

# Summary Report: Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group Meeting #2

November 5, 2025, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

Metro Hall, Room 308-309

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





VISION

WHO?

NEXT STEPS

WHY?



# Contents

- Meeting Details ..... 1
- Discussion Highlights.....2
- Detailed Feedback .....3
- Part 1. Feedback on the Draft Terms of Reference .....3
- Part 2. Feedback on Bike Share Stations .....7
- Part 3. Process Advice .....9
- Part 4. Questions of Clarification .....9
- Next Steps ..... 10

Appendices

- Appendix A. List of Meeting Participants
- Appendix B. Meeting Agenda

# Meeting Details

---

On Wednesday, November 5, 2025, the City of Toronto's Parks and Recreation Division hosted the second Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- introduce new members selected through a civic lottery;
- share process updates related to three working groups;
- provide an overview and a status update on the Toronto Island Park Plan projects;
- seek feedback on Bike Share station locations by the beach; and
- start a discussion on the draft proposed Terms of Reference.

Eighteen (of 29) members of the working group participated in the meeting in person and online. Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik and Tom Davidson also attended the meeting. Netami Stuart (Senior Project Manager, Toronto Island, Parks and Recreation), chaired the meeting and provided an overview presentation. Yulia Pak, Adrien Hall, and Stephanie Quezada from Third Party Public facilitated the meeting. Nadia Galati (Senior Public Consultation Coordinator, Parks and Recreation) attended as the working group coordinator. See Appendix A for a full list of Working Group members, including those who participated.

The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix B to this report. This summary report includes:

- Discussion Highlights
- Detailed Feedback
- Part 1. Feedback on the Draft Terms of Reference
- Part 2. Feedback on Bike Share Stations
- Part 3. Process Advice
- Part 4. Questions of Clarification
- Appendix A. List of Meeting Participants
- Appendix B. Meeting Agenda

Third Party Public prepared this summary. The summary was reviewed by meeting participants in draft before it was 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.

- There was a strong call to rethink and refine the draft Terms of Reference. The general sentiment shared at the meeting was that the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) were top-heavy, overly rigorous, inconsistent with the overarching City policies and unclear in certain sections. Generally, participants wanted to see a more horizontal approach to roles and responsibilities and a more concise document. Some said that the draft ToR did not reflect on the feedback shared at the Re-set Meeting. It was also noted that some sections, as currently drafted, may preclude some members from participating in the Working Group.
- The P&R team thanked participants for their feedback and noted the importance of working together to create Terms of Reference that everyone can agree and encouraged participants to provide additional feedback in writing. The P&R team re-emphasized their commitment to working with participant feedback to inform next steps.
- There was a range of opinions about the number and the locations of Bike Share stations along the beach. Some participants liked seeing Bike Share on the Island for convenience and were especially interested in seeing cargo bikes added along with maintenance and repair stations. Others expressed concern about loose bikes blocking accessible routes, and that more Bike Share stations may attract more people resulting in damage to the dunes. Participants shared suggestions to avoid overcrowding, ensure better protection of the natural environment, and improve accessibility.

# Detailed Feedback

---

This section captures feedback shared at the meeting as well as the feedback shared after the meeting in writing. The feedback captured in this section is not a verbatim transcript. Answers from City staff are noted in *italics*.

## Part 1. Feedback on the Draft Terms of Reference

**Overall, there was a strong call to rethink and refine the draft Terms of Reference.** The general sentiment shared at the meeting was that the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) were top-heavy, overly rigorous, inconsistent with the overarching City policies and unclear in certain sections. Generally, participants wanted to see a more horizontal approach to roles and responsibilities and a more concise document. It was noted that the draft ToR did not reflect well the feedback shared at the Re-set Meeting, particularly around the need for transparency and honesty from the City. It was also noted that some sections, as currently drafted, may preclude some members from participating in the Working Group.

Participants shared the following suggestions for the draft Terms of Reference:

### General

- Consider including an amending formula.
- Consider using a shorter name and moniker for this working group. After the full name of the group has been identified at the beginning of the document, for brevity and convenience, consider replacing subsequent occurrences of the full name with the term “the Group”.

### Section 1. Context

- Recognize the broader community effort, including the group’s prominent individuals and groups, such as the Friends of Hanlan’s and thousands of people, who contributed to the Island Park Plan work and the formation of this group. It is not just the City-led community consultation.

### Section 4.1 Recruitment

- Confirm and clarify that 12 (not 15-20) spots in this group are reserved for users of Hanlan’s Point Beach (not the “Toronto Island Park”) selected through Civic Lottery.

### Section 4.2 Composition

- Include disabilities in the criteria. There are many various disabilities – visible and invisible. Explicitly including different disabilities makes a big difference, especially if convenors and implementors are not disabled.

- Remove the civic lottery demographic criteria, as this group is intended to be long-term, and the make-up of the city will continue evolving. Include an explanation that the selection criteria for individual members were based on the demographic data related to surveys.

### **Section 4.3 Eligibility**

- Explain the reasons for excluding members of the Council Advisory Body. For example, if someone serves on the 2SLGBTQ+ Advisory Committee and the Accessibility Committee, would they be allowed to join this working group, or would there be a conflict? If so, what is the conflict?
- Explain the reasons for excluding former members of Hanlan's Working Group from participating for future terms. Restricting former members is limiting the talent pool. Instead, consider term breaks or alternative approaches to allow new organizations to come in without precluding the former members from applying.
- Consider a leave of absence clause.

### **Section 4.4 Termination of membership**

- If the City is expecting Working Group members to abide by the City's Human Rights and Anti-Harassment/Discrimination (HRAP) policy, then the ToR should abide by the City's HRAP procedures. Provide clarity if:
  - the termination of working group members is triggered after a complaint through the City's HRAP procedures and the following investigation, or if the process begins and is managed at the P&R Staff's discretion (as outlined in the draft ToR);
  - the termination would depend on the type of incident and the guidance of the HRO office;
  - the working group members forego the remedies and procedures for the complainant and respondent, if they agree to these ToR.
- Remove the role of the Councillor in determining membership termination if terminations are related to contravening HRAP, or include a clear role for the Councillor if termination of membership follows the procedure led by PF&R staff.
- Voting on membership termination is in direct contravention of confidentiality requirements and other HRAP procedures the City must follow. Provide clarity on how voting to terminate membership would unfold. For example, a member is accused of harassment, but only 65% vote in favour of removing the member. How does that impact the complainant's and the respondent's ability to continue to participate in the process?

#### **Section 4.5 Replacement of Working Group Members**

- Provide clarity on the replacement of working group members representing organizations and the organizations themselves.

#### **Section 4.7 Term and Schedule**

- Consider 1/3 – 1/2 of lottery members to be cycled out every year (after the initial two-year term). Having all lottery members' terms end at the same time and having to reorient everyone at the same time would lose momentum and institutional memory.
- Consider aligning the term with the term of City Council.
- Consider allowing one renewal.

#### **Section 5. Agenda-setting Protocol / Topics for Discussion**

- To respect members' time, members should receive the agenda and all related materials a minimum of five business days before the meeting.

#### **Section 6. Roles and Responsibilities**

- Roles, restrictions and responsibilities need to be more horizontal – e.g. conditions, requirements and protections need to apply to everyone equally.
- It should be everyone's responsibility, including City staff and facilitators, to understand the history of this group and its evolution.
- Provide clarity on who the facilitators will be at each meeting and their role for this term and beyond.

#### **Section 6.1 Responsibilities of Working Group members**

- Re-think the restriction on "replicating, paraphrasing or commenting on the views... of other members". It is not possible for the organizational reporting structure. Consider the Chatham House Rules approach for not naming who said what explicitly.
- It should be permitted for any member(s) to have a full, candid discussion with any other member(s) even outside a Working Group meeting.
- Provide clarity on "lobbying from impacted parties". Explain how the City is making a distinction between members acting as messengers of information to/from their communities and "lobbying".
- Provide clarity on "trading in influence" – e.g. if a member meets for a conversation with Nieuport Aviation, would it be considered "trading in influence"?

#### **Section 6.2 Responsibilities of P&R Division**

- Provide clarity on due consideration of members' feedback and how staff will report out to the group – and to council – on when/where/why you are not following the suggestions of the working group.

- Include a responsibility for P&R staff to keep members updated on significant decisions and developments related to the Island.

### **Section 7. Meetings with City Staff**

- Remove Section 7. It significantly limits members' ability to advocate and engage with any City staff on Island-related topics, compared to anyone else who is not on the working group. In addition, there is no certain way for working group members to know what topics may or may not be on the future agenda for quarterly meetings. This section limits how working group members can engage with the public service.
- Consider monthly meetings. 4 meetings a year is not sufficient if engagement with City staff is not permitted in between meetings.

### **Section 8.4 Quorum**

- Quorum should be standardized and not at the discretion of the Chair.

### **Section 8.5 Code of Conduct**

- Remove “patronizing” and “offensive” or provide clarity on who decides what feels “patronizing” and “offensive”? “Discriminatory” comments are not in the same category as “patronizing”, “offensive”.

### **Section 8.6 Meeting Format**

- Consider clearly stating that a vote to call can be asked for by any voting member, not at the discretion of the Chair.
- Any voting mechanism should come with clarity as to whether it is up to the Chair's discretion to hold the vote, and it should be noted.

### **Section 8.7 Consensus and Divergent Viewpoints**

- There is no need for such strict quorum and consensus requirements – the group is not writing and passing laws.
- The consensus of 70% might not be fair when there is an impact on a minority group, e.g. people with disabilities.
- The first two paragraphs overlap significantly. Consider combining them into one paragraph, as follows: “Although Working Group members need not reach full consensus, they will seek it to the greatest extent reasonably possible. Consensus means that, in the opinion of the Facilitator (or the Working Group as a whole), a clear majority—generally understood to be at least 70% of members in attendance—support or can live with a given position. Divergent views will be acknowledged and reflected in official summaries of input received. Members retain the right to question the Facilitator's or Project Team's assessment of whether consensus exists and whether a summary of the consensus position is accurate.”

## Section 8.8 Openness and In-Camera Proceedings

- It is unreasonable to ask people to include photos and names on the City's website – some have gotten death threats for their advocacy before. There are also safety and privacy concerns given the nudist nature of the beach and its site as a historic cruising ground.

## Section 8.11 Coordination with other Toronto Island Working Groups

- Presently, there are more HPBWG members than who are also members of the Island Working Group. Clarify if these members will be able to continue to be on both groups or only one cross-appointment will be allowed, and these members would have a choice on which group they would like to stay on.

# Part 2. Feedback on Bike Share Stations

**There was a range of opinions about the number and the locations of Bike Share stations.** Some participants supported the idea of having more Bike Share stations along the beach, noting that using bikes on the island is very convenient, improves accessibility, and that there is capacity and demand for more bike stations along the beach. Some noted Bike Share service, while great for tourists, fundamentally alters the experience for the islanders. Some said that they did not support more bike stations because more bikes would attract too many people, reduce privacy, and damage the natural environment. A particular concern was expressed about loose bikes blocking accessible pathways and being dragged into the dunes when no docks are available. Others emphasized the importance of creating a balance between preserving Hanlan's beach as a secluded clothing-optional oasis and creating more access. It was also noted that more information and context about Bike Share operations and the City's experience with it to date would better inform this discussion.

As part of the range of opinions, participants also shared the following feedback and advice:

### Location and accessibility suggestions

- **Consider locating stations further away from the popular spots to prevent overcrowding and to distribute beach use more evenly.** Overcrowding of the beach is a shared concern. A few participants suggested the Bike Share locations to be on the far ends of the beach, including the existing one at the far south end by the washrooms. With the stations at the far ends of the beach, the City could remove the station by the Mermaid café.
- **Consider locating the stations 300-500 m away from the beach access points, and not immediately by the beach.** Doing so would be less intrusive, and it would

also keep beach entrances more accessible for people with mobility issues, not having to navigate through docking stations and loose bikes.

- **Consider locating fully accessible covered docking stations for Bike Share bikes, personal bikes, and mobility aides close to the beach.** There is a need for fully covered docking stations with dedicated spaces reserved for mobility devices only. Locate a 24/7 self-service repair centre near them.

#### Maintenance and repair

- **It is important to ensure better maintenance of all Bike Share stations.** Often, the challenges with Bike Share bikes occur because many of the stations are broken, and users cannot dock the bikes.
- **Consider locating bike repair and pumping stations, as well as storage, at the docking stations for beach equipment.**

#### Signage & information

- **Consider signage and a pop-up notice on the Bike Share app to remind people not to drag bikes into the dunes.** People damaging the dunes and not respecting the natural environment on the bikes is a shared concern. While some advocated for stronger physical signs at the beach (e.g. “No bikes past this point”, “Do not dump bikes at the beach”) and digital pop-up reminders in the app not to drag the bikes through the dunes, others felt that signage is not currently effective on the island, and many island users break different rules.
- **Consider creating information points,** similar to the ones at CNE, on the locations of different stations, including Bike Share, pumping stations, and repair and maintenance stations.

#### Other important considerations

- **Provide bikes with increased cargo capacity that would allow people to bring items to the beach.** There was a strong desire from working group members to see rentals for trikes, cargo bikes, bikes with baskets and saddle bags that would allow people to bring items of various sizes to and from the beach, from lunches to coolers. It would add convenience and support a more sustainable use of the beach.
- **Consider safety for 2SLGBTQ+ communities and people of colour.** There have been reports that negative experiences with bikes at the stations (e.g. long wait time; lack of bike availability) on the island have resulted in aggression against 2SLGBTQ+ people and people of colour.

## Part 3. Process Advice

- **Do not use acronyms in presentations** and when presenting meeting materials. If acronyms are used, they need to be fully spelled out – verbally and in writing.
- **Consider not scheduling events on days significant to the Working Group members’ communities.** For example, November 20<sup>th</sup> is the Transgender Day of Remembrance.
- **Consider connecting with TransmassTO** to include more trans people in the group.
- **Clarify in the Re-Set Meeting summary that “police” refers to “marine police”** in the context of enforcement in watercraft exclusion zones.
- **Create a more COVID-safe environment for in-person meetings.** Include easily accessible N95 masks, consider masking requirements, and provide HEPA filters. A working group member offered their assistance with this task and noted that the provision of masks would also be useful on the beach for bird clean-up to prevent bird flu.

Answer provided by the City team: *We cannot commit to finding filters sized appropriately to the volume of the room and the anticipated number of people, but we’ll inquire with the appropriate City staff. We will also look into masking requirements.*

## Part 4. Questions of Clarification

- **What is the current number of members in the working group?**  
Answer provided by the City team: *There are 29 spots now, and not all places have been filled yet. We are still looking for additional representation from trans men and trans women, families and boaters.*
- **Were the presented draft Terms of Reference invented specifically for this group?** Other P&R Community Advisory Groups do not have such Terms of Reference.  
Answer provided by the facilitation team: To our knowledge, the P&R team used a standardized template for some of the City-led community-based group engagement processes and modified it to reflect the needs of the Island Park Implementation work.
- **Is there a Ferry Landing design brief that can be shared with the group?**  
Answer provided by the City team: *Yes, there is a design brief that can be shared with the group.*
- **Are the Motorized Watercraft Exclusion Zone survey results available?**  
Answer provided by the City team: *No, not yet. The City is still working on it. We can notify you once they are posted online.*

## Next Steps

---

Netami thanked everyone for their participation and feedback, particularly on the draft Terms of Reference. She emphasized that this meeting was the start of a conversation on how to get the Terms of Reference right, as it needs to be a document everyone can agree on. She further reminded participants to provide additional feedback in the next two weeks by November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2025, and keep an eye out for an invitation from the City to participate in the Bike Share meeting on December 3, 2025.

Yulia and Adrien committed to sharing the meeting summary in draft for participant review before finalizing it.

# 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**

Ausma Malik, First Deputy Mayor and  
the Deputy Mayor of Toronto & East  
York, Councillor Spadina-Fort York  
Tom Davidson, Director, Waterfront  
Revitalization Initiatives

## Facilitation Team

### **Third Party Public**

Adrien Hall  
Stephani Quezada  
Yulia Pak

## Community Advisory Committee

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

Federation of Canadian Naturists –  
Stephane Deschenes  
**Friends of Hanlan's** – Rhys and Travis  
**Hanlan's Collective** – Jess  
**MWEZ Community Watch** – Roland  
Brunner  
**Pride Toronto** – Sandra Henein and  
Diego  
**The 519** – Curran Stikuts  
**Trans Lobby Group / Toronto Trans  
Coalition** – Susan Gapka  
Two-Spirit of the First Nations  
Aditya Singhal  
Anjali Iddamsetty  
**Alan Drummond**  
Atticus Hawk

**Blaine Lamorandiere**  
Cappucine Ferguson  
**Carissa Nippard**  
Cheri DiNovo  
**David McIntosh**  
David Rubio Gomes  
Emilio Estevez  
**Faelix**  
Homa Parwana  
**Jamie Lavery**  
**Jessica Martin**  
**Lisa Amin**  
**Mikiki**  
Peter Gray  
**Peter Simm**

# Appendix B. Meeting Agenda

## Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group

Meeting #2  
Wednesday, November 5, 2025  
6:00 – 8:00 pm  
Metro Hall, Room 308-309  
55 John St, Toronto, M5V 3C6



### Proposed Meeting Agenda

6:00 PM

#### Acknowledgements

##### Welcome, agenda review, introductions of new members

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Toronto  
Yulia Pak, facilitation team, Third Party Public

6:15

#### Island Park Plan Updates

Part 1: Process updates  
Part 2: Updates on Island Park projects  
*Questions of clarification*

6:30

#### Discussion on Bike Share station locations

1. *What factors does the City need to consider when deciding how many Bike Share stations should be at beach access points? Would you like to see more of them or fewer of them along the beach?*
2. *Are there any beach access points that work better than others to locate Bike Share stations?*

6:45

#### Bio break

6:55

#### Draft Proposed Terms of Reference

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Toronto  
Yulia Pak & Adrien Hall, facilitation team, Third Party Public

7:20

#### Discussion

1. How well do the draft proposed Terms of Reference respond to your advice on how to work together? Anything missing or off base?
2. Other Terms of Reference questions for HPBWG:
  - a. Membership Term: Is the group comfortable with the proposed two-year membership term running from November 2025 to November 2027?
  - b. Membership Replacement: To what extent does the group want the City to replace working group members, and under what circumstances should replacements be made?
  - c. Decision-Making and Consensus: Does the group agree with the current definition of "consensus" in the Terms of Reference—meaning that at least 70% of members in attendance support, or can live with, a given position? Should it be higher?
3. Any other suggestions or advice?

7:50

#### Wrap-up & next steps

- Review in-progress Guiding Document
  - City to follow up with members to collect short bios
- Member announcements (if you have any, please share them with Netami in advance of the meeting)
- Reminder: December 6<sup>th</sup> onboarding event

8:00 PM

#### Adjourn

#### Meeting purpose

To introduce new members of the HPBWG, share process updates related to the three working groups, provide updates on the Toronto Island Park Plan projects and seek feedback on Bikeshare station locations and present and seek feedback on the draft proposed Terms of Reference.

#### Resources:

[Toronto Island Park Plan Project Website](#)

[Proposed Toronto Island Master Plan – Working Group Tracking Tool](#)

[Hanlan's Point Beach Working Group DRAFT Terms of Reference](#)