest urban farmers market and local crafts/goods to be sold. Very low overhead, most sustainable, and supports local Ontario small businesses and farmers.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We are losing a lot (Some Heritage Zeidler structures, West Island, Pebble Beach, 850 mature trees, public park), but what are the citizens of Toronto/Ontario gaining for this for profit 95-year lease with Therme? We must have recourse as residents of this city to have more transparency and ensure that any redevelopment meets the needs of the citizens of Toronto, that live in close proximity to Ontario Place and use it all the time. I'm very disappointed in what the Province is doing.

171. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I believe the Therme project has improved. However, adding the Ontario Science Centre to the site is a mistake. That belongs at the other end of the subway line in its present site. A use for the pods needs to be defined, yes, but the current plan is impractical for visitors.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am ok with redeveloping Ontario Place. I do feel like the province is ramming this through, but it is an artificial island and I don't feel parkland and public space policies are appropriate to apply as mandatory. Ontario Place should be allowed to evolve to suit Ontario and Toronto needs.

172. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It has changed to address some issues but not the environmental issues. [The applicants] responses did not answer the questions asked during the community consultation meeting, and the answers were far too long not leaving time for those who attended. The city staff were excellent and provided information.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The parking must be addressed as well as the environment of the trees and birds. Also, the city must have the waterfront is for the public not the rich for a SPA.

173. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. This proposal is the worst thing that could happen to the city and is against the democratic process that we hold dear in Canada. How are we proposing to give up public lands to a private developer for the purpose of building a spa and giving them money in the process to do so? Please turn this into a public park.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

174. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Privatization of the waterfront is wrong. Ontario is full of beautiful, publicly-owned provincial parks that are open to all. Stealing land from the public and making it a private good, unaffordable to most people who live in Toronto, is the wrong thing to do. Putting taxpayers on the hook for an insane half-billion dollar underground/underwater garage is a crime against both the climate and the public treasury. The City of Toronto should exhaust all avenues to ensure that Premier Ford's corrupt Ontario Place Mega-spa plan is stopped.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

175. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. N/A*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I strongly object to the Theme spa proposal and the removal of hundreds of trees this will cause.

176. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. I feel the concerns of citizens is not being addressed. The need for this space to be an open and free area for families is urgent.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

177. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. It's changed only in extremely marginal ways and not in any way that significantly fixes the issue that public parkland will be razed for a long-term lease of public, waterfront parkland that is beautiful and loved by the city and visitors.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please find a way to stop this.

178. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. N/A*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I do NOT want a mega-spa I do NOT want a large, expensive parking garage I WANT affordable housing I WANT outbox green spaces I WANT public washrooms everywhere.

179. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. N/A*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The revised plan does not satisfy the original mandate of Ontario Place - to create a public and accessible park that articulates the values and spirit of this province. For me, the key message remains 'everyone belongs here'. If the waterpark/ spa significantly reduces its entrance fees so that a typical working class family with three to five children can afford to attend once or twice/ week my position might be more empathetic. With the entrance fee set at \$40/pp, I am shocked that a proposal like this would be taken seriously. Second, the current proposal does not honour the land or take seriously climate change: as a city we are extremely vulnerable to heat (see Paris), the energy required to maintain an all glass building cool in the summer and warm in the winter is obnoxious, not to mention the building's incursion on green space and the tree canopy. So much hubris. Finally, does the city know what type of contract Therme Spa has with the Province? Is the City's position to privatize this land when the spa fails? Why aren't citizens of this province privy to the details of a contract that determines the use of highly valuable public land for 95 years?

180. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The architects should be Canadian. The site use should be public, not private. The Science Center should not be moved. The City, not the Province, should have veto power.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place has been a jewel in the city for decades and for generations. Please ensure that the re-development maintains public, accessible, natural use of the lands.

181. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application changes do not satisfy environmental risks, public access issues and negative impacts on existing Ontario Place heritage structures.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Does the City of Toronto support requesting Therme Canada to conduct an environmental assessment of impacted lands. Also can the City of Toronto intervene so that no clear-cutting of Ontario Place trees and vegetation is conducted in the interim.

182. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I live in Pembroke, far from Toronto, but Toronto is the key city, the standard for Ontario and Canada. To destroy a beautiful public place and put in a spa for the wealthy and a car park, to lose the trees and beach, this is all wrong. Toronto and Ontario are fortunate have Ontario Place and it should be retained, enhanced if anything, not destroyed.

183. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This application is still a terrible idea for Toronto. It will destroy Ontario Place and the beautiful natural environment, bring even more polluting cars into an area that's already a traffic disaster and give away our land to a soulless private company - all while taxpayers foot the bill. KEEP THIS SPA OUT OF OUR CITY AND PROVINCE.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

184. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This project is still an abomination for our waterfront. The giant publicly-funded parking garage remains part of the plan, the spa building footprint is only 5.8% smaller and would still destroy sensitive ecosystems that exist at Ontario Place. Therme plans to move the beach next to a combined sewer overflow -- Who would want to swim there? There's no environmental assessment, which is preposterous given the plans to raze the entire existing park, and put up a large GLASS building in a bird migration route. Not to mention, how will that glass look after sitting next to Lakeshore and the Gardiner? My guess is that the building will be entirely coated in brown dirt most days. No one from the city or province has detailed the benefits of moving the Ontario Science Centre to this new location. Why downgrade a state-of-the-art facility that will soon be connected to public transport? We are relying on the city to push for answers to these questions. Too much is at stake.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I urge city officials to take a hard look at this project for what it is: a disaster. For the environment, for wildlife, and for the people of Toronto. With our population only forecasted to grow, we desperately need more green space. I agree that Ontario Place could use a face lift, but it should be only to enhance the property as a park for everyone to enjoy. We are not a European city, we don't have a strong spa culture. The Great Wolf Lodge already exists for families. A waterpark at this location already failed. Why make this same mistake again? Why destroy some of the last remaining green space we have?

185. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes don't really help with the essential problem, that a public park has been privatized and is no longer a place I can happily take my children to. And why would we use a beach next to a combined sewer overflow? The second plan is less magisterial but it is still destructive.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Cancel this project, please. Who signs such a long lease anyway? We went through this with the Tugg's perma-lease at Kew Beach in the Beaches. It was a disaster.

186. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* We should not be letting by a private spa company that will only cater to the wealthy take up space at Ontario Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

187. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Public Meeting Exhibition Place September 7, 2023: First of all to all the participants on stage, and to people manning the display boards I say to you with all the kindness I can muster... Shame on you. Shame on you all. How dare you, the City Of Toronto, be the Shill for yet another of Premier Doug Ford's pandering to Developers. You presented this ill conceived, environmentally insensitive, unimaginative, full of industrial landscape architecture not in any way a 'park like setting.' This is for the Province to present. You should be there to protect your citizens from provincial harm. Park like setting. All of you go visit Tommy Thompson park on the former garbage site to see what can be accomplished. Furthermore not one of you did their homework on how Therme Spas operate at other Ontario locations, like Whitby, where 72 Spa clients are suing Therme for 5 million for staph infections. Therme is not an Ontario based, not even a Canadian company yet they received a long-term year lease normally reserved for PUBLIC buildings like the Ontario Science Centre, a World Class Architectural building, one of 3 in Toronto. City Hall, Ontario Place, and the Ontario Science Centre. We're about to ruin 2. The hurried afterthought to move the Ontario Science Centre to the waterfront. Smaller, less functionality, and years before ready. Did you show a comparative study, contrasting the cost of refurbishing and updating the existing building in to building a new one? Where is that study? Don't you care about the people at Don Mills and Eglinton? Did you do a traffic study on the already jammed Lakeshore Blvd to see what results when hundreds more cars buses trucks and school buses need access and egress let alone parking. Who came up with that arbitrary 10% of visitors will come by car? Concerned about the cost of the underground parking of \$400 million. Concerned about moving the beach in proximity to the combined sewer overflow (CSO) pipe and the cost associated with fixing the CSO. Concerned about the number of washrooms at the Therme Spa and Live Nation Stage because of thousands of gallons of chlorinated water dumping into the lake, which is illegal.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Did you calculate the cost of amending the existing shores. Is it cheaper than a billion? What will it cost to move that CSO? What will it cost to service the Therme Spa and Live Nation for water and sewage. For fire hydrant pressure. For dumping thousands of gallons of chlorinated water? There should be a shuttle bus from Exhibition GO station to Ontario Place. There is a Metro Link to the Ontario Science Centre now. Concerned about the 850 trees, a hidden Dire Climate Impact Report, and Greenbelt Scandal. Do the numbers.

188. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This is not the correct site for a facility like this.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

189. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ok, I just spent an hour on feedback, submitted, rejected so, keeping this short: NO thank you, go away Therme, Diamond Schmitt, all the rest... Hands off our waterfront, Ontario Science Centre, West Island biodiversity, trees, foxes, mink, beavers, herons, turtles, monarchs, birds, bees, the people of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, and the world... We hate everything regarding the latest application, UNACCEPTABLE!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Premier Doug Ford walked back on Greenbelt, yay! Let's walk Ford & Surma back on OP! City Planners, stand with the people against this disastrous project. Thank You!

190. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I don't feel like [the revised proposal] has changed. There are far too many discrepancies, variable and constant changing numbers

and statistics given by different people with a total lack of transparency. Giving us boilerplate answers that they were advised to give in response to public questioning. This feels like a back room deal that benefits the developers and leaves the public at a loss of one of closest, enjoyable green space the surrounding area has free access to.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City should not allow the land to be developed and be kept as a heritage site that is free to all. Not cutting down mature trees, interrupting migratory paths and diverse ecosystems that have developed over decades. A sidewalk and fake bio-mass with a few trees in planters is not the same.

191. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The spa is still too large, the parking garage too big, the environmental impact too high. This project doesn't fit at Ontario Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

192. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ontario Place should be public space.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

193. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The biggest issue is the change from public to private. This is my main issue and it has not been addressed at all.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

194. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Save Ontario Place from the Austrian Spa and other commercial horrors.

195. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am opposed to the secret deal to build a spa in a public space. As well opposed to the cutting down of trees to build a parking lot and not making the space and nature totally accessible to regular people from Toronto, Ontario and Canada.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am worried about the Province taking the lead here when it has demonstrated corrupt practices with the Greenbelt, developers, anti environmental practices and policies, long-term care lack of inspections, education cut backs and right-wing policies creeping in focused on trans youth and LGBTQ people and many more concerning issues. Lack of appreciation and understanding that the Ontario Science Centre needs to remain where it is. Thank you.

196. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Please keep Ontario Place a public place, without all the clear cutting of trees and not to be privatized to a European company.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See previous comment

197. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Don't believe there has been enough outreach, public engagement or public consultation.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

198. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Why not keep the mature trees as is, develop the centre part of the West Island while revitalizing the shoreline trails and expanding the current pebble park? New plans lead to less waterfront edge trails with that weird seating area with no views of the water. It's not even a great design for a world class city.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

199. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am absolutely against the current proposal for redevelopment of Ontario Place. The private Therme spa will remove our access to the waterfront, we will lose a treasured local attraction with the destruction of the Ontario Science Centre, the proposed Therme beach is next to a combined sewer overflow, Therme has not yet committed to the environmental assessment requested by the city for lakefilling, and last but not least the destruction of mature trees and the devastation this will cause to local species is a crime. We must stop this nightmare!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Reject this proposal and keep the trees, the Science Centre, and our public access to Ontario Place lands.

200. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I was not aware or not notified of earlier meeting regarding Ontario Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please keep Ontario Place park-like and free of unessential buildings like a Spa. Keep it community oriented.

201. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The privatization of a previously public space (especially a space with free access to Lake Ontario's waterfront) and the removal of trees at this time of climate crisis are unacceptable. At the very least, a proper environmental assessment needs to occur and consultation with First Nations, as per Truth and Reconciliation.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I think this whole process, especially the 'secret' lease with Therme, is an appalling abuse of power.

202. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This destruction must not happen. So many problems with this proposal including cutting down trees, taking a large park on the waterfront and "gifting" it to a private entity, building a large parking garage at public expense and the secrecy of the contract.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please stop [the proposal] for future generations.

203. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* There are still some major fundamental issues with the project: the giant publicly-funded parking garage remains, the spa building footprint is actually only 5.8% smaller (not the misleading 25% stat being advertised by Therme), the proposed Therme beach is next to a combined sewer overflow, Therme has not yet committed to the environmental assessment requested by the city for lakefilling, and the Ontario Science Centre still faces a future of demolition for a half-size version on top of the parking garage.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Overall, this project - from the onset - was not initiated in good faith, with full transparency in mind, and the needs of immediate residents and broader residents of the GTA. It is unsustainable, destructive, and only benefits the provincial government and Therme - a European country that has no interest in creating a public space.

204. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It feels like nothing more than spin to try and make it sound like they are listening, but it's more of the same - selling off public land to private enterprise, destroying this beautiful gem on our waterfront. In some cases the proposed changes are actually worse, and less thought out. This project needs to be halted immediately, and replaced with new ideas about how to make this a beautiful, nature first, jewel at the foot of our city.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place should be a shining example of what makes a world class city, not a plot of land for another developer to dump a throw away money grabbing tourist attraction. There are SOOOO many other places in the city that a spa like what is being proposed could be built. The city's priceless waterfront is not the place for it. Look at the success of other projects along the water front, the gardens, the urban beaches, and how many people have been pulled down

there because of those thoughtful updates. That's what Ontario Place should be, but on a massive scale. Even look to the Leslie Spit and the thousands of people walking and cycling there. There is a massive demand in the city for natural escapes close at hand. That's what we need to build. Also, moving the Ontario Science Centre is easily the least thought out idea I've ever heard. Premier Doug Ford wants it moved so he can sell off the land as prime real estate, close to the new transportation hub that will be right next door once the Eglinton line and Ontario Line both meet there. This madness must be stopped and replaced with real, actual urban planning, not planning led by developer dollar figures.

205. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I was unaware of the September meetings but have read the news reports of the proposed changes to the design. Not good enough. There is no place for this spa, or the parking, at Ontario place. And there is absolutely no excuse for cutting down mature trees in order to build them.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place needs maintenance and improvements in order to be better used and accessible to all, not decimated and rebuilt in private interests. There is a shortage of accessible green space in Toronto - what we have must not be squandered.

206. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I totally disagree with the currently proposed future use and development of Ontario Place. I also object as a taxpayer to pay for a parking structure or anything else for Therme corporation. This space needs to be kept as a place for all residents of this city, not just the top 5%. Please use my tax dollars for something in the city that needs it, like transit for instance. I have voiced my disapproval to the Premier and to my MPP Christine Hogarth but not one person from either office has responded.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I am really tired of seeing all the ways that Premier Doug Ford and his rich cronies are screwing the people of this province and the City of Toronto. We can't even house refugees BUT the premier expects taxpayers to foot the bill for a development that is deeply flawed.

207. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The plan for the Therme Spa/West Island is completely unacceptable - on so many levels: complete destruction of the Michael Hough landscape which forms an integral and critical part of the cultural heritage value of Ontario Place; the unacceptable scale of the proposed spa facility; the connecting bridge and the entrance pavilion the new roof top landscape plan which is unlikely to provide suitable, comfortable or successful public space the continuing refusal to extend the environmental assessment on the public realm to the West Island plans the plan to induce even more private automobile use by adding 1500 parking spaces in an unsustainable underwater parking garage the undisclosed carbon footprint of the destruction, construction and operations of the spa the refusal of the province to disclose the terms of the lease and demonstrate that the long term interests of Ontario's are protected and, finally, the last minute plan to move the Ontario Science Centre over the objections of the public bringing with it a greatly diminished educational facility, even more unsustainable traffic impacts and harm to the Thorncliffe Park community. The more we learn, the more the reasons for the City to reject this proposal and withhold approval.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Even though it is clear that the Province will use its powers to override the City, if necessary, I feel it is important for the City to stand firm to protect the Official Plan principles and the overwhelming sentiment of Torontonians. The City should not be complicit in this folly and should take every step to encourage the Province to find a place for Therme in another part of the City. If this project were to go ahead and given the reality of a 95 year lease that has not been shared with the public or even the City, must demand disclosure of the lease including such details as how the public interest will be protected if the business fails. In addition, as Therme is a private off-shore company, there has been no disclosure of who the actual owners and investors are. Who exactly is the Province hooking us up with for 95 years? Who is being given access to a strategic location in Ontario's capital for 95 years? We have no real idea. How can this lack of transparency be tolerated?

208. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Minimal changes. I don't think Ontario Place should be handed over to a private company in the first place. Should be kept public and dedicated to public space and natural environment. The plans will devastate the natural space, and way too much public tax dollars are going towards funding the project. Not good for Toronto or Ontario, only good for the checkbooks of politicians, developers and company involved...

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

209. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I don't see how this project should go ahead as planned as there is no approval for an environmental assessment, despite the need to cut down mature trees, lakefilling, disrupt a bird migration flight pattern, and build a glass enclosed structure the size of multiple football fields. While we are in the midst of a climate emergency. It doesn't make any sense.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city should not allow this project to go ahead as it is riddled with opacity from the provincial government.

210. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This is a laughable change. There is still a huge parking lot, which should not exist. The proposed building footprint has only decreased by less than 10%. The supposed canopy replacement is adding some green onto a bridge, which is ridiculous. How does this remotely fit with the city's plans to become more environmentally sound? How does it make a more whole city end to end? Why are there still plans to demolish the Ontario Science Centre and create something interior downtown? Why was this proponent picked? What are the details of the lease? The whole thing stinks, and is in the same vein as the Greenbelt underhanded deals.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city should ABSOLUTELY NOT support this proposal, should refuse to sell the city-owned parcel of land, and should explore other options, with a view to keeping the space public and green, with safe pedestrian and transit access.

211. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Therme spa claims that it reduced the overall size of the facility by 20% but this was by volume. They made the building shorter, but did not alter the floor plan sufficiently. The public realm of the West Island is limited to fancy sidewalks to move us around the Spa facility. There is a lack of park space for recreation or resting. The rooftop walkway is another way to move through the space, but not stay there for any length of time. This is not creating a sense of a welcoming environment. The public spaces are multi-use, so that the playground doubles as an amphitheater, and so on. This may be due to the need to accommodate thousands of visitors a day, but it seems that it would quickly become overcrowded and conflicts would arise as many groups need to share this limited space. There appears to be no plan to change the combined sewer overflow which is located close to a planned beach. Unless this is fixed it will be dangerous to swim at this location. The planned transportation to the West Island was not properly explained. It seems like a contradiction to say that we need a half billion dollar underground garage, built at taxpayer expense, but that most people will be using public transit. Representatives from Therme Spa said that they do not have any other downtown locations. They always locate outside a city. They decided that Toronto is a good location because it is thought that the citizens here have enough disposable income to come several times a year at the cost of about \$40/person for 3 hours. The design of the facility creates a space that is too expensive for families or the majority of residents. If they want us to use the facility, they should ask us what we want, and then design accordingly or locate somewhere else.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Therme Spa says it expects 6K visitors/day and 14K/month. These numbers do not add up. Please explain how many visitors are expected and how the space will be used. If Therme Spa has information such as an environmental assessment or a business plan, it needs to be shown to the public. Has there been any business plan for leaving the West Island as a public park? It may be much less expensive than a poorly thought out private development. The Science Centre must not be moved, made smaller or redesigned. This is not a good location for an educational centre.

212. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Cannot comment.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I have made my comments known to people and many times on Facebook over the past number of months. There should be No Spas, Garage or Ontario Science Centre on the grounds. Because of the Climate Crisis and Global Warming, we need to Keep Ontario Place as Green as possible. That means treating the place more like an Urban Forest than an Entertainment or Commercial area....

213. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The redevelopment of Ontario Place, as planned by the government in partnership with architects etc, is destructive of the environment (mature trees cannot be replaced by saplings, the new West Island beach will be near a sewage outlet vs the present ultra clean beach) a massive (even if reduced in size, its still massive) glass and steel building will disrupt bird migrations and be an ugly eyesore on the water does not honour Ontario's heritage or population in any way (destroying the bell that honoured Japanese Canadians to be replaced by a spa that could be absolutely anywhere in the world it is so anodyne). And it will not be accessible -- narrow pathways, admission fees, service fees etc will make the space hostile to Ontario residents, let alone the residents of our city. All public space will be radically reduced. We now cycle, walk, swim, picnic at Ontario Place, even after the construction fences went up (to no purpose, by the way, other than to block public use, as there was no construction). Please do not allow such a great space to be destroyed. The design, the redevelopment MUST be done in alignment with the environmental significance of the space, to honour Ontarians (not Austrian spa builders), to be fully accessible to all members of the public at no or minimal cost.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Honour this important part of our city for all of Ontario -- do not destroy it for the few.

214. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I don't think the project should go ahead without an environmental assessment. The public needs accessible greenspace, and a fee-charging spa should be built elsewhere.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Fight hard to stop the mega spa project from happening. Keep Ontario Place where it is and build a satellite Ontario Place that focuses on the Great Lakes.

215. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Strongly object to the removal of trees and green space so vital to downtown core, there are too few green spaces as it is. Strongly object to private firm using public land and benefiting from taxpayer funded parking lot. Strongly object to location and size - send it to Downsview Park. Strongly object to demolition of the Ontario Science Centre and its relocation. Strongly object to lack of transparency and public consultation. The whole project is corrupt and will not benefit the average working Toronto resident - who will be able to afford the spa? Currently the space is free to citizens. This whole situation is very shady and does not acknowledge the needs and wants of taxpayer residents.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Will the federal government assist with demanding a mandatory environmental assessment? Can an injunction be used to stop the cutting of trees which, I understand, is going to happen very soon? How can that happen? It would take me months to get approval to cut down one tree in my backyard? How is the removal of trees even legal at this point in time?

216. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The spa building is still too massive, the beach is terrible, and the entire project robs us of a great public space.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

217. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The provincial government needs to re-submit their application with an environmental assessment. Otherwise the proposal is advancing corporate greed, and dismissing the public's concerns regarding accessibility, and environmental impact to public land.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

218. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Still not acceptable. The proposed beach is where city garbage is washed up after a heavy storm.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Cancel the whole project and let RCMP investigate this one too.

219. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. We don't need a spa, but we do need trees! Eliminate the spa. Leave the Ontario Science Centre where it is, and update it as necessary.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place is an important civic, cultural, and environmental resource that should not be destroyed by privatization (the spa) and deforestation of mature trees.

220. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Not adequate. No private facility should be built on the Ontario Place grounds, period. We should not cut down mature trees as we see extreme heat events increasing year over year. Toronto is a busy city and very little space is left public. It's absolutely absurd that a spa is planned in what should be one of the best public spaces in the city. Building this facility would be a disaster for decades to come. Not to mention there is not going to be an environmental impact study on such a massive building with such a massive footprint. It's unacceptable.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See my answer to previous question.

221. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Ontario Place is a public landmark both for the city and nature. Destroying it to be replaced with private infrastructure, and paying for a parking garage with public dollars, is a disgusting decision.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Why aren't the people being listened to? Premier Doug Ford was just shown to be selling the greenbelt for a cut of the profits. Why is he being allowed to do the same with Ontario Place?

222. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. Ontario Place is a treasure in Toronto for all of Ontario to enjoy and should be able to continue to enjoy for years to come. The destruction of trees and crucial eco-habitat is unimaginable!*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please do all in your power to stop this.

223. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. The public has not been given the opportunity to respond the development resubmission and an environmental report has not been submitted in order to check about the impact this building will have on the land and the lakefilling that will take place. This is necessary before you go ahead with the destruction of 800 trees. The concerns proposed size of the Therme building have not been addressed. Please do not alter this beautiful land.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] The public has not been given the opportunity to respond the development resubmission and an environmental report has not been submitted in order to check about the impact this building will have on the land and the lakefilling that will take place. This is necessary before you go ahead with the destruction of 800 trees. The concerns proposed size of the Therme building have not been addressed. Please do not alter this beautiful land.

224. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed. It reminds me of an application being submitted to the old Ontario Municipal Board. The developer would originally ask for 50*

stories even when their modelling was done for 25 stories. Then they would amend the submission to 25 stories. Everyone should be grateful when the size cut in half even though it is still 5 times the zoned size. This is a minor alteration to a bad idea.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This is one so few access points to the lake front for thousands and thousands of people that live in the downtown waterfront community. While Toronto islands are in the district they are not free access. The cost of the ferry puts it out of reach of many people, particularly families. Giving this giant piece of land to an international corporation, on a what for so many will be a lifelong lease, is unconscionable. Has anyone that designed this huge parking ever tried to drive to Ontario Place on a night there is a baseball, basketball, hockey or concert event downtown? None of the patrons of the Spa/water park will be able to get there in a car. As a business person it seems like a bad business decision. As a citizen it seems criminal.

225. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I disagree that Ontarians should pay for the parking garage. I do not want a spa but rather more outdoor natural space.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

226. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The provincial representatives and the developers are not listening. They are also selectively presenting the small change to the size of the spa. Rather than telling us that the footprint has only been reduced by 5%, they are misrepresenting the change in height. The path around the West Island is still inadequate and will be dangerous as we know from other area paths where cyclists are a danger to pedestrians due to their speed and location. Such paths need to be designed to protect pedestrians. The issue of traffic along Lakeshore Blvd has not been addressed and those of us who live in Liberty Village already experience heavy traffic at the best of times. Having the spa with the expected vehicular traffic (cars and buses) will be on top of what happens whenever there is an event. Providing more parking will only encourage more people to drive into this area. The walk from the GO transit station and the Bathurst streetcar is long and unpleasant, thus adding further disincentive to travel by public transit.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See my answer to previous question. Will the city reiterate the problems of size of the spa, the inappropriate parking garage, the traffic issues and the real costs to the people of Ontario and Toronto?

227. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes to the project have not done enough to mitigate the disaster that this project is. No changes other than not destroying West Island and not building a giant out of proportion private spa will suffice. Ontario Place should be a free public park for all. The size and scale of the proposed building is still vastly out of proportion with the area, will block views of the historic structures at Ontario Place. A private spa does not belong on the waterfront. We only have so much waterfront, it is a precious space. A spa could be built anywhere, but there is only one waterfront. The proposed public area is an extremely small strip of land beside a humongous building which is not inviting. Trees on top of the building to attempt to say there is park space is ridiculous, not just in the technical aspects of trying to grow trees on top of a building that they are alleging will be glass, but trees on top of the building is not a park. Ontario Place is on a bird migratory route which is no place for a giant glass building. The new plan will still destroy the heritage aspects, such as the Michael Hough landscape. The newly proposed plan does not have any meaningful park or open space, is too hardscape, does not meet any Waterfront Plans or priorities. No one except Therme, Ford and enablers such as architects Diamond Schmitt, want this. The entrance building and colossal bridge are still too large. A taxpayer funded private underground parking lot beside the lake is poor planning from many angles, but how will traffic work on an already congested Lakeshore Blvd? There are significant concerns of all the traffic crossing the pedestrian and bike paths. The amended plan is still a complete and utter failure and does not address a single concern. This project cannot be allowed to continue.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This project cannot be allowed to continue. It has no place on the waterfront and is strongly opposed by everyone. None of the

amendments come anywhere close to resolving my concerns or the concerns the residents of Ontario and Toronto. The city must not give permission for this project to go ahead.

228. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This project is COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

229. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This plan is not a good use of space for a waterfront property and a massive parking lot does not make sense. The traffic to get in and out of that area would be ridiculous if that many cars were going in and out and it's terribly expensive. Also, I do not agree with cutting down so many mature trees. This whole plan is a mess.

230. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ontario Place should be for all with no spa, no parking garage, no trees cut, no special 90 year lease obtained under questionable means. A place for all means just that.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

231. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The City of Toronto and Therme apparently need to hear this message louder and clearer. NO PRIVATE SPA AT ONTARIO PLACE. Ontario Place is a public park, and should remain a public park. Take a stand and reject Therme Spa's proposal altogether. Invest in a beautiful public park, not a mega-spa for rich developers that requires a giant parking lot and massive gas expansion.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It is utterly absurd that the City of Toronto is even considering this proposal. Reject it. Now.

232. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes are not acceptable. There is still a significant # of trees that need to be removed construction will be disruptive to local communities and wildlife it includes a massive parking lot that will encourage driving and add to gridlock (while we're trying to invest in transit and get cars off the road, especially downtown!) and it's a huge price tag for an attraction that city residents have clearly stated they do not want. The only way the application can be acceptable is if it's removed and the city focuses on restoring this green space to a public, environmentally friendly attraction with low impact features (e.g. splash pads, ice rink in winter, kayak/paddleboard rentals, etc).

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. It is important that the City defend the interests and feedback of its residents in this decision, not private developers and opinions from people who do not live in this city (aka provincial government leaders).

233. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The spa plans by Therme and the multi-level garage plans should not be permitted. The new plans have not improved.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City of Toronto should not let this plan go forward. The only acceptable plan is for a park and public space that is open to all without a large price tag. The multi-level garage idea is very foolish, it is on the edge of a large lake and with climate change making flooding an increasing reality, it is poorly positioned to withstand a massive flooding event.

234. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The provincial government seems to have already made up it's mind once again to take a public resource and hand it over to a for profit organization. There is the barest pretense.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We must fight this and all other efforts by governments to weaken privatize and sell off public resources and use all possible means to equalize all our possibilities to live a fairer, healthier life while overcoming the impending climate crisis that could end the existence of most living things.

235. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We are already seeing the consequences of climate change. This year Canada saw fires and we had smoke in Toronto for several days. It's an absurd that the city wants to kill a natural place home to trees and animals to create more buildings and structure that is not needed. This is destroying not only trees but a natural place for people to rest around the city. Ontario Place is great for walking, biking, hanging out and nothing should be changed, especially for money. There are thousands of other places that could get a spa, Ontario Place should not be one.

236. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I had a time conflict on September 7 and was unable to attend the online meeting because it was not offered in an accessible format that works with my seeing aid which is free open source. The new application fails to address the need for accessible water access south facing, as we swimmers know the west beach will be terrible with sewage and highway dust and noise next to the road. The spa fails on environmental grounds, e.g. interplay between environment and environment. It fails to encourage people to use the lake more. In fact, it discourages use of the lake by relocating the beach to the dirtiest most inhospitable place, rather than the existing pebble beach that is south facing and is the cleanest beach in Toronto at present. We cannot allow this project to move forward as-is, since it will damage Toronto's cleanest waterfront access, and it will also set a bad precedent and example to the world. The project threatens our national security and water supply because it discourages rather than encourages lake swimming and lake swimming is the best way to protect our water supply. Damage to fish habitat would also be extensive and we need a full environmental assessment. In this sense Therme's proposal is threatening our fish and wildlife and threatening the security and sovereignty of our freshwater supply. Ontario is home to the world's largest freshwater lake which holds 10% of the world's freshwater, and our Great Lakes hold 21% of the world's and 84% of North America's freshwater, and Toronto is the largest city on the Great Lakes so Toronto is freshwater capital of the world and we need to set a good example to the world on freshwater stewardship by encouraging people to swim in, and therefore value and protect Lake Ontario, as Ontario is our example of freshwater stewardship. Toronto is our capital, and the only waterfront access in Downtown Toronto Urban Growth Centre is Ontario Place. In this sense Ontario Place is water capital.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The new application fails to address the need for accessible water access South-facing, as we swimmers know the West beach will be terrible with sewage and highway dust and noise next to the road. The spa fails on environmental grounds, e.g. interplay between environments. It fails to encourage people to use the lake more. In fact it discourages use of the lake by relocating the beach to the dirtiest most inhospitable place, rather than the existing pebble beach that is South-facing and is the cleanest beach in Toronto at present. We cannot allow this project to move forward as-is, since it will damage Toronto's cleanest waterfront access, and it will also set a bad precedent and example to the world. The project threatens our national security and water supply because it discourages rather than encourages lake swimming and lake swimming is the best way to protect our water supply. Damage to fish habitat would also be extensive and we need a full environmental assessment. In this sense Therme's proposal is threatening our fish and wildlife and threatening the security and sovereignty of our freshwater supply. Ontario is home to the world's largest freshwater lake which holds 10% of the world's freshwater, and our Great Lakes hold 21% of the world's and 84% of North America's freshwater, and Toronto is the largest city on the Great Lakes so Toronto is freshwater capital of the world and we need to set a good example to the world on freshwater stewardship by encouraging people to swim in, and therefore value and protect Lake Ontario, as Ontario is our example of freshwater stewardship. Toronto is our capital, and the only waterfront access in Downtown Toronto Urban Growth Centre is Ontario Place. In this sense Ontario Place is the freshwater capital of the world, and is too important to give up to a private company who wants to 'ensewage' the beach in order to sell more pool passes (see my OPed in Toronto Star).

237. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Very little changes. Overall design does not respect the desires of Toronto residents to have a park accessible to all residents, no businesses catering to the wealthy crowd and no thrashing the trees and greenery that took so many years to grow.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City of Toronto should not bend to the Province wishes. We should hold firm for what is in the best interest of all Toronto residents.

238. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The fundamental issue with the proposal remains: it is not for a world-renowned public park, like Trillium Park. It is still a proposal to turn a public waterfront park into a private space. The space does not need to be privatized or over-programmed in order to be a huge attraction. We have seen proof with Trillium Park. Passive, peaceful, beautiful public park space IS an attraction, and in fact, it is a necessity of the thousands upon thousands of people who live in nearby Liberty Village and other continuously growing condo developments.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. As I implied in the previous question: I feel the City of Toronto should reject the proposal and fight tooth and nail to keep Ontario Place as public parkland.

239. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Toronto needs a large, green public park on the waterfront, not an expensive mega spa that will destroy and dominate the landscape.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please stop this project from proceeding further.

240. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes are not enough, and the information with regards to reducing building volume is misleading if the square footage hasn't much changed. The only acceptable Ontario Place plan preserves the existing tree canopy, preserves the current beach, cancels the taxpayer funded parking lot, leaves the Ontario Science Centre where it is, and leaves Ontario Place affordable for all Ontarians. Therme should not be allowed to build on the waterfront.

We need the City of Toronto to stand up to Premier Doug Ford and his buddies' plans for Ontario Place. The City should take control of the Ontario Science Centre if Ford won't preserve it.

241. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It will be a tragic loss to all Ontarians if Ontario Place does not remain a public park accessible to all.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I make extensive use of Ontario Place in it's current form and will be very disappointed if this is no longer possible.

242. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Scaling down the size of the Therme spa isn't enough. The privatization of public land, a secret long-term lease, the destruction of trees, is horrifying.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We need the City of Toronto to stand up to Premier Doug Ford and his buddies' plans for Ontario Place. The City should take control of the Ontario Science Centre if Premier Doug Ford won't preserve it.

243. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It does not address the environmental impact, the long-term lease or the beach beside the combined sewer overflow.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This spa project needs to stop as soon as possible. The environmental impact of cutting down 850 trees and building a spa would be devastating.

244. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The City and Province should be protecting this asset in the same way that New York City protects Central Park. It should be connected to the new Ontario subway line so that it is accessible to all residents. And once it is gone, we will never get it back again. So so sad..

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The people who need this asset the most can't protest the current development plan when they're having to earn a living so they can make

their rent put food on the table. All city meetings and communications need to be scheduled and followed up in ways that make it easy for folks to participate.

245. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Not much change in Therme's plans. Plus they have not had the property environmentally assessed. Do not know how they are able to continue. Moving the Ontario Science Centre is crazy.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Stop Therme. Stop Ford.

246. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please investigate all Premier Doug Ford dealings.

247. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This site must not be privatized, not a spa, let alone a single use, adult only, mainly tourists, use. NO to a long-term lease, a very one sided business decision. The relocation, lack of access and reduction in size of Ontario Place is not feasible either. How are schools from outside Toronto's borders, especially north and east going to access what is supposed to be Ontario's Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Don't let this happen.

248. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The major issues about the Ontario Place redevelopment have not been addressed especially the relocation of the Ontario Science Centre and the inappropriate use of these public lands for a private wellness spa.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

249. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The privatization of Ontario Place and reduction of natural public spaces is a terrible idea. The application includes a giant parking garage, a for-profit spa building, a Therme beach adjacent to a combined sewer overflow. In addition, Therme has not yet committed to the environmental assessment requested by the City for lakefilling. We must stop the destruction of Ontario Place -- a beloved, accessible public resource.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

250. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. NO Spa

251. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The fundamental plan for the Therme Spa is the problem. It's a public park that Premier Doug Ford and his developer friends are trying to turn into an inaccessible-for-most-Ontarians spa that will limit access and activity in that area. No. Having a publicly funded Parkdale would be smart - if the public would be able to utilize Ontario Place. But most will not be able to. This entire plan needs to be scrapped and a publicly inclusive plan needs to happen instead. The east side was revitalized with such consideration (except for the Waterpark which should have been saved). The west side of Ontario place deserves the same treatment. And I'm a gal who loves a good spa - but destroying trees and such an important green space is not acceptable.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

252. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Too much prime City waterfront used for a massive building. Too many mature trees destroyed. Too much of my taxes to fund a large underground parking lot. Much too little area allotted for families to enjoy our waterfront. A large spa, with an expensive entrance fee, and with extensive parking needs is better located elsewhere.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. An environmental

assessment should be done. The City should not support this excessive development on our prime waterfront land.

253. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I find that all of the essential problems with the Therme application remain. It is too large for its waterfront location, is dependent on the mass-felling of trees and requires a massive parking lot to be built.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

254. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It's a sham.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

255. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I think that Ontario Place is an icon that should be about parks and people enjoying the waterfront. The idea to rethink of it as a park for all to enjoy vs. the notion of a company for the 1%. DO NOT REMOVE THE TREES! This a step back in the dark ages. Why not make it a space that does cost some money to help with the upkeep. I would be willing to pay for it in my taxes.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

256. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The new design still has a massive footprint. The sub-level parking complex is ludicrous and a waste of taxpayers money for decades to come. The two glass domes of the new design are, again, a hazard to birds, both local and migratory. I believe Torontonians want to spotlight their waterfront with a natural park setting for local, provincial and other visitors from beyond to enjoy. A spa/water world can be located anywhere else in the City. Why waste a view and environment for that purpose?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I want the City to continue to push for a Federal environmental assessment of the proposed spa at Ontario Place and for the Ontario Science Centre to remain in the incredible building it has been at for decades.

257. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The revised submission is tone deaf to the concerns of the many Torontonians opposed to putting a water park/spa at Ontario Place. A slightly reduced footprint of the massive spa does nothing to address the loss of trees, the risk of bird strikes, the loss of public space. Placing greenery and a path on the rooftop cannot be considered a public park as it controlled by the proponent. The heavily compromised Ontario Science Centre in sharply reduced space will be severely diminished in its role as an educational centre for children and their families. The underground parking garage is a leaking disaster in the making (just ask Harbourfront about their lakeside underground parking) and the fractionally reduced number of parking spaces in the revised scheme will have no impact on this very real risk.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City must leverage all tools and means at its disposal to stop this project from happening.

258. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* No to the Spa development. Ontario Place is for all Ontario Citizens not the wealthy few. Keep Ontario place for all. It was built by and for ALL Ontario citizens.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See previous comment. I support moving the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place, but do not support the Ontario Science Centre lands being used for up-scale housing that does not address the city's needs - only helps the rich and generates profits for builders.

259. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* This project takes public land to build a private spa with a prolonged lease that affects the environment and wildlife in this beautiful piece of land.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I do not think the plans for Ontario Place should go through. Public opinion should be sought and the land reconsidered.

260. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Do not create a massive parking lot. The area is congested enough without encouraging more cars. Whenever there is an event (e.g., CNE, hockey game, baseball game, concert, etc) that area is severely congested and a nightmare for people who live in the area. I also object strongly to privatization of a city/provincial treasure. Ontario Place is unique and should be maintained as such. The addition of a 'spa' does nothing but destroy the environmental theme and only provides service to a very limited number of people. Destruction of forested areas that took many years to mature is not progress - it's a money grab.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See previous comment. I support moving the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place, but do not support the Ontario Science Centre lands being used for up-scale housing that does not address the city's needs - only helps the rich and generates profits for builders.

261. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Keep the trees and valuable wildlife. Keep commercialization out of Ontario Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See previous answer. Don't let Premier Doug Ford bulldoze you.

262. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The average citizen has little access to the land along the lake. The proposed development is completely misguided. A spa can be built anywhere. It doesn't have to take up the scarce lakefront we have access to. And an underground parking lot at taxpayers' expense is insane!!! It's asking for long term expensive maintenance that the city cannot afford. And the spa's profits will leave the country and go to the corporation that is developing this monstrosity on stolen land!!!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. We need to preserve green space for citizens. Cutting down mature trees for this project is completely counter to what we need. It is criminal. Please stop this development from happening.

263. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Cancel the private sector development and develop the park as a park!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

264. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Please stop this non-inclusive, destructive, irresponsible proposal from the Ford government.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

265. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The destruction of mature trees that were put in place by a renowned landscape architect and that are home to many wildlife species should not be permitted. The filling in of parts of the lake should not be permitted, The creation of underground parking using public funds should not be permitted. The scale of this project is still too large. We should be able to celebrate architectural history and not destroy it. Moving the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place should not be permitted.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. For the sake of the

environment, the whole Therme concept should be moved to a more appropriate location, perhaps somewhere near Canada's Wonderland. Ontario Place is a jewel and should be refurbished. The Ontario Science Centre is a jewel and should be refurbished.

266. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes are minor, they don't change much. Don't be blinded by the light. Listen to the opposition. Get all the facts about the deal that was done behind closed doors, without public consultation. Ford finally backed down on the Greenbelt scandal. He should be pressured to backtrack on this. We lost ancient trees at Osgoode Hall Gardens by this corrupt government that has given Infrastructure Ontario and Metrolinx a free hand - again with no consultation or transparency. It's clearly a pattern that Toronto citizens and residents and visitors are all up in arms against. We're counting on City Council, under the blessed leadership of Mayor Olivia Chow, to stop the destruction of Ontario Place.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. I wasn't able to attend the September 7, 2023 meeting but I've attended many previous ones, virtually and in person, including at Ontario Place and the West Island. It's criminal to cut down thousands of trees and allow foreign money to destroy a Toronto treasure for the benefit of the rich. Ontario belongs to the people. Stop its destruction. No one is fooled by the bullshit. Listen to the opposition, pay attention to the facts and use every means available to prevent Ford's travesty from becoming a reality.

267. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place's West Island is a mature forest that provides habitat to more than 125 species of birds, as well as mink, beavers and foxes. It's a precious greenspace in Downtown Toronto, where that is pretty rare. Just like carving up the Greenbelt, this is a real disservice to our environment and a real disservice to future generations of Ontarians.

268. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Protect the trees, do not move forward with proposed development and destruction of Ontario Place as it stands today. Enhance Nature. Don't destroy it. We only have one planet to call home. Our city is less attractive as a concrete and glass jungle.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. [Previous response repeated] Protect the trees, do not move forward with proposed development and destruction of Ontario Place as it stands today. Enhance Nature. Don't destroy it. We only have one planet to call home. Our city is less attractive as a concrete and glass jungle.

269. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application has not been amended to reduce the destruction of ecosystems and mature trees on the West Island, or the proposed placement of a beach next to a sewer pipe. I run the adopt a tree program at Bellwoods - I know first hand that the city does NOT have sufficient resources to care for and water new saplings to ensure their survival and strong growth. There are no residents at Ontario Place to provide water to new trees when the city inevitably fails to do so. Destroying these mature trees and ecosystems will not be repaired by planting saplings that no one then cares for and die before reaching maturity, as we've seen ACROSS THE CITY. Our urban forest is already dying, we don't need to cut down a portion of it on top of that. How are we going to be a "city within a park" without trees?

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The application has not been amended to reduce the destruction of ecosystems and mature trees on the west island, or the proposed placement of a beach next to a sewer pipe. I run the adopt a tree program at Bellwoods - I know first hand that the city does NOT have sufficient resources to care for and water new saplings to ensure their survival and strong growth. There are no residents at Ontario Place to provide water to new trees when the city inevitably fails to do so due to lack of resources. Destroying these mature trees and ecosystems will not be repaired by planting saplings that no one then cares for and die before reaching maturity, as we've seen ACROSS THE CITY. Our urban forest is already dying, we don't need to cut down a portion of it on top of that. How are we going to be a "city within a park" without trees? Ontario Place needs to be renewed, that's undeniable, but the shady business deals

and lack of transparency we've seen from this government shows that the concern the public has regarding this proposal are well founded.

270. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* It still takes away public green space and encloses it in glass for a rich people playground. It's a waste of money and will be an eyesore on the waterfront. Say no to Doug.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Premier Doug Ford has made back room deals on other developments and this one with Therme stinks too.

271. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The changes are lipstick on a pig. The entire project is a travesty. Spending taxpayers money to allow a foreign company to clear cut a treasured landscape to construct a building that could go anywhere. And for a long-term lease. Disgraceful!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

272. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* While most of the plan is good, and uncontroversial, the big problem for the community has been the destruction of habitat and giving over public land to run a private business. Rather than listening to the citizens of Toronto who use this space, and removing these contentious issues, the planners have merely scaled back the problems a tiny bit, as if they are haggling, and this is a sale or business, rather than a stewardship of public land. There should not be compromise on things that will have large negative impacts on the community, both wildlife and human. There should be NO private spa, and NO destruction of natural habitat. Toronto is in short supply of nature. This is a dated, car-centric, rich person's plan of how to use public land and we should not accept a compromise of the rich people's snatching land for their playground, only a little bit smaller. They should build their spa on private land, or somewhere the community can agree it would serve them well.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please do not allow the privatization of public space happen at Ontario Place, or anywhere else in the city.

273. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* No comment.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario Place belongs to the people and the government has no place selling it off to private companies. The tremendous destruction of mature forest, animal habitat, and fully accessible public space far outweigh the 'jobs' a private spa will offer. The Ford government is shameless in its disregard for public opinion and privatization of spaces and system that are so important to us.

274. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The revised proposal still does not address my concerns for an Ontario Place that meets the needs of the people of Toronto. My concerns:

- The destruction of mature trees and vegetation, and significant wildlife habitat, in the critical context of a climate crisis.
- The lack of an environmental assessment on the Therme project.
- Unknown volume of spa water and impact of that heated and treated water on the local waterway and wildlife.
- Still too much built space, concrete and non-natural materials, that overshadow the natural parkland that already exists.
- Business model doesn't seem sustainable given the price point and target clients. It is unclear what would happen to the built spaces if the spa model is not viable.
- Traffic congestion since there is not enough planning/reliance around transit.

- Impact of 2000 car underground parking, especially given the site is landfill and surrounded by water. Therefore, major risk of water leakage and need for ongoing and potentially expensive maintenance.
- Lack of clarity as to who is responsible for public areas (e.g., rooftop park area).

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. See last response

275. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Ontario Place should protect its trees and animals living in them, it should be a park offering recreation to Toronto residents.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Ontario place should protect its trees and animals living in them, there should be a park offering recreation and relief from the overbuilt urban jungle that Toronto has become to its residents. It should also be a place to enjoy and interact with art

276. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The updated plan is still a disaster for Ontario Place and our city. No one should be allowed to clear cut the West Island and build a private enterprise on public land. The Therme spa will be for elites with money, not for the average Ontarian. And even Therme says the parking garage is unnecessary, but it is not being removed from the Province's plan. The whole plan is a disaster that was signed in secret and should be cancelled.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The city should not agree to the land swap needed for the plan to go forward, and should be vigilant in making sure that no destruction/construction begins without permission. Remember the Foundry!

277. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The application would still mean this huge structure plopped onto the area, restricting access to those who can pay, and imminently removing mature trees. I strongly object to this.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. Please do not charge ahead with this redevelopment. Please maximize accessibility and ease of use. We don't need a huge parking lot and a private facility plunked onto this site.

278. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I think this is a moment to stand up for what we all know to be the right decision for our city. It's a park that's about to be cut down for a spa. There is no argument for it.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

279. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* Window-dressing in a failed attempt to satisfy complaints.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. This privatization of precious public parkland, destruction of 850 trees and anti-environmental creation of a 1000-car parking garage is a Mike Harris (407)-style insult hurled at the City of Toronto. In addition, the proposed transfer of the Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place is a disgusting and wasteful idea. The City must oppose these fraudulent plans any way it can.

280. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I continue to be extremely disappointed in the project. It is preposterous to remove mature trees from the space in an area of the city that is already surrounded by parking lots and that so dearly needs green space. The project in its current state has little to no value for the population of Toronto or for visitors, and it is indicative of how little imagination and vision the province has for the city of Toronto.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. If the city of Toronto is a world-class city, as it so often refers to itself, then the Province and the City need to make decisions that reflect

this mentality. The current state of this project does not reflect it whatsoever. Please continue to fight for the protection of the very few green spaces in the downtown core of this city.

281. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I don't understand why we are cutting down mature trees, destroying a wildlife home for an eyesore of a spa, and spending over \$600 Million in taxpayer dollars to do it. I take a walk down at Ontario Place nearly every day as it's the biggest park near me (Liberty Village) and I will be devastated if this plan goes ahead.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. If the City gets final say on Ontario Place, why is the provincial government moving ahead? What is in the agreement with Therme? Why don't they have to do an environmental assessment? There are way too many questions out there right now for this project to get approved.

282. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* The redesign addresses none of the concerns initially brought forward. The cutting of trees will continue. There is no business case for this (how many spas does Toronto need? Do we not have enough?). The deal is secretive and looks corrupt without transparency (e.g. the long-term lease). There is no explanation as to how this meets Ontario's climate goals. The glass building on the waterfront will kill and displace numerous birds. I have no idea how the infrastructure changes that will be needed (e.g., sewer, water) will be paid for. Traffic is already horrendous here and building more parking will only make this worse. There is no environmental assessment. Finally, a private corporation shouldn't be allowed to take over public land.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The City of Toronto needs to stand up to the provincial government. They should do everything in their power to fight this very bad idea.

283. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I understand that the government of Ontario has most of the power, limiting what the city of Toronto can do. However, I feel the destruction of special old trees at Ontario Place and building a (luxury) spa that will only interest a few people is a total mistake and abuse of power.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

284. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed.* I am deeply concerned about the Ontario Science Centre move to Ontario Place - both the impact on the Ontario Science Centre community and the changes to the Ontario Place space. The spa and waterpark and additional parking/car pollution, destruction of existing trees and loss of bicycle paths are devastating to our waterfront community the deeply harmful to the environment. Our families always went to Ontario Place and our visiting friends and family consider Ontario Place a 'go-to' spot. It is incredibly meaningful to Toronto providing waterfront space for families, a gathering place and honoring our beautiful big trees. The decision is clearly driven by money at the expense of Torontonians, the land and the wildlife who make Ontario Place their home. Our city supports people, land and culture over profits.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. N/A

285. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The spa is very expensive and the unnecessary underground parking paid for by us should be cancelled. We need more park space for families to have picnics, play games, with very reasonable parking rates. We need more trees, not fewer trees. Toronto is deficient in park space - hence the popularity of Toronto Islands -this is what should be provided at Ontario Place. Theme parks should be replaced with children's play areas - mini golf may be very unfashionable but remains very popular with kids and their parents.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: The City should be concentrating on simple green spaces for families and visitors to enjoy. Most of us would never be able to afford a day at the Therme Spa, but would appreciate spending time on a simple Ontario Place with access to GO/TTC, or reasonable parking rates. Get over this fancy stuff, we do not need and cannot afford it.

286. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The building of the private Therme spa on public land, and destruction of trees and natural habitat on a bird migratory route is a travesty and must be stopped. I have never been so angry about an issue affecting the City in 55 years of living here.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* N/A
287. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* This project should go through. We need to keep the west end of Ontario Place public.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* N/A
288. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* I am against the ceding of public property and Lake Ontario access to a private for profit company. I am against the use of a huge amount of taxpayer money over ten years to fund a pay-for-use amenity for the rich when we are in the middle of a healthcare, education, and housing crisis, and when this space is currently a valued public resource that is open to all, free to use and important to the health and wellbeing of residents of this city. I am against allowing the destruction of one of the few green spaces and natural habitats in the downtown core, the removal of 850 trees, and the backfilling of a great lake, all without environmental assessment, to replace it with a glass and concrete heat pit in the middle of a climate emergency. I support the investigation of this development project for corruption and do not believe any part of it should be allowed to move forward until those investigations are concluded.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* We do not agree to this project. At all. It's another clear example of corruption and profit seeking in the provincial government, and it happening at the expense of the people of Ontario at a time when we desperately need funding for dozens of important issues for our health, well being, and environment. I support the refitting of existing buildings at Ontario place that have gone into disrepair and the use of the city as a cultural resource that is accessible to all, but no part of this public property should become private, certainly not as yet another expensive amenity exclusively for the city's wealthy, and most of all, no taxpayer money should go to subsidizing it. As a resident of the neighbourhood, I also strictly oppose the wholesale environmental destruction of West Island. This is an important site for residents to exercise and spend time outdoors and we need more forested areas as the climate gets more extreme, not less. None of your proposals have even addressed the fact that the therme project, the relocation of the science center, and the invitation of more car traffic and more parking into the area are extremely unpopular with residents, and we want to see the space used entirely differently.
289. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The loss of green space (mature trees) is still proposed and should be stopped.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* N/A
290. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* Public land should remain public. Testing down 800 mature trees is ecocide. And Ford's murky, secretive, off the public record 95 lease reeks of his typical corruption. None of this project should move forward. I don't need or want a mega spa in my backyard.
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* Please do not let foreign corporations beside what happens to our waterfront. Architects do not care about the future or our wellbeing. This is a luxury project for a select few to take what belongs to all of us. Do what is right: do not give up our land.
291. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A
- Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know:* I am opposed in so many ways to the proposed development. From the re-location (& demotion) of the Ontario Science Centre, to the proposed privately-owned spa, (which seems to have mis-represented intentions to 'improve' and modify plans) and the destruction of vegetation and especially, of mature trees (after Ontario as a province has lost so many trees to fires???) - I find the entire process and planning despicable.

292. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The invasive design from a foreign corporation kills the concept of a Canadian design. It's a franchise design. It disposes disrespects and destroys trees and the once enjoyable Cinesphere and Ontario Place..Really ? Or just like any other costly euro-centric space elsewhere.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Keep the trees in Ontario Place.

293. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* I am a recently-retired Toronto teacher who worked with students from all demographics. This redevelopment plan is catering to those in the city & the province who can afford amusement park tickets, zoo passes & trips to Great Wolf Lodge. What about everyone else? This redevelopment is yet another money-making deal by the province that we need our city council to stop in its tracks. The signing of a multi-decade contract with Therme is another money-making deal that Ford has been hoping would go under the radar, like the plan that was set to ruin our provincial treasure, the Greenbelt. We have to let him know we are not letting him off the hook with another provincial treasure, Ontario Place. When I first heard Ontario Place was being developed, I was delighted. When I saw the plans I was devastated. This is the "Well-off Folks of Ontario Place". People from the inner city & downtown, and all the province, need a place to relax & enjoy nature, not see another a shrine to excess. Destroying mature trees is NOT the way to go. Nor is a huge parking lot, encouraging more car traffic, a good idea. And we certainly do not need a mega-spa DOWNTOWN. Please — do not let this happen!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: See last section, please.

294. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The changes are a mockery, it is still a waste of tax payers dollars, it is still stealing precious public park land from the many residents of the area. Ontario Place has become one of the best options to enjoy outdoor activities all season for the residents. The area's condo density needs to be balanced with public park infrastructure not with a PRIVATE, tacky, Las Vegas style offer of wellbeing for rich people!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Please stop this shady deal, there are no rational ways to defend the viability of this project as it is right now, if you are trying to do what is best for the Toronto community, that is.

295. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The concept of a century lease for an out of country company to operate a elite spa on publicly funded and owned parkland is beyond absurd it is obscene. I have always considered Ontario Place a public citizen owned space , not real estate open to the highest bidder. As lifelong Toronto residents, both my spouse and I feel this way about this deal and trail of slime leading directly back to the Ford Government. Please act on our behalf to stop this Farce.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Please refer to our thoughts outlined in previous response. We ask that the City do everything in their power to stop this action and development scam with Public Parkland and waterfront greenspace. The Greenbelt is not the only corruptive act by the Ontario conservatives.

296. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* It has not changed ENOUGH! Scrap it and start over.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Redevelopment' CANNOT include destruction of irreplaceable amenities and natural resources. It CANNOT involve creation of unaffordable for-profit businesses as a replacement for amenities intended to be free and open to the public. It CANNOT involve needless relocation of landmark facilities like the Ontario Science Centre, so that still more lands can be sold off to business interests friendly with the Ontario government, for the construction of yet more eyesore residences for the ultra-wealthy. These projects need to be SCRAPPED immediately, and re-conceived based solely on what the PUBLIC wants.

297. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* It seems there are only minor changes to the application. It continues to be an application that threatens the birds, animals that live in this area and the mature trees that provide shelter. Building a massive parking lot flies in the face of the City's environmental goals to reduce pollution, encourage public transit, and to have this precious area at the lake to be accessible for everyone. I haven't seen an environmental assessment, there should be more than one.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Tinkering with the application is not the answer. Please see my previous comments.

298. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* Creating a deck with trees on the top of the structure is an inadequate solution for creating extra "Park Space". Too much paved space exists in this proposal. I am unhappy with the underground parking lot. Patrons should be using the transit system. The existing green, treed space on the site is too precious and too important for Toronto citizens and tourists to be developed. This space is our Central Park and accessible to all!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: N/A

299. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The proposal shows some response to public concerns but complete cancellation would be more acceptable. The other aspect of this plan is the huge parking garage, which will have terrible impacts, particularly the message it sends about the importance of cars just at the time the Ontario Line is being built..... We do not need to drive to Ontario Place when there is a new subway line.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: The natural area at Ontario Place is a respite from the paved and over-developed shoreline of Lake Ontario. It needs to be preserved and nurtured, not altered beyond recognition, particularly when public access will be reduced and restricted.

300. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* It still requires Ontario taxpayers to foot the bill for the parking changes. The Lakeshore cannot handle the increase in traffic for the Therme project, which will promote vehicle emissions above the current level. Make everyone park elsewhere and travel here by TTC or GO. I don't think it will be well attended, given that 25% of Canada's population will be over 65 in a short time period. Not many of us go to spas. I also object to the cutting of mature trees and the lack of an environmental assessment. Perhaps Therme would decide it's not worth the effort. They should be paying a huge carbon tax for their monstrosity.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Don't turn over the city property to Ontario without massive compensation and replacement trees!

301. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Do not approve of the whole agreement between the Province and proposed new occupants of the previously named Ontario Place and surrounding lands. The details of the lease agreement has been under the radar and minus consultation with residents of the city.

302. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: This Ontario West Island tree situation is so upsetting, Premier Doug Ford changed his mind on the Greenbelt, where is your conscience about the 850 trees and animal life uprooted. We cannot let this happen.

303. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* Public lands should be kept public. Especially environmentally sensitive public lands such as those at Ontario Place. We don't need a spa there.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: No development on needed greenspace whether at Ontario Place, or in place of the parkland promised us on the rail deck (this area is too population dense already).

304. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: I am concerned about: loss of carbon sequestration via felling of mature trees; loss of green space serving the central city; privatization of public land; use of public land becoming less equitable (pay to enter); viability of the proposed enterprise and what costs might be incurred to rescue a failed enterprise and a hulking structure on the city's waterfront; the inappropriate scale of the proposed building from an urban design perspective.

305. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: I strongly disagree with the SPA at Ontario Place. I am appalled and angry with the 99 yr lease. I want it totally scrapped.

306. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* It hasn't changed enough. Ontario Place should wholly remain in the public realm, not privatized.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: N/A

307. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* N/A

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Please save the trees on Ontario Place property... Also: the giant publicly-funded parking garage remains, the spa building footprint is actually only 5.8% smaller (not the misleading 25% stat being advertised by Therme), the proposed Therme beach is next to a combined sewer overflow, Therme has not yet committed to the environmental assessment requested by the city for lakefilling, and the Ontario Science Centre still faces a future of demolition for a half-size version on top of the parking garage.

308. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* I think the redesign was carefully thought out. The rooftop garden and its view are going to be amazing. The entrance is far more welcoming than before and the terracing will really help the whole thing feel more green. Toronto has a real lack of indoor amenities with greenery too, so this will really be a game-changer. I don't go to Ontario Place much now, but I definitely will if Therme gets built!

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Please don't bow to the demands of 'Ontario Place for All' and the Swim group. They don't speak for all, in fact, they didn't even reach the minimum number of signatures they needed on the two petitions they had started! I really think people are going to love the West Island redesign once it's built. But do try to resist the move of the Ontario Science Centre when that proposal comes up and keep pushing to reduce the parking in favour of better public transit connections.

309. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The proposed 'green space' on the roof of the Therme building is not really public parkland. From the renderings it's a pathway that goes by the windows of the private water park structure. It's really just greenwashing this environmentally unfriendly, glass enclosed private structure on the publicly owned waterfront land. I am concerned that there is no environmental assessment of this project even though it involves significant waterfront landfill and relocating a public beach. The combined sewer outflow into the area of the proposed 'new beach' has not been resolved and where is the agreement that says Therme will pay for that fix? Also the Therme reps (Infrastructure Ontario) also indicated that public transit of all sorts would service this site. Are they going to fund improvements to TTC, and Metrolinx services to facilitate this? Too many factors are still unknown and up in the air. It's just the wrong plan in the wrong location. Forget the Therme spa completely. Also planting 2000 trees can in no way replace the mature trees that were planted 50 years ago. This is another instance of greenwashing and should not be allowed.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: See my previous comments.

310. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed: The green space added is on the roof, where people can't go...?*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: A spa? Parking for it when we need more public transportation. Trees being cut, for what, a spa?

311. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed: No real changes from what I have read. The plan is still to go ahead with a mega spa, an underground parking lot and the destruction of hundreds of trees, devastating the ecosystem. Also, plans are still to move the Ontario Science Centre, such a travesty.*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: We do not need or want a mega spa that will only serve the rich and will take up masses of parkland. The Ontario Science Centre is a historical building and should remain in place and not be destroyed or moved to the waterfront. The land where it presently sits is not even conducive to building homes on. Why is moving it even a thought in this governments mind? Ontario Places should remain an open park for all Ontarians without specialty places that many will never be able to use.

312. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed: I feel the disfigurement of Ontario Place is just very wrong!*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Ontario Place is a precious city resource that needs to be protected and enhanced not destroyed in support of private companies!

313. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed: I have been 'asking questions and sharing comments' via surveys & many meetings 'consultations' since this fiasco if a 'plan' was first leaked. Is anyone listening and capable of doing what's right and not playing the 'wrong' politics? So .. now.. as an asinine attempt to appease the protest of 1.) Handing over public space to a PRIVATE Foreign company; and 2.) By leveling one of the few densely green with mature 60 year old trees parks in that part of our new cement city - you propose - to add grass to the roof of the private building (creating a human traffic corridor to allow (maybe - it depends!) humans to walk up and over the monstrosity of a building no one wants in OUR park to get to the other sliver of 'public cement space'. Hey 'planners' have you not heard of space and the sense of space that space actually provides? Not only will a long established ecological, environmental beneficial space will be destroyed forever, but the space will be too. Add to this 'Plan' the parking to be built by taxpayers for a private company! Add to that the bigger & louder & more traffic (without the realistic or real infrastructure to support the masses of people) to attend a huge performance venue. What's wrong with the one that's there now? At least tickets to these shows at this smaller current venue are half-way affordable. And, who says we need: More congestion, noise, and no REAL green space, trees and grass in planter pots is NOT! a PARK! Whoever had the idea of Lisgar Park should never have graduated from anything more than cement mixing school. I sure saw a lot of people relaxing on a blanket on the concrete this summer .. not! No one can use that space as a 'park', it's a good dog spot though - which is needed - but people need swathes of grass and shade trees to sit under - as do the birds & animals!!*

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Do whatever and everything!! to stop this runaway train disaster from happening!! If there's any teeth left in municipal powers - bite hard - now. I'm not sure whose driving the bus on these 'plans' / changes to the plans - but a distinct lack of Will is showing on the part of the city 'planners'. Do your job!! Ya, sometimes it's hard & unpleasant but remember Who You Work For! Stop trying to 'appease' and start fighting Back! We Need You to Fight Ford - using Every tactic available to STOP! this, not .. 'make it more palatable'.. because it never will be. And, we all know that in 25-30 years the 'spa' will be leveled & either hotels or condos or casinos or .. ALL of the above will .. appear! on this nice chunk of gated waterfront property taken Away from the people of Ontario!! - with access to the waterfront - cut off! If there are bylaws that exist on height etc restrictions - Enforce! them . Let the process

drag through the appeals process .. by then we can expect .. Premier Doug Ford will be .. gone! And his dirty back room dealings can go with him.

314. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* There are still some major fundamental issues with the project: the giant publicly-funded parking garage remains, the spa building footprint is actually only 5.8% smaller (not the misleading 25% stat being advertised by Therme), the proposed Therme beach is next to a combined sewer overflow, Therme has not yet committed to the environmental assessment requested by the city for lakefilling, and the Ontario Science Centre still faces a future of demolition for a half-size version on top of the parking garage. These are all unacceptable.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: I am in favour of maximum, radical resistance to this development on the part of the city.

315. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* Keep the natural condition of the island in Lake Ontario. Mature trees and wildlife need to be part of Toronto and the Waterfront.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Respect some of the natural places that Toronto has. Especially the waterfront. It is full of high building and a green park is necessary for wildlife. And also for people, we cannot just live in a concrete world.

316. *Please share your comments, feedback, or questions on how the application has changed:* The significant environmental impact remains unaddressed in this application. The continued therme partnership to construct and operate a spa seems tone-def to the environmental, social, and economic climate from local to worldwide, ignoring the short and long term interests of Ontario-wide and specifically local residents. I hope that our city and province can work with Ontarians and investors to re-envision this project in a way that brings both economic and environmental gains. Thank you city staff for your continued work on this important issue.

Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know: Thank you for the incredible amount of time you are putting into this. As a 10+ year resident of the city, mother of 3, and part of a household with 2 self-employed entrepreneurs who would be able to afford and enjoy the spa, I can not stand behind this application and hope that my children get to experience this incredible spot in the city in a way that connects them further with nature and with people, unique to the location this site offers. The spa accomplishes none of that and I hope that we can find a way to hand this special part of West Toronto to the next generation as a symbol of hope and togetherness for the future - a place that inspires! Not excludes and isolates.

Appendix B:

September 7

In-person Community Meeting

Q&A Transcript

Engagement Summary:

Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

September 2023

Appendix B:

September 7

In-person Community Meeting

Q&A Transcript

Please note, all questions and comments shared during the in-person community meeting were transcribed by Gladki Planning Associates. Due to the illegibility of some comments, some of the comments have been edited for clarity (See transcription index below). Verbatim responses containing harmful or offensive content have been edited or removed. Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The verbatim responses represent the respondents opinion and have not been fact-checked and may include information that may not be factually correct.

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

1. Attendee question: Why has [Infrastructure Ontario] put themselves through public scrutiny with this a private building and submit their plans to such scrutiny, what would happen to the land if this [project] fails? Torontonians are disappointed with the lease length.

City response: An Environmental Assessment (EA) is mandatory as per the City of Toronto's Official Plan (OP), and the City has asked about the lifecycle of the building.

Applicant response: They will comply and follow required EA's for the redevelopment.

2. Attendee comment: The reduced building size is appreciated, however, the size and scale of the facility would be better if it was reduced by 80%. If Therme does not gain any profit they should not be have to access the land. There are missing details regarding the estimated cost and budget to construct the underground parking structure. The provincial government could spend the \$400 million towards environmental and sustainability initiatives instead of building a parking structure. The province should reconsider the application and reallocate the budget for this project to other provincial priorities.

3. Attendee comment: The Premier of the province mentioned that this is an integral project, but the community was only asked to consult on a few pieces except for the Budweiser Stage, this process seems illegitimate. But if there's more details that would be great. The idea to put an attraction on the waterfront is insane.

4. Attendee question: Are there considerations to incorporate lodging accommodations for the spa facility? This can generate more revenue to ensure the project is financially sustainable. There is great potential to turn Ontario Place into a world-wide tourist destination.

Applicant response: A goal of this project is to improve connectivity between Ontario Place with the city by improving access by improving the transportation network and public transit connections. There is greater access to existing hotels in downtown with better connectivity.

5. Attendee comment: The application is disappointing. Waterfront access is very important for the Parkdale community because it contributes to the quality of life and offers space to relax. Many community members and Torontonians cannot afford to pay for spa access and amenities because of the high cost of living and rent. There should be more public green spaces with plants and trees in the proposal. The land should be returned to the people if the spa facility fails. The proposed beach on the West Island is not an ideal location.

Applicant response: The intention is to deliver more and better public waterfront open space. The Therme site will be a ticketed area and other sections of the West Island will be publicly accessible open space for the public to use. The West Island public realm will be operated and managed the same way as Trillium park on the East Island. The goal is to improve access to public space and increase of total area of public space on the West Island.

6. Attendee question: What areas of the West Island will be public and private? How much public money is going towards the redevelopment of Ontario place? How is the spa benefiting Ontarians?

Applicant response: There are sections of the West Island that will have public open space and will also include the spa facility rooftop public open space. Therme will have private ticketed areas on the West Island. Since 2012, the future of Ontario Place has been explored as an attraction destination or more housing, but there was a renewed commitment to keep the Ontario Place as its intended use as an attraction destination when it was first created as a public space.

Applicant response: When the province was conducting preliminary consultation for Ontario Place redevelopment, the provide heard that the public liked the idea of a spa as the main attraction.

7. Attendee question: Who will own the rooftop public open space?

Applicant response: The Therme lands on the West Island is subject to the lease and the public open space

and rooftop public space will be managed similarly to Trillium Park on the East Island. This newly formed management group will manage the West Island public realm.

City response: The Therme lands will be owned by Therme and public open space will operate similarly to a Privately Owned Public Spaces model, which refer to areas or spaces that are owned by private entities, but are accessible for public use.

8. Attendee question: Who will own and use the Biosphere? Who will oversee the entire Ontario Place site including the West and East Island?

Applicant response: The Ontario Science Centre programming will be located in the Biosphere and will remain owned by the province.

9. Attendee comment: There's not enough green space in the proposal, which seems to be tokenistic. The renderings in the presentation show a lot of people on concrete. People should enjoy sitting on the grass and experiencing the natural environment. Many people are not supporting the spa because of the ticketed admission and separate paid amenities. The spa will divide spa users and non-spa users on the West Island. The Therme building size and scale should be reduced.

10. Attendee question: More clarity is needed on parks on the West Island. Will the publicly accessible space will be open 24 hours? Who will be leasing and managing the public spaces? Will Therme use public spaces for private events? If so, how will it be managed?

Applicant response: The West Island will have 16 acres of public space and will be fully publicly accessible 365 days a year. The West Island public open space will be managed by a similar organization/model that oversees Trillium park on the East Island. There are opportunities for private events.

11. Attendee question: There isn't enough infrastructure in Toronto to get to downtown by transit. How are people getting to Ontario Place? The spa is projecting a lot of people during the day, where are those people coming from? Where are these numbers from? How will the traffic system work? What is the basis for visitorship projections?

Applicant response: A comprehensive traffic study has been submitted as part of the application and the City will review it. The study looks at worst case high traffic and congestion scenarios, such as, large-scale events. Those scenarios were assessed in order to mitigate congestion. The study relies on the new Ontario Subway Line and improved direct connection to the GO Exhibition station and Ontario Place. The Therme program is based on an affordable price point and programming is supposed to be inclusive.

12. Attendee question: The proposed beach is too large on the West island. What happens if there isn't a cost effective solution to address the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) adjacent to the beach? How is the beach feasible from a construction perspective? What happens if lake filling is not successful? How can there be more land added? If the public spaces are open year round, safety is a concern, what is the method planned for snow and ice clearing?

Applicant response: The project team is discussing potential solutions with the City. The beach does not take up 50% of the West Island, there are a number of beaches and water swimming access across the West Island. The beach is part of the shoreline retention work. The location of the beach is supported by an artificial reef, there will be 8 acres of aquatic habitat. The beach is about twice the size of Sugar Beach. From a maintenance standpoint, the issues of safety will be a primary concern, and a management plan will be completed over time.

City response: The City is aware of the CSO near the West Island. There are currently many programs underway to mitigate CSO's across the city, however, there are no plans for mitigation plans for the CSO near the West Island.

13. Attendee question: Ontario Place closed in 2012 and reopened with the new mandate which was to transform Ontario Place into a destination with public-private offerings. Since 2017, festivals at Ontario Place met this objective really well. The Ontario Place corporation managed excellent festivals and lots of people enjoyed the waterfront and the winter programming. There was food and beverage offerings as well and other types of successful events. Those festivals and programming met the mandate of Ontario Place – why wasn't that enough? Those festivals paid for themselves and generated revenue, why do we have to create a spa? We can meet the mandate of public-private destination with food and beverage ticketed and non-ticketed events.

Applicant response: Previous festivals and events were a huge success and are precedents that the Province wants to continue at Ontario Place. The changes proposed in the application are meant to introduce new infrastructure to host those festivals and events.

14. Attendee question: What are the traffic projections based on, and what is the modal split breakdown for each mode of transportation? Where does projected 10% of car users come from? Are the applicants traffic studies the same as the City's studies?

Applicant response: To clarify, the 10% will be those who drive but there are others who will arrive as passengers which will make up around 30% of users in total. However, there is a huge reliance on transit and active transportation and regional transportation for the traffic study.

City response: The City's Transportation Services team is reviewing the application materials. The applicants transportation study is publicly available.

15. Attendee question: The water at Ontario Place is really high quality and clean and the existing south facing pebble beach is suitable for swimming. In addition, the existing pebble beach is a great location because it is south facing and is not exposed to sewage outflow in comparison to the proposed west facing beach. The pebble beach hasn't experience erosion and the west facing sand beach isn't fully accessible. Why does the beach have to move to another location?

Applicant response: In addition to the proposed west facing sand beach, there are swimming opportunities on the south end of the West Island. The existing south facing beach is popular, but the proposed beach is meant to be bigger in size and offer more experiences.

16. Attendee question: At a previous Design Review Panel meeting, Therme mentioned that the combined sewer overflow is not under their responsibility to address. More clarification is needed to understand who will be ultimately responsible for the public realm on the West Island and how do we make sure its publicly available for 95 years? What is the guarantee that the public land will be publicly accessible, and will this be included as a condition of the lease?

Applicant response: The public realm will be managed by the province through the similar model as Ontario Place corporation managing Trillium Park on the East Island. Therme is funding the renewal of Ontario Place but the province will manage the public realm. The province will continue to be the steward for Ontario Place. The lease will include these details.

17. Attendee question: Why is the lease not publicly available? The lease should be open for public review. In addition, there was amazing children's programming at Ontario Place and it would be nice to see this continue. Access at Ontario Place should be completely free to use including free activities and programming.

Applicant response: Creative and nature-based children's programming will be integrated in the public open spaces. The West Island will have a nature based children's play space and there will be a major amphitheatre space to host 3-4,000 people as a performance space and will be free to the public as a free space. In addition, the government identified the opportunity at Ontario Place for public-private partnership to reinvent the site as a destination.

18. Attendee question: Infrastructure Ontario should publicly release the business plan to relocate the existing Ontario Science Centre to Ontario Place. The current site is a great location for families across the Greater Toronto Area, and is conveniently in proximity to two major transit lines. What is the reason behind relocating an existing community asset?

Applicant response: The comment is noted, and Infrastructure Ontario will share the business case however the release date is undetermined.

19. Attendee question: Ontario Place is a significant place for Ontario identity, but why is there an agreement between the province and private Austrian company to redevelop Ontario Place? It is hard for the public to fully understand the application because of the lack of clarity. For example, what are public spaces and private spaces? Clarification is needed to understand the projection of transit and car users. Additionally, the building size reduction doesn't make sense because there's only a small decrease in the square footage of the building. More clarity is needed to understand the justification of moving the existing pebble beach.

Applicant response: The parking numbers and modal split projection numbers represent the accumulation of all different users of Ontario Place. The 10% of car users comes from all of the users to Ontario Place, and the peak demand is 10% of auto drivers. The projected auto drivers are also driven by the Live Nation entertainment activities. The building volume reduction is made of a footprint reduction, the overall height is reduced from 41 metres to 36 metres and 32 metres. The volume and height reductions continue over the building so it's a cumulative reduction all over the different heights of the building. The calculation methodology will be included in the submission.

City response: The 25% volume reduction is the cubic space reduction including the ceiling span. The actual floors space reduction is only 5.8%.

20. Attendee question: What is the net change decrease of biomass during construction of the public realm and rooftop public open space? There are concerns about the loss of biomass, and the growth success rate because the rooftop cannot mimic a natural ecosystem. What is the effect on the ecosystem and surrounding biomass?

Applicant response: The biomass calculation is not completed. The paving will be permeable and will support public movement around the West Island. The paving will allow for hydration of the land. For example, Trillium Park on the East Island was a former parking lot, however, the park is a huge success and now supports flora and fauna. The intention is to continue these strategies on the West Island and expand on the achievements of Trillium Park.

21. Attendee question: The Auditor General is currently looking into the Greenbelt scandal, and there are investigations on the lack of financing details. The City should look into the financial viability of the Therme company. Does the City have a forensic accountant looking into the due diligence process for the project?

City response: The City has not looked into this.

Appendix C:

September 12

Virtual Community Meeting

Q&A Box Transcript

Engagement Summary:

Ontario Place Community Consultation Meetings

September 2023

Appendix C:

September 12

Virtual Community Meeting

Q&A Box Transcript

Please note, all questions and submitted in the WebEx Q&A box during the virtual community consultation meeting were transcribed by Gladki Planning Associates. Due to the illegibility of some comments, some of the comments have been edited for clarity (See transcription index below). Verbatim responses containing harmful or offensive content have been edited or removed. Please share general comments, feedback, or questions you would like the City to know. The verbatim responses represent the respondents opinion and have not been fact-checked and may include information that may not be factually correct.

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

1. Has anyone from Toronto City Council visited the Therme location in Whitby? Are you aware of the \$5 million dollar lawsuit by 72 guests who have suffered skin and ear infection from the Spa pool.
2. Why is there a 99-year lease for Therme and Live Nation? What happens to the lease if either of them fails, will the land revert back to us? And why cant the public know the terms of the lease?
3. How much will it cost the City to move the combined sewer overflow pipe affecting the western beach? When is it slated to be moved now as we were told you're starting with the east end?
4. How much will the transportation improvements from the GO Exhibition station to Ontario Place cost the City?
5. In a first status report this year, City staff wrote about the proposal "Overall, in their current form, the applications do not adequately respond to key policy directions of the Official Plan and the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan". What issues do city staff see in the present resubmission? Does the construction of a large waterfront parking garage and removal of hundreds of trees align with environmental policies?
6. The value of the Spa development is \$350 million, yet the city will pay \$650 million for the parking lot, then transportation, then the sewer costs. I'm guessing we'll be on the hook for a billion. For a Spa no one seems to want but the participants here. Why is the cost so lopsided?
7. Important Dates Slide shows the Therme project being rammed through this year with the acknowledgment that there are indeed 3-4 other parcels of the Ontario Place redevelopment still needing Site Plan Approval. The City should pause the approval process until Live Nation, Parking Structure, and Trillium Park details are provided by Infrastructure Ontario. Ontario Place is a sum of all parts not piece by piece.
8. With the recent confirmation that the Combined Sewer Overflow located where the planned Western beach will be built is not on the City of Toronto's list of infrastructure updates in the near term. Will the Government of Ontario commit to providing the funding for this upgrade in light of Toronto's budget crunch.
9. The underground parking, is it really a viable endeavor and why is the province paying for it? The Government of Ontario has a terrible track record for doing projects on time and on budget. What about the environmental impact to do such an underground parking removing tainted infill soil?
10. How is the removal of 850 trees meeting our climate goals when trees are the only way we will continue to breathe?
11. Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik, you say you've seen this 95-year lease? Why have you not made it public?
12. Will the Province commit to release the details of what will happen to the Ontario Place site of the Therme or Live Nation leased properties are no longer economically viable? Will Therme and Live Nation retain a lease of this land until year 2117?
13. Why the need for a multi-level below grade parking garage at a \$500 million cost, considering the Ontario line and other lines will serve the site?
14. Any work at Ontario Place should be subject to the same environmental assessment (EA) that all other projects in Ontario are subject to. Again, Infrastructure Ontario (IO) is trying to get away with something that is wrong, like a modified simplistic EA. Can we have IO commitment that they will indeed do a proper EA.
15. When should we expect an update in terms of the plans to move the Ontario Science Centre and Underground Parking lot?
16. Ontario Science Centre, A 2nd one at Ontario Place would be a viable benefit for downtown people, but the one at Don Mills and Eglinton should stay in that location to accommodate the explosion of population expected to Toronto/Ontario. Not everyone wants to go downtown for all activities. There are hundreds of condos being built on Eglinton, if the city/province did not mandate affordable housing or rentals in those locations that is [not good] and short sighted of them. Seriously, I have so many concerns about Ontario Place.

17. If the Combined Sewer Overflow is not able to be upgraded will the plan need to be resubmitted to adjust the location of the breach or will the new beach go forward irrespective of the combined sewer overflow upgrade result?
18. What do you mean by broader issues?
19. Will the Goh Ohn Bell Shelter be retained in it's current location?
20. How much of the current proposal has been merged with public consultation from the Province's Engage Ontario Place website?
21. Will the Province commit to submit both the Therme and Live Nation plans to environmental assessment (despite private builds being exempt)?
22. Recognizing parts of Ontario Place was paid entry with different tiers, how will the entry fee to Therme be comparable to the paid areas of Ontario Place of old, or be affordable to all?
23. With the spa expecting about 4,200 people per day, what happens when they don't get the attendance they expected, would they sue the Government of Ontario? Would the Province try to create another space to make money in the waterfront like a casino? Do we have any guarantee or have seen the contract for the conditions?
24. How are elementary school kids expected to travel to the proposed Ontario Science Centre on school trips? On public transit? Or is there space for school buses? I am concerned about young elementary school kids on buses on the Gardiner and Don Valley Expressway
25. Where's the seating? It just looks like a concrete slab.
26. Can we go back to basic and talk about why only one proposal was received and why wasn't this a public bid? Why is the city not reclaiming 100% of this land?
27. Rooftop and bridge. Will it be possible for people to climb up on the edges or throw things over the edges?
28. The spa/wellness facility is the subject of irrefutable public back lash. Leading voices in architecture and design have also come out against the project, including KPMB, World Monuments Fund, and Ontario Architectural Conservancy among others. My question is, what democratic tools do members of the public have at their disposal to stop the development? We don't want it!
29. How much will it cost to access this place? Is this a community centre?
30. Why aren't fences shown in these renderings? Specifically, on the terraced areas?
31. Some of these trees look VERY tall. Realistically, how mature are the trees that you are able to plant going to be? And how will you ensure they survive?
32. Could the status of the Combined Sewer Overflow next to the proposed Therme beach please be addressed and whose responsibility it will be to address the current issues it has?
33. Toronto public parks are accessible to the public from 530AM-midnight every day. Are the rooftop green roofs open to the public according to these hours? And who is responsible for the maintenance and cost of these spaces?
34. Ecology/landscape consultants, is rendered greening more than "gestural" and beyond trillium park's manicure to yield to biological self regulation? Do you have details on the supportive sky islands for the 2 arctic bird flyways and track record? Are you experienced in specification for Mitigation Planning after the EA? Example lake bed disturbances from pipelines demand the provision of wildlife project-duration refugee habitat for much smaller sensitive site interventions than this project proposes.

35. How much water will this use? Will any water [from the Spa facility] be released directly into Lake Ontario?
36. These improvements could be made without the Therme building for a tiny fraction of the hundreds of millions of tax dollars going into razing the land and building a parking garage. To Infrastructure Ontario, why not scrap the spa?
37. I notice many renderings do not show tree canopy or shade for pedestrians. With climate change shifting our summer climate into higher temperatures, what are some considerations for the pedestrian experience under the summer sun?
38. Please explain how you think it is viable to create park space on top of the spa building, instead of keeping existing park land and tree cover.
39. Therme claims that the project will be beyond LEED Platinum, Net-Zero, and TGS 4. How do they plan to achieve this with so much glazing, processing of water, and 5-storey below grade parking garage (the most carbon intensive structure possible)? Therme's Bucharest LEED Platinum project is based on LEED 2009 which is much less stringent.
40. The plans look fantastic, during the construction process what is being done to minimize how long the trail around the West Island is closed for - especially the trail linking east to west? - I was frustrated to find this trail shut already, despite no sign of construction.
41. The addition of green space on top of the spa is being presented as increased public space. The slopes look steep. Has any AODA work been done to check the sloping paths. It looks like people with wheel chairs, strollers or any mobility issues will not be able to use the roof. A risk in both ascent and decent.
42. What is the expected family fee to access the new Ontario Place?
43. Why has Therme not considered other sites, with less damaging environmental impacts, such as tree removal.
44. What has been done in the new plan to mitigate the clear-cutting of the 800 mature trees on the West Island? Why is there no plan to preserve the existing mature canopy?
45. A few questions. I like the expanded green roof and public access on top of Therme. However, how will the structure support and grow thriving, mature trees that are being cut down for the Therme structure?
46. I understand that there is focus in access to water but with this neighborhood growing, what is the expected water usage with this new change? How much more water is expected to be used in this area and how will that impact the neighborhood?
47. What can we do to stop the relocation of the Ontario Science Centre?
48. What are the transportation projections based on? Why create so much parking when your driving projections are so low? What is your plan for increased biking infrastructure?
49. How will cars access Ontario Place? Currently, they cross the Martin Goodman Trail. Will it be done the same way?
50. Will there be ample benches/seating available for those who might need more places to rest across all public access spaces?
51. Why can't the pebble West Island Beach be preserved and protected as a swimming option in addition to the swimming proposed public beach?
52. When will the applicant make the lease agreement terms available to Ontario taxpayers? What will happen if the project fails?
53. We have the opportunity to make this the "Stanley Park" of Toronto - a desired destination for visitors and residents. Why don't we stop Therme and focus on making this a true park?

54. Wondering if the applicant team/City have given consideration to how the increased car traffic due to the parking space will impact people running and cycling along the Martin Goodman Trail? I am very concerned about increased risk of collisions. It is already bad.
55. Ontario Place provides many in the community to do outdoor activities like biking, running, and skating. Are there plans to create a separation between pedestrian pathways, and ones that are similar to ActiveTO?
56. I'd like to point out, the Therme building is supposed to cost \$350 million of Therme money, and the underground parking lot \$650 million and the Combined Sewer Overflow removal cost for their poorly placed West Island beach an undisclosed amount of money. So, a billion dollars for us Ontarians to provide for a private company's profit?
57. Have you done detailed evaluations concerning how bringing over foreign trees and fauna impact our native species on the long-term. Bacteria has proven to sit dormant on trees, plant life and when activated can invade lesser strong species.
58. I continue to have many concerns about this development including why Ontario residents still have not seen details regarding the lease. When can we expect to have these details. Of course, we ask why it was 95 years? What fees are being charged to Therme for this waterfront property.
59. I've read that this location of the proposed beach has a Combined Sewer Overflow. What are you proposing to do about this because the City can't afford to move it?
60. Why isn't the Therme building on the existing parking lot south of Lakeshore. Why not consider parking lot space north of Lakeshore on CNE grounds for development close to water but not on West Island?
61. How is the rooftop park accessed? And how do you expect trees to grow there if their roots have nowhere to go?
62. Urban Strategies / City - Can a Partner be involved in the planning process that has lived experience of being unable to afford vacation and recreation? Being promised "aquafit" is off base; a financially tight family will not travel far to their aquafit, rather will use unregimented nature space in lieu of affording a Provincial Park booking. Such a Partner could also Mitigate Economic Risk to a local workforce. Much like at Grassy Narrows, promises of employment don't ever come true. We worry in South Toronto.
63. My question is in regards to the construction staff required for this project. The Province and City are committed to building homes on an urgent basis. Why is the Ontario Place redevelopment not put on hold in order for construction personnel to be redirected to housing construction? We have a housing crisis, but are directing man hours to build an entertainment venue that is not truly needed.
64. Does the City deem it acceptable to remove all the mature trees regardless of the scale of the building?
65. What is the plan to examine the elimination of 800 mature trees?
66. Why is the west beach being relocated to a Combined Sewer Overflow area? How is this safe for swimmers? Why can't we keep the current beach the way it is?
67. I am concerned that the environmental assessment did not cover West Island. Why is that and will there be an environmental assessment on the West Island plan, that speaks to concerns about clearcutting the land, the impact on fauna, etc.?
68. Can the revitalization of the public realm at Ontario Place, particularly on the West Island, go ahead without the Therme spa?
69. The transit considerations look at getting in and out of Ontario Place. With the number of people attending events and the growth of the area - what is the traffic already heavy, what additional considerations have been taken to manage traffic, demographic?

70. I am now a senior citizen, started to go to Ontario Place since it opened in 1971. In my opinion, the biggest issue with Ontario Place is getting to and from the site using public transit. It is about a 30-minute walk from Exhibition Place. I believe Ontario Place needs 1 or 2 accessible public accessible trans buses. Stations and roads on-site, which will allow for the movement of a few people to moving 20,000 people effectively all at once (i.e., after a concert), e.g., 1 bus when there is little going on to, 100 buses after a concert. Thank you.
71. Why is the parking lot so big if you project most people will not arrive by car?
72. Canada Border Services had thought restrictions on foreign plant life being brought over. Look what happened with the species that destroyed maple tree species.
73. The renderings show a lot of impermeable pedestrian routes through the West Island with people walking - there is nothing leisurely about it. It appears to be just a through path - not able to use the island - that the public is relegated to the scant perimeter - the lake fill. Is this correct?
74. What is happening to the Japanese Canadian Centennial Temple Bell?
75. Despite the reduction of the size of the Spa, the fact it is primarily glass and in the migratory flightpath of birds, I did not hear anyone address this legitimate concern.
76. Q1 Explain the long term viability and practicality of the rooftop "park" area. Where has this been done before? Will it work in winter? Why can't we have more park and public area at grade vs the massive Therme structure (which is still HUGE)
77. I use Lakeshore Boulevard regularly and I am extremely concerned about the impact of such a large parking lot being added. If the underground parking lot floods or fails, who is responsible for repairing damage? How will Lakeshore Boulevard be improved to handle volumes?
78. Who is paying for the underground parking lot?
79. I am puzzled by the need for a foreign company vs. a Canadian company to build this so-called wellness centre/ water park and b) why this lease is so long? Please provide rationale?!!!
80. What is the structural life expectancy of the Ontario Place Pods ?
81. Could you please identify concerns that came up during consultations with Indigenous communities? Thank you
82. And who is paying for building the Therme Spa building?
83. With Therme being a foreign company, what level of risk does Toronto have to accept for upgrades, hiring people at-least living wages and investing in Ontario? With any profits, does it all leave Ontario? Or does a certain percentage have to stay in Toronto?
84. I like that the Pods are being preserved and incorporated. However, the size and footprint of Pods is nothing compared to the current Ontario Science Centre and exhibit space. Keep Ontario Place where it is and create a satellite Ontario Science Centre at Ontario Place that specifically focuses on nature, wetlands, Indigenous history etc. Or something new like a Children's Museum for Toronto. Why not consider keeping Ontario Science Centre where it is and create a small satellite site with specific focus?
85. City traffic is going to be a disaster - when we have events at the Rogers Center and at the Scotiabank Arena the traffic is totally blocked - the other weekend back past the Humber. Add to that TFC games, the CNE and other events in the city and the roads already cannot handle the volume of traffic - even on weekends. Today we were told the traffic could be 30,000 drop offs and pick up a day - lets get a proper traffic plan done to see what the real impact of Live Nation and Therme would be.
86. Comment. The size and scale of Therme continues to be at a scale overbearing to the public space at ground level. Overall concern, the heritage of the landscape is not protected, very little usable public space on the West Island is greenspace, other than some pathways on the roof, majority appears to be cement.

87. Which parts of the [Ontario Place] will be free to the public? Therme, Live Nation, Ontario Science Centre will probably not be free.
88. Q2 please explain where the lakefront swimming areas are and how they compare in size and location to current. How have you mitigated existing water discharge location which I understand is quite filthy today? Why are you not retaining the pebble beach?
89. The shoreline works are described as flood mitigation / erosion mitigation. However, these are engineered solutions which will ultimately fail and are not being subject to an environmental assessment. How is the applicant addressing the long term potential impacts? What are the planning horizons used for the environmental impacts?
90. How reasonable is it to expect that people visiting this site will walk almost a kilometer to get to the gate from public transit? The answer to this question will have impact on all the projections on the "arriving by" slide.
91. Follow up to AODA access to roof. If it is not fully accessible, it is a green roof not public space.
92. The traffic plan is not adequate. The roads cannot handle existing traffic comfortably and adding in 30,000 pick up and drop offs a day - there is no way the existing roads can handle the volume of traffic at that location.
93. Why is the Therme facility an appropriate use on the site? What other sites did Therme consider in the GTHA?
94. I am very concerned about the lack of an environmental assessment. It may be debated whether or not it is a legal requirement, but it is simply the *right* thing to do. We want a space that is environmentally responsible.
95. Does the city have to make any infrastructure investments for this project (i.e. watermain, electricity...) And would the taxpayers of the city be responsible for these investments (if they're needed)?
96. Q3 If the Therme portion is unsuccessful (the attendance projections are optimistic based on other Therme projects) would it be possible to convert these to a casino and what can be done to prevent this?
97. Why a 95-year lease for Therme? And how will Therme guarantee affordable access for all Ontarians? Recently went to Great Wolf Lodge and definitely not affordable or something a majority of families can afford. Free entry every month? Discounts for people who live in Toronto? Will a reduced lease be considered?
98. What would happen if during construction they discover the 'park' land added to the roof of Therme is not actually feasible to build? How are they going to make sure that doesn't happen?
99. Is it Infrastructure Ontario's view that public-private partnerships are required to maintain Ontario parklands? Will this be the Province's approach to parkland going forward?
100. Good to see that the applicant has made revisions to increase the free public space, address concern around the environment and increased accessibility. I strongly support LEAVING the Ontario Science Centre in its present location. The [Ontario Science Centre] needs renovations but it is a magnificent historical and much loved centre, one that Ontario should keep into the future.
101. Why should critics of this project who see the alternative as 100% park space change to supporting it - what is the sales pitch for people to support privatization of publicly owned space in any capacity?
102. What measures have been taken to look at flooding and wind damage and other issues to climate change mitigation.
103. The "pretty pictures" showed over 80 trees on the entry side of rooftop park - that means over 3.3 million kg of soil required to meet city guidelines. It seems we are being shown pretty pictures that are not realistic. And going back to the conceptual to the real - the ROM Crystal was totally changed to meet the realities of Canadian Winters. Why are we not seeing a model that accurately reflects the scale?

104. Why are you creating a beach on top of the combined sewer overflow, adjacent to Lake Shore Boulevard. When there is the perfectly lovely South facing, perfectly clean Michael Hough Beach
105. How will the traffic be addressed in the area with the significant forecasted growth in visitors? What is the budget to address gridlock/traffic flow in this area?
106. Affordability is my major concern at the Therme. Who will make sure that the entrance fee will be reasonable, or sometimes supported by an agency?
107. The Therme building is still a very large footprint on the West Island and certainly dwarfs the proposed Ontario Science Centre. With science education for our young people such a critical issue, why has the Ontario Science Centre received such a small area ? I believe smaller than it currently occupies.
108. The walkway area along the south side of the building is horrid - a 16 metre sidewalk beside a glass high-rise. That is more like walking along the office buildings on Yonge Street.
109. Will the City support keeping Ontario Science Centre where it is?
110. This is a comment, not a question. I think some above ground parking is necessary for ambulances, fire trucks, etc. In case underground parking suffers obstruction. Thank you.
111. How does this building impact migratory birds?
112. I'm concerned that the waterpark is not environmentally sustainable and up keep, like cooling and heating is costly and uses a lot of energy.
113. Where can we find the research to show a glass, Therme style building will last a 95-year lease?
114. Many people have expressed they are not interested in having a spa here at all. I also agree, and would like to see the spa moved somewhere else, maybe the Exhibition grounds or North York.
115. As are monarchs! Monarch migration has begun - nothing can replace or protect the migratory flyway - no redesign of an enormous glass building - or any building can accommodate wildlife as they move through.
116. Given the care for heritage preservation going into this project, what are the ramifications of moving the Ontario Science Centre on the heritage Raymond Moriyama building at the original location?
117. Question about parking, Who is paying for the development of this parking lot and is the estimate online of around 400 million for the parking structure accurate?
118. Does there need to be a large swimming beach when there are already lots of swimming options nearby, especially if sewage and water quality is going to be an issue? Create a swimming space with reduced beach and more trees preserved and natural habitat possibly?
119. What power do City staff have to change the location of this project?
120. Why is there a beach near a Combined Sewer Overflow?
121. Just applauding, thank you [name redacted], well said, I concur. If the public is paying 50% and represented by the Infrastructure Ontario which legislated away ecological safety controls, we need real numbers, business plans, the lease, the environmental assessment which will have to be footed by the City or federal government.
122. The redwashing that Therme, Infrastructure Ontario, Diamond Schmitt is employing in your marketing of this project is disturbing, unconscionable.
123. I'm asking about the slide entitled The Opportunity. It says "Expanding a Cluster of Existing Uses," and shows a photo of the CNE, not of Ontario Place. Does applicant want to move CNE to Ontario Place? If not, why wasn't a photo of Ontario Place events used?

124. The design team suggests a “new and improved Science Centre”. There will be a 50% reduction in the size of the Ontario Science Centre (OSC); that will lead to reduction in exhibits and less learning/interactive learning opportunities. Love the idea of OSC satellite to incorporate wetland learning but don't get why we'd close the original location.
125. I see too much concrete in the drawings. Why not keep the green space, in particular the 850 trees and work around them? The Therme Spa is much too large. It is taking over the green space at our waterfront.
126. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. Can you explain why the Therme site was not included in the environmental assessment? And will there be an environmental assessment in the future?
127. Concerns the scale of the Ontario Science Centre along a public foot/bicycle path, along with significantly reduced size of current Ontario Science centre.
128. The lease should be available as it is public space. Would Therme Spa consider showing good faith and sharing the lease agreement?
129. Are we looking at alternate sites for Therme? There is a giant parking lot across the street...Why not there? The West Island should be a fully public park and not be privatized. Ontario deserves better than this.
130. My question is how much, which areas on the map will no longer be free, accessible without paying?
131. Clarification - the lease is bound by privacy laws automatically by its nature or the province has designated it as being subject to those laws? Could the province share it if it was so inclined?
132. The plan is showing the footprint of Live Nation as it exists now, however, it's supposedly expanding. How are we to give our input to this plan when a substantial proportion of it will change?
133. As I understand the Spa is still stadium sized at 660,279 sq. ft or 12 football stadiums and I see a lot of white space vs green - will this be concrete?
134. Following on earlier comment calling for greater thoroughness and transparency, I've heard tonight that there is now more public space and a net increase in trees in the revised plans. How much of Lake Ontario are we losing in the process through lake filling? How many 50 years+ trees are being cut down?
135. Comments for all. I do not support this plan. I can not support this plan. We need open free parks for all. Let this be our Central Park not a private spa for the privileged. We need green space not glass domes.
136. A beach currently exists, why move it next to sewage? If this is the design idea of Therme Spa then they should be responsible to upgrade the sewage system. As a taxpayer I do not want to be responsible to pay for something a private company is making the choice to move the current beach.
137. Given the recent scandals associated with the Province's process around the Greenbelt, why should the public trust this process? An artificial demand to move quickly towards arbitrary deadlines and protecting proprietary interests harms the public good.
138. Lake Shore Boulevard is a parking lot at the best of times, why bring more attractions to this site?
139. What possible justification could there be for no environmental assessment of the West Island especially when the proposal involves lake infill?
140. Is it possible to leverage off site parking, and use a shuttle service?
141. If we are setting a priority for a huge parking allocation, it will be necessary to move towards supporting electric vehicles and charging. Has that been considered in the planning? And, by the way, parking charges increases the cost to users.

142. How has the Ontario Science Centre (OSC) been included in the considerations for transportation demand (especially as it relates to increased demand and parking)? This appears to be a variable while it has not been confirmed if the OSC is being relocated.
143. I have asked multiple friends - not one person (all with easy access to TTC) would spend the money to go to a spa and then deal with public transit to down and back.
144. There are sports organizations using the waterway by the West Island where the training takes place, specifically rowing. What are the plans to mitigate the water traffic when you introduce canoe and kayak rentals to use the same space?
145. The "white space" on the drawings. The new "park" or green space being added to roofs, how accessible?
146. Looking at the graphic of the West Island, even with the land being filled in, very little of the West Island will be public, the ratio is not appropriate for the space. Many cities have revitalized waterfronts to 100% public greenspace/promenades, more similar to Trillium park, which have been a significant public/tourist draw on their own. There is not a need for a spa to revitalize the area.
147. Will the public have the opportunity to review the terms of the 95-year lease? If transparency is important and this is public land, can you provide a timeline for sharing this important information?
148. Why a 95-year lease? Will Therme just allow someone else to move in when they are not profitable with the spa facility?
149. I am extremely concerned about the parking garage in general and the size of the garage. Not only will it bring in more traffic and pollution, it is costing the tax payer a tremendous amount of money. Can we skip the parking and encourage public transportation instead? And if public transportation is to be the main source, who will pay for the extra buses etc.?
150. I do not support any build.
151. Thank you to the City staff who are working to prepare this report and expressed concerns that I share over this revised proposal. The Therme facility does not belong on this site. Cutting down 800 trees and building a huge parking lot is exactly what we do NOT need in the city. Ontario Place can be revitalized at a much lower cost to taxpayers, to the environment, and to the health of the people of Toronto if we simply improve the public waterfront that exists as a park today.
152. Species at risk, in particular bird migration is a problem. How will these tall and large buildings prevent window collisions? An environmental assessment is required. Will the Province do the right thing and get one done?
153. I am seeing major sustainability issues 1) energy use of Therme spa, in the middle of winter ~a tropical environment? 2) old growth trees native to the area, should be retained to align with sustainability vs. saplings on a roof, 3) sustainability of the rooftop greenspace, is this going to withstand more extreme weather events. 4) can Therme spa be built on existing developed land 5) landfilling - please use existing land.
154. The present Ontario Science Centre should not be moved. A complimentary Ontario Science Centre does make sense, but leave the original Ontario Science Centre where it is.
155. We fully agree with the points exposed by CH(?)
156. Moving the Ontario Science Centre requires a separate public consultation from its current site. There is a public outcry about moving this centre from where it is. Spreading out Ontario's educational/recreational resources is important to consider.
157. Original vision of Ontario Place may be dated in our current global environmental crisis. We can still enjoy "play", but it doesn't need to be this.

158. The East Island public realm should be extended to the West Island, with a reduction or removal of Therme.
159. 99 years is more than an average lifetime.
160. When did the rebrand of the Therme spa to a Therme waterpark take place?
161. Why is there interest in moving the Ontario Science Centre, which backs into a beautiful ravine, great to learn about nature, to the waterfront, where students will learn about asphalt and lakeshore Boulevard?
162. [Names redacted], yes it is a lease but a lease for 95 years and we the public have no clue what is in the lease. This is not acceptable to me as a taxpayer. Either make public or cancel it.
163. Keep the Ontario Science Centre where it is and add in satellite ones on Ontario Place!
164. What other sites for a Therme spa were considered around the province?
165. This project would be perfect at the CNE which badly needs a new life. Will the city of Toronto offer the CNE to Therme and Ontario Place can remain as a public space and the Ontario science centre could remain on site in Don Mills?
166. On the record, I remain against the development of the West Island by Therme and feel that it would be better placed *away* from the waterfront. I just want to be clear - I do not want this. You need to consider that many Torontonians do not have access to cottages and other waterfront areas. This needs to be for a growing population to have access to natural parkland.
167. Should Therme move on when profits are not there what happens to the building?
168. I disagree with the comments made by the applicant for there Ontario Science Centre. The Ontario Science Centre has not had received appropriate funding for years. It is not a business case to scrap the existing location by funding cuts and neglect.
169. What is wrong with moving tourists around Toronto? Why is clustering at waterfront needed?
170. The Ontario Science Centre is a gem in Toronto and it is an asset where it is. As a parent it will be too busy for me to take my children to Ontario Place to visit the Ontario Science Centre. Currently it is in an accessible location. As a taxpayer I would not like to see the Ontario Science Centre moved.
171. Moving the Ontario Science Centre robs other neighbourhoods in Toronto and takes away economically from these neighbourhoods. Not everything has to be located downtown. Leave the Ontario Science Centre where it is and create satellite site. No where close to size or capacity of current Ontario Science Centre.
172. [Name redacted], Toronto does not want Raymond Moriyama's SC to be torn down, diminished, moved, HELLO!
173. Sorry but the Province is trying to bamboozle us - people are not going to go to the spa and Ontario Science Centre. To move the Ontario Science Centre to justify the business case for Ontario Place is just wrong. Ontarians. And just as the Crosstown is due to arrive.
174. Will Toronto's drinking water be used by Therme to fill its pools, hot tubs, laundry facilities and water its palm trees? If so, how does this model support the City's environmental policies and model responsible use of our most precious resource?
175. Who benefits from the parking revenue?
176. Can the neighbourhood accommodate that many more cars in the area? It already has significant traffic issues.
177. Who will get the revenue from the parking fees?
178. [Names redacted], you are not talking to your audience as though they are obtuse.

179. How many people walk from the Black Creek subway station to Black Creek Village? What is the break down of the various modes to the Black Creek Village tourist attraction.
180. What kind of independent environmental and traffic study has been undertaken by the City or Province?
181. Is the Province liable for repairs if the Therme spa is ever flooded or damaged due to significant storm activity, which we can expect to happen as we see increasingly severe storms due to climate change? Similarly, how much will the ongoing cost to maintain the ridiculous underground parking structure be, with expected increased storm activity? An underground structure built right on the lake cannot be cheap to maintain.
182. [Name redacted], I do believe that the parking lot was originally for the Therme Spa. Regardless of which service people will attend Ontario Place, the parking lot only encourages more driving in an area that is already extremely busy!
183. We heard from the alternative idea for Ontario Place that the parking spaces in Exhibition Place could be integrated and available via a bridge connecting the two sites. Is this a consideration on the table?
184. How would an environmental assessment ever consider removing old growth trees as feasible.
185. How many users does Therme need a day to make it profitable?
186. Can we see the environmental assessment that Therme is conducting? Please share on the website for public viewing.
187. Regarding the earlier comment about Ontario Place being an “accessible” destination compared to the Ontario Science Centre’s current location, how is that attainable given the Lakeshore and Strachan Avenue are frequently overwhelmed or even closed during events at the Exhibition grounds? Are road changes planned to allow visitors to [visit]?
188. The rules can be changed, so that Therme can be subject to an environmental assessment (EA) as we have seen this government change rules for other things. So, if Therme is mirroring the EA then can they share exactly what is being done? Will the Province be open to changing the rules so that an EA can be done to allow the public to trust the process?
189. The Ontario Science Centre is perfectly located in the middle of the city with good access from all areas for schools trips, local citizens and even tourists. It will be a great mistake to move it to Ontario Place and bring another big attraction downtown, specially when we have so much traffic now and it will be a lot worse later on.
190. How can residents be confident that the proposal will not be approved through an Minister’s Zoning Orders regardless of public consultation? Will the applicant commit to following standard process and not applying for an Minister’s Zoning Orders?
191. Have these design changes been reviewed with the people at Swim OP (Swim Ontario Place)? Will there be a CLEAN beach that they can continue to swim at?
192. The question about why not use taxpayer money to renew the west island without the intervention of Therme?
193. How are you going to increase transit use without improve transit. All I see is just a bus. Is still seasonal ? Will the bus run during Toronto Indy? Will there be a bus from the Exhibition/Ontario line transit stop?
194. How much is Therme paying for the lease?
195. Sorry to be late if this was covered... How was it decided to build a huge spa on this land in the first place? What need is it filling?
196. Good evening, question about the 800-plus trees currently on West Island. What will be done with them?

197. I am a member of SwimOP group and, like many other Torontonians, regularly use the beach for swimming. Can you explain how replacing the existing pebble beach with a sand beach next to the sewer pipe a fair trade? Sewer is just one issue.
198. I'm concerned about the grove of pine trees on West Island. It's a key feature of Michael Hough's heritage landscape. Nowhere else in Toronto can we sit below pines with a view of the lake, listening to the waves. How does applicant justify destroying these trees?
199. The Therme building scheme traces the West Island's perimeter leaving only circulation spaces around the periphery. It would be nice to include a significant public space as in a 'Place', similar to the Forum Fountain on the East Island.
200. The rooftop public space is a joke as was voiced at the in-person public consultation, there is no biomass there! Yes, outside looking in, bad.
201. Cement, cement & more cement, design, seating, fountains - what happens to the nature?
202. The rooftop on which the "park" is designed, this is a rooftop to what structure?
203. So yes, concrete is permeability- That is a lot of concrete! No thanks
204. Not a question, permeability does address heat island....
205. Correction, permeability does NOT address heat island.
206. The building still looks tall- and it looks like it sits further out into the lake- further blocking views of the lake?
207. The park is being taken away from the people of Ontario. There is currently beautiful green space, trees, and a wonderful beach. Why all the concrete? It actually looks ugly and not very welcoming. Why would someone come there for leisure? The only people that may use it are the guests of Therme Spa. How will you encourage and invite the general public to the area if the green space is minimal? Please do not tell me that the green roof top is value added green space. It is hot and unwelcoming.
208. A balance between culture and nature or a balance between commerce and non profit space?
209. The City of Toronto had a mandate to achieve 40% canopy cover by 2050. Does the proposed changes result in more than 40% canopy cover?
210. Who pays for the landscaping, over what timeframe would it be established and what is the budget for this?
211. City of Toronto, can you look at canopy cover before and after?
212. Why is Therme determined to build on our waterfront and not other locations that would be suitable in the city? It is not something that fits with the natural setting.
213. [Name redacted] - large traffic area, like HC(?) chaos between pedestrians, cyclists, ouch!
214. Just curious what gift the applicants got the Premier's daughter at the stag and doe?
215. Where will school bus park?
216. With respect to Live Nation - if hundreds of people are expected, the exit to shore appears too small in the event of an emergency (fire, shooting, etc.) A second exit (even if only for emergencies or end-of-show) on the west side of that venue toward the north shore boardwalk seems to be wise.
217. Where will school buses park?
218. The idea of moving the Ontario Science Centre does not seem to be well thought out, can you please explain why it is being moved to Ontario Place?

219. Shame on you by not answering about the unnecessary move of the Ontario Science Centre
220. What considerations are being made for migratory birds given the large amounts of glass in the Therme buildings, in addition to other wildlife/marine life that may be affected during development?
221. Daytime drop offs in downtown Toronto is VERY different than the current Don Mills (easily accessible from highways) location. More consultation required!
222. FYI I live in North York. I don't consider any part of the lakeshore as the centre of the city
223. [Name redacted] we like it [Ontario Place] just the way it is, don't [change] it!
224. Will we received individual answers to questions we posted in Q&A Box? Will a record of our questions be kept and used in future planning and considerations?
225. We have High Park that is used by many, and it has a diversity of experiences. Why can't Ontario Place be left as a green space, with its current trees, waterfront access, and flora and fauna? It is good for our mental health to have access to such green space in a growing city. Why can't Therme move, rather than everything that is there already having to move?
226. I would be much more for this revitalization if there was more integration with the existing beautiful tree population. I've been impressed by some of the landscape experts yet today we should respect old trees and integrate them into this design. Environmental fundamental don't cut down trees unnecessarily. Please integrate.
227. Green roof - expensive, hardly doable, not sustainable, no biomass, no mature trees for many years...
228. The lakeshore is a brutal place to be during the winter months, but illustrations of busy plazas show little protection from wind and cold. The rooftop "parks" are equally open. The current landscape incorporates protection from the elements year round. If Infrastructure Ontario and Therme expect to have visitors year round, how will it keep non-paying visitors comfortable?
229. Yes, maintain the West Island as a free public space. This Spa should not be on this unique public piece of land.
230. How will the green roof be sheltered from the very aggressive and ever changing weather that occurs at the waterfront?
231. Looking at the revised master plan, assuming it's to scale, can't Therme spa just go where the Plaza and Ontario Science Centre is being proposed?
232. People will swim where they want to swim.
233. Is Therme paying for improvements to the East Island? If so, how will this be monitored? Who will look after upkeep?
234. Why is the building so unpleasant to look at? If this is to be replacing the existing heritage of Ontarians why can't the building at least look good?
235. Michael Hough's West Island Beach has not eroded since it was created, spin!, Lies!
236. Get rid of the spa then you could make a fantastic public beach - put the money toward that, especially because of climate change Toronto residents need more clean urban beaches.
237. Jeff Craft (Studio TLA) it is a unique opportunity for you, but not for Ontarians it is already a unique place right in our city. We do not need concrete there, nor a rooftop park. And you not work with what is already there? Make it like a cottage space for those who do not have an opportunity for a getaway out of the city?

238. Lake levels depend on St. Lawrence locks. The watershed only goes up to about the town of Palgrave. It's a very stable water levels. The berms on West Island are good. And a whole datum shift is not that necessary, except to account for the Therme program.
239. Follow up to [Name redacted] about my questions about the rooftop. You may be excited about this innovation but my 30+ years of engineering and strategic planning says be skeptical about all the complexity if it hasn't been done. It will backfire \$\$\$
240. The rooftop on which the "park" is designed. This is a rooftop to what structure?
241. Why chop down all the trees then?
242. Nobody wants this, why do you pursue?
243. Why palm trees? We already have trees that grow naturally in Ontario.
244. What, if any, are you sustaining about the current site, vs. replanting, re-establishing green space. I am not clear about sustainability plans vs. destruction followed by reconstruction?
245. Thanks, so much [Name redacted] et al. - I'll share whatever I know.
246. Are you folks so invested in making billions of \$\$\$?
247. Why must the spa be so very large and tall? It does not fit in with the setting. Can Therme, or is Therme and the Province willing to find another suitable location that is not on our waterfront?
248. Swimming area on south side of Ontario Place appears to have better water quality - please take a look at River House in Ottawa, also Paris/Helsinki/Gord Downy Pier for beautiful safe deep water swimming options. Some public water features are lovely, but the Therme building, moving the Ontario Science Centre and building parking garages are huge concerns. Existing Ontario Place went into disrepair - could it happen again were there another Pandemic? Downtown green space more sustainable/needed than spa.
249. Light pollution is a huge problem in the city. Be kind to wildlife and people who want to see the night sky.
250. Why is the spa still larger than the Cinesphere?
251. Likewise, why are the walkways 2/3 the height of the Cinesphere?
252. Two large glass domes lit up at night and appearing like a fly through during the day are not compatible with bird life and its migration.
253. Given the depth of the Lake bed on this shore how can you justify the cost of building and the ongoing cost of maintenance. There is sound reason to move the Ontario Science Centre.
254. Why aren't the costs of proposed parking lot being shared by all the infrastructure that they will benefit from? Both Therme and Live Nation should be contributing.
255. No sound reason to move the Ontario Science Centre.
256. Why isn't expanded parking underground being considered at CNE parking lot grounds?
257. Infrastructure Ontario has a responsibility to tell Ontario taxpayers what will happen if this project fails. Ontarians will be left with a huge "unique" functionally specific structure. The province needs to give more due diligence to this possibility. "Whatever" is not an adequate response to concerns expressed about this kind of outcome.
258. Just put your spa somewhere else.

259. Why won't Therme choose a new location, instead of removing hundreds of trees.
260. I am very saddened that we are not able to see others comments and questions. It feels very much like we are being controlled and not heard.
261. If non-auto usage is being encouraged, why is a parking lot being built? It seems to me that by building the parking lot you are encouraging cars [Name redacted].
262. The earlier point about being on the outside looking in hasn't been addressed. Especially since the private for pay space is a spa, a luxury. The design includes this have not divide. Not something that will help us in Toronto as climate impacts worsen and we need to come together. Please take this up in your working teams and look for ways to mitigate this class divisiveness.
263. Is there a way to get the public involved in the landscaping? For example, adding bricks with names on it or involved in tree planting, gardens.