

Summary Report: Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group Meeting #3

December 6, 2025, 10:00 am – 1:00 pm

Metro Hall, Room 308-309

55 John St, Toronto, M5V 3C6 and via Teams





VISION

WHO?

NEXT STEPS

WHY?



Contents

- About the Meeting and this Report..... 1
- Discussion Highlights2
- Detailed Feedback3
 - Updated Draft Terms of Reference Feedback.....3
 - Questions and Other Process Feedback9
 - Member Updates 10
- Appendices..... 11

About the Meeting and this Report

On Saturday, December 6, 2025, the City of Toronto's Parks and Recreation Division hosted the third meeting of 2025 with the Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group. The purpose of the meeting was to share and seek feedback on a revised Draft Terms of Reference for the working group. The Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group is one of three groups the City of Toronto is convening to advise on and support the implementation of the Toronto Island Park Plan.

17 of about 30 working group members participated in the meeting. Tom Davidson from Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's office also attended the meeting. Netami Stuart (Senior Project Manager, Toronto Island, Parks and Recreation), chaired the meeting and provided an overview presentation along with Nadia Galati (Senior Public Consultation Coordinator, Parks and Recreation), the working group coordinator. Ian Malczewski and Adrien Hall from Third Party Public facilitated the meeting. See Appendix A for a full list of Working Group members and participants.

The meeting began with a Land Acknowledgement and African Ancestral Acknowledgement, followed by presentations and plenary, small group, and virtual discussions. After the discussions, Netami, Nadia, and Ian thanked everyone for their feedback, and Ian reminded participants to provide additional feedback by December 16, saying a draft meeting summary would be shared with participants for review after the feedback deadline. See Appendix B for the Meeting Agenda.

Third Party Public prepared this summary for participant review; it is not intended as a verbatim transcript. This summary was shared for participant review in draft before being finalized.

Discussion Highlights

The following points summarize key takeaways and themes of the feedback shared during the meeting. They are meant to be read as part of the more detailed summary that follows.

The Draft Terms of Reference are much improved. Generally, participants said the Terms of Reference were a big improvement on what the City had shared in the previous meeting. Several said that the group could move on for now and revisit the Terms of Reference after the City and the group have lived with it for a while. There were still a few areas where they wanted additional refinements and clarifications, including the composition of and perspectives represented on the group, the City's Code of Conduct and its potential use in non-HRAP decision-making around membership, and more.

Interest in maintaining diverse representation requirements on the group. Participants agreed with the removal of the demographic "shopping list" that had appeared in the previous draft of the Terms of Reference, but said it was important for the Terms of Reference to name the spectrum of diverse communities whose perspectives need to be included on the group, especially given that the project team composition and demographics of Hanlan's Point Beach users could change over time.

Agreement that organizations should be able to delegate alternate representatives. Participants said organizations should be able to identify alternate representatives to attend meetings on their behalf so that there is continuity of participation if a primary representative cannot attend for any reason. A few said that the Terms of Reference need to clarify or address potential imbalances of influence between civic lottery members and organizations (especially given civic lottery members' term limits).

Some support for adding working group members' "beach stories" to meeting agendas. A few members supported the City's proposal to have working group members share their Beach Story as part of meeting agendas, though they said these stories should be connected to timely projects and/or decision-making, not an opportunity for general storytelling.

Interest in having non-City public agency staff attend meetings, such as TRCA and PortsTO, so that working group members and these agencies can hear directly from each other when relevant.

Detailed Feedback

This section captures feedback shared at the meeting as well as the feedback shared in writing after the meeting. It includes sections summarizing feedback about the Draft Terms of Reference, Other Questions and Feedback, and Feedback shared during Member Updates. Responses from the project team, where given, are *in italics*.

Updated Draft Terms of Reference Feedback

The discussion in the meeting focused almost entirely on the updated Draft Terms of Reference. The City began by thanking participants for their critical feedback on the previous draft and said it had made many changes to the draft in an effort to respond.

Overall feedback

Generally, participants were comfortable with the revised Draft Terms of Reference, with some saying it was a big improvement. While some things may still need to change, it's good for now — the City and group should work together guided by the Terms of Reference, see what works and what doesn't, and consider revisiting it once everyone has seen how it works in practice.

Participants also suggested refinements and clarifications that they thought would be important to include in a final Terms of Reference. This feedback is summarized below, organized under the relevant section of the presented framework.

Structural and overall suggestions

- Be consistent throughout the document when referring to the different types of working group members. Terms like “groups,” “organizations,” and “community representatives” are used interchangeably which is confusing.
- Consider moving the entirety of Section 5 – Agenda-Setting Protocol to a subsection of Section 8 – Procedures
- Consider making the entirety of Section 8 an Appendix or Attachment to the Terms of Reference

Section 1. Project Context

- Include specific references to Friends of Hanlan's in the first paragraph, including:
 - between “from” and “community members”

- between “formal requests from” and “community members and an unprecedented...”

Section 2. Objective

- Remove the word “small” from the opening sentence that reads: “Parks & Recreation (P&R) aims to give a small, diverse group of Hanlan’s Beach users the opportunity to work with staff to advance the Toronto Island Park Plan and provide informed perspectives on day-to-day beach operations and management.”

Section 3. Mandate

- Add the word “on” between “Advise” and “the appropriateness” in the fourth bullet point that reads: “Advise the appropriateness and desirability of projects not identified in the Toronto Island Park Plan or proposed by third parties, including businesses, community groups, private citizens, or other Working Group members.”

Section 4. Membership

Section 4.2 Composition

Up-front section

- Concern that the membership of organizational representatives and individual community members selected through civic lottery is not horizontal – those that have to rotate out are at a disadvantage as they will have to advocate without resources.
- Change “At the time of selection” to “As of November 2025” in the first sentence.
- Change “nudists” to “naturists/nudists,” add “women and femme folk,” and add “environmentalist” to the second bullet point.
- Consider adding language recognizing that the Federation of Canadian Naturists includes family interests, and other represented organizations may also intersectionally include family interests.
- Consider adding language requiring representatives of groups or organizations connected to Hanlan’s Point Beach from boating, family, and disability communities to also belong to 2SLGBTQ+ or naturist/nudist communities to protect those core communities’ interests.
- Consider preserving the list of Working Group member types (beach users, representatives of groups of organizations, and members-at-large) but removing the specific numbers associated with each.
- Explain the origin of “members at large” and who they are.

Selection Criteria

- Change “gender” to “gender identity” or “gender diversity” in the sentence reading “...selection will follow equity, inclusion, and broad representation, considering

gender, sexuality, ethnicity, disability, age, and experiences of beach use (including clothing-optional participation).

- Support for the removal of the demographic “shopping list” and instead including a statement indicating that the spectrum of demographic and ethnographic diversity of the community across the city needs to be represented on the group (with demographic categories named).

Organizational and Community Representation

- Support for organizations being able to delegate alternate individuals to attend on their behalf.
- Consider adding an explanation of how each organization has contributed / contributes to Hanlan’s Point Beach.
- Clarify whether organizations with two “seats” only have one vote (with several participants saying this should be the case so that organizations do not outweigh the individual participants).
- Create a provision that enables Working Group members to identify and add other organizational and community representatives.
- Add a note that there will be “1 representative for each organization unless noted otherwise.”
- Add “Hanlan’s” before MWEZ Community Watch.
- Add “(x2) after the “Federation of Canadian Naturists” in the list of organizations.

Section 4.4 Termination of Membership

Section 4.4.2 - Termination related to Human Rights and Anti-discrimination Policy (HRAP)

- Clarify which section of the City’s HRAP policy (external versus internal) will apply.
- Consider also adding the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA) as a policy that would apply.
- Add “at a meeting” to the end of the first sentence that reads “If a concern arises that a member has violated the City’s Human Rights & Anti-Discrimination Policy” (so as to not be applied broadly across all communications between members and the City).

Section 4.4.3 Termination for Non-HRAP Reasons (Participation or Conduct Issues)

- Reconsider whether “participation or conduct issues” should be grounds for removal – some concern that the Code of Conduct (Section 8.5) could be used as a rationale for a working group member to be removed based on “vibes.”
- If including “chronic non-attendance” as a criterion for removal, this term needs to be clearly defined.

Section 4.5 Vacancies

- Add the words “resigns or” after “civic lottery” the first sentence that reads, “If a Working Group member selected through civic lottery has their participation terminated before the end of their term, a replacement member will be randomly selected from amongst the pool of applicants who originally applied to participate in that term of the panel.”
- Remove the final sentence that says, “There is no requirement to replace group representatives who are terminated.”

Section 4.7 Term and Schedule

- Clarify why the one-year break for lottery-selected members is required, with some concern that this break could disrupt continuity of feedback. Consider removing the one-year break if a working group member has been deemed to have made “significant contributions.”
- Consider adding a provision or note that there will be an evaluation of the group at the end of its term.
- Add the exact dates for the working group terms.
- Add “or members at large” after “community representatives” in the sentence, “Working Group members who are community representatives will not be subject to term limits.”
- Add “lottery-selected” after “each” in the sentence that reads, “The end of each member’s term will occur at the end of the beach season so that opportunities to participate in the next civic lottery can be appropriately advertised to beachgoers.”

Section 4.8 Meeting Location

- Change “gender-neutral” to “gender-neutral/single-stall washrooms” and add that “members will be notified in advance if such washrooms will not be available.”

Section 5 – Agenda-Setting Protocol

Member-Proposed topics

- Consider changing the lead time for members to propose agenda topics to 1 week in advance of a meeting, adding a provision that allows members to propose a topic once a draft agenda has been circulated (with a 2-day cut-off before the meeting).
- Consider changing the 10 minutes allocated to “Other Business” to 30 minutes.
- Consider identifying and holding space on the agenda for non-City agencies (like the TRCA, PortsTO) to come and share updates and make sure these agencies are receiving meeting summaries.

- Some support to include individual group members’ “Beach Stories” as part of future agendas, provided these are specific to current projects or decision-making processes on the agenda.
- Add the word “relevant” after “members may propose” in the sentence reading: “Members may propose discussion topics by emailing the Chair or Coordinator at least two (2) weeks before a scheduled meeting.”
- Add the word “relevant” before the word “items” in the sentence reading: Agendas will include ten minutes for “Other Business,” during which members may raise additional items.

Section 6 – Roles and Responsibilities

- Add a note that working group members should be able to pass information and questions (and receive immediate answers) about immediate issues, like environmental degradation.
- Add a note that “Members are also expected to prepare themselves in advance of meetings.”

Section 6.1 Responsibilities of Working Group Members

Community Engagement vs Lobbying

- Clarify that “external interests” does not include the interests of represented organizations or their members.
- Remove “personal” in the sentence reading: “Members must not use their position to secure personal, financial, or business benefits, nor advocate for decisions that advance external interests.”

Section 6.2 Responsibilities of Parks & Recreation

- Indicate in this section that City staff cannot vote.

Public Communication

- Consider adding that group members get formal approval on communications attributed to the group before these communications are shared with media.

Reporting accountability

- Consider adding a time timeline for City follow-up if working group recommendations are not adopted.

Section 7. Meetings with Staff

- Simplify the wording in the final sentence to say members are not limited in their ability to meet “with members of Council of their staff.”

Section 8. Procedures

- Consider moving this whole section to an Appendix or a separate document.
- State that there is an expectation that members read any material shared in advance (and that project team presentations therefore do not have to provide detailed overviews of materials shared in advance). The priority of meeting time should be knowledge translation and exchange of opinions and feedback.

Section 8.4 Quorum

- Change the quorum requirement to 70% (not 73%) and remove the specific number of members (18) in this calculation
- For voting, consider allowing online voting after meetings and clarifying whether votes will be anonymous and private.

Section 8.5 Code of Conduct

- Some concern that the Code of Conduct is too subjective and broadly worded and could be used to terminate membership based on "vibes" (with a few saying the City's HRAP policy is sufficient and that this section may not be needed or could be simplified).
- Consider revising this section to focus more on goals and principles of respect, especially given semantic bleaching that sometimes happens in the communities represented on this group and the probability the working group members may bring passion to their criticism.
- Suggested text refinements:
 - Remove the second bullet ("Treat all members and staff with respect, including during disagreements") as it is very similar to the first, which is less open to interpretation ("Listen actively and keep an open mind by valuing a diversity of views and experiences"). At a minimum, either define or remove the word
 - "respect" in the second bullet.
 - Remove "not individuals" from the third bullet point stating "Focus on ideas, not individuals, when offering feedback or critique."
 - Remove "communicate respectfully, avoiding cursing or" and begin the sentence with "Avoid" in the fourth bullet stating "Communicate respectfully, avoiding cursing or behaviour that disrupts the meeting." The group is made up of adults.
 - Define what "listen actively" means and what constitutes "disruptive behaviour."

Section 8.6 Meeting Format

- Add a note that "Materials provided in advance to members need not be presented or reviewed in detail at the meeting."

- Consider adding that another member needs to second a request to vote on a specific item.

Section 8.8 Openness and In-Camera

- Some participants were not sure whether in-camera meetings would be needed or appropriate.

Section 8.9 Guiding Document and Meeting Summaries

- Clarify what happens if 75% of working group members do not approve Meeting Summaries.

Section 9.0 Modification of Terms

- Suggestion that the modification of terms should be approved at the consensus level rather than the majority level.

Questions and Other Process Feedback

Questions about the Terms of Reference

Participants asked a few questions about the Terms of Reference, including:

- Why was the previous Draft Terms of Reference written the way it was? *The City said that its previous version was an adaptation of the Terms of Reference City Planning used for its Planning Review Panel. The City used this model in an effort to reflect that it was trying to do something different with this working group and that the group will meet over the long-term, not just for a one-off capital project. The City added that the Planning Review Panel may not have been the right model for this group and the changes made since the previous meeting represent its efforts to better align the model with the group's preferences.*
- What were the roles of City staff and Third Party Public in preparing the updated Draft Terms of Reference? *Third Party Public said its role was to prepare a detailed summary of feedback shared in and after the November 5 meeting, integrate that feedback into a Draft Summary Report for both the City and participants (circulated earlier in the week), and provide a structure for the City to use when sharing how the feedback had informed its revisions. The City said that it had worked with the feedback shared by working group members (as summarized by Third Party Public) to prepare the updated draft.*

Feedback about the “yearbook”

Participants shared a range of perspectives about the City’s proposed idea to develop a “yearbook,” Guiding Document, or website highlighting working group members’ faces, names, and bios. Perspectives shared included:

- This seems like a nice thought, but it would be preferable to get to work since the group will have spent almost two years getting set up and discussing Terms of Reference.
- If the City pursues this idea, it needs to carefully consider to what degree consistency of working group member representation in the yearbook will be required given that some working group members will want their names, faces, and bios associated with the work and others would prefer to be anonymous to maintain their privacy. Consider requesting all working group members to submit initials in place of full names.

Other process feedback

Other suggestions participants shared included:

- Consider adding a Terms of Reference check-in meeting mid-year for the group to review and assess how things are going.
- Make sure participants attending virtually have a good audio experience. The handheld microphones provided poor audio quality for those online.
- Consider creating a Microsoft Teams Work Group or similar group chat platform for communication in between meetings.
- Consider developing asynchronous voting tools so that, if people aren’t present in a meeting, the lack of a vote does not stall progress.
- On future meeting agendas, include a) the meeting link so that participants don’t miss it in their inboxes and b) whether the meeting venue has gender-neutral/single stall washrooms.

Member Updates

As part of the Member Updates part of the meeting, a few working group members told the City that beavers have been doing a lot of damage to trees near Hanlan’s Point Beach and that someone should inform the TRCA. They added that they would like to see the TRCA revisit its “no cull” policy if there is significant environmental impact from wildlife.

Appendices

Appendix A. List of Meeting Participants

City of Toronto

Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager,
Toronto Island – *Chair*
Nadia Galati, Senior Public Consultation
Coordinator – *Coordinator*

Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's Office

Tom Davidson, Director, Waterfront
Revitalization Initiatives

Facilitation Team

Third Party Public

Adrien Hall
Ian Malczewski

Working Group Members

*Note that the organizations and individuals in **bold** participated in the meeting.*

Organizations

Federation of Canadian Naturists
Friends of Hanlan's
Hanlan's Collective
Lez Beach

MWEZ Community Watch
Pride Toronto
The 519
Trans Lobby Group/Toronto Trans Coalition

Members At-Large

Cheri DiNovo
Peter Gray

Peter Simm

Community Members

Lisa Amin
Alan Drummond
Emilio Estevez
Cappucine Ferguson
David Rubio Gomes
Atticus Hawk
Anjali Iddamsetty
Blaine Lamorandiere

Jamie Lavery
Jessica Martin
David McIntosh
Mikiki
Faelix
Homa Parwana
Aditya Singhal

Appendix B. Meeting Agenda

Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group Meeting #3

Toronto Island Park Plan Implementation
Saturday, December 6, 2025
10:00 am –12:30 pm
Metro Hall, Room 308/309
55 John St, Toronto, M5V 3C6



Proposed meeting agenda

10:00 AM Acknowledgements

Welcome and agenda review

Netami Stuart, City of Toronto
Ian Malczewski, Third Party Public

10:10 Proposed Updated Draft Terms of Reference

Netami Stuart and Nadia Galati, City of Toronto

- What we heard
- Overview of proposed updates
- Next steps in finalizing the Terms of Reference

10:40 *Questions of clarification*

10:45 Discussion

1. How comfortable are you with the proposed updated Draft Terms of Reference? Does the rationale for where we've landed make sense to you?
2. What other refinements (if any) would you suggest?
3. Do you have any other comments or advice?

11:45 Report back and plenary discussion

12:20 Member updates and next steps

12:30 PM Adjourn

Until 13:00 Additional time if required

Meeting purpose

To share and seek feedback on an updated Draft Terms of Reference for the Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group.

Resources

[Toronto Island Park Plan Project Website](#)