



PIER 8, BLOCK 16: RESIDENTIAL TOWER DESIGN OPTIONS

Summary of Community Meeting Input from March 8, 2022 for DRP Meeting #1

Prepared by:
Independent Facilitator Sue Cumming,
Cumming+Company



March 9, 2022

High-Level of Summary of feedback received at the Community Public Meeting held on March 8, 2022 prepared for the Design Review Panel for their meeting on March 10, 2022. The summary is organized by key topics and themes pertaining to sustainability, quality of life and design excellence. This summary will be appended to the full Community Meeting Feedback Report when it is prepared.

**PIER 8, BLOCK 16: RESIDENTIAL TOWER DESIGN OPTIONS
COMMUNITY MEETING (WEBINAR) held March 8, 2022
High-Level Summary of Feedback for Design Review Panel**

About This Summary

The city has initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments on lands identified as Pier 8, Block 16 located at 65 Guise Street. The applications propose a 45-storey residential building consisting of approximately 429 units. A special design review process is being followed which involves public consultation and input through a Design Review Panel. A Community Meeting (Webinar) was held on Tuesday, March 8 from 6:30 to 9:00 p.m. The meeting was hosted by the City of Hamilton Municipal Land Development Office and Waterfront Shores Partners to provide information about three tower design options for Pier 8, Block 16.

The purpose of the Community meeting was to:

- Overview the design review process
- Present three tower design options that address innovation in three areas: sustainability, quality of life and design excellence.
- Receive feedback from the public on the tower design options and answer questions.

The meeting was held virtually due to Covid restrictions via a webinar. Participants registered in advance of the meeting. 190 participants registered and 124 connections participated at the meeting. Some of these may have included more than one individual. The format for the meeting included live presentations followed by questions and answers. Those who wanted to share a comment or ask questions, were able to do so by typing these into the Q and A question box which was read aloud by the Independent Facilitator. Participants could ask multiple questions.

Presenters included:

City of Hamilton	Jennifer Roth, Planning and Economic Development Department Chris Phillips, Municipal Land Development Office
Waterfront Shores Partners	Bruce Kuwabara of KPMB Luka Matutinovic of Purpose Building

A detailed Community Meeting Feedback Report is being prepared which will include verbatim input on what was heard at the meeting and responses to questions and comments. The Independent Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company has prepared this summary of what was heard about the tower design options with respect to comments pertaining to sustainability, quality of life and design excellence. This summary has been prepared to assist the Design Review Panel in their deliberations at their Meeting #1 being held on March 10, 2022.

In addition to the key topics and themes contained in this summary, there were other key messages and comments noted at the Community Meeting. The full Community Meeting Public Feedback Report will include all of the feedback received including:

- Comments about the planning history for Block 16.
- Questions about the application approval process, public consultation and notification.
- Comments about other Pier 8 projects noting that if the number of units remains the same across the Pier 8 development, will other buildings be shorter, slimmer, and have more commercial?
- Importance of keeping the waterfront green with public access and use.
- Concerns about public transit, parking and services to support the development occurring at Pier 8 and north end neighbourhood.

Figure 1 is a summary of What was Heard about the Tower Design Options that were presented at the meeting. The feedback noted at Figure 1 is **not** intended as a full record of the feedback from the Community Meeting held on March 8, 2022. Responses provided to the questions at the meeting are not included here and will be referenced in the full report.

Figure 1 – What was Heard about the Tower Design Options Presented

Topic	Key themes – Comments and Questions Noted
<p>1. Feedback on sustainability</p>	<p>Climate Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification was sought on how the building would address climate change with specific reference to what elements would contribute to climate action – i.e., heat pumps, solar, wind, the provision of usable green space on rooftop of any of these designs, and other green infrastructure. <p>Environmental Sustainability and Energy Efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference was made to low carbon, integrated passive measures. Participants asked for more explanation on what this means. Specific questions included: Is this tower being built to Passive House standards? Is PHIUS or PHI certification being pursued. Where can we learn more about levels of energy efficiency that will be realized? Comments were made by participants that they believe that towers are less energy efficient than low/mid rise buildings and the desire for a tower in this location is trumping the desire for sustainability. More information is sought on why the circular form was noted to be inherently efficient. <p>Other Sustainability considerations noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable keeps being thrown around but not sure what that means. How will road salt be used on lakeside roads? Will there be a lot of road salt washing into the lake from the road? Will local building materials be used? Will local talent be employed to build? Will that be a part of the sustainability? What effect will the "wave" design have on the light coming into the residential spaces? Issue of how the building will look over time was noted how will air quality affect the lightly coloured building. The Stelco Tower was referenced as an example to what not to do.
<p>2. Feedback on Quality of Life</p>	<p>Verbatim comments noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> My comment is that it just doesn't make sense to me that a building this tall could be considered an enhancement to either the aesthetic or the quality of life of the harbour area. Don't get me wrong - It's a beautiful building. It's a gorgeous building. And I'm sure it will be as climate friendly as humanly possible. It just shouldn't be built there. If I lived there, I'd love it. If I didn't, I'd hate it. And most of us wouldn't be living there. The original 8 storeys would be a better quality of life for surrounding residential areas; 45 storeys will overwhelm the area which has traditionally been single family and quiet. It might be an architectural desire, but not practical for the surrounding neighbourhoods. It will change the "feel" of the area forever - the height in particular. I am encouraged to see that the design allows for 2- and 3-bedroom apartments which bring more families into our neighbourhood.

Topic	Key themes – Comments and Questions Noted
<p>3. Feedback on design excellence</p>	<p>Differentiation of design options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3 design options presented are more like 3 variations on 1 design. Would you come back with 3 distinct options that are significantly different from each other? • Each design iteration is a repeating extrusion of one floor plate. Earlier in the presentation, you showed a building that were much more dynamic with non-uniform floor plates. Will you explore different types of tower shapes that aren't simply an extrusion of one floor plate shape? • Will the exterior cladding material be the same for all 3 designs? <p>Comments on important considerations for the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information is sought on how the building would be 'bird friendly' to minimize bird strikes noting that this is an important bird migration and habitat location. • Will there be the inclusion of architectural lighting features? i.e., a lit crown, lighting on the podium, lighting throughout the tower? • We have heard a lot about this being a beacon, an icon of the community. The top portion of this building should be a lookout for the public. If this is to be a civic landmark, with this height will there be a viewing platform on top for the public and not just residents? • On inset balconies vs. wraparound balconies, has there been thought re: ensuring the elegant appearance is maintained? Glazing on the tower slab edge was envisioned as very clean; are there plans to avoid spandrel panels and messy window wall interfering with the design so that appearance can be achieved? Is higher quality unitized curtain wall potentially on the table? • Questions were noted about how the townhouses fit into the development including views, walk out areas, landscaping areas and the use of more organic brick materials. <p>Questions about studies undertaken for the tower proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was there a detailed vibration assessment done? Will the floors shake? • Were detailed wind studies done to model effects of any of the designs?. • How much extraordinary engineering is required to build a building of this height on a pier? • How will accessibility be addressed in the building design? Will there be accessible drop-offs, multiple elevators and accessible design? • Is there a cost study? Is one of the designs more cost-effective than the others? <p>Other verbatim comment about design excellence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the Lily design option (option 3) is the most interesting and best showcases the landmark nature of the site. (noted by two participants) • The design looks beautiful, and I would be interested in selling my place to live on this new landmark. • This is a beautiful building, but I truly believe it is in the wrong place. It reminds me of Montparnasse, a single tall tower out of place on the Paris skyline. • The concept is too bright and out-of-place. The goal of making it a regional landmark speaks more to it standing out/alone that being part of a neighbourhood.

Topic	Key themes – Comments and Questions Noted
<p>4. Comments opposing a 45-storey building on Block 16</p>	<p>Verbatim comments about the height of the building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not want tall towers on the site at all. • These towers are too high and out of place. Hamilton has always had a small/big town feel. 45 storeys is way too big for the area. • How will this tall building avoid becoming like the waterfronts in Vancouver and Toronto with too many condominiums in a row? Not happy with such a mega development focus. • Believe me I'm very sensitive to the fact that you have put a lot of talent, time, imagination and passion into the design, but I would be fundamentally opposed to allowing it to be built on Pier 8. • How is this monstrous building going to be engaging with the existing community? Will the local community be able to engage with this building or is it just another condo? It looks like a silo and self-contained structure standing out and not contributing to any community engagement. A giant eye sore really. • The building will be 147 metres tall--the escarpment is 90 metres. Does this not make the tower disproportionate to the landscape? Does the city still have height limits shaped by our unique geography? <p>Verbatim comment expressing concerns about views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 45 stories this will be an absolute eye sore, blocking out the view for many. Will look like the Toronto skyline with views extremely limited. • There will only be panoramic views for the people that can afford to live in this building. That is not a draw for the neighbourhood unless the building will have public access. If not, this tall building will in fact prevent panoramic views for the rest of the neighbourhood. • Block 1 is blocked from any westerly view. Will this devalue these smaller properties? • No towers along the waterfront! The waterfront belongs to all the citizens of Hamilton. And we need to keep the view free from vertical obstructions. • Not completely sold on this concept. Was there just today and I've been looking at the sight from the Mountain Brow. Very concerned about the city approving more tall towers. I don't want the view of the Bay blocked by a tower. <p>Comments about the tower becoming a precedent for building other towers along the waterfront:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern that while it was noted that this is one building and one project that the approval of a tower on this site could create a precedent for other towers to be considered at the Waterfront. How can the city ensure that this doesn't happen? • Contracts change, rules change and landscapes change. What's to stop a future developer from wanting to build a tower in another location on the waterfront. What stops a variance going through to change the heights?

Topic	Key themes – Comments and Questions Noted
<p>5. Comments about parking and site planning</p>	<p>Verbatim comments on parking for the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your earlier mention of three underground stories of parking seems inadequate when considering 1.5 parking spaces per unit. Are you sure that it will be enough? • Being so close to the waters edge, how will the parking not be below water level? • Given the proximity to the GO Station, the city's climate emergency declaration and the trend in a growing number of cities to reduce/eliminate personal car use, will the parking ratio be optimized with this foresight and to also decrease unit costs and increase affordability? • Is the City enforcing minimum parking requirements? Parking spaces are expensive, and many go unsold. Ideally this site will be marketed as being great for transit users given the close proximity to West Harbour • It seems as though the back-of-house functions like loading and parking access take up a very prominent portion of the building's frontage along the waterfront and public promenade. Has the team studied whether these functions could be incorporated along the south or east sides of the building, to ensure more active and outward facing uses are achieved along this frontage? • There needs to be parking for visitors going to the building. <p>Verbatim comments about accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that pedestrian access will not be accessible for the disabled. How will DARTS get through if there is a huge pedestrian mall space? • Is 'loading and parking' large enough for DARTS shuttles? <p>Comments about public parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is everyone going to park? Is it all street parking? Where is the public parking? What about public coming to the skating ring or for a walk on Promenade? • A number of participants noted concerns about the lack of availability of public parking at the Waterfront together with the need for increased transit service.
<p>6. Comments about affordability and family friendly units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these rentals or condominiums? • Will a percentage of the units in the tower be affordable i.e., rent-geared to income to make them more affordable for a greater number of Hamiltonians? • Can you clarify whether/how many of the 5% designated as affordable housing will be family units? • What guarantees that the family units that will be built will at least partially be included in the affordable units? • We are in great need of housing supply, and all three options would be beautiful additions to our city. Thanks to all involved for working so hard to balance diverse community and environmental needs with this development!