

RECEIVED MAR 4 1986

*Sarah*



## Department of the City Clerk

City Hall, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 2N2

Roy V. Henderson / City Clerk

Barbara Caplan / Deputy City Clerk

Ms. Jane Lockwood 392-7039

February 25, 1986

Ms. Sarah Miller  
Canadian Environmental Law Assoc.  
243 Queen St. W., 4th Floor  
Toronto M5V 1Z4

Dear Ms. Miller:

City Council, at its meeting on February 24, 1986, gave consideration to the attached Clause 19 contained in Report No. 4 of the Neighbourhoods Committee, entitled "Wave Pool Facility - Hanlan's Point".

Council adopted the Clause without amendment, and it is forwarded to you for information and any necessary action.

Yours truly,

*Roy V. Henderson*  
City Clerk

*JL* /ms  
JL

Encl.

Mr. David Harris, President, Toronto Island Residents' Assoc.,  
23 - 6th Street, Ward's Island, Toronto

Mr. Steve Varga, 5900 Yonge St., #618, Willowdale M2M 3T8

Ms. Sarah Miller, Canadian Environmental Law Assoc., 243 Queen St. W.,  
4th Floor, Toronto M5V 1Z4

Ms. Mary Smith, Toronto Field Naturalists, 49 Thorncrest Rd.,  
Islington M9A 1S6

Mr. Andrew Lesk, The Body Politic, 43 Wolseley St., Toronto M5T 1A3  
Metropolitan Toronto Council, c/o Mr. W. Lotto, Metropolitan Toronto Cle  
Task Force on Future Uses of Exhibition Place, c/o Mr. Dale Richmond,  
Chief Executive Officer, Metropolitan Clerk's Dept.

CITY OF TORONTO  
DEPARTMENT OF THE  
CITY CLERK

CLAUSE EMBODIED IN REPORT NO. 4 OF THE  
NEIGHBOURHOODS COMMITTEE WHICH WAS ADOPTED  
BY CITY COUNCIL AT ITS MEETING HELD ON  
FEBRUARY 24, 1986.

.....

19

### WAVE POOL FACILITY - HANLAN'S POINT

The Committee recommends that the City of Toronto indicate to the Metropolitan Toronto Council that the Toronto Island is an impractical and inappropriate location for a wave pool facility and that the City supports the intent to seek an alternative location, such as the Canadian National Exhibition or the Sunnyside Pavillion, for such a facility somewhere along the waterfront; and that the suggested alternative locations be referred to the Task Force on Future Uses of Exhibition Place.

*Mr. David Harris, 23 Sixth Street, Toronto, addressed the Committee.*

*Councillor Layton also addressed the Committee.*

The Committee submits the communication (February 3, 1986) from Councillor Layton:

I would like to have this matter placed on the Neighbourhoods Committee agenda as a deputation item.

The situation has changed since this matter was last considered and I believe it is timely for the City to reconsider its position.

I am enclosing for the Committee's consideration:

- (1) The report of the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation of September 4, 1984.
- (2) My letter to the Metro Executive Committee of January 27, 1986.
- (3) A letter from the Metro Clerk, dated January 30, 1986, indicating the disposition of this matter by the Metro Executive Committee.

Recommendation: That the City of Toronto indicate to Metro Toronto that the Toronto Island is an impractical and inappropriate location for a wave pool facility and that the City supports the intent to seek an alternative location for such a facility somewhere along the waterfront.

*(Report dated September 4, 1984, from the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation)*

Subject: Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility

Origin: Commissioner of Parks and Recreation (c36nhc84185:122)

Comments: At its meeting held on August 16, 1984, the Neighbourhoods Committee considered a communication from the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk entitled, "Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility". The Committee requested that I, in consultation with the Commissioner of Planning and Development report for its meeting to be held on September 6, 1984.

As you know, from my earlier reports I am not in favour of establishing a wave pool at Hanlan's Point, nor am I in favour of a wave pool being built with public funds. You will note from the data provided by the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk that of the 18 sites noted in his report, 14 are private, three are public and Montreal has a combination of both public and private.

Additionally, the Commissioner notes that there are three sites presently under consideration in the Metro area; Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke. I would suggest that since these three Municipalities have already commenced work on the development of wave pools, it would be worthwhile having these facilities built and operational and an evaluation undertaken prior to considering building any other facilities in the Metro region.

The Commissioner states that he would expect an attendance of some 4,000 on weekends or holidays between June and September. On a hot weekend in the summer, Sunnyside pool accommodates between 3,000 and 4,000 bathers. In addition to Sunnyside, the City operates eleven other outdoor pools, each of which would have approximately 1,000 bathers per day.

In my earlier reports, I noted the difficulties related to this site in terms of accessibility and parking. Additionally, in terms of the economics of the facility, the admission charges for the wave pool in Hamilton are \$3.00 for adults and \$2.00 for children. If one were to take into account the admission charge of this facility were it to be located on the Island, the cost of the Ferry, T.T.C. fare and/or parking costs, I would suggest that this facility would be too costly for many Toronto families to enjoy.

Conclusion: This report is submitted for the consideration of your Committee.

*(Communication dated January 27, 1986, from Councillor Layton)*

I am requesting the Executive Committee to refer the whole question of a wave pool at Hanlan's Point back to the Parks and Property Committee for further consideration. I have also asked the City of Toronto's Neighbourhoods Committee to re-examine the proposal, especially in light of the serious reservations voiced by the City's Commissioners of Parks and Planning.

When the wave pool proposal was first tendered there was only one serious bid from the private sector. Forrec Construction is a consortium of companies with considerable expertise in this area and I have no doubt that their figures are accurate. Their financing has now fallen through and I believe that there are several reasons for re-considering the whole proposal rather than simply re-tendering it.

- (1) The cost has risen substantially. As first budgetted by the Commissioner of Parks and Property in June 1984, it was in the range of \$3.6 to \$3.8 million. Forrec's most recent figures are \$5 million and the final figure could be even higher.
- (2) The Forrec proposal contained provision for a 1-acre miniature golf course. No doubt this was included to increase revenues. In the Commissioner's report of January 29, 1985, he indicates that the "facility would not produce a positive cash flow after financing until the ninth year of operation." There is also the current question of the cost of liability by insurance. In light of these factors, I have a growing concern that the project may not be financially viable.
- (3) Most wave pools are associated with larger theme parks. Indeed, that may be the impression some people have of the Hanlan's Point proposal. The North York Council, for example, on November 20, 1984, expressed their approval of "the development of water theme park facilities including a wave pool and giant water slide to be located on the Toronto Island Park." I am concerned that if the wave pool proved unprofitable, this may lead to even more theme park development on Hanlan's Point in order to increase revenues.
- (4) I have growing reservations about the viability as well as desirability of this site. The Department's own figures indicated that less than 1 in 10 Island visitors come from Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, York, or East York. The majority come from the City or are visitors to Toronto staying close to the waterfront. The population of Metro is growing at the fringes and people from the outlying municipalities face lengthy transit trips (with reduced service on weekends) or a long drive to the waterfront with the prospect of parking at \$10 per day if they are fortunate enough to find it in the weekend crush at Harbourfront in the summer. I support development of wave pool facilities for the people

of Metro, but the present transit and parking facilities around the ferry docks raise grave doubts about the Island as an accessible site.

- (5) There are continuing questions about the desirability of the Hanlan's Point site as well. Hanlan's Point has always attracted people who prefer a more contemplative park experience. Those who want a more active time necessarily gravitate towards Centre Island. While I support the trackless train proposal, it will only ease traffic to Centre Island to the extent that people can reach it by taking the Hanlan's ferry and the train. With the second dock and a more maneuverable Trillium, there should be more than sufficient capacity for the numbers wanting to go to Centre Island.

I believe that the present arrangements make a good deal of sense by concentrating active use at Centre and leaving the unique, undeveloped areas at Hanlan's for those whose preference is that kind of park use. Wave pools can be developed on presently underused land in the City. Wild spaces like Hanlan's Point are unique. I support the Department's intent to upgrade the landscaping of the area and improve the facilities for games, but there seems to be a contradiction in the whole idea of retaining Hanlan's Point as a quieter, contemplative part of the Island, yet bending over backwards in the effort to re-direct people to that destination by installing more and more active facilities there.

- (6) The primary ground for the wave pool proposal was a survey conducted over a period of days in the summer of 1983. As the Commissioner states in his report of May 14, 1984, this was a particularly hot summer when the majority of public beaches were closed. As he also notes, many respondents were unaware of the park features that presently exist at Hanlan's Point. The survey of necessity did not include the Spring and Fall visitors (as well as those hardy enough to visit in the winter with the present lack of facilities) many of whom are attracted to the Island precisely because it is not developed and has been preserved as a wild space within a few hundred metres of downtown. With the planned and projected wave pools and water theme parks in other parts of Metro and the region, it is time to reconsider whether or not we should despoil the unique but little known features of Hanlan's Point. I support the Department's intent to improve signage and the dissemination of information about parts of the Island Park beyond Centre Island. I would recommend that we await the results of this undertaking and then re-survey Island visitors to determine how many of those who come at all seasons of the year would prefer a wave pool to leaving Hanlan's largely as it is today, with the proposed improvements to the landscaping and the addition of a trackless train to give greater access to the area.

Recommendation: That this clause be referred to the Parks and Property Committee for further consideration.

*(Communication dated January 30, 1986, from Mr. W. J. Lotto, Metropolitan Toronto Clerk)*

The Metropolitan Executive Committee on January 28, 1986, had before it a report (January 13, 1986) from the Commissioner of Parks and Property advising that the Executive Committee on July 30, 1985, had before it a report dated July 23, 1985, from the Commissioner of Parks and Property recommending that the Metropolitan Corporation enter into an agreement with Forrec Construction Limited for the design, construction and operation of a Wave Pool/Slide Ride at Hanlan's Point, Toronto Island; that the Executive Committee referred such report back to the Commissioner of Parks and Property for further negotiation respecting revenues that might accrue to the Corporation and requested the Commissioner to contact experts and consultants in the business of constructing and operating water parks and report thereon to the Executive Committee; that pursuant to the foregoing request of the Executive Committee, discussions have been held with the proponent, Forrec Construction Limited, and a consultant was retained to assist staff in its deliberations with the proponent; that the proponent had subsequently withdrew their initial proposal and had suggested a new investment approach which is not acceptable to the Metropolitan Corporation; that the proponent has significantly changed the original proposal and is not in a position to now undertake the development as originally proposed; and recommending that:

- (1) negotiations with Forrec Construction Ltd. be terminated and the certified cheque (bid deposit) in the amount of \$2,000.00 be cashed and used to offset incurred expenses;
- (2) The Corporation re-advertise the call for proposals for the provision of a Toronto Island wave pool facility; and

- (3) the appropriate Metropolitan Officials be directed to take the necessary action to give effect to the foregoing.

The Metropolitan Executive Committee also had before it the following communications:

- (October 10, 1986) from Ms. L. Nadeau in opposition to the proposed Wave Pool at Hanlan's Point;
- (January 27, 1986) from Councillor Jack G. Layton, City of Toronto and a Member of the Metropolitan Council, recommending that the foregoing matter be referred to the Parks, Recreation and Property Committee for further consideration.

The following persons appeared before the Metropolitan Executive Committee:

- Mr. Grahame Beakhus, on behalf of Councillor Layton, in support of referring the foregoing matter to the Parks, Recreation and Property Committee for further consideration;
- Mr. David Harris, Chairman of the Toronto Island Residents' Association, in opposition to the development of a wave pool at Hanlan's Point.

The Metropolitan Executive Committee referred the aforementioned report and communications back to the Commissioner of Parks and Property with a request that he consult with the Cities of Etobicoke and Scarborough regarding their wave pool proposals in order that such proposals can be planned together and report thereon to the Executive Committee.

The Metropolitan Executive Committee also directed that the following motion by Mayor Eggleton, as amended by Controller Yuill, be referred to the Commissioner of Parks and Property for consideration:

"That the aforementioned report of the Commissioner of Parks and Property be adopted, subject to Recommendation No. (2) being amended to read as follows:

- '(2) the Corporation re-advertise the call for proposals for the provision of a wave pool facility in the Central Waterfront area, including Exhibition Place, the nearby lands, and the Toronto Island'."

**The Committee also submits the report (February 11, 1986) from the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation:**

Origin: Commissioner of Parks and Recreation (c36nhc86027:12)

Comments: The Secretary of the Neighbourhoods Committee referred to me for report Councillor Layton's communication regarding the Wave Pool. Your Committee has a copy of my report of September 4th to the Neighbourhoods Committee which deals with the matter. In essence, my position has not changed, and I do not believe that a Wave Pool at this location is appropriate. The following is a summary of the rationale for this position:

1. Any new development on the Toronto Islands takes an existing use out and replaces it with a new use, whereas developments in the suburbs can take advantage of undeveloped and uncommitted space.
2. Hanlan's Point is a pristine, natural environment - a scarce commodity within the heart of the City. One questions the appropriateness of developing a six-acre site in this area that could be utilized a maximum of three months a year.
3. At the moment, the Toronto Island parks system provides users with a choice from very intense, active uses at Centre Island to an opportunity for quiet escape (biking, reading or walking) at Hanlan's Point. The proposal would appear to remove that choice and it seems to me that a regional parks system should respond to a balance of needs.
4. Eventual cost to users and accessibility to this site are of great concern. Transportation costs, parking and admission fees could well be prohibitive for many people within the Metro area.

5. In the context of waterfront development (Harbourfront, Ontario Place, Exhibition Place, Centreville), Hanlan's Point is one of the few places where City dwellers can escape from the urban jungle.
6. Two other sites are currently under consideration in Metro - one in Etobicoke and one in Scarborough. If a proposal is to be pursued in an area central to Metro Toronto, consideration might be given to locating it within the area of Exhibition Place as it would relate very well to the entertainment and leisure facility at Ontario Place.

Conclusion: The foregoing is submitted to your Committee for its consideration.

The Committee resubmits, for information, Clause 43 of Executive Committee Report No. 23 which was adopted, as amended, by City Council on September 17, 1984:

---

16: The Executive Committee resubmits Clause 45 of Neighbourhoods Committee Report No.

---

The Neighbourhoods Committee submits the following matter to City Council at the request of Alderman Gilbert.

*The Neighbourhoods Committee advises having requested the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation to report, in consultation with the Commissioner of Planning and Development, for its meeting to be held on September 6, 1984, on the alternative site analysis submitted by the Metropolitan Toronto Commissioner of Parks and Property in his report dated July 18, 1984.*

*The following motion by Alderman Gilbert was voted on and lost:*

*Having regard for the facts: (1) that there are wave pool proposals for the Cities of Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough, and no other proposal for the City of Toronto, (2) that Metropolitan Toronto could accommodate up to five wave pool facilities, and (3) that the largest group using the Toronto Islands comprises City of Toronto residents; City Council now endorse the proposed Metropolitan Toronto wave pool at Hanlan's Point.*

The Neighbourhoods Committee submits the communication (July 30, 1984) from the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk:

The Metropolitan Executive Committee on July 27, 1984, had before it the attached report (July 18, 1984) from the Commissioner of Parks and Property respecting an analysis of alternative sites for the proposed Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool facility; and recommending such report be forwarded to the Area Municipalities for their review and comments; such comments to be forwarded to the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk no later than September 4, 1984.

The Metropolitan Executive Committee adopted the aforementioned report of the Commissioner of Parks and Property.

---

Metropolitan Executive Committee

Subject: Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility

At its meeting held on June 8, 1984, the Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto adopted, as amended, Clause No. 2 of Report No. 9 of the Parks, Recreation and Property Committee entitled "Toronto Island Concept Plan". This amendment to the Report directed that I submit a report on other possible sites for a wave pool within Metropolitan Toronto to the

Metropolitan Executive Committee, and the Committee forward such report to the Area Municipalities for consideration and any suggestions they may have on alternative or additional sites".

Accordingly, the following report is submitted for your review and the appropriate action as predetermined by Council.

On May 27, 1982, the Parks, Recreation and Property Committee received my initial report "Wave Pool Facility For Metropolitan Toronto". This report summarized in general terms, the nature and characteristics of outdoor wave pools and their financial performance. In addition, the report contained an analysis of all potential alternative sites within the existing public park system of Metropolitan Toronto which were evaluated based on a number of commonly accepted site and economic criteria used to determine the suitability of wave pool sites.

#### Wave Pool Up-date Since 1982

The popularity of wave pools in North America is evidenced by the significant increase in the number of facilities either in operation or under development within the past two years. In 1982, at the time of submission of our initial report, there were thirty wave pool installations either built or under construction in the United States whereas today there are approximately eighty. Also in 1982, there were only three wave pool projects in Canada; two public indoor wave pools under construction in Calgary and an outdoor facility approved for Hamilton's Confederation Park to be operated by the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority. The Hamilton facility, "The Wild Waterworks", is now in its second year of operation. During its inaugural 1983 outdoor season, the total attendance was 133,000 patrons which surpassed expectations. Patronage this year is greater.

The following table indicates the status of other known existing or proposed wave pool facilities across Canada:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Ownership</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Metropolitan Toronto</u>		
City of Scarborough (Morningside and Ellesmere)	private developer leasing lands from City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development is in preliminary planning stages</li> <li>- land is a former landfill site; environmental issues must be resolved prior to construction</li> </ul>
City of North York (E.T. Seton Park)	private developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discussions are very preliminary at this time</li> <li>- developer is investigating the use of parklands to the southwest of the Ontario Science Centre to operate a wave pool/slide ride</li> </ul>
City of Etobicoke (Centennial Park)	City will be seeking proposals from private developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposals will be sought in the fall of 1984 for a slide ride attraction, this could potentially include a wave pool component</li> </ul>
<u>Metropolitan Region</u>		
Vaughan Highway 27 and Steeles	private "Fomar Canada Ltd."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- major water theme park scheduled to open May, 1985</li> <li>- plans call for construction to commence Fall, 1984</li> </ul>
Ajax	private	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- called "Funwave"; development is to include wave pool, slide rides and other water activities</li> <li>- scheduled to open in 1985</li> </ul>
<u>Ontario</u>		
Confederation Park	Hamilton Region Conservation Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- called "The Wild Waterworks"</li> <li>- new in second year of operation</li> </ul>

<u>Location</u>	<u>Ownership</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Kitchener Bingeman Park	private	- combination waterslide/wavepool/campground in operation for two years
Kitchener Pioneer Sports Park	concessionaires	- presently a multi-use park i.e. mini golf, driving range, water slide rides, other activity areas - it is anticipated that this park may, in the future, have a wave pool associated with its slide ride facility
Barrie	private	- discussions are preliminary
Wasaga Beach	private "Water World Ltd."	- construction commenced, but development halted due to financial problems.
Muskoka	private	- development is in the planning stages
London	private	- in the preliminary site investigation stages
Windsor	private	- in the preliminary site investigation stages
<u>Other</u>		
Calgary, Alberta	three public facilities City of Calgary Parks and Recreation Dept.	- all indoor facilities opened in 1982
Edmonton, Alberta	public City of Edmonton	- indoor facility opened in 1982 - "Millswoods Leisure Centres Pool"
St. Adele Quebec	private Super Splash Ltd.	- opened in June, 1984
Montreal Region	public/private	- 3 wave pools now in preliminary planning stages
Moncton, New Brunswick	private	- presently in development stage

In total, there are seven operating wave pools in Canada, and several more are in the planning or development stages.

Given this developing interest in wave pools by both the public and private sector, it is not surprising that Metropolitan Toronto, with a population exceeding 2.0 million residents, has been of interest to those considering the development of wave pool facilities.

Discussions with potential developers and their consultants investigating the Metropolitan area have led to the following conclusions:

1. Total populations required to support wave pool/aquatic park facilities vary from 100,000 for small scale developments to 4,000,000 for larger scale water theme parks. It has been indicated by various consultants who have researched the feasibility of wave pools for developers in Metropolitan Toronto that Metropolitan Toronto is large enough to sustain up to five wave pools in the future as swimming is expected to remain one of the most popular recreational activities. This is supported by the fact that Hamilton's wave pool, now in its second successful year, is supported by a population of only 400,000.
2. The Toronto Island, accommodating a park patronage greater than 1.0 million visitors per annum, the majority of whom visit the Island in the period May 1 to September 7, is its own marketplace and presently provides sufficient patronage to justify a wave pool. This visitation is greater than many cities which have a wave pool facility.
3. Accessibility is not a major issue for the Island site as the park has, over the years, demonstrated its ability to attract and sustain visitors.
4. A wave pool located along a waterfront area is not out of context in the Canadian environment, given the cold water temperatures and the public perception that swimming should be available along the waterfront. Existing waterfront pools such as Sunnyside and Donald D. Summerville as well as Hamilton's wave pool are well used and attest to this fact.
5. A wave pool at Hanlan's Point will serve to attract tourists from the downtown hotel area. Presently 29 per cent of Island visitors come from outside Metropolitan Toronto.
6. The development of a wave pool at Hanlan's Point would satisfy one of the main objectives of the Toronto Island Concept Plan; that being to decentralize public use away from Centre Island to other areas which are not achieving their public use potential.

#### Site Analysis Update

A review of the earlier site analysis summary (Appendix A) provided in the May 1982 report reveals that while most of the factors (i.e. physical site criteria, accessibility factors, economic viability, compatibility and availability of services) have not changed; the announced new wave pool proposals impact significantly on the market areas of a number of the mainland park sites and would affect their financial viability.

For example, the two proposals for Ajax and Scarborough would adversely affect development at Morningside Park and East Point Park. Similarly, the announced major water theme park at Highway 27 and Steeles, would have a negative impact on the primary market areas for developments at Thistletown, G. Ross Lord, Earl Bales and Downsview Dells, as would a wave pool for Centennial Park in Etobicoke.

The foregoing analysis further strengthens our belief that of the comparatively few sites potentially available within the regional public open space system, Hanlan's Point remains an ideal site for a public outdoor wave pool facility for Metropolitan Toronto.

Accordingly, it is recommended that:

This report be forwarded to the area municipalities for their review and comments respecting any alternative or additional sites for the proposed wave pool facility; such comments to be forwarded to the Metropolitan Clerk no later than September 4, 1984.

**APPENDIX A -**

**ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS - PROPOSED METROPOLITAN TORONTO WAVE POOL FACILITY**

**RANKING ORDER - EXCELLENT**  
 - GOOD  
 - FAIR  
 - POOR  
 - NONE

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>DOWNSVIEW DELLS</b>	<b>EARL BALES</b>	<b>EAST POINT</b>	<b>E.T. SETON</b>	<b>G. ROSS LORD</b>
<b>PHYSICAL</b>					
Size of Site	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Fair
Flood Plain Restrictions	Poor	Good for Tableland Poor for Valley Site	Good	Poor	Good
Micro Climate	Fair	Poor for Valley Site	Good	Good	Good
<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>					
Geographical Location	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Poor
Visual Accessibility	Poor	Good	Poor	Good	Excellent
Access via Public and Private Modes of Transportation	Good	Good	Poor	Good	Poor
Proximity to Other Tourist Attractions	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Poor
Established Park with Significant Public Attraction Value	Fair	Good	None	Good	Good
<b>ECONOMIC</b>					
Public Attraction Potential	Good	Good	Poor	Good	Good
Economic Spin-offs	Fair	Good	None	None	Poor
Maintenance Cost Minimization	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Capital Cost Implications	Poor	Good for Tableland	Poor	Good	Good
Use of Existing Park Structures without Major Retrofit Work	Poor	Poor	None	Poor	Poor
<b>COMPATIBILITY</b>					
Compatible with Surrounding Land Use	Poor	Fair	Good	Fair	Good
Impact on Local Residential Communities	Poor	Poor	None	Good	Excellent
Compatible with Existing Park Theme	Poor	Poor	Poor for Proposed Theme	Poor	Fair
Minimization of Environmental Impacts	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair
<b>SERVICES</b>					
Use of Existing Services	Poor	Good	None	Poor	Excellent
Potential for Service Expansion	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent
<b>COMPETITION</b>					
Out of Market Area of existing or proposed similar developments	Poor	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair

CRITERIA	WARRIE			TORONTO		
	CURTIS	MORNINGSIDE	SUNNYBROOK	THISTLETOWN	ISLAND	
<b>PHYSICAL</b>						
Size of Site	Fair	Good	Good	Excellent	Fair	Excellent
Flood Plain Restrictions	Poor	Poor	Poor	Good	Poor	Good
Micro Climate	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair
<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>						
Geographical Location	Poor	Poor	Poor	Good	Poor	Excellent
Visual Accessibility	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair	Poor
Access via Public and Private						
Modes of Transportation	Poor	Poor	Good	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Proximity to other Tourist						
Attractions	Poor	Poor	Good	Good	Fair	Excellent
Established Park with Significant						
Public Attraction Value	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent
<b>ECONOMIC</b>						
Public Attraction Potential	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent
Economic Spin-offs	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	None	Excellent
Maintenance Cost Minimization	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Good
Capital Cost Implications	Poor	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Fair
Use of Existing Park Structures						
without Major Retrofit Work	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	None	Poor
<b>COMPATIBILITY</b>						
Capable with Surrounding Land Use	Good	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent
Impact on Local Residential						
Communities	Poor	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Compatible with Existing Park Theme	Good	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Minimization of Environmental						
Impacts	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair
<b>SERVICES</b>						
Use of Existing Services						
Potential for Services Expansion	Poor	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Good
	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
<b>COMPETITION</b>						
Out of Market Area of existing						
or proposed similar developments	Good	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent

*(City Council Action - September 4, 1984)*

*During consideration of the foregoing, Council also had before it a further communication (September 6, 1984) from the Neighbourhoods Committee.*

*At its meeting held on September 6, 1984, the Neighbourhoods Committee again had before it a communication (July 30, 1984) from the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk forwarding, for comments by September 4, 1984, a report (July 18, 1984) from the Metropolitan Toronto Commissioner of Parks and Property, entitled "Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility".*

*The Committee also had before it a report (September 4, 1984) from the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation, as requested, regarding the foregoing matter.*

*The Committee received the above noted material and decided to forward the foregoing report from the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation to City Council, for information, for its meeting to be held on September 7, 1984, at which time it will consider Clause 45 of the Neighbourhoods Committee Report No. 16, entitled "Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility".*

*(Report (September 4, 1984) addressed to the Neighbourhoods Committee from the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation)*

*Subject: Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility*

*Origin: Commissioner of Parks and Recreation (c36nhc84185:122)*

*Comments: At its meeting held on August 16, 1984, the Neighbourhoods Committee considered a communication from the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk entitled, "Alternative Site Analysis - Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool Facility". The Committee requested that I, in consultation with the Commissioner of Planning and Development report for its meeting to be held on September 6, 1984.*

*As you know, from my earlier reports I am not in favour of establishing a wave pool at Hanlan's Point, nor am I in favour of a wave pool being built with public funds. You will note from the data provided by the Metropolitan Toronto Clerk that of the 18 sites noted in his report, 14 are private, three are public and Montreal has a combination of both public and private.*

*Additionally, the Commissioner notes that there are three sites presently under consideration in the Metro area; Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke. I would suggest that since these three Municipalities have already commenced work on the development of wave pools, it would be worthwhile having these facilities built and operational and an evaluation undertaken prior to considering building any other facilities in the Metro region.*

*The Commissioner states that he would expect an attendance of some 4,000 on weekends or holidays between June and September. On a hot weekend in the summer, Sunnyside pool accommodates between 3,000 and 4,000 bathers. In addition to Sunnyside, the City operates eleven other outdoor pools, each of which would have approximately 1,000 bathers per day.*

*In my earlier reports, I noted the difficulties related to this site in terms of accessibility and parking. Additionally, in terms of the economics of the facility, the admission charges for the wave pool in Hamilton are \$3.00 for adults and \$2.00 for children. If one were to take into account the admission charge of this facility were it to be located on the Island, the cost of the Ferry, T.T.C. fare and/or parking costs, I would suggest that this facility would be too costly for many Toronto families to enjoy.*

*Conclusion: This report is submitted for the consideration of your Committee.*

*Council referred the Clause back to the Executive Committee for resubmission to City Council on September 17, 1984, and directed that the Metropolitan Toronto Corporation be so advised.*

*(Council Action - September 17, 1984)*

**Alderman Beavis, seconded by Alderman Grys, moved that this Clause be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:**

**"It is recommended that the Metropolitan Corporation be advised that City Council endorses the proposed Metropolitan Toronto Wave Pool at Hanlan's Point."**

**which was adopted on the following division of votes:**

*Yeas: His Worship the Mayor and Aldermen Beavis, Rowlands, Hope, Boytchuk, Grys, Clifford, Gee, Walker, Gilbert, Kanter, Korwin-Kuczynski, Shea, and Jakobek - 14.*

*Nays: Aldermen Johnston, Martin, Layton, Campbell, Pantalone, Reville, and Thomas - 7. September 17, 1984.*