EVENT REPORT

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

Public Advisory Group Meeting No.1

April 4, 2019

mbtw group inc.

Hamilton

EVENT REPORT

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

Public Advisory Group Meeting No.1 // April 4, 2019

1.0 Introduction

On April 9, 2019, The MBTW Group and the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) conducted the first of a series of Public Advisory Group meetings for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan project. The meeting was held at the Concession Street Library located at 255 Concession St, Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented and summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting.

The Public Advisory Group (PAG) was formed by the City of Hamilton LAS and includes a variety of representatives from the community. This PAG has been assembled specifically to provide input into the development of the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan. All members are volunteers from the community. A total of 19 people attended the meeting.

Meeting No.1 provided the group with background information, project purpose, tentative project schedule, and presented a set of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for consideration and discussion. The meeting outcome provided the project team with initial concerns and ideas from the public regarding the history of Sam Lawrence Park, the Master Plan process, and the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria (Criteria for Success). The following sections provide a summary of the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria that was presented, followed by a summary of the key points that were discussed during the meeting.

The meeting material was presented to the group using multiple methods including a digital display, printed 11x17 booklets, and printed 24x36 panels that were mounted on the wall. As the project team presented the preliminary evaluation criteria, comments were recorded on sticky notes by MBTW Group and placed on 24x36 panels. Meeting minutes were recorded by the City of Hamilton LAS.

PAG Meeting No.1 included:

- A brief presentation (refer to Attachment A) conducted by the City's Project Manager, John Vandriel, of Landscape Architectural Services and Jana Joyce,The MBTW Group;
- Display Panels to facilitate discussion (refer to Attachment B); and
- Open discussion.

2.0 Preliminary Evaluation Criteria (Criteria for Success)

In addition to the background material, the Public Advisory Group was presented with a set of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for review and discussion. The Preliminary Evaluation Criteria presented was based on feedback previously collected from:

- Staff Stakeholder Meetings;
- Informal public engagement 'pop-up' events; and
- Public Meeting No.1.

The evaluation criteria will represent the key goals and objectives of the master plan and are being developed by the project team with input from the public and internal stakeholders. More specifically, the final evaluation criteria will form

a schedule of questions aimed at measuring developed design concepts against the key goals and objectives, ensuring that the final master plan concept represents the most responsive design for the Park.

The Preliminary Evaluation Criteria was presented to the Public Advisory Group under a series of themes, each with a set of questions aimed at qualifying the proposed design concepts. The preliminary themes presented by the project team included:

- Connectivity
- Maintenance
- Safety
- Amenities
- Character & Heritage
- Interpretation & Education
- Landscape, Design & Programming
- Barrier Free Design (Social)
- Barrier Free Design (Physical)
- Traffic & Mobility

A summary of comments and open discussion regarding the criteria themes is provided in the following sections.

Theme > Connectivity

1) Wayfinding would improve the pedestrian experience and navigation around the site.
2) The pedestrian walkway adjacent to the Jolley Cut (connecting to the display gardens) presents the feeling of being unsafe next to vehicular traffic.
3) A pedestrian bridge over the Jolley Cut would improve connections to different park segments, particularly to the Concession Street businesses.
4) Currently, you cannot walk circuitously around the entire park; most people just go in and out the way they came in. A pedestrian bridge connection would allow for this movement to occur.
5) The lower walkways currently provide park users with the option to connect to the display gardens without walking next to the Jolley Cut; however, they are unsafe at certain times of day and different times of the year.
6) The pedestrian walkway directly north of (below) the west parking lot is currently too narrow for strollers, buggies, and park maintenance vehicles. Consider widening.
7) While some people have difficulty navigating stairs, others have difficulty navigating ramps / slopes. The Master Plan should consider this in its design.
8) Consider transit vehicle movements in any proposed traffic calming design measures.
9) Signage and wayfinding could be improved in the park, particularly to the different park segments.

Theme > Maintenance

1) The escarpment walkways are not plowed in winter.
2) There is litter scattered everywhere in the wooded areas (plastic bags in trees).
3) Horticultural-themed display gardens (similar to those at the Royal Botanical Gardens) that are low maintenance and drought-tolerant are a way of keeping the gardens aesthetically beautiful, but with minimal maintenance and use of water.
4) Redesigning the display gardens to be minimal maintenance will allow Parks staff to focus efforts around the rest of the park (litter clean-up, etc.)
5) Sometimes kids like to toboggan in the dark through trees and on top of some of the garden areas. Can the future garden design consider this?

Theme > Safety

1) Lighting that provides a sense of safety, but also does not take away from the dark sky would be desired.
2) There may be certain areas that are appropriate to light up and other areas that are not.
3) Examining safety of the pathways is needed.

Theme > Amenities

1) A shade structure / gazebo on the upper lawn area would be desired. Currently there isn't much shade.
2) "Shakespeare in the Park" would be a great programming opportunity in this park.
3) Many people have wedding photos taken here. Sometimes wedding parties come with tour buses, which create conflict with other park users, especially in the parking lot.
4) Some people use the parking lot as a park-and-ride lot, commuting in to the Lower City each day.
5) Currently the park serves the needs of adults. There may be opportunity to add amenities that also accommodate children (playground?)

Theme > Character & Heritage

1) Ensure the character of the park is preserved.
2) It is understood that views are a critical component of the Park's character and history. Maintaining views and the Park's status in the City's park network will be an important element is

Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Connectivity

Does the Design Concept:

Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve pedestrian access into the park? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Connectivity. WAYFINDING along the entire park

Improve. Connections from Highway? (removed)

Park zones. (thinking across roads)

Looping Connection

Cyclists.

Maintenance

Does the Design Concept:

Utilize resilient and durable park elements? (e.g. vandal and wear resistance) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. 'future-proofing', escarpment stability) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Pr… emoval ope… (e.… es and space… inter pro… ❑ Yes ❑ No

Winter Programming.

Approvals (water) from the MST. Narrow Walkway

Pro… for garden maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Utilize l… vege… planting… (e.g. little… o mai… ss irrigation i… ❑ Yes ❑ No

Host. Themes. National

$ Budget? Low Maint.?

Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Safety

Does the Design Concept:

Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding? (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve… egy throughout the park? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve… ability of paths and park edges? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Light pollution.

Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED]) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide access to emergency services? (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide access for emergency services? (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas) ❑ Yes ❑ No

Temporary Fence? What is it?

reliminary Evaluation Criteria

Landscape & Design

Does the Design Concept:

Provide protection from the elements?
(e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/ thermal comfort)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide a variety of areas and elements for resting/sitting?
(e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Integrate Concession Street into the park design?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Retain mature trees and propose a succession/ replanting/protection strategy?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Barrier Free Design - Social

Does the Design Concept:

Integrate social inclusiveness?
(e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups?
(e.g. negative uses or users do not dominate the space)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide for all abilities and ages?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide activities for different times of the day/ year?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide free/no cost access?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Barrier Free Design - Physical

Does the Design Concept:

Minimize circulation barriers?
(e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Provide alternate paths to key park features?
(e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Incorporate the Urban Braille system?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

Improve the access to, quality, and location of parking?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve vehicle access to the park?
(e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience?
(e.g. crossing streets)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?
❑ Yes ❑ No

Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.?
(e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Rebalance the mobility focus?
(e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)
❑ Yes ❑ No

Parking? Regulation + posting + limits.