



Hamilton

PIER 8 SOLICITATION PROCESS

PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMER WORKSHOP RESULTS

BACKGROUND

The City of Hamilton is preparing to embark on the redevelopment of its Pier 8 lands (“Project”) through a process that will engage with the private development industry from which we will solicit development proposals and financial bids (“Solicitation Process”). Staff have been directed by City Council to present a recommended strategy and process that would result in identifying winning proposals from interested bidders. Staff intend to present this recommendation to Council by Q4 2016.

The Pier 8 Project is one phase of a larger-scale initiative to revitalize the entire West Harbour district. The ongoing efforts to revitalize Hamilton’s waterfront will transform the precinct for both residents and visitors as the water’s edge becomes more accessible and developed. Given the significance of this Project, Staff have been executing a far-reaching community engagement strategy to inform Hamiltonians about the project’s goals and give them an opportunity to participate in the ongoing dialogue to shape project outcomes.

PURPOSE

As we approach the critical point in our project where Staff will be making recommendations to Council regarding the Solicitation Process for Pier 8, we wanted to garner public opinion on issues that will ultimately impact how a request for proposals would be made to the development community.

To this end, an interactive workshop was created with the objective of helping to answer the following questions:

1. What attributes of a prospective development proposal does the public view as important?
2. What relative importance would the public place on each of those attributes for consideration in the assessment of prospective proposals?
3. How can these desired outcomes be posed through the Solicitation Process?

It is Staff’s intent to take the results of the workshop into consideration as it formulates its forthcoming recommendations to Council.

FORMAT

SUMMER WORKSHOP SERIES

The workshops consisted of two activities taking place simultaneously in the same location:

1. Public Information Centre – Passive engagement consisting of display boards and Staff on hand to answer questions on an ad hoc basis. Ideal for participants who are new to the subject matter and/or have a specific question they would like answered. Also helps establish a base of knowledge to participate in the interactive questionnaire.
2. Interactive questionnaire – Active engagement wherein a facilitator walks participants through a scripted questionnaire supplemented by brief educational segments. Standardized activity equalizes each participant’s contribution and influence.

People who showed up at any of the sessions were invited to participate in either or both activities; most, but not all, chose to participate in both.

In order to give people a degree of choice over when to participate, 3 dates in three different locations were scheduled throughout the summer:

- July 14 at the Evergreen Community Storefront (294 James St. N.)
- August 11 at the New Beasley Community Centre (145 Wilson St.)
- September 8 at the Good Shepherd Bishop Tonnos Apartments (10 Pearl St.)

The interactive questionnaire, which required a commitment of approximately 30 minutes, was scheduled for three different start times at each of the above locations, for a total of 9 opportunities for people to show up and participate at a date and time that best fit their personal schedules.

The interactive questionnaire was designed specifically to give each participant a chance to have direct input and influence on the Solicitation Process. Previous to the workshop series, the City had engaged with the public through various other live, interactive formats including open discussion forums, educational presentations, group activities with fellow citizens, and Q&A sessions with City Staff. The summer workshop series was developed as a new format specifically to achieve the following objectives:

1. **Equality** – Contrary to most of the other engagement formats that can be dominated by a few individuals, the questionnaire format gives each participant a voice on each question that is equal to everyone else’s. Furthermore, the anonymous nature of the questionnaire allows everyone to be completely honest without fear of peer judgement.
2. **Focus** – Open forum discussions and group activities can easily become derailed by individuals who commandeer the conversation. The questionnaire format is highly structured, and by following a script and limiting intermittent questions, the facilitator further ensures adherence to the task at hand, thus ensuring that the desired responses can be obtained during the allotted time.
3. **Quantifiable Results** – While other engagement formats are useful in hearing the range of opinions and rationale on a given subject, there is no method to quantify those opinions and make judgements about whether they are widely or narrowly held. The questionnaire format is empirical and allows Staff to consider and present factual results that are devoid of conjecture. Furthermore, the questionnaire used did provide an open format comment area for each and every question, giving participants an opportunity to elaborate further on topics as they wished.

4. **Make Choices** – as we approach the time to make firm recommendations to Council, open debate must eventually defer to decisions, even though it may be an uncomfortable task. The questionnaire format eliminates the option to engage in continued debate as a tactic to avoid making decisions, and at least provides an anonymous arena where participants can make their choices free from the influence of others.

Although an online version of this workshop was considered, the decision was made to not pursue it further due to the constraints of time and technical resources, coupled with the practical difficulties of replicating the same experience in a digital platform that would result in a high completion rate (i.e., the lengthy format, in a voluntary private setting, would likely result in many people not completing the activity to the end). If given further direction and time to consider additional public input, Staff would consider a variation of the workshop better suited to online replication.

A copy of the facilitator’s script, including survey questions, can be found in Appendix A.

SURVEY RESULTS


A copy of the questionnaire, including tallied results and a listing of all comments, can be found in Appendix B. When reviewing the analysis of results, please be aware that all questions were given a “Choose to Not Answer” option, which may have resulted in fewer than the entire pool of participants answering each question. In the analysis below, the number of respondents will be indicated for each question, and all percentages have been calculated using the number of actual respondents as the denominator.

SAMPLE SIZE & PROFILE

While multiple opportunities to participate were offered, only **37 people** in total participated in the interactive questionnaire portion of the workshop. Due to the small total pool of results, the analysis herein cannot include attribution (e.g., what percentage of people from Ancaster said x?) nor are any of the results considered to be statistically significant (i.e., the sample’s results cannot be considered to represent the whole and any perceived patterns are not reliable).

Notwithstanding the small size of the participant group, the following is a profile of the sample:

- They are avid users of Hamilton’s waterfront – over 50% said they visited the Waterfront monthly or more frequently, and one-third said weekly or more;
- They are keeping abreast of the issues – when asked to self-assess their knowledge of the issues surrounding the vision and prospective sale of Pier 8, 70% said they feel “relatively well” or “very well” informed;
- They came to the workshop with an intended purpose – 100% indicated that they came specifically to “learn more”, “ask a question”, “contribute opinions”, or “all of the above”; on one came “out of curiosity” with “no expectations”; and
- They came from different parts of the City – however, participants from North End and Beasley did make up approximately one-third of the entire pool of participants.



Participants were asked to provide the first three digits of their postal code. This geo-location information was specific enough to see what parts of the City people were coming from, but vague enough that we could not pinpoint locations.

In addition to north end and central neighbourhoods, the workshop managed to draw participants from the Upper Mountain, Ancaster, Dundas, Stoney Creek, and West Burlington.

36 out of 37 participants provided their postal code information.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

LAND VALUE VS. COMMUNITY VALUES


One of the key parameters that Staff need to establish for the solicitation process is the role that price will play in the evaluation of proposals. Traditionally, land deals are seen as transactions where price is the primary, if not sole, measure of a proposal’s desirability. In this type of scenario, the goal is to maximize the sale price so that the profits can be used to pay for any number of projects throughout the City that need funding. However, given Pier 8’s scale and strategically desirable location, the City is in a unique position to leverage the competitive bid process to seek additional social, environmental and civic outcomes that could benefit the local community and the City as a whole. Likewise, the private development industry is coming around to recognizing that offering community benefits is a way to distinguish their bid from their competitors.

In order to take best advantage of this shifting sentiment, the Solicitation Process can be executed to encourage proposals that include a combination of both land price and community benefits. The question is – how far should we push in one direction or another? When we set the scorecard and provide bidders with submission instructions, we will need to let them know how much price will factor into the final assessment.


To garner public opinion on this topic, survey participants were asked the following question: **Where along the spectrum between seeking maximum community benefits and maximum financial return should the City be aiming when negotiating with developers?**

Participants were asked to indicate their preference along a spectrum of nine possible positions ranging from maximizing community benefits on one end to maximizing financial benefits (sale price) on the other. 35 out of 37 participants completed this exercise.

The largest majority (17 out of 35, or 49%) were in the middle third of the spectrum, while 43% fell into the upper third, and 9% in the lower third.



Looking at the distribution another way, 60% (21 out of 35, in orange) want a tilt towards community benefits, 20% (7 out of 35, in green) want a tilt towards financial return, while another 20% (7 out of 35, in blue) want a split down the middle.



In terms of highest frequency of responses, the largest single category at (9 out of 35) want the City to position to fully maximize community benefits, while the second largest group (7 out of 35) want an even balance.


SETTING PRIORITIES

Diving deeper into the question of what a desirable proposal might look like, we conducted an exercise that gave participants a chance to distribute votes amongst a group of potential “community benefits” that they might want to see in a proposal.

The question posed was: **If it was up to you, what elements would you ask developers to provide?** We presented a number of different elements and gave people 15 votes that they could distribute amongst the choices as they wished. The only limitation on this exercise was that the total votes cast could not exceed nor fall short of 15 as Staff could not make an arbitrary decision regarding which categories to allocate uncast votes, or which categories excess votes should be eliminated from. Due to this limitation, although all 37 people participated in this exercise, 4 were disqualified, leaving 33 included responses representing a total of 495 votes cast.

The results showed a clear preference for environmental sustainability, affordable housing options, family-friendly developments, and commercial uses that would be beneficial for the local neighbourhood. Reinforcing what we had seen from the previous exercise, maximizing the land sale price was clearly the lowest priority.

In terms of the most desired elements, environmental sustainability had a clear single majority with 17% of votes. However, the two options for delivering affordable units – rent-geared-to-income and modest market housing (orange bars) – together made up 23% of total votes.



Elements such as architectural design excellence (i.e., an award winning architect on developer’s team), policy integrity (i.e., developer promise to not seek amendments to secondary plan or zoning), extra funding for community resources (e.g., jobs programs, day cares), and a commitment for a high standard for accessibility (i.e., higher than AODA) did fall lower on the priority scale, but did collectively garner 33% of the total votes.


AFFORDABLE HOUSING

While the debate about affordable housing specifically on Pier 8 has been a prominent issue since the Project was first conceived, there has been no accord on what forms of affordable housing delivery would be most appropriate for this development.

With the understanding that affordable units can come in the form of rental or ownership tenures, and can range from subsidized to mid-market pricing models, this workshop gave Staff an opportunity to pose the question explicitly. Participants were asked: **Out of the following possible affordable housing delivery methods, please indicate your primary preference for Pier 8?**

It was predicted that if participants were given the option to choose more than one, the most likely response would be a mix of all. As such, the question specifically asked them to choose just one as a way to understand how people generally perceive the concept of affordable units and how they perceive the delivery of affordable units to align with the character of the Pier 8 development vision.

A total of 34 out of 37 participants answered this question and the results can be seen in the pie chart below.



The two blue segments totalling the largest portion (39%) represent forms of ownership tenure, whether mid-market and/or delivered through some sort of ownership assistance program (e.g. Habitat for Humanity model, subsidized down-payment loan programs)

The purple segments represent forms of rental tenure. It is interesting to note that no one chose “modest finish/modest priced rental” as their primary delivery method. Meanwhile, a full 29% chose subsidized rental (e.g. Rent Geared to Income) as their primary method of delivering affordable units at Pier 8.

The orange segment represents the 1/3 of participants who said they actually do not agree with any form of affordable housing on Pier 8.

VALUE JUDGEMENTS

Which attributes within prospective proposals does the City want to emphasize or promote – affordability, environmental sustainability, design, community infrastructure, accessibility, or something else? It is easy to say

“all of the above”, but even in that context, there are probably certain elements that we may value over another. The Value Judgements exercise was designed to bring some of the more difficult choices to the forefront. These judgements may inform recommendations about how the City’s desired outcomes will be articulated in the request for proposal instructions and evaluation criteria.

In this exercise, a series of scenarios were presented wherein one potential priority was placed in conflict with another (e.g., sustainable development vs. affordability). Participants were then asked if they would be willing to make the posed trade-off. Without knowing in advance, which attributes participants would view as their top priorities, Staff made educated guesses to craft the presented scenarios. The main attributes that the exercise focused on were affordability, price, sustainable development, family-friendly units, policy integrity, and neighbourhood amenities. In the interest of time, the survey was unable to conduct a complete head-to-head series of all the issues.

The following table summarizes how each attribute fared in its various match-ups against the others. The heading “Matches” refers to the number of Value Judgement questions the attribute was included in; “Wins” refers to the number of Value Judgement questions where the attribute garnered the majority of favour, and “% Won” is the win rate (i.e., Wins divided by Matches). A full narrative of the Value Judgement scenarios and responses can be found in Question 6 of Appendix B.

Attribute	Matches	Wins	% Won	Won against	Lost To
Affordability	4	1	25%	Price	Policy Integrity Sustainability Family Friendly
Price	3	0	0%		Affordability Sustainability Family Friendly
Policy Integrity	2	1	50%	Affordability	Amenities
Sustainability	2	2	100%	Price Affordability	
Family Friendly	2	2	100%	Price Affordability	
Amenities	1	1	100%	Policy Integrity	

In line with the results of the previous exercises, unsurprisingly, participants suggested that price was not the most important factor, causing it to lose all of its matchups. Also in line with the previous exercises, sustainability was a strong performer, as was support for family friendly units.

What was perhaps a bit of a surprise was that, despite garnering the highest support in the voting exercise, when presented in the value judgements, affordability only beat out price in four different matchups. It should be noted that affordability’s matchups against policy integrity and family friendly were very close, but the margin of support for sustainability over affordability was quite significant.

Despite the fact that participants were reminded that the scenarios did not represent actual trade-offs that were being contemplated as part of the Solicitation Process, but were merely being posed for the purpose of drawing out preferences, it was a reasonable assumption that some of the choices posed during the Value Judgement exercise, even in an anonymous format, might be uncomfortable for some to answer or may not be subject to a black-and-white response. As with all other questions in the survey, a “Choose to not answer” option was offered for all Value Judgement questions.

The following table shows the rates of participants choosing to opt out of each Value Judgement question. These are listed in the order that the questions were asked during the survey. The questions were intentionally set in an order that Staff believed would go from least-to-most controversial.

Matchup	Opt Out Rate
Affordability vs. Price	0% (0 out of 37)
Amenities vs. Policy Integrity	5% (2 out of 37)
Sustainability vs. Price	8% (3 out of 37)
Affordability vs. Policy Integrity	0% (0 out of 37)
Family-friendly vs. Price	14% (5 out of 37)
Affordability vs. Sustainability	16% (6 out of 37)
Affordability vs. Family-friendly	27% (10 out of 37)

True to Staff’s speculation, the opt-out rate increased as the value judgements required a choice between community benefits perceived to be increasingly desirable. It is also possible that by this stage of the survey, participants began feeling fatigued or overwhelmed with making decisions.

While there is no fault directed at participants who opted out of the questions, Staff are presented with the challenge of making recommendations based on very small sample sizes; unfortunately, there is no “opting out” of bringing recommendations to Council. Therefore, any recommendations based on the results of this study should bear in mind the size of the sample under consideration.

Notwithstanding the cautionary note above, the results of this exercise appear to place highest priority on sustainability, family friendly units, affordability, and desirable neighbourhood amenities.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

In addition to a “Choose to not answer” option, all questions also were provided with comment boxes where participants could make free-form comments. Additionally, at the end of the workshop, we asked participants to identify any outstanding/under-represented issues and to provide feedback on the workshop formats. A qualitative examination of all comments reveals some themes to further supplement the quantitative findings:

- **Pier 8 is a unique opportunity:** There is general consensus that Pier 8 is a unique opportunity that could achieve a wide variety of objectives – place-making, financial, and civic – due to its desirable location translating into strong land value.
- **Idealism:** Some respondents believe that because of Pier 8’s desirability, there should be neither a trade-off between price and community benefits, nor a tradeoff between most community benefits. They believe that the City can demand both maximum community benefits and maximum financial value.
- **Seeking balance:** Notwithstanding the idealism of some as described above, most others accepted the likelihood of a set of tradeoffs. What they wished for was that the City will strike a balance that reflects what citizens want. A few gave advice along the lines of not trying to achieve too many broad objectives, but rather aiming for excellence in a small handful of areas. A common sentiment was to make Pier 8 a leading model for sustainable development.
- **Affordable housing solutions:** Notwithstanding Question #4 that asked participant to choose just one delivery format for affordable housing, many participants who agreed to some form of affordable housing on Pier 8 added a comment that a mix of tenures and delivery methods would be preferable. Other

preferences included distributing affordable units among market units and allocating some affordable units towards families.

- **Traffic, parking, and transit need more attention:** Several participant comments identified traffic, parking, and transit as topics that did not get deserved attention. This has been acknowledged by Staff.
- **Appreciation for feedback process:** Lastly, appreciation for the workshop itself was fairly prevalent, with participants giving thanks for listening to public opinion, acknowledging the difficult task that the Staff and Council face in making decisions, and commending the format of the workshop to gather nuanced information.

All comments have been provided in unedited form and consolidated in Appendix B.

SUPPLEMENTAL EXERCISE

On September 29, 2016 at a regularly scheduled monthly Community Conversation meeting, Staff presented the results of the summer workshop series. Given that the total number of workshop participants was relatively small, Staff wanted to use the monthly meeting as an extra opportunity to conduct supplemental exercises that could be appended to the body of knowledge acquired through the workshops. After presenting the findings of the workshops, meeting attendees were asked to participate in two activities that would build off of questions and exercises that were completed in the workshops.

The two activities both followed the same format and scoring methodology:

- Participants were given two stickers – one marked as a First Choice and the other as Second Choice;
- A question was posed that asked participants’ preference out of a pre-defined set of options – presentation boards included sheets with headings, each allocated to a different option;
- Participants were asked to indicate their First and Second Choices by placing their stickers under the respective headings;
- At the end of the exercise, Staff tallied the number of First and Second Choice votes that each option received – First Choice votes garnered 2 points each, Second Choice votes received 1 point each
- The tallies and point totals are presented below.

Descriptions and results of the two activities are presented below and photos of the final voting boards are provided in Appendix C of this report.

ACTIVITY #1 – COMMUNITY BENEFITS

This activity builds off of the workshop exercises that asked participants to identify which potential community benefits they would like proposals to prioritize. The options offered included some of the more popular selections from the workshops.

Activity instructions: This exercise is intended to gather your opinion on which COMMUNITY BENEFITS you think should be most prominent in development proposals for Pier 8. For this exercise, please use your RED and GREEN stickers and indicate your first (RED) and second (GREEN) choices among the headings provided.

	1st Choice Count	2nd Choice Count	Total Weighted Score
Unit mix to include affordable housing options	6	4	16
Unit mix to include family-friendly options	6	3	15
Environmentally sustainable design & construction	5	4	14
Contributions to social infrastructure and/or training and jobs programs	0	5	5
Exceptional barrier free design (in unit, common areas, exterior)	0	0	0

The results of this activity appear to reaffirm the workshop results that place affordability, family friendly units, and environmental sustainability as the distinct priorities, and in fairly equal proportion to each other.

ACTIVITY #2 - AFFORDABILITY

This activity, focusing on the spectrum of affordable housing delivery methods, is a direct repeat of Question #4 from the workshop. The options are exactly the same, but this time participants were allowed to choose two rather than just one preferred delivery method.

Activity instructions: This exercise is intended to gather your opinion on which forms of AFFORDABLE HOUSING you think are most appropriate for Pier 8. For this exercise, please use your YELLOW and BLUE stickers and indicate your first (YELLOW) and second (BLUE) choices among the list provided below.

	1st Choice Count	2nd Choice Count	Total Weighted Score
Ownership Assistance Programs (e.g., Habitat for Humanity)	4	6	14
Subsidized Rental (e.g., rent-geared-to-income)	4	3	11
Mid-market Rental (modestly finished, limited common area amenities, not subsidized)	4	2	10
Mid-market Ownership (modestly finished, limited common area amenities, not subsidized)	2	1	5
No affordable housing on Pier 8	0	2	2

In this iteration of the exercise, we saw a notable shift of votes from not wanting affordable housing on Pier 8 to wanting some form of affordable housing measures; 32% in the workshop did not want any affordable housing on Pier 8, while in this activity, only 5% of total vote score was for this option. Similar to the workshop results, the split between ownership and rental tenure preferences was fairly even. In this iteration, we were also able to observe a preference for subsidized business models, although market-based pricing was still considered generally acceptable.

CONCLUSIONS

Interpreting the combined results from the summer workshop series, we draw the following conclusions and recommendations:

- When formulating the Solicitation Process and Evaluation Criteria, Staff should consider the public’s preference to seek a measured balance between land sale price and community benefits;
- Participants of this survey would like to see proposals prioritize environmental sustainability, family-friendly unit options, affordability, and amenities that benefit the local community;
- On the question of affordable housing delivery, both rental and ownership tenures are acceptable, with a slight preference for a subsidized business model over market-based pricing; and
- If Council desires additional citizen feedback prior to finalizing the Evaluation Criteria, Staff recommends a variation of the same workshop, but in a format better suited to online replication. The content can be expanded to capture more opinions on the topics of transit, parking and traffic, if desired.

APPENDIX A – FACILITATOR’S SCRIPT

WELCOME

Thank you for coming out tonight to participate in our workshop regarding the proposed development of Pier 8 on Hamilton’s waterfront.

As you may know, the City is looking to sell lands on Piers 8 to the development community to help realize a vision for a revitalized Waterfront.

Your participation in tonight’s exercises will inform City Staff of your priorities which will factor into a recommendation to Council about how the sale process should progress.

We know that this topic may be fairly new to some of you. But your interest in showing up tonight is very encouraging so we’ll do our best to bring you up to speed and make it worth your while for having shown up.

[CLICK]

So this is how the session will work.

[CLICK] First, I’m going to start with a brief overview of the project to give you a little bit of background context.

[CLICK] Next I’ll ask a couple of baseline setting questions that lets us know your current understanding and opinion of the project.

[CLICK] From there, I’ll move onto describing some specific topics that the City will need to address as it prepares its sale process.

[CLICK] Then we will do a couple of exercises that ask for your personal opinion regarding these topics.

[CLICK] We’ll then wrap up with a few questions that asks for your feedback on this workshop.

This entire exercise should take about 25 minutes to complete; and we do ask that, if at all possible, you stay through to the end so that your responses can be recorded to completion.

[CLICK] To allow us to be consistent between each time we run these sessions, I’m going to ask that you please hold any questions until the very end. There will be an opportunity at the end of the session to chat directly with me if you have a specific question or topic you’d like to discuss in more detail.

So, let’s get into a little bit of background context...

BACKGROUND CONTEXT

[CLICK]

[Aerial Picture of industrial Pier 8 today]

This is Piers 7 & 8. Some of you may know it as where Sarcoa Restaurant, Williams Café, and the skating rink are. The entire site we’re talking about runs all the way towards the left where the HMCS Haida is docked. And the City owns all the land to the right of this picture out towards Bayfront Park.

The future uses at Piers 8 and along the waterfront already have a plan that has been worked on for almost 20 years between City Hall and the public. The concept and rules are outlined in a secondary plan document that goes by the name “Setting Sail”. Setting Sail is a legal document that all future development in the area must follow – including both private development as well as publicly accessible areas provided by the City. Setting Sail

lays out principles and policies related to the character of the neighbourhood, environmental sensitivities, waterfront access, design standards, and cultural considerations. Through consultation with the public, we heard that two additional principles are very important to the community – affordability and accessibility.

And based on Setting Sail, this [\[CLICK\]](#)

is a visualization of what Pier 7 & 8 could look like at full build-out.



The triangular waterfront park near the middle of the picture is Pier 7. The remainder is considered Pier 8. You can see that the skating rink, Williams Café building, and Sarcoa building will remain as is. For the rest of the development, the plan is for mostly residential buildings no higher than 8 storeys with several having retail and commercial uses on the ground floor.

If you could step into this picture, you’d see that the architectural styles are interesting and varied, streets are animated, and the buildings showcase enviro-friendly features. You’d also see that all around the perimeter is a 30-metre wide public promenade that allows everybody to enjoy the water’s edge and has different uses along different segments – maybe a little waterpark for kids in one area, and areas for dock fishing in another, public art to be enjoyed as you wander about, and an artificial beach to meet up with friends for a picnic. Park your bike and grab an ice cream with the kids, or sip a cool iced tea on a patio while you watch sailboats breeze by.

The public spaces and underground municipal services (e.g. sewers, water, electricity, etc.) will be developed and retained by the City, while the buildings will be built by the private development industry who will purchase the lands from the City. Rather than just selling the lands through an offer process, the City will be carrying out a more in-depth process that will require interested developers to make concept and pricing proposals to demonstrate that their plans align with the City’s desires.

The feedback we’ve gotten on this vision has generally been quite positive.

However, getting from this [\[CLICK BACK\]](#) to this [\[CLICK FWD\]](#), is not a straightforward task. The City and Council have already made a commitment to provide the publicly accessible pieces, but those are still yet to be defined. As for the buildings themselves, the City has to find a partner, or set of partners, from the private development industry who are in agreement with this vision and are willing to join us in the journey. Our biggest challenge for this task is to translate all the pieces of this vision image into words as a set of instructions and wishes in a way that still allows developers to feel like they can make a profit while delivering what we ask for.

Hamilton is large city that represents a wide variety of people, values, cultures, and ideas. The purpose of this workshop is to gather opinions from citizens like you so we can start to understand what we collectively value and prioritize as a City. These value judgements and priorities will help us to put into words, the expectations that we will set for developers to address and agree to if they want to be a successful bidder for lands on Pier 8.

Before we get started, I want to remind everyone that we’re here to talk about the pieces that are potentially requesting private developers to provide. There are many parts of the Pier 8 project that City Hall is going to provide, and there will be opportunities in the future to discuss those elements.

Today’s task is to focus on what we will ask the development industry to provide.

So let’s get started with a couple of baseline setting questions...

[CLICK] To participate in our questionnaire, please use the form provided when you first walked in. I’ll call out the question number, read the question aloud, and give you approximately 30 seconds to consider and mark your answer. I’ll also put the question up on the screen for you to read as well.

If you feel that you don’t have enough information to answer the posed question, you can do the following:

- Tick the “Choose not to answer” box provided for each question; and/or
- Answer the question as best you can but also leave a comment in the box provided for each question – please be sure to indicate if there was a point of confusion and elaborate as best as you can

Are you ready? Let’s begin...**[CLICK]**

BASELINE QUESTIONS

- 1) How often do you visit Hamilton’s Waterfront area? Choose all that apply to you.
 - a) Weekly or more frequently
 - b) More than once a month
 - c) A few times a year
 - d) Once a year or less
 - e) Lots in the summer, rarely in the winter
 - f) I live in the vicinity of the Waterfront

Question 2...**[CLICK]**

- 2) Please rate your current knowledge of the issues surrounding the planned development of Pier 8
 - a) Know very little to nothing about the issues
 - b) Somewhat familiar
 - c) Feel relatively well informed
 - d) Very well informed

Great. Moving on...[\[CLICK\]](#)

- 3) This project is seen by some as an opportunity for the City of Hamilton to accomplish various social, environmental, and civic objectives that are seen as beneficial to the local neighbourhood and the City as a whole. As the owner of these valuable lands, the City is in a unique position to be able to negotiate with prospective developers to try and secure community benefits through the proposal evaluation and sale process. Opponents to this approach claim that requiring the provision of such benefits by the developer may reduce the financial return to the City reflected in a lower sale price for the lands. They suggest that the City should try to maximize the sale price so that the profits can be used to pay for any number of projects throughout the City that need funding.

In your opinion, where along the spectrum between seeking maximum community benefits and maximum financial return should the City be aiming for when negotiating with developers? Please mark one box along the spectrum with an 'x'.

...Please make your selection now...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Max Benefits									Max Price

Great. Thanks for sticking with me this far.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

Now, let's go a little deeper into some of the issues and ideas that may affect the sale of lands and the proposed developments...

For each of the following topics, a brief overview will be given that attempts to pinpoint the main trade-offs. You can follow along on the provided document.

[\[CLICK\]](#)

After we review these statements, you will be asked to provide your own opinion, so please take care to listen to the reasoning from both sides and think about how much you agree with either side.

[\[CLICK\]](#)

Environmentally Friendly Development

There is no doubt that environmentally friendly development is something that is applauded by the public. Developers can do this through energy conservation efforts, designing for car-free lifestyles, clean water initiatives, or low-impact construction techniques. However, implementing some of these practices can be quite costly as

many of the most impactful practices are driven by new technologies. Providing these features isn’t necessarily difficult, but the financial return does tend to be a major consideration.

[CLICK]

Land Use Regulations

Legal limits are currently in place for unit density, building heights and parking ratios, as a way to control the population density and built form character on Pier 8 and surrounding areas. These limitations, along with the engineering challenges of building on a pier over water, could result in a developer determining the only way to make development feasible would be to purchase the land at a discounted price. Conversely, if concessions were granted to allow the developer to build more units, taller buildings, or reduce on-site parking in order to improve the financial feasibility of developing the sites, traffic could increase, resources strained, and the enjoyment of the area impacted.

[CLICK]

Affordable Housing

Advocates of healthy communities support providing housing options for a mix of households, including those who require affordable housing. Some use a definition of affordability relative to income, which is no more than 30% of gross income spent on housing costs, while others interpret affordability as a pricing level that is lower than an accepted market average. Affordable ownership can also be made possible through down-payment assistance programs. Some take the position that affordable housing should comprise a portion of the units on Pier 8. Alternatively, others suggest that the City should try to extract the highest sale price for these lands by appealing to higher price-point projects, and instead commit to allocate a portion of the sales proceeds to affordable housing priorities throughout the City’s portfolio, including within the immediate neighbourhoods. In either case, it should be noted that there is a distinction between rented and owned affordable housing, with rental units requiring ongoing maintenance, operation, and administration resources, which will eventually fall to the City or other administering agency.

[CLICK]

Neighbourhood Character

Setting Sail requires that any prospective development on Pier 8 respects and enhances the character of the surrounding neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood character is a concept that’s difficult to express as it encompasses a number of different attributes including, but not limited to, built form, demography, land use, and both public and private realm activities. Residents of this particular area have indicated that being “child and family friendly” is a definitive part of their neighbourhood’s character. Contributors to this character include a healthy mix of larger, family-friendly units, businesses that cater to the needs of local residents, and safe streets for people traveling by bike, mobility device, or on foot. The introduction of a development the size of what is envisioned for Pier 8 will inevitably have an impact on the surrounding neighbourhoods. More people in the area may contribute to

increased traffic and demand for local resources. But, having more people living in the area will also provide support to enhance existing amenities and prompt demand for new amenities to be built in the area.

VALUE JUDGEMENTS

We have just discussed various principles that the City may ask bidders to address in their proposals. Each has its own merits, but some are potentially in conflict with each other. Our challenge is to try and articulate how we value and prioritize these principles so we can set the right expectations and provide direction to interested bidders.

The remainder of our workshop questions will focus on making some value judgements that will help City Staff understand what you and your fellow citizens care about and prioritize.

[CLICK]

- 4) **Affordable Housing:** This is one of the more complex issues as we have noted there are different interpretations of affordable housing. This question is intended to get your personal opinion on what affordable housing on Pier 8 might mean.

Out of the following possible affordable housing delivery methods, please indicate your primary preference for Pier 8

- a) Modest finish / modest priced rental
- b) Modest finish / modest priced ownership
- c) Ownership assistance programs
- d) Subsidized rental (e.g., geared to income)
- e) Affordable housing on Pier 8 should not be a consideration

[CLICK]

- 5) **Allocated Votes:** We will be asking bidders to prepare a proposal that fulfills the desires of the City of Hamilton. If it was up to you, what elements would you ask developers to provide? You are given 15 votes that you can distribute however you wish among the following – tick from zero up to six boxes for each category without allowing your total to exceed 15. Please be careful to enter Subtotal and Total Counts to re-confirm the maximum is not shorted or exceeded, as miscounted entries for this exercise will not be eligible to be included in the final pooled results.

I’ll read through each element and then will give you 2-and-a-half minutes to complete this exercise

The City requests that the Developer provide...	Vote Allocation	Subtotal
An award-winning architect on its team	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

A promise not to apply for a change to the height/density/parking regulations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Affordable housing that is geared to income	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
The highest possible purchase price for the lands	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial contributions to community programs like scholarships or job training, or to community facilities like libraries and daycares	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Family-friendly units	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Accessible units to a higher standard than provincial legislation and municipal guidelines for barrier-free access	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
An environmentally friendly vision	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Commercial uses that are beneficial to the surrounding neighbourhood	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Modestly outfitted units that are in a more affordable price range	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Total Count		

Times up. Ready for the next exercise?... [\[CLICK\]](#)

- 6) You will now be presented with a series of choices and asked to indicate whether you would be willing to make the described trade-off. I will describe a scenario, and then will ask you if you would be willing to make the described trade-off.

As always, you can choose to not answer and leave a comment

Please keep in mind that these scenarios are meant to get a feel for your priorities. They are not actual options that will be offered to developers. The posing of these scenarios is not meant to debate the planning merits of the underlying principles nor will it influence the review of any applications for zoning or subdivision.

Lastly, where the term “affordable housing” is used, please consider it to mean subsidized rental units that the City would purchase from the developer and operate municipally.

So let’s begin...[\[CLICK\]](#)

Q6(a): Value Judgment 1	Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing on-site, but reduces the price it is willing to pay for the lands.	Question: Would you be willing to accept a <i>lower land sale price</i> in exchange for <i>affordable housing</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(b): Value Judgment 2	Scenario: A national grocer expresses interest in locating in the Pier 8 development. Current parking regulations say they need to provide 80 parking stalls to ensure that customers coming from further away by car can be accommodated. The grocer is only willing to locate on Pier 8 if they can reduce the requirement to 60 stalls.	Question: Would you be willing to <i>relax parking regulations</i> in exchange for a <i>desirable neighbourhood amenity</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(c): Value Judgment 3	Scenario: The City requires buildings on Pier 8 to incorporate a renewable energy feature such as solar panels. A developer claims that this is an expensive upfront cost and therefore reduces the price they are willing to pay for the land.	Question: Would you be willing to accept a <i>lower land sale price</i> in exchange for <i>sustainable development</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(d): Value Judgment 4	Scenario: A developer offers to provide a floor of affordable housing but only if they are given the right to build an additional floor above the 8-storey limit.	Question: Would you be willing to <i>allow the developer to build a taller building</i> in exchange for <i>affordable housing</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(e): Value Judgment 5	Scenario: A developer is willing to build a desirable number of family-friendly housing options but these larger units are not as profitable on a per square foot basis, so they reduce the price they are willing to pay for the lands.	Question: Would you be willing to accept a <i>lower land sale price</i> in exchange for <i>family-friendly units</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(f): Value Judgment 6	Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing but would like to eliminate some of the more costly low-carbon impact building features from the overall development scheme to make it more affordable.	Question: Would you be willing to accept a <i>lower standard for enviro-friendly features</i> in exchange for <i>affordable housing</i> on Pier 8?
[CLICK] Q6(g): Value Judgment 7	Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing but in order to maximize the number of affordable units they can fit into the area, they will need to reduce the number of larger, family-sized units in the total development scheme.	Question: Would you be willing to <i>reduce the overall number of family-sized units</i> in exchange for an <i>increase in the number of affordable housing units</i> on Pier 8?

Great, we’re almost done...[CLICK]

- 7) Earlier in the workshop we asked you to indicate where along the spectrum between seeking maximum community benefits and maximum financial return, the City should be aiming for when negotiating with developers. Has your opinion changed at all as a result of participating in this workshop?

Please mark one box along the spectrum with an 'x' that reflects your current opinion and leave a comment, especially if your opinion has changed.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Max Benefits

Max Price

That’s it for questions about Pier 8

PARTICIPANT PROFILE & FEEDBACK

To help us make even better use of your input and improve future public workshop experiences please provide answers the following questions: [\[CLICK\]](#)

- 8) What are the first 3 digits of your postal code? _____ [\[CLICK\]](#)
- 9) What was your reason for participating in today’s workshop?
- a) I wanted to learn more about the project and issues
 - b) I wanted to ask a specific question of City Staff
 - c) I wanted to help shape the outcome of this project by contributing my opinions
 - d) All of the above
 - e) I was just curious and had no expectations

[\[CLICK\]](#)

- 10) Did this workshop session improve your understanding of the project and issues, and did you feel knowledgeable enough to answer all of the questions? Please choose the statement that best describes your experience today:
- a) I feel much better informed and felt knowledgeable enough to answer the questions
 - b) I learned some things I previously did not know but still do not feel knowledgeable enough to answer some/most of the questions
 - c) I learned a few new things and felt knowledgeable enough to answer the questions
 - d) I already knew most/all of what was covered, but I am happy to participate and contribute my opinion
 - e) I only wanted to be informed and did not want to contribute my opinions
 - f) This workshop was a waste of my time

[\[CLICK\]](#)

- 11) Are there any topics that you think are important but we did not adequately address? Any other comments you’d like to leave with us? Please use the space provided for Question 10.

[\[CLICK\]](#)

Thank you very much for your time and input into this process. We’ll be holding these same sessions throughout the summer months and we hope to get a great turnout. Please spread the word to your friends and neighbours to come out to our future sessions to ensure that the City is getting a good feel for what the public wants.

Our goal is to have results tallied by late-September and we’ll be taking the results into account when making future recommendations to Council. Stay tuned for announcements about when these results will be publicly available. Join our mailing list or visit our website to be kept in the loop.

Please be sure to turn in your response sheets as well as the statement read-along sheets so they can be re-used.

If you have any specific questions, I’ll be available for about 10 minutes as we get prepared to start our next session. Alternatively, you can take down my contact information here and reach out at a later date.

Thanks again, and enjoy your summer.

APPENDIX B – SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES

Q1: Baseline 1

How often do you visit Hamilton’s Waterfront area? Choose all that apply to you.

- a) Weekly or more frequently
- b) More than once a month
- c) A few times a year
- d) Once a year or less
- e) Lots in the summer, rarely in the winter
- f) I live in the vicinity of the Waterfront

12	9	5	1	10	7	0
A	B	C	D	E	F	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- **View from my living room - across the street**
- **Use it daily**
- **I currently live near James & Barton**
- **For recreation purposes**
- **Daily or minimum 3x per week**
- **I help in festivals & community events, plus attend invitation-only public forums as well**
- **Daily**

Q2: Baseline 2 – Select only one

Please rate your current knowledge of the issues surrounding the planned development of Pier 8

- a) Know very little to nothing about the issues
- b) Somewhat familiar
- c) Feel relatively well informed
- d) Very well informed

2	8	10	15	2
A	B	C	D	Choose to not answer


Comments:

- **Have attended many public sessions & have interacted with city staff**
- **Attended 2/3 of meetings & go of line with city officials with poverty reduction organizations as a member as well**

Q3: Baseline 3 – Mark along the spectrum with an ‘x’ the choice that best matches your opinion

This project is seen by some as an opportunity for the City of Hamilton to accomplish various social, environmental, and civic objectives that are seen as beneficial to the local neighbourhood and the City as a whole. As the owner of these valuable lands, the City is in a unique position to be able to negotiate with prospective developers to try and secure community benefits through the proposal evaluation and sale process. Opponents to this approach claim that requiring the provision of such benefits by the developer may reduce the financial return to the City reflected in a lower sale price for the lands. They suggest that the City should try to maximize the sale price so that the profits can be used to pay for any number of projects throughout the City that need funding.

In your opinion, where along the spectrum between seeking maximum community benefits and maximum financial return should the City be aiming for when negotiating with developers? Please mark one box along the spectrum with an 'x'.



Choose to not answer 1

Comments:

- **Pier 8 and immediate area - not elsewhere - in order to keep the vision**
- **Tend more towards maximizing financial return provided proceeds invested in affordable housing**
- **I believe has to be a balance; however, to ensure benefits always considered must give extra priority here to ensure balance. Default will bias toward profit.**
- **Max price if it is to provide affordable housing**
- **Label should say "Max Financial Return" to match slide**
- **I consider the creation of housing, both rental and purchasable, for average and lower income people the top priority. I think the City should retain a 25% ownership in all lands.**
- **This is a unique site, waterfront access is a rare & wonderful resource. We need to get the best possible use of it.**
- **There is a real opportunity to create a place for all Hamiltonians to enjoy, much like the waterfront is now. Actually, I think this is a false dichotomy - why not aim for both? If done well, financial benefits will naturally follow.**
- **We only have one waterfront at West Harbour - let's ensuring residents win**
- **Little confusing to a average tax payer, maybe a future forum or media release to explain this concept**
- **Tough question to answer - what would city us \$'s for**
- **Sale price premium for no restrictions will be small compared to long term community benefits**
- **Waterside public land is limited and I'm [illegible] Is for future generations**
- **I honestly don't see this as a real tradeoff. I think the City can require benefits without yielding on price.**
- **Definition of price is ambiguous. Total cost over 20 years or just sale price at time of sale?**
- **Not sure these are mutually exclusive. Want to keep having benefit to com after sale (long term). Value maximum community benefit overall but don't know best way to achieve that. Am not a business person**

Q4: Affordable Housing – select only one

This is one of the more complex issues as we have noted there are different interpretations of affordable housing. This question is intended to get your personal opinion on what affordable housing on Pier 8 might mean.

Out of the following possible affordable housing delivery methods, please indicate your primary preference for Pier 8

- a) Modest finish / modest priced rental
- b) Modest finish / modest priced ownership
- c) Ownership assistance programs
- d) Subsidized rental (e.g., geared to income)
- e) Affordable housing on Pier 8 should not be a consideration

0 5 8 10 11 3
 A B C D E Choose to not answer

Comments:

- **30 seconds not enough time to evaluate options for such a complex issue**
- **Some amount of affordable housing (small amount) but otherwise maximize profits to build affordable housing elsewhere in West Harbour**
- **as mentioned in presentation, many forms/defn's of affordable housing; all need to be considered. If geared-to-income included as priority, others will also**
- **It's too bad that we can't pick more than one. I would choose A, B, and C. Define "modest"**
- **I think a mix of 50/50 rental and owned would also work**
- **Affordable housing must be included, 10-20% of the units. How it's done is less important. It's a great location for affordable housing and needed to create the mixed-income neighbourhood required by city policies, including Setting Sail.**
- **Essential to have affordable housing. Again, these things are not necessarily in competition with each other.**
- **Ownership is key (as opposed to rentals)**
- **Many different types of affordable housing should adopt inclusionary zoning i.e.: accessible, elderly are included this will create a balance within the neighbourhood**
- **Only depends with the raising increases of rentals across Hamilton stays same as CITY HOUSING prices or AFFORDABLE. If no increases to OW/ODSP then no one on social services will be able to afford any rental units somewhat like Toronto or Ottawa!**
- **Critical to have mixed income community. And has to be integrated well, not clumped together for only maximum density. Does not have to be at Pier 8, but in N End/Harbour West**
- **Very minor affordable housing**
- **A blended solution**
- **A mix is probably the answer = A/B/C+D**
- **Subsidized rental appears to meet greatest need, but ownership options could also be incorporated into Pier 8**
- **Providing government is prepared to properly fund maintenance of rental units over the long term**
- **What does modest finish mean. Don't want it to become a place for wealthy ppl. Want all of these except E**

<p>Q5: Allocated Votes: We will be asking bidders to prepare a proposal that fulfills the desires of the City of Hamilton. If it was up to you, what elements would you ask developers to provide? You are given 15 votes that you can distribute however you wish among the following – tick from zero up to <u>six</u> boxes for each category without allowing your total to exceed 15. Please be careful to enter Subtotal and Total Counts to re-confirm the maximum is not shorted or exceeded, as miscounted entries for this exercise will not be eligible to be included in the final pooled results.</p>		
Choose to not participate 0 Disqualified (shorted or exceeded 15): 4	Votes (tick 0 up to 6)	Subtotal
An award-winning architect on its team	46	
A promise not to apply for a change to the height/density/parking regulations	40	
Affordable housing that is geared to income	67	
The highest possible purchase price for the lands	23	
Financial contributions to community programs like scholarships or job training, or to community facilities like libraries and daycares	39	
Family-friendly units	57	
Accessible units to a higher standard than provincial legislation and municipal guidelines for barrier-free access	39	
An environmentally friendly vision	85	
Commercial uses that are beneficial to the surrounding neighbourhood	53	
Modestly outfitted units that are in a more affordable price range	46	
Total Count (not to exceed 15)		495
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • don't try to achieve too many objectives. Do 2 or 3 really well instead of 5 done badly • RGI affordable housing not financially viable. Highest price balanced with other objectives as possible. Modestly outfitted units - some but not a high proportion so can maximize returns & use \$ to build affordable housing elsewhere • There is a time (City history) and a place (neighbourhood community) for urban planning goals. This project is needed to attract a demographic that counter-balances the north-end communities • Don't make the north end too congested with cars and people • Confusing to have two affordable housing options • I want it to be a real neighbourhood, not an upscale, sanitized neighbourhood • Make the site an award-winning eco-community - put Hamilton on the map! • % of income is a loaded question think of OW recipients with sunshine list members 30% is a wide range. Not if affordable housing is excluded • Difficult to come out with only 15 points when half of the subjects I agree on from 5-6 points. Still, well-thought out survey 		

- Evaluation criteria should include considerations that are strict on: thermal comfort, operations cost, durability. The EU is phasing in these 3 considerations into law right now for all new development with many cities & regions already having developed local laws. Their approach is nearly net-zero, or Passive House. This is law for all new construction by 2020. For government buildings it's 2018. Hamilton can do the same here.
- Will there be parks for sports? All residential - need more commercial
- Refer to architecture article in Macleans Magazine Summer 2016
- Other priorities!! Traffic - parking, transit
- Answered in the context that 1600 units and 13,000 sqm of commercial is serious over-building
- What do architects win awards for? I may not like the categories. (re: Promise) does this mean anything? (re: promise not to change regulations) Can break promise. (re: Financial contribution) City or buyer? (re: Family friendly) also seniors, yes. So little new construction of housing in Hamilton + very few accessible units = need this a lot. (re: modestly outfitted) what does this mean?

Q6(a): Value Judgement 1

Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing on-site, but reduces the price it is willing to pay for the lands.

Question: Would you be willing to accept a *lower land sale price* in exchange for *affordable housing* on Pier 8?

24	13	0
Yes	No	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- Same as before. Some moderately affordable, not RGI, and max \$ to build elsewhere
- This is likely to happen and should be accepted to get affordable housing here
- But I don't want us to undersell the asset
- Different situation for shops & restaurants
- Good idea!
- How much lower - is developer still making the same profit
- Affordable housing important, but does not have to be there. Can be a few blocks away
- This is not fair the city makes the money back over the long term
- Yes, but as stated earlier, I believe that Pier 8 represents a rare opportunity for both developers + city + tradeoff should not be needed
- Not sure why the developer would need to offer less for the land in a competitive market
- Disagree with city operating the affordable housing. Doesn't have a good record for this . Would prefer Indewell or other org to do it. Would affordable housing stay affordable over time - forever?
- If affordable ownership units, price wouldn't need to be lowered...?

Q6(b): Value Judgement 2

Scenario: A national grocer expresses interest in locating in the Pier 8 development. Current parking regulations say they need to provide 80 parking stalls to ensure that customers coming from further away by car can be accommodated. The grocer is only willing to locate on Pier 8 if they can reduce the requirement to 60 stalls.

Question: Would you be willing to *relax parking regulations* in exchange for *a desirable neighbourhood amenity* on Pier 8?

	28	7	2
	Yes	No	Choose to not answer
Comments:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • but NOT for a grocery store. Would have to be another "desirable neighbourhood amenity" • LRT. 80 is a lot of space invested towards parking • I wouldn't want a grocery store on Pier 8 though • If the scenario included the LRT to the Waterfront, I could answer yes • City should also consider reducing parking requirements for higher densities • I think that with adequate public transit, it should be possible to reduce car use • Parking • A multi-modal planning approach would make this a feasible trade-off • Overall - reduced parking requirements & use public transit! And bikes • Green roofs also • Simple we have a free trolley all summer. Farmers Market pays parking. Winter a bus to area same ticket pricing • Would be willing to go down even further to make it 100% walking & biking accessible and no vehicles • Is national grocer a desirable option? Alternatives? • Desirable neighbourhood amenity!!! • Development on Pier 8 should emphasize car-free lifestyle, therefore, reduced demand for parking • The point is to serve the local community not to draw customers from far away who need to drive • Depends on size of store. People shouldn't drive so much. Need bike parking + transit 		

Q6(c): Value Judgement 3

Scenario: The City requires buildings on Pier 8 to incorporate a renewable energy feature such as solar panels. A developer claims that this is an expensive upfront cost and therefore reduces the price they are willing to pay for the land.

Question: Would you be willing to accept a *lower land sale price* in exchange for *sustainable development* on Pier 8?

	25	9	3
	Yes	No	Choose to not answer
Comments:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEED should be part of solution • But solar panels, unlike affordable housing, are used as marketing features in luxury housing, so price reduction should be less than other community benefits • However, I think the City should thoroughly investigate if solar panels really boost the cost per unit that much • We have a bad habit in this city of letting developers set the agenda. I'd like to see us change that habit, and demand top price AND good development. Not sure why they are mutually exclusive. • Absolutely - make the development sustainable - it will pay off with higher priced units • They should do it without a bribe! • As ONT/FED government to give developers a tax reduction since HYDRO is expensive. WIN-WIN. Cut hydro for city • True value & economic assessment on value of "sustainable development" needs to be understood before making that value judgement! • But not solar. Focus on better buildings that are efficient • Are we looking into solar energy in other parts of the city • Most programs are subsidized already • It should make the units more marketable so why would they need to offer less 		

- Except - environmentally friendly over time saves developer \$ on energy etc. So not sure agree with scenario
- Assuming net positive benefits to the community

Q6(d): Value Judgement 4

Scenario: A developer offers to provide a floor of affordable housing but only if they are given the right to build an additional floor above the 8-storey limit.

Question: Would you be willing to *allow the developer to build a taller building* in exchange for *affordable housing* on Pier 8?

17	20	0
Yes	No	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- **Stick to Setting Sail!!!**
- **Absolutely!**
- **But affordable housing should be required period. Developers should understand that and not be offering trade-offs**
- **Make sense to help developers maximize returns - a good trade-off**
- **And the affordable units should not be all on one floor**
- **Only if its approved by all. Not to exceed 25 to 30 floors so the rest of city view is cut off like T.O.**
- **Too high ruins it for everyone (see Toronto)**
- **It would take away from...**
- **Affordable housing should be a requirement within existing height limits**
- **If able to demonstrate the need**
- **Yes if sale price goes up - not in all spots**
- **Affordable housing would be better to be distributed throughout the project vs. one floor**

Q6(e): Value Judgement 5

Scenario: A developer is willing to build a desirable number of family-friendly housing options but these larger units are not as profitable on a per square foot basis, so they reduce the price they are willing to pay for the lands.

Question: Would you be willing to accept a *lower land sale price* in exchange for *family-friendly units* on Pier 8?

21	11	5
Yes	No	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- **Am contradicting myself but on a few units - mostly maximize \$**
- **However, the City should investigate whether the price difference is justified**
- **Yes!**
- **North End is a "child & family friendly neighbourhood"**
- **Because of our aging baby boomers we need more housing for newcomers or even outside of Hamilton newcomers - jobs & tax revenue**
- **So long as there is control over potential for conversion - would prefer more flexibly built units that are adaptable over time with no discount!**
- **Yes, but not much. And family friendly can be small, doesn't have to be large.**
- **Who are these developers?**
- **The City has the ability to decide the size**
- **Larger units must be a requirement - should not affect price paid for land**
- **Maybe not huge family friendly (e.g., big families) but yes for families of 3-4**

- Depends on how units are allocated and price impact

Q6(f): Value Judgement 6

Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing but would like to eliminate some of the more costly low-carbon impact building features from the overall development scheme to make it more affordable.

Question: Would you be willing to accept a *lower standard for enviro-friendly features* in exchange for *affordable housing* on Pier 8?

9	22	6
Yes	No	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- Possibly - depending on what is being offered as trade *one enviro feature is...
- Can't decide. Somewhere in the middle
- No deal - GHG emissions are important
- If a developer talks like this, they should be eliminated from the process
- Both should be required
- Please don't pit poverty against the environment
- Environmental feature are key differentiator
- That is so short-sighted!!!
- Depends on which corners are cut
- Most enviro-friendly features fail or are not within the price in net enviro/[illegible] benefit!
- Good building design is critical (and includes efficiency, thermal comfort, etc.) while affordable housing can happen in the vicinity
- Be a leader in this option
- Yes, but...
- Within reason
- What is a low carbon impact building?
- Affordable rental housing will come more burden than benefit in this development

Q6(g): Value Judgement 7

Scenario: A developer offers to provide affordable housing but in order to maximize the number of affordable units they can fit into the area, they will need to reduce the number of larger, family-sized units in the total development scheme.

Question: Would you be willing to *reduce the overall number of family-sized units* in exchange for an *increase in the number of affordable housing units* on Pier 8?

13	14	9
Yes	No	Choose to not answer

Comments:

- Family sized units are important to neighbourhood. Lots of smaller units will be available
- Family sized but not necessarily also affordable
- No affordable housing unless height limits increased
- We need affordable family units, so this trade-off doesn't make sense
- Yes, but what about families that require affordable housing
- Family units are key!

- **What about families who need affordable housing???**
- **Use Pier 7 or outside of Pier 8 less intensification**
- **Make family units adaptable on an interim basis**
- **Unit totals are already higher than originally planned**
- **Again both affordable units as a % of total units and larger units as % of total should be required**
- **Within a range. Not to fundamentally change Pier 8 to single people only accommodation**
- **Affordable accessible units yes. Not sure how many large families looking for housing / housing need for large family. Is this need met elsewhere**
- **Don't think affordable rentals is a viable long-term option for the city for this project**

Q7: Baseline 3 Reconfirmation – Mark an ‘x’ along the spectrum that best reflects your preference

9	2	4	6	7	4	0	0	3
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

← Max Benefits Max Financial →

Choose to not answer **2**

Comments:

- **do not feel affordable housing should be developed on Pier 8 and city should not make financial concessions for affordable housing**
- **No change - still want both but really a little of both - some benefits, but not high proportion so also get reasonable price**
- **No change**
- **Don't make the designated area congested with too much housing**
- **Didn't completely understand the question at first**
- **I think the City should simply tell the developer what will be allowed, instead of begging them**
- **My desired benefits are not related to low income**
- **No change**
- **Believe that design can include enhancements without compromising community benefits and still be profitable for developer**
- **Hamilton: Be bold and aim high - seek out developers who understand the vision for**
- **I got so fed up with the trade-off demands!!!**
- **Opinion has not changed, but I better understand the challenge to City staff in negotiating**
- **More confused**
- **Too vague...maximum community benefits could mean many different things to different people**

Q8: Feedback 1

First 3 Digits of Postal Code	1
	Choose to not answer

L8P	9	Durand, Kirkendall, Chedoke
L8L	12	North End, Beasley, West Industrial, West Crown Point, North Stipley, North Gibson, Landsdale, Keith
L8R	3	Central, Strathcona, South Dundurn
L8N	3	Stinson, Corktown
L9H	1	Dundas
L8T	2	Sherwood, Huntington, Upper King's Forest, Lisgar, Berrisfield, Hampton Heights, Sunninghill
L7P	1	Burlington West
L8S	1	Westdale, Cootes Paradise, Ainslie Wood
L9G	2	Ancaster West
L8K	1	East Delta, Bartonville, Glenview, Rosedale, Lower King's Forest, Red Hill, Corman, Vincent, South Gershome
L8J	1	East Albion Falls, South Stoney Creek

Q9: Feedback 2

What was your reason for participating in today’s workshop?

- a) I wanted to learn more about the project and issues
- b) I wanted to ask a specific question of City Staff
- c) I wanted to help shape the outcome of this project by contributing my opinions
- d) All of the above
- e) I was just curious and had no expectations

4	1	18	11	0	3
A	B	C	D	E	Choose to not answer

Q10: Feedback 3

Did this workshop session improve your understanding of the project and issues, and did you feel knowledgeable enough to answer all of the questions? Please choose the statement that best describes your experience today:

- a) I feel much better informed and felt knowledgeable enough to answer the questions
- b) I learned some things I previously did not know but still do not feel knowledgeable enough to answer some/most of the questions
- c) I learned a few new things and felt knowledgeable enough to answer the questions
- d) I already knew most/all of what was covered, but I am happy to participate and contribute my opinion
- e) I only wanted to be informed and did not want to contribute my opinions
- f) This workshop was a waste of my time

2	5	13	15	0	0	2
A	B	C	D	E	F	Choose to not answer

Q11: Feedback 4

Are there any topics that you think are important but we did not adequately address? Any other comments you’d like to leave with us?

Comments:



- **Would like to see a state-of-the-art environmentally friendly project**
- **Environmental problems may be avoided by having a smaller/minimal impact on the footprint of**

development. i.e., leave mature trees, don't forget grassy areas too, can't walk on flower beds

- Thanks for the presentation
- Well done! Difficult perspectives to get at.
- It's hard to judge on the word "modest", it may mean different things to different people
- Maximize value for city to fund services across the city. What's the timeline??
- Social housing is important. We have Beasley Neighbourhood and adjacent Ward 3 should be considered for social & affordable housing. Hamilton should not feel guilty about social and affordable housing in its city
- Make development more for seniors housing
- I think the city should explore other options such as: a) engaging directly in the construction of affordable housing, both rental and purchasable; b) getting community organizations, churches, and unions involved as co-owners of buildings, co-developers
- Excellent presentation. Thank you!
- Very informative! Thank you! And appreciate the opportunity to participate! Thank you very much!
- Some of the trade offs, Q6, should not be trade-offs, some requirements - a set percentage mix of affordable housing, geared-to-income and below market rent - should be mandated and insisted on. Same with environmental. Give bonus marks for going beyond minimums, but minimums are non-negotiable
- I think some of the questions were inappropriate for the general public. I feel that it has already been decided that we cannot have an excellent development all-round, and that we will have to make compromises that will make it less than it could be. Please don't sell this asset short!
- Thank you for holding public consultations, would like to have more definite schedule for construction, but overall, satisfied with process
- This was a very well thought out exercise - sophisticated, objective, quantifiable!!! Well done!!!
- Inclusionary housing should be addressed
- Yes keep me on the mailing list
- I will follow up and have discussions with poverty reduction groups and non profits on affordable housing. Seeing you have approx 400 more units now in Pier 8, but spread out units
- Great format. Really. Thank you. Project is looking awesome. Two key points: - High quality design of built form (i.e., Passive House, not passive solar, LEED, etc.) is so [illegible] - must change from renewables to [illegible] about high quality structures (thermal comfort, low operations cost, durability). Everything else you are doing is amazing, thanks!
- Questions all [illegible] geared to affordable housing
- It would be nice for this process to be participated by more people. Questions as to the scope of the development as some of the area can remain as is
- Process was efficient and useful
- Don't feel can actually shape outcome. Would like to know stats on what kinds of housing needed in Hamilton + why. Want to know more about sale + how impact Hamilton
- I applaud the city in this effort to gather community feedback before proceeding. Thanks!

APPENDIX C – SEPTEMBER 29TH SUPPLEMENTAL EXERCISE RESULTS

Activity #1 – Community Benefits (2 voting boards)



Activity #2 – Affordability (2 voting boards)

