



PIER 8 BLOCK 16 OPPORTUNITY STUDY VIRTUAL CONSULTATION PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT

About This Report

The City of Hamilton is carrying out an update to the Pier 7+8 Urban Design Study (2016) for lands identified as Block 16 on Pier 8 in Hamilton’s West Harbour. The purpose of the study is to develop urban design guidelines for mid-rise and high-rise development on Block 16.

The study is a result of an Ontario Land Tribunal (formerly Local Planning Appeal Tribunal) settlement decision regarding Case No. PL170742, which directs the City to bring forward, for Council’s consideration, an amendment to the Setting Sail Secondary Plan and an implementing zoning by-law amendment that would re-designate the existing institutional block (Block 16) to permit residential or mixed use in a mid-rise or high-rise form.

This study is not taking a position or recommending a specific outcome related to height, however, it will provide information on urban design direction for a mid-rise scenario and a tall building scenario on Block 16. The final materials will be presented to Council for their approval and if approved will be used to assist in the evaluation of future development applications for Block 16.

Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, all consultations within the City are being held virtually to protect the health and safety of Hamilton residents and staff.

Virtual consultations were held in November 2020 and included the opportunity to participate in a Live Information Meeting held on November 5, 2020 from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm. and to complete an online survey available on the Engage Hamilton website from November 5 to November 19, 2020.

This report, prepared by Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company, provides a summary with the verbatim public input that resulted from the virtual consultation including public comments and questions from the Live Information Meeting and online survey. Staff are also reviewing comments received through the Engage Hamilton website. All feedback is being considered.

Contents

1. How the Virtual Consultation was Organized	2
2. What was Heard	3
3. Next Steps	5

Appendices

Appendix 1: Comments noted through the November 5, 2020 Live Information Meeting.....	6
Appendix 2: Input from the Let’s Talk Pier 8 Block 16 Study Online Survey	14

PIER 8 BLOCK 16 OPPORTUNITY STUDY VIRTUAL CONSULTATION PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT

1. HOW THE VIRTUAL CONSULTATION WAS ORGANIZED

The Pier 8 Block 16 Opportunity Study consultations were held virtually and provided the following ways for individuals to participate and provide comments:

By joining and participating in a LIVE Information meeting which was held on Thursday, November 5, 2020 from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm.

The information meeting was hosted on WebEx Events and included a live presentation followed by facilitated question and discussion.

By completing the Let's Talk Pier 8 Block 16 Online Survey which was available on the Engage Hamilton website from November 5 to November 19, 2020.

The survey asked questions about objectives for Block 16 and urban design guidelines for mid-rise and high-rise buildings among other design considerations.

The City of Hamilton hosted a virtual public information session on November 5, 2020 from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. The meeting was advertised in the Hamilton Spectator and on the city's website. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information to the public on the background for why the study was being undertaken and to present draft urban design guidelines for a mid-rise or tall building on Block 16, to hear comments and provide responses.

Residents registered for the meeting via WebEx. The format included a live presentation by Jennifer Roth, City of Hamilton and Victor Cheung of Brook McIlroy urban design consultants followed by a facilitated question and answer period. Questions were typed into the Q and A bar for the meeting and read aloud by the facilitator. The Live Information Meeting Panel Members included the following:

Christine Newbold, City of Hamilton
Alissa Mahood, City of Hamilton
Jennifer Roth, City of Hamilton
Melanie Pham, City of Hamilton
Chris Phillips, City of Hamilton

Calvin Brook, Brook McIlroy
Victor Cheung, Brook McIlroy
Wei Shi, Brook McIlroy
Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company,
Facilitator

The online materials available on the Engage Hamilton website included background for the project, and the Pier 8 Block 16 Draft Urban Design Guidelines. The presentation portion of the meeting was recorded and posted on the project website for viewing a few days after the meeting. Throughout the month of November, the website was visited 987 times. Sixty-four (64) individuals participated in the LIVE information meeting. Thirty-two (32) individuals completed the online comment survey form.

This report, prepared by the Facilitator, Sue Cumming, includes a synthesis of key messages heard and the verbatim input received at the live information meeting together with the input from the completed online surveys. The verbatim input from the virtual consultation is included in the report appendices as follows:

- Appendix 1 - Comments noted through the November 5, 2020 Live Information Meeting.
- Appendix 2 - Input from the Let’s Talk Pier 8 Block 16 Opportunity Study Online Survey.

2. WHAT WAS HEARD

There continues to be a high degree of public interest in the Pier 8 Development. There were numerous questions about why City staff were developing urban design guidelines for either a mid-rise or a tall building on Block 16. City Staff were able to explain why the work was being done resulting from direction from the settlement and the importance of having criteria for Council’s future decision-making. City Staff were also able to clarify that they were not taking a position on the built form and height of any building on Block 16.

The meeting was important for clarifying the purpose of the Block 16 Opportunity Study, for discussing urban design objectives and draft guidelines and confirming that any new building for the site would go through a planning process which would culminate in a City Council decision for the site.

Based on the public discussion at the Live Public Information Meeting it is evident that there are mixed views about the potential for a tall building on Block 16 with some individuals opposed to any form of high rise on this site whereas other individuals appear supportive of a architecturally significant landmark building.

Questions arose about the impact of having a residential building on Block 16 could have on the rest of the Pier 8 lands. City staff responded that the maximum number of units for the entirety of the project, including any building on Block 16, would remain at 1645 units. Further questions were noted about family housing and whether these would be in a mid rise or high rise on Block 16 or elsewhere on Pier 8 lands. City staff confirmed that the increase in family units referenced could be anywhere on Pier 8 lands. Questions and comments on the draft urban design guidelines sought to clarify step backs, building separation, outdoor landscaping, and site lines. Discussion also occurred on bird safety and bird friendly design.

The frequently noted topics from the Live Information Meeting are included in **Figure 1**. Appendix 1, **Figure 4** includes the verbatim comments grouped under these topics.

Figure 1 – Live Information Meeting Questions/ Comments Frequently Noted Topics

- Why city staff are preparing tall building guidelines for Block 16
- The effect a tall building on Block 16 could have with respect to the rest of Pier 8
- Who will decide the height of a building on Block 16
- Increase in height in relation to proportional increase in family units
- Building step backs and separation between buildings
- Outdoor landscaped elements including balconies and terraces
- Bird safety, migration patterns and bird friendly design
- Site lines and light pollution
- Parking for new residents
- Transportation options envisioned for Pier 8

- Parking for area users
- Existing designation for Block 16
- The tenure of a proposed building
- Who will develop Pier 8

The online survey was completed by 32 individuals. The survey included specific questions about the urban design objectives and asked opinions on what the important design elements for would be either a mid rise or high-rise building on Block 16.

55% indicated that they felt that the urban design guidelines capture the design elements that they think are important for Block 16. Survey questions including the opportunity to comment on urban design objectives, specific design elements and included open text questions for receiving ideas and comment on what individuals feel would be important site design considerations for a mid-rise and for a high-rise on Block 16.

With respect to the urban design objectives, the survey responses indicate that the objectives generally ranked evenly. The three that received the highest ranking are as follows:

1. Create a high-quality accessible public realm with unique active uses at grade.
2. Capture the public imagination: achieve a unique, high-quality building design that is exceptional.
3. Integrate green and environmental features in both the building and landscape design.

With respect to design elements, architectural design ranked the highest. This was followed by environmentally friendly building practices and building location and orientation.

Responses were sought as to what were the most important elements of site design for both a mid-rise and tall building on Block 16. The questions were open text and provided the opportunity for individuals to express their ideas about what is important to them. **Figures 2 and 3** are a synthesis of feedback received.

For the question on a mid-rise building, 26 individuals responded to this question. Several noted that they do not support a mid-rise building on this site with some preferring a low density building and others expressing that they feel that a mid-rise is a lost opportunity to have a landmark building here. The detailed verbatim comments are included in Appendix 2, page 15.

For the question on a high-rise building, 27 individuals responded to this question. Nine individuals noted that they do not support a high-rise building on this site. The detailed verbatim comments are included in Appendix 2, page 17.

Figure 2 – Important Elements of Site Design for a Mid-rise Building on Block 16

- Built to maximize sunlight and views such that no building should obstruct views of the waterfront. Set back from the waterfront to keep an open view of the Bay.
- Sufficient setback so the building does not feel oppressive.
- Public access to the waterfront.

Figure 2 – Important Elements of Site Design for a Mid-rise Building on Block 16

- Green features including living walls, generous sized balconies, terraces, and rooftops.
- Green space and landscaping.
- Retail and community event space at the ground floor level.
- Mix of housing including affordable housing.
- Consistency with the human-scaled street-level pedestrian environment that is being created on the rest of Pier 8. Achieves a dense, urban form, without being overwhelming and dehumanizing.
- Architecturally significant. Iteration and engagement with site context.
- Exceptional architectural design.

Figure 3 – Important Elements of Site Design for a High-Rise Building on Block 16

- Creation of an amazing signature stand out building of exceptional architectural design.
- A unique bold visual anchor.
- It should meet the street well, be situated on a reasonable size podium (maybe four storeys) and should be of exceptional architectural quality and exceptional material quality.
- Public realm and surrounding amenities should be substantive enough to match the proposed density.
- Windows and unique visual design worthy of a historical landmark.
- Should not overpower the property due to height and size.
- No building should obstruct the view of the waterfront.
- Set far back from the waterfront, to keep the open view of the bay.
- Should be designed to not overshadow abutting uses and commercial and public space.
- Should ensure that the waterfront should be open and airy, with easy, tree-lined access to the water and boardwalk.

The survey included an open text question where individuals could share other comments and ideas about the Urban Design Guidelines and Block 16 Opportunity Study. 24 individuals responded to this question and the verbatim comments are included in Appendix 2, page 19.

The City is committed to ensuring that there is full transparency in reporting on what was heard to ensure that the public feedback received and is considered in the finalization of the urban design guidelines for the Pier 8, Block 16 Opportunity Study. It is important that this synthesis of what was heard be read in conjunction with the verbatim detailed comments found in Appendices 1 and 2.

3. NEXT STEPS

Public input received from the meeting and survey will be used to inform revisions to the Pier 8 Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines.

The Opportunity Study and Urban Design Guidelines will be presented to Council for approval. Once approved they will serve as design, form, and functional benchmarks to which

future Official Plan and Zoning By-law Regulations would be developed to implement the Opportunity Study. Development applications on the Block 16 will be required to conform to the requirements of the Opportunity Study.

Appendix 1 – Comments noted through November 5, 2020 Live Information Meeting.

Following the presentations, individuals could ask questions by typing these into the WebEx Q and A Bar and the facilitator read aloud the questions and comments noted. **Figure 4** includes the verbatim comments and questions received. Where possible the responses provided at the meeting by City Staff and Brook McIlroy are included. The comments received have been grouped under the themes noted. These are numbered for reference purpose only and each number represents a different individuals’ question of comments.

Figure 4 – Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
Why city staff are preparing tall building guidelines for Block 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is City Staff making Draft Guidelines for Tall Building Scenario? We do not want any increase in height that blocks out views from escarpment and any buildings South of Barton Street! 2. The public had input into the proposed development of Pier 8. 3. We do not want height increases, and these requests from the City Staff undermine the values of residents, are insulting and unnecessarily time consuming. 4. The ratepayers (city residents) have already voiced their desire for a maximum height of 4 stories for the West Harbour Recreation Master Plan area. 5. This is an incredible opportunity to build something aesthetically beautiful that fits in with the environment immediately around it. To consider putting a prominent, angular building beside a large water feature makes no sense to me. 6. Who will be able to afford these units? The public made their comments known on the existing Pier 8 plans. This did not include a tall tower and it is disappointing to have this idea come forward now. <p><i>Response from City Staff: The LPAT Settlement Decision referred to in the presentation directed staff to identify considerations for different scenarios on Block 16 to include mid-rise and tall buildings. City Staff felt that it was important to develop evaluation criteria or parameters, checks and balances for Council to decide to either support or deny an increase in height. Council is the final decision maker.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. These sound like boiler plate urban design guidelines. When it comes to the final design, what assurance do we have that it will be exceptional rather than mediocre?

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
	<p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: We do not think that these are boiler plate. They are pretty specific. Urban design guidelines do not guarantee an exceptional building. A design review process over regular process must occur. There must be a positive contribution.</i></p>
<p>The effect a tall building on Block 16 could have with respect to the rest of Pier 8</p>	<p>8. What effect will a tall building have on the rest of Pier 8. Will the urban design or built form be affected?</p> <p>9. If Pier 8 can not exceed 1645 units, how will this affect the original drawings and suggestions for the remaining blocks. It would appear as close to half of the unit will be in these high-rise buildings.</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: It does have an impact in the sense that any units built on Block 16 will be deducted from any units constructed on the rest of Pier 8. Reduces scale of the rest of the pier which is based on 8 storey maximums. If more units go into Block 16 which was originally designated for residential, this gives flexibility for the rest of the development to have less units and more height variation in under 8 storeys. Relieves pressure on other blocks. A maximum of 300 units will be in the taller building.</i></p> <p>10. If a tall building is approved does the existing planning framework permit a second or third building or does the 8 storey limit continue to apply to the rest of Pier 8.</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: There would be no other changes for the rest of lands to go taller than 8 storeys. This site can only accommodate one tall building. The Memorandum of Understanding with the purchaser and the City says the zoning can't change. The original zoning is confirmed through the LPAT settlement.</i></p> <p>11. It should be noted that the approved height limit for Pier 8 is 8 stories and not 4 stories?</p> <p><i>Response by City Staff: Block 16 was a maximum of 4 and the rest was 8 storeys.</i></p> <p>12. If there is a tall building, what buildings would be on the rest of the land?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: The rest of pier 8 is intended to be developed for mid rise.</i></p>
	<p>13. In plain English, city council has the right to veto a high rise if they choose. Correct?</p>

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
<p>Who will decide the height of a building on Block 16</p> <p>Who will decide the height of a building on Block 16 (continued)</p>	<p><i>Response from City Staff: Yes, they can approve or deny.</i></p> <p>14. City Staff can veto the height request! Wow, so City residents have already said that they don't want height increases and was adopted into the Master Plan, are you placating developers desires over all the historical concerns of city residents?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: We are being directed through the LPAT settlement. A new building on Block 16 will go through the Planning Act Process with public input. Council will decide. The settlement was a balance between several issues.</i></p>
<p>Increase in height in relation to proportional increase in family units</p>	<p>15. What is the desire for a high rise apposed to a lower level?</p> <p><i>Response from Staff: The LPAT settlement references that more family units would be provided with a taller building and opportunities for a public parking facility.</i></p> <p>16. Just to confirm, the increase in height of the tall building would lead to proportional increase in family units. This would do well to support the City's motto as a great place to raise children & the North End being a family friendly neighbourhood.</p> <p>17. Would a panelist identify the connection of the building size to the significant increase in family friendly housing on Pier 8 and reduced density next to the existing homes.</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: Density has not changed across all of pier 8.</i></p> <p>18. Do we know how much residential square footage is estimated on Blocks 1 to 15 and how much sq ft would be added with a 45 storey tower on 16?</p> <p>19. Why not put family friendly units in the proposed Pier 8 plans? Why would families want to be on 35 storey building?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: More units on block 16 doesn't mean the family units are on Block 16. It increases the requirements across all of Pier 8. At least 10% of the units in a mid rise or tall building will be family units. We expect family units to be spread out across Pier 8. Response from Brook McIlroy: The best place for family units is on the lower floors of buildings.</i></p>
<p>Building stepbacks and separation between buildings</p>	<p>20. Clarification of the proposed building separations of 25m between tower faces. Some municipalities require 30 m.</p>

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
Building step backs and separation between buildings (continued)	<p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: The setback of 25 metres is between Block 16 and an 8 storey max.</i></p> <p>21. Could you please clarify the building setback at sidewalk level and the available street tree plantings available and pedestrian walkway areas.</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: It depends on which building side:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mid rise on east side, 12 metres</i> • <i>Tall rise on east side, 15 metres</i> • <i>Other 3 sides, setbacks range from 3 - 5 metres, minimum area of landscaped open space.</i> • <i>There will be other areas that will be substantially more landscaped.</i> <p>22. Green buffer zone setbacks ought to be 30m. Where is there a 5m (16ft) balcony in other urban scenarios? Most Architectural Designs have 2.5m balconies.</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Setback above 3rd floor would be a common amenity terrace. Agree more architectural designs have 2.5 m balcony depths and this is the average in the Urban Design Guidelines with 2.7m increased on the south side.</i></p> <p>23. With regards to Brook McIlroy’s response regarding the setbacks. Are the 3rd storey 5m terraces private or public? I assume private, so why is City Staff considering reducing the public green space setback to 25 metres?</p> <p>24. Why is City Staff reducing this space compared to provincial standards and other communities’ standards?</p>
Outdoor landscaped elements including balconies and terraces	<p>25. Why is there not going to be green elements on all facades?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: green elements are encouraged. We want balconies and terraces that are deep enough to have outdoor landscape elements and an expansion of living areas. These are specifically mentioned in the guidelines for the south façade – practical level to grow plants on the south side. Visual prominence perspective of the view looking down James St. We can explore expanding the greenery on all sides.</i></p> <p>26. Would the underground construction accommodate the required tree planting depths?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Yes – 5 ft depth in trenches.</i></p>

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
Bird safety, migration patterns and bird friendly design	<p>27. Bird safety and migration paths need to be considered when exterior lighting is planned at water's edge.</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Must look at lighting carefully through studies and modulation of light. At certain periods of the year the building wouldn't be illuminated</i></p> <p>28. Is there consideration of bird friendly design materials for the facade treatments of any buildings?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Yes, by avoiding the reflectivity of glass, so that a bird knows to avoid glass.</i></p>
Site lines and light pollution	<p>29. Will you be considering light pollution and site line interruption to current residents?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: We tested various views from the surrounding neighbourhood. Those views have been documented in the guidelines and in tonight's presentation. Yes, you will be able to see any building, a mid rise or a tall building. There will need to be a future analysis on light pollution.</i></p> <p>30. Height increases over 4 stories will reduce actual views of the water, from King and James or anywhere within the sightlines of the waterfront.</p> <p>31. If I am standing at King and James, can I see a 30 storey building vs a 45 storey building?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Yes. you would be able to see both. The 45 storeys would be taller, and it depends on your vantage point you may or may not perceive the difference.</i></p>
Parking for new residents	<p>32. Where would parking be located for the residents of a tower? It is not realistic to have underground parking there because of water table. So?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Going more than one level down is expensive but it is feasible. If it is a tall building site, they will go two stories down. Combined with Block 1, the parking can be accommodated. It is feasible but costs more money.</i></p> <p>33. By parking structure do you mean an above ground parking garage?</p> <p><i>Response from Brook McIlroy: Parking structures for the residential building would not be above grade and would be all below grade.</i></p>

--	--

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
Parking for area users (continued)	<p><i>meaning parking was being removed. Parking is going to be looked at for Piers 6 to 8.</i></p> <p>41. What about parking for the public? For the individuals that have a boat at the marina? residents?</p> <p>42. Will the Harbour West marina boaters have to pay for parking?</p> <p>43. Will the parking for the harbour west marina be eliminated?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: there is no specific parking for each area. The parking on Block 16 will eventually be eliminated and parking will be provided by Leander.</i></p> <p>44. How will the City build a parking structure at Pier 6/7 if those properties are currently for sale?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: A parking structure is identified within the Recreation Master Plan and is worked into the sale.</i></p>
Existing designation for Block 16	<p>45. The original designs had Block 16 as a market area, entertainment area etc. for the inhabitants of Pier 8 as well as the public. Will there still be these services for Pier 8?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: It is important to clarify that the original Pier 7 and 8 study had Block 16 as an institutional designation. You may be referring to lands to the west of Block 16.</i></p>
The tenure of a proposed building	<p>46. Would these units be allowed to be rentals, Airbnb etc.?</p> <p>47. Is this proposed building a rental unit or condo's for purchase?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff. It is not known at this time if the units would be condominium or rental. With respect to Airbnb and short-term rentals, the city is considering requirements for this on a city-wide basis and any future buildings will need to meet the requirements that are established.</i></p>
Who will develop Pier 8	<p>48. Has Pier 8 been sold to the development consortium yet?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: The sale is being finalized.</i></p> <p>49. If the family units are spread out across the development and different developers could this force the last developer to build all family units?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: One developer has been chosen so they have to provide them across the site.</i></p>

Themes Noted	Live Information Meeting Comments and Responses Noted
	<p>50. Does the approval of a mid size or tall building have a bearing on contract negotiations with Waterfront Shores?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: This development block was already included in the original negotiations.</i></p> <p>51. If a tall building is approved by council is it a given that it would be designed by the team from Waterfront Shores i.e., Bruce Kuwabara etc., or could it be a competition.</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: Yes, WSC and Bruce Kuwabara are the ones designing.</i></p> <p>52. What is the timeline for the promenade completion?</p> <p><i>Response from City Staff: The Copps pier is under construction now. The underground works are going on now with a planned July 2021 opening.</i></p>

In addition to the comment noted at the meeting, there were several emails that were received following the meeting and these are noted in **Figure 5**. The comments are verbatim. Each number represents a different individual's comment.

Figure 5 – Email follow-up comments to November 5, 2020 Meeting

1. Thank you very much for the webinar last evening - most informative. I am still perplexed about the entire aspect of the tower whether it be 8 stories or 45. The design as presented by waterfront shores won the tender, for its design. This did not include a high rise or a medium rise. It did include "the snail" - the building that would be a "community center" of sorts. The neighbourhood clearly do not wish for this structure, no matter how high and I am not sure that Hamiltonians wish for this either. Why do we need a beacon? If, as has been said, that the high rise (medium rise) permits more family friendly units, then simply add them into the remaining blocks. Especially with COVID-19 and probably the enduring and lasting changes, people will be working from home. So, these larger units are not even necessarily family friendly, they are work from home friendly. I have not seen anywhere, discussion of a school. How can you have family friendly when there is no school? Please consider returning to Bruce K.'s plan and design.
2. A couple of comments. City Staff said that parking would be moving around as construction happened. There was an error in his comment. West harbour marina uses to have their own gated secure parking which has been taken away. When an event occurs at the Royal and Leander there will be little or no parking available. Why we would we not put the tall building on block 4 (on the Haida side) instead and not take away everyone's view of the gorgeous sunsets we have.
3. Hi, I would like Towers in the Shape of Lighthouses calling out our Sailing and Industrial Heritage with Lights Above flashing in Different Colours or for Different Occasions hope

you will take some of these Options for Consideration know there is a lot out there.
Thanks for your time.

4. I have been reviewing the Pier 7& 8 Tower study meeting/video of Nov5 and am not understanding the Family Units (2BR or more) details or concepts. I understand with a tall bldg the total units across Pier 8 stays fixed at 1645. your presentation says the current zoning pegs FU to be a min of 15%, or 195 Family Units.... $15\% \text{ of } 1645 = 247.???$ Where does the 195 come from? If the tall building gets approved, then the remaining 4-8 storey buildings will more or less not change height, will not reduce in #'s of total units, but the sizes of some of the units within those 4-8 storey buildings will increase - is this the concept? Also, I understand there are no residential units on Pier 7, correct?

Appendix 2: Input from the Let’s Talk Pier 8 Block 16 Opportunity Study Online Survey

The virtual consultations included an online survey which was available on the Engage Hamilton website. The survey included 6 questions. It was completed by 32 individuals. Not everyone who responded completed every question and some were left blank. The following are the verbatim responses to the questions posed.

Question 1: Do the draft urban design guidelines capture the design elements that you think are important for Block 16?

31 individuals responded to this question. Over 50% indicated that they felt that the urban design guidelines capture the design elements that they think are important for Block 16. The responses are shown on **Figure 6**.

Figure 6 – Question 1 Responses

Response Choices	Number of responses
Yes	17
No	10
Not Sure	4
Total Number of Responses	31

Question 2: Rank the important of these urban design objectives for Block 16 from most important (1) to least important (7).

31 individuals responded to this question. The responses are shown on **Figure 7**. The responses indicate that the objectives generally ranked evenly.

Figure 7 – Responses to Question 2

Response Choices - Urban Design Objectives	Ranking based on how assigned in survey response Ranking	Order of how each was ranked from responses
Create a high-quality accessible public realm with unique active uses at grade.	3.29	1
Capture the public imagination: achieve a unique, high-quality building design that is exceptional.	3.37	2
Integrate green and environmental features in both the building and landscape design.	3.71	3
Provide flexibility to support innovative architectural design, forms, and orientation.	4.1	4
Focus on the unique site opportunities which provide a meaningful location for a landmark building.	4.2	5
Create a visual anchor at the Harbour: emblematic of the Harbour’s renewal.	4.4	6
Provide a sufficient building envelope to ensure appropriate transition and sufficient separation distance to the planned and existing context.	4.77	7

Question 3: Rank the importance of these design elements from most important (1) to least important (7).

31 individuals responded to this question. This question asked individuals to rank the design elements from most important to least important. The responses are shown on **Figure 8**. The responses indicate that Architectural Design ranked the highest. The survey question also included a response choice of other. When this was selected, individuals were asked to indicate what these other design elements should be.

Figure 8 – Question 3 Responses

Response Choices – Design Elements	Ranking based on how assigned in survey response	Order of how each was ranked from responses
Architectural design	2.48	1
Environmentally friendly building practices	3.35	2
Building location and orientation	3.58	3
Landscaping elements	3.97	4
Building materials	4.00	5
Affordable housing	4.39	6
Other	5.44	7

If other was selected for question 3, individuals were asked what design element were being referred to. Nine individuals provided the following responses:

- Off grid or alternative energy sources. Focus on non-vehicular traffic on the pier itself (peripheral parking).
- Parking, the MUST be parking.
- In my opinion this area should be emblematic of a lighthouse - calling ships into the harbor, and thus should have a design that reflects that - with light at the top of the building, and a design that reflects a lighthouse design.
- Low-rise Waterfront buildings only on the waterfront.
- Courage to allow a great design, without arbitrary restrictions (example: no taller than Landmark Place)
- Compatibility with a human-scale pedestrian environment.
- Uniqueness.
- Human scale building height.
- Building height - LOW building height as per original Setting Sail plan.

Question 4: What elements of site design do you consider most important for a mid-rise building on Block 16?

This question focused on what individuals feel is most important about site design elements for a mid-rise building on Block 16. 26 individuals responded to this question. The following are numbered for reference purposes. Each number represents a different individual's comment.

1. Family units and green features (living walls and rooftops).
2. Plenty of windows and green space.
3. Green space and landscaping.
4. Built to maximize sunlight and setbacks to allow for access to the water.
5. Accessibility for all citizens to waterfront.
6. It should definitely not be a skyscraper. 45 stories may be too high. I think between 25 & 30 is high enough. It needs to include environmentally friendly landscape and perhaps public use garden space.
7. Proper setback so the building does not feel oppressive. Architectural design for first 3-6 levels that isn't architecturally lazy (cookie cutter designs) that has an architectural craftsmanship feel to it that harmonizes with the rest of the buildings around it architectural excellence of design - nothing super ultra modern - something that shows work. No precast concrete legoblock design - make the exterior look like effort was put into it. Some level of craftsmanship - too long have we gone now where materials are just slapped together without a concept of harmony and architectural detail - no cheap ikea-like designs.
8. The building should be set far back from the waterfront, to keep the open view of the bay. No building should obstruct the view of the waterfront.
9. Mixed use, creation of street wall and enhanced street scape. Architecturally significant. Iteration and engagement with site context.
10. Does not block view.
11. The primary consideration for this site should be consistency with the human-scaled street-level pedestrian environment that is being created on the rest of Pier 8. The primary value proposition of the Pier 8 development is that it achieves a dense, urban form, without being overwhelming and dehumanizing. It is akin to the centuries-old, dense, but human-scaled, urban form that might be seen in Amsterdam, Paris, or Copenhagen, in its respect of the pedestrian realm and of human sensibilities. This is its greatest feature. The plans truly make it a standout, and a model for future intensification in Hamilton. No mid-rise development on Block 16 should jeopardize that sense of intimacy and human-scale.
12. Minimal setbacks, sidewalks on all sides of streets, windows at ground floor.
13. Multi use for business, culture, living, art, hotel, recreation.
14. A mid-rise building is a missed opportunity to achieve the maximum community benefit of Pier 7-8. The more density and the more occupants on the Pier the more street and public space vitality, and the more likely we will see commercial viability.
15. With intensification being a necessary goal, it would be a missed opportunity to take advantage of both creating a waterfront icon for the city and more density.
16. That it remains a focal point of our city.
17. A mid-rise building on Block 16 would represent a missed opportunity to do something special and unique on the waterfront. However, if a mid-rise form is chosen, it should meet

the street well, be lined with retail spaces of varying size (small retail creates a great varied streetscape and provides opportunities for small business, so please include small spaces as well), should be a large mid-rise building (around 12 storeys), and should be of exceptional architectural design (consider an architecture competition).

18. Density and economic diversity of residents. In other words, allowing for a greater capacity of residents and a greater variation in their income and lifestyles to improve community, culture, and commercial viability in the pier.
19. Generous sized balconies, preferably terraces.
20. Mixed use: affordable, accessible housing and condos, but no high rises!!
21. Prefer a low-rise building as originally intended for the site. Ensure it contributes to an accessible public space. Keep it to scale with the surrounding North End neighbourhood. Ensure there is appropriate parking provided.
22. Affordable housing is something that should not limit a landmark building. It can be prioritized throughout the whole development but shouldn't hold up a landmark building.
23. Gathering aspect - food and beverage opportunities - Christmas market - summer events
24. Environmental building practices, affordable housing, and landscaping.
25. Do not want a mid rise building, stick with the original 4-8 storey plans.
26. Landscaping and community use, affordable housing.

Question 5: What elements of site design do you consider most important for a high-rise building on Block 16?

This question focused on what individuals feel is most important about site design elements for a high-rise building on Block 16. 27 individuals responded to this question. The following are numbered for reference purposes. Each number represents a different individual's comment.

1. Really kick-ass amazing design that makes the harbour stand out as a recreational water-sport hub and socially & environmentally conscious focal point of a renewed & re-envisioned Hamilton that honours its labour history and actively seeks to make the world (acting locally, thinking globally) a brighter and better place: family units, affordable units, green/renewable resources.
2. Windows and unique visual design worthy of a historical landmark
3. Highrise buildings have no place in our neighbourhood.
4. Not to be built. To not block view nor overpower the property due to height and size.
5. No high rise on the waterfront
6. Again 30 floors are enough otherwise same as above.
7. Its shadows cannot block landmark locations - like the patio area of Williams Pub next door where sunlight for eating, dancing, and skating are paramount. It has to have some sort of illumination on the top of the building - and the top of the building should not be flat. The building should be anything but rectangular - we are really starting to develop a

modular tabletop design feature standard in this city, and it makes us look unimaginative - a landmark feature should stand out and not look like everything else - but also not look like a giant cigar sticking out of the ground. Mississauga's landmark towards is a great example in which they almost look like giant pop bottles - we need innovation like that in this city. It should not be brown grey or taupe in design - it makes the design look tired as was evidenced by the George Street design when built with white and blue glass elements - it made the buildings beside it look tired. This building should stand out and look clean. It should also be an architectural marvel. Not amazing due to height and amt of glass but also the actual architectural elements to it. Go big or go home. If this is going to be our landmark waterfront building, make it a shining jewel with architectural buildings. Take a cue from the supreme court justice building downtown - a mix of stone and glass brings a timeless look

This building should be seen like a lighthouse, which would tie in the element of being on a harbour perfectly - and thus its design elements should perfectly match that. Look at the sail building in Dubai - it became emblematic of its location. This building should do the same.

The whole building should have potential for illumination like the CN Tower – especially on each side of the green strip climbing up it from the green path, so that at night those elements are accentuated and can still be appreciated. Make it so that people have something to look up at in awe.

8. The building should be set far back from the waterfront, to keep the open view of the bay. No building should obstruct the view of the waterfront.
9. Creation of signature stand out building of exceptional architectural design. This will set the precedent for future developments. Additionally, the scope of the public realm and surround amenities should be substantive enough to match the proposed density and be on mixed use.
10. Please no high-rise at the shore. Please, please please.
11. High quality design, high quality materials
12. Firstly, no high-rise building should even be considered for the location. Notwithstanding that input, by no means should any building in the lower city be higher than the escarpment. The citizens of this city gave you feedback around tall buildings, and we unequivocally requested that no buildings should be higher than the escarpment. You thankfully established guidelines accordingly. By even entertaining a building that is higher than the escarpment, you are telling the citizens who in good faith contributed to that process, that the city is happy to throw the resulting plans in the garbage. You undermine all future consultation efforts and poison future citizen engagement by even bringing this option to the table. Not to mention you make it impossible for the City to credibly enforce the escarpment height limit on any future building applications.
13. Minimal setbacks, sidewalks on all sides of streets, windows at ground floor
14. One of a kind, unique, bold statement, multi facets, live & work bldg including medical, dental, labs, businesses etc.

15. Bruce Kuwabara is the most important Canadian architect of our era, full stop.
Please just leave him unencumbered to use his best design judgement of what will be appropriate; no one on City Council or staff should impede his vision.
16. That the architectural design be left in the hands of Bruce Kuwabara a highly celebrated architect. We should consider ourselves fortunate they he is invested in this project.
17. Creating a visual anchor that redefines Hamilton would be a key component. The striking visual of industry cannot be the main view of our waterfront or guests to our city will be left with the impression that we are only our industry.
18. A high-rise building on Block 16 is the most appropriate and sensible option both economically and physically. It should meet the street well, be situated on a reasonable size podium (maybe four storeys) and should of exceptional architectural quality and exceptional material quality.
If Bruce Kuwabara is the architect in charge of the tower on Block 16, he will no doubt bring a tower unlike any other to Hamilton, and I implore you not to fiddle with the details too much or let the architecture suffer under bureaucracy and design-by-committee.
19. Unbridled creativity and innovation in architecture, create something inspiring and iconic for the city, free from bureaucratic constraints or the meddling of councillors.
20. This should not be a high-rise building. Stick to the maximum height of 8 stories or less.
21. Not acceptable on this site or anywhere near the harbour. Do NOT do what Toronto did to their shoreline. It is disgusting and inaccessible to many due to the overbuild of condos.
22. No high-rise building please! No beacon please - this will be disruptive (light pollution to existing North end neighbourhood, impact on bird migration).
23. Something outstanding / iconic. There are two recognizable building in Hamilton that can be seen for those passing through/by. The gas globe and the cathedral. This has the opportunity to be the third.
24. Free parking
25. Environmental building practices, affordable housing, and architectural design
26. For me this is a leap of faith with Bruce Kuwabara, given his reputation we would trust his judgement.
27. Not in favour of a high-rise building.

Question 6: Do you have any additional comments or feedback you would like to share?

The following are the responses received to the question of whether there were any additional comments or feedback that individuals would like to share. 24 individuals responded to this question. Each of the following numbered comments represents an individual's opinion. These are numbered for reference only and are not listed in any order.

1. Highrise buildings have no place in our neighborhood!!

2. I think the city's money should be going into existing infrastructure and not this gigantic waste of money.
3. I think that a mid size building with 2 bedroom apartments is extremely important, but the height of the building, I feel will destroy the ambiance of waterfront.
4. One high-rise will lead to more and destroy the hopes for a free, open, and beautiful space for all to enjoy.
5. This is an opportunity for the city to help alleviate the affordable housing lack. Every new build should be mandated to provide a percentage (10 - 20%) of affordable housing units.
6. I have concerns over how taking away all the parking for the Williams pub area is going to affect people coming down to this area from the rest of the city. While I understand they will have new patrons from the residential area itself I question how it is going to affect people's ability to get here and enjoy it, esp. in times like the winter. Is there enough parking to meet this demand and the demand of the city itself for this region?

Also keeping the roofs as purely a green roof thing seems like a giant waste of this entire footprint - why not make every square inch of the footprint you have taken up be useable and make the roofs be areas that can be accessible for restaurants, play areas, gardens, places to grow food, etc.? We should be using all our roof space.

I also hope that you are not going to go the ultra modern route for the new townhouse designs - imo this area should be something that would be welcome in downtown Oakville, and the architecture should be high quality to prove it- and not just be cheap modular designs passed off as "chic" but, just cheaper to produce.

7. The waterfront should be open and airy, with easy, tree-lined access to the water and boardwalk. Any buildings, especially medium- or high-rise buildings should be set far back from the water. There should be no obstruction of the view. If you build one high-rise, there will be many more in years to come and it will be the disastrous wall of condos that has happened to Toronto's waterfront. Another example is Kelowna. They had a beautiful waterfront and boardwalk until high-rises took away the view, the nature, the air, and the sunlight. It made it darker and more dangerous too. People want to have safe access and views, with light, sun, and space. Consider what Chicago has done to their waterfront. The waterfront is open to a nice park, the roadway runs up from that, and the high rises are farther back. It is a people place, in nature, bright and accessible.
Please, please keep the waterfront open and airy, not blocked by buildings. Set those buildings way back and keep them, at the very most, 8 stories high.
8. I think the city should consider the approval of increased density. If done correctly this can add great value to the city of Hamilton. This should be used as an opportunity to establish a precedent that will allow for future development in the city.
9. When I saw the idea for a signature tower at Pier 8, I was excited, but I genuinely do not feel like this will get off the ground. I do not believe our current Council has the courage or foresight to enable such an opportunity.
10. Please, do not ruin the Pier 8 development by allowing a high-rise. We need high-quality examples of intensification in this city, and if people start to equate intensification with

inhuman, imposing high-rises, you are fundamentally undermining any such future efforts. There are centuries-worth of amazing examples of human-friendly, dense, urban spaces, please draw from those examples. The city should use Pier 8 to showcase the opportunities for densification, but it should be Denmark-inspired density, Dutch-inspired density - not Dubai-inspired density. Please do not permit a high-rise building at that location.

11. There is little impact on the perception of height at grade from mid-rise to high-rise, especially if a +/4 storey podium is implemented. This is a great opportunity to create an iconic high-rise building on Hamilton's waterfront.
12. I love to have an absolute WOW building that can be seen in Toronto, Niagara, from anywhere in Hamilton. They have stunning buildings throughout the world. Make this building the talk of the world in shape, height, light, uses.
13. It is wonderful that this Urban Design Study proves that a high tower is very appropriate and very possible on this site, and the many excellent city building benefits it will deliver. I totally agree with this concept.

But adding the Block 16 land to the Pier 7 and 8 development yet holding the already very low maximum density is actually reducing the overall number of units and people, an extraordinarily poor and backward decision in 2020. This is also completely irrational. The only issue would be proving that the traffic works, which I am sure intuitively it will, and an update to the traffic study is fast and inexpensive. By reducing the potential Pier 7 and 8 density City Council and staff will create a community of only the wealthy on the Pier, and shame on them for this.

More density, height and units will deliver a wider range of unit size and cost, as well as more street vitality, commercial viability, tax revenue, higher quality architecture, etc., all needed to ensure that the Pier 7 and 8 development delivers the greatest community benefit.

You should always fight the battle for the right things, instead of surrendering to a few toxic cranks. There are always NIMBYs who fear change.

City Council and staff also must get past their fear of height and density. Reading the OMB decision on the Television City project is a good place to start. Please listen to this Urban Design Report also.

I recommend that the City ask Bruce K. what he believes is an appropriate urban form for the entirety of Pier 7 and 8 and adjust the plan accordingly. The current plan does not deliver the most appropriate height and density for this site, and this is a one-time opportunity to get this critical site developed correctly.

Please do the right thing and develop the entire Pier with the most appropriate height and density to get the maximum community benefit.

14. I believe this concept will add great value to the North end and the city as a whole. Having lived in the North end, I know there are those who are hesitant and apprehensive to

change. In my experience, many of "those" have come around once change has been implemented. Indwell is a great example of a building and use which was met with resistance and is now being celebrated in the North End.

15. Rampant NIMBYism chokes Hamilton. We are the confluence of both a major housing crisis and a need to redefine our city. A city defining waterfront skyscraper would address both needs.
16. The inclusion of a tower on Pier 8 is positive. However, it is my understand that because the tower will include a large number of units, the rest of the buildings built on the Pier 8 lands will be downsized. This may hasten the end of the LPAT dispute, but it does not make sense from an urban point of view, a housing supply point of view, an economic point of view, or a highest-and-best-use point of view.

The rest of the development can and should be denser and taller. The mid-rise buildings on the rest of the site should not be downsized to 3-6 storeys because of the inclusion of a tower, otherwise the result will be a development with appropriate density in one location and missed density (opportunity) on the rest of the site.

We only have one opportunity to develop this land - do not squander the opportunity. Push for the most density that makes sense, along with as many units as possible to allow as many citizens as possible the ability to live on our lovely waterfront and ensure that all the requirements for a quality urban community are met (retail, high pop. density, pedestrian friendly streets, exceptional urban environment, etc.)

17. Do not let this project get watered down by the lack of political vision, imagination, and accomplishment of Hamilton politicians.
18. Generous public space and access to the waterfront with room for pedestrians and cyclists.
19. I am a resident of the North End. The North End Neighbourhood Association does not represent the interests of "north enders." We were not in favour of the LPAT nor the proposed changes for a mid-rise or high-rise building on Pier 8.