Welcome & Agenda Overview (Diedre Beintema):

- Thanks to everyone here for coming out tonight and we apologize for the confusion because we’re not meeting on our regular time or at our regular meeting spot at Evergreen. The meeting date was moved up a week to avoid any conflicts with vacation plans for Canada Day and after we made the change we found out that Evergreen was booked for this week Thursday. The next meeting will be back on our regular date of the last Thursday of the month (July 28) at Evergreen Community Storefront (294 James St N).

- The opening of the new boardwalk and transient docking station on Pier 7 + 8 was on Monday morning. The boardwalk and dock are now open for public use. There are 14 new benches and 6 lounge chairs along the boardwalk as well as 12 docking spaces for transient dock users. What you see currently is phase 1 of the project – the park and public spaces will be increased and enhanced as we get further into construction.

- The technical studies about Pier 7 + 8 were posted online in early June. The studies were completed to help staff better understand the features of the land and the work that will need to be done to make them ready for residential use. We realize that those are very long studies with a lot of information in them so we’re planning several open houses and drop-in sessions over the summer to give you a chance to talk to staff about what’s in those studies. Tonight is the first of those events: we have Brian Hollingworth from IBI Group to explain his findings in the parking and traffic studies.

- Agenda:
  
  o Plan Local – Sherri Selway from the Plan Local Advisory Committee will give a presentation about Plan Local with opportunity to vote at the end of the meeting.

  o Diedre will give a quick explanation about the project timeline and events schedule sheet (printed copies will be made available at Evergreen Storefront)

  o Philbert Kim will explain the land solicitation process for Pier 8 and how land developers will be selected. There will be opportunities for the community to participate during the summer.
- Brian Hollingworth from IBI Group will give more information about the findings of the traffic and parking studies.

Plan Local Ward 2 Safe Streets (Sherri Selway – Plan Local Advisory Committee)

- A ward 2 initiative – citizen supported decision making. Citizens were asked to identify unsafe locations in their neighbourhoods. $1 million in infrastructure funding will be used to make the top selected locations safer.

- In Phase 1, 100 locations were identified by residents. In Phase 2, 24 projects from across ward 2 were chosen for the final voting list – all neighbourhoods are equally represented on the list.

- The goal: projects in each neighbourhood will be identified and selected as the final projects.

- Any resident or business owner can vote (including students and children)

- Look online (http://planlocal.ca/) to see the approximate value of each project and to see interactive maps

- Voting period is from June 20-30

- Voting stations are at Bennetto, Beasley and Central Memorial Community Centres, Central Library and several pop up voting stations (such as the Farmer’s Market, local coffee shops)

Project Timeline & Events Schedule (Diedre Beintema):

- The timeline and events schedule was created to give residents a better sense of what staff are currently working on and when upcoming meetings will be. At last month’s meeting, we heard concerns from many of you that you’re not always sure of stage we’re at in a certain process, which staff are responsible for which pieces of work (in particular, many people seem to be wondering why Alan Waterfield isn’t involved in the reviewing the subdivision application – this is because Alan’s role is to deal with the policy side of things like creating the Urban Design Study so Edward John is now working with us because his speciality is making sure that the actual implementation follows the guidelines laid out in the policy documents). This document will help show when those kinds of shifts in the project are happening.

- Key things to note: dates are subject to change, the document will be updated regularly and be posted online and available in hard copy (at monthly meetings and at Evergreen storefront)

- Colour coding (page 1) shows the colours used throughout the schedule and time. All boxes that are the same colour are part of the same process and the staff leading that process.
- The Q2 column on “Project timeline and key milestones” (page 5) shows the four components of the project staff are working on right now and how long the work will take.

- The “events schedule” on pages 2-4 shows specific dates and milestones that we’re aiming for such as engagement booths, open houses, community meetings, Committee and Council dates.

- Staff are will looking for more events throughout the summer where we can bring the West Harbour community wide engagement booth to increase Hamiltonian’s awareness of the work going on in the West Harbour.

Land Solicitation Process (Philbert Kim)

- Philbert is responsible for strategizing and executing the land solicitation process for the Pier 7 + 8 lands. The land solicitation process exists because, even though the City owns the land on Pier 7 & 8, the City won’t be responsible for physically constructing the buildings but will lead a complex real estate sale process to ensure that the right partner is selected to construct the buildings.

- Pier 7 + 8 is a former shipping pier owned by the City that is currently being underutilized. Selling this land to a land developer is an opportunity to create a unique visitor and resident experience.

- The Pier 7 + 8 Urban Design study describes what the area could possibly look like in the future. In order to get there, the City needs to:
  - Create a plan for the future subdivision and rezone the land to put in a road network, utilities and rights of way
  - Create new public spaces and recreation facilities

- The buildings themselves will be built by private developers, not by the City.

- Our commitment:
  - “best in class” – we are looking for a great outcome and will set the bar high for potential developers
  - “shared values” – The waterfront is a city-wide asset. City staff will engage in an ongoing dialogue with resident and identify shared values and desired outcomes.
  - “innovator” – Other municipalities have done similar projects. Staff have been consulting them to learn from their experiences and will follow best practices. Opportunity exists for Hamilton to come up with some new ideas and tactics and be seen as a leader and progressive community because of this work.
  - “collaboratively” – Advice from our peer municipalities around the country was to build a successful working relationship with the land development partner. It will
take a long time to reach the end of the project (when everything is completely constructed) so we want to ensure that we can work successfully as a team. Realities will inevitably change during that time, so having a good working partner who will cooperate is important.

- “city-building priorities” – This process requires us to think about what’s important to Hamilton and how we want the rest of the country and world to view our city.

- The steps we’ll take to reach the best proposal:
  
  o Our official plan, SSSP, the UDS, vision framework, zoning bylaw all express what we would like to see for our community.
  
  o We need to read through these documents to see which parts apply to the land developer (i.e. design, innovation, unit types, etc.) and which parts are the City’s responsibility to create (i.e. public spaces, roads, infrastructure, etc.).
  
  o We won’t accept proposals from land developers who are the “wrong fit” for Hamilton and this project. Only developers who are considered a “good fit” will be asked to submit their proposals.

- This will be a three-stage solicitation process. The three stages are:
  
  o Prequalification (request for qualification-RFQ) – this is the stage where we determine if the potential developer is capable of doing a project of this size and whether their values align with ours.
  
  o Proposals (request for proposal-RFP) – this is the stage where they tell us the details of their plan and we look at it to make sure it aligns with our priorities (i.e. from the official planning documents and other priorities the community has indicated) and make sure that it is financially feasible.
  
  o Negotiation – the final price, technical details, strategy for dealing with risks and other changes, governance model, etc. will be decided.

- The draft (because it hasn’t been endorsed by Council yet) process map shows the sequence of events and key milestones. Once the process starts, there probably won’t be much interaction with Council because we need to maintain the integrity of the process. Staff will seek council’s approval of this process in the fall – there are still details that need to be figured out before that point.

- There are key points where we will need community involved but, similar to Council, there will be long periods of time where the process runs without community input.

- Three community workshops will be held over the summer (July 14, August 11, September 8) to give community members a chance to give their ideas and opinions on the solicitation process and how decisions should be made. This is resident’s main opportunity to influence the outcome of the solicitation process.
- The format of the workshops is to be determined. The discussions at the workshops will be focused on:
  
  o Scope – determining what we want (e.g. RFQ/RFP response requirements)

  o Partner – what qualities should our ideal partner have? (E.g. pre-qualification evaluation criteria)

  o How should proposals be evaluated, scored and selected? (E.g. evaluation criteria & their weightings, trade-offs that we’re willing to make).

- In staff’s report to Council, input from the community will be balanced with input from industry players and technical experts in order to put forward a balanced recommendation to Council.

- If you’d like to attend a small working group meeting (Thursday, June 30) to help us determine the format and logistics of the summer engagement sessions, contact Diedre (Diedre.beintema@hamilton.ca or 905-546-2424 ext 3283) to receive the information.

- Q&A:

  o Why is the neighbourhood not mentioned as a partner in the land solicitation process on the “Our Commitment” slide?
    
    ▪ The phrase “shared values” was intended to reflect the shared values of Hamilton residents and the City of Hamilton.

  o How will Setting Sail and the Vision framework be used to assess developer’s proposals?
    
    ▪ The evaluation method hasn’t been determined yet but it will be based on feedback from the public, industry players and technical experts.

  o When will the public have a chance to review each developer’s proposal?
    
    ▪ The public is being consulted this summer to ensure their priorities are included in the evaluation tool. The tool will be used to ensure developer’s proposals align with the public’s priorities.

  o Can the Vision framework be included in the Request for Proposal documents so developers know what’s expected of them in advance of submitting a proposal?
    
    ▪ Yes, developers will be expected to respond to the RFP in a way that shows how they plan to meet the criteria in our Vision and how their values align with ours.

    ▪ Bidders will all be expected to review these framework documents and in their response, indicate how they align with the vision and values.
Will citizens be able to see the prequalification/evaluation tools staff are proposing before it's presented to Council?

- This will be an open process. We will follow the normal process for releasing the information: bring the plans forward first to the West Harbour Development Sub-committee, then to GIC, then Council.

Are the starred points on the process sequence map the only points of Council interaction?

- Yes, we won’t be able to publicly say too much about the proposals or negotiations while the process is underway but we will be able to give updates that will mostly consist of information such as number of proposals, expected timelines, etc. Revealing too much information during the process could be unfair to the participants.
- We hope to bring in a Fairness Commissioner (usually a retired judge) who will oversee the process to ensure all negotiations are fair and equal for all partners.

Comment: I support the idea of using a Fairness Commissioner. Strict qualifications should set to ensure that the person selected is capable of doing the role.

What is the public’s role, for example, in determining whether a developer’s values align with Hamilton’s?

- The summer workshops are the public’s opportunity to weigh in on which shared values should be used during this process.

Hasn’t this exercise already been done in the Vision framework?

- Yes, but our summer sessions will drill down into even more detail by asking people to define what the Vision concepts should look like and how developers should be evaluated according to the Vision. This process will make the Vision more concrete.

Why is the word “partner” used often on your slides than “partners”?

- Good observation, we’re still open to considering one or multiple partners based on who meets prequalifications. We still have to decide whether we’re selling these sites as individual blocks, clusters, or the whole thing at once.
- This decision will also have a determining impact on who is even capable of meeting the pre-qualifications (i.e., capacity to do the whole thing versus just one block)
Isn't the vision framework is essentially a scorecard as it is?

- Yes, the Vision framework is based on SS but our task now is to determine which elements of the vision apply to potential developers and which are still the City's responsibility.

Don't focus on one column of the vision framework at a time – look at how they connect and enhance one another (i.e. don't just ask for “world class design” but also tell developers to consider other vision columns, such as accessibility, as part of their design)

- Yes, we're taking this into consideration but we don't want to discourage innovation

What if we set the criteria too strict so that no developers are able to meet our criteria?

- Yes, this is possible, it's called “bid failure”. The City still has the right to stop the process and begin again. We're doing a lot of research ahead of time and consulting with other municipalities in order to avoid this. We're the owner and vendor of the land so the City can avoid selling to a “bad” vendor but there is a chance that a developer will agree to give us what we ask for but the price they offer to pay is too low/less than we'd like

- Also our market soundings with the development community are intended to get a good reading on the amount of interest that currently exists and to hopefully generate even more demand

What are the timelines?

- Each bar on the “Possible Solicitation Process Sequence” slide roughly indicates a year (so 2016, 2017 and 2018 are shown). The process is expected to be complete by end of 2018.

Pier 7 & 8 Transportation and Parking (Brian Hollingworth – IBI Group)

- This is a follow up to Brian's first presentation to the community on December 9 to talk about his early findings on traffic and parking issues in the area. The feedback received on December 9 was incorporated into his reports and the final presentation you see tonight.

- Traffic Study:

  - The traffic study looked at:

    - The impact that the planned community on Pier 7 + 8 could have on the roads in the surrounding areas
• Travel demand management (TDM) strategies to help minimize potential traffic and parking challenges

• How much parking will be needed on Pier 7 + 8

• Parking needs for the broader waterfront area based on the plans and objectives of Setting Sail and the Rec Master Plan with recommendations about a larger parking strategy for the entire West Harbour area

○ Attendees at the December 9 meeting had the following key concerns:

  • The impact of increased traffic from the Pier 7 + 8 development on residential streets, especially near schools
  • Will parking spillover into the neighbourhood?
  • Boaters’ and marina’s parking need for safe parking areas that are close to the marina
  • How parking shortages might impact the success of the marina
  • The North End Traffic Management Study was done in 2008. Are the plans for development based on the same assumptions in the Study?

○ The assumptions IBI Group followed are very similar to the assumptions used in the North End Traffic Management Plan. IBI’s assumptions were:

  ○ That there will be around 1300 residential units (this number is the mid-point of the range mentioned in the UDS, 1300-1531 or so with the variation resulting from the size of the units). The unit size impacts how many people can live in the unit.

  ○ There will be 6800 square metres of institutional space and 7740 square metres of commercial space

  ○ The number of trips generated in the morning (at peak hour) is assumed to be 175 in and 419 out of the area and the number of trips in the afternoon (at peak hour) is assumed to be 503 in and 313 out. This is about 80 more trips that the North End Traffic Management Plan assumed.

  ○ Numbers in the plan are based on “full build out” (when the Pier 7 + 8 development is completed) which will take a long time (i.e. 10-15 years) to achieve so the issues will grow gradually and can be mitigated as they develop

  ○ Key routes in and out of the area were mapped at peak times

    • IBI looked at current traffic conditions on key routes (i.e. James at Burlington, John north of Burlington) to determine if lanes are currently at
or near capacity. The number of new cars (from the existing residential areas as well as from the new development) were estimated and added to the current total.

- There are many mitigation issues and strategies that can be used in the West Harbour to reduce and prevent the traffic issues that IBI foresees:
  - North End Traffic Management Plan includes a number of mitigation measures that are currently being implemented as pilot projects and their effects are being measured
  - Closing off intersections, lane narrowings, bump outs, etc. can be used to discourage and slow traffic
  - May need traffic signals at James at Burlington and Ferguson at Burlington in the long term to slow traffic and keep pedestrians safe
  - Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures involve encouraging people to change the time of their trips or working from home, using alternative modes of travel to reduce the number of cars on the road. Some strategies to incentivize alternative transit could include providing carshare, bike parking, good cycling infrastructure and pre-loaded presto cards to the residents of new buildings. These measures will reduce the residents need to use cards. The design of the community will be the main deciding factor in the success of TDM efforts

- Pier 7 + 8 Parking Study:
  - Best practices for parking strategies include:
    - Avoiding too much parking space because this increases car ownership and use
    - Setting parking maximums instead of parking minimums (this won’t be necessary on Pier 7 + 8 since the area is already constrained by space)
    - Shared parking (there is good potential for shared parking on this in Pier 7 + 8 because there is potential for residents and their visitors to use an institution’s parking at night)
    - Unbundled parking (condo buyers won’t be required to purchase a parking space with their unit)
    - Using TDM measures to reduce demand for parking
    - On street parking
    - Pedestrian environment is considered and prioritized over car driver’s parking
IBI’s approach in studying the area’s parking needs:

- Traffic can have a clear impact on the residential areas so a careful balance must be met: too much parking can result in too much traffic in the existing residential areas but too little parking can result in parking spillover into the residential areas.

- Acknowledged that parking is necessary to support the plan for the area.

- Looked at the current by-law (no. 6593) and the future by-law (05-200) to determine what the current and future requirements for parking will be.

- Compare the area to the parking solutions used in similar areas in other cities.

- Determine and select appropriate parking rates for each land use category.

Recommendations for parking needs on Pier 7 + 8:

- The proposed rate of parking spaces for each residence is 0.85 (current rate in Hamilton is 1 space per unit) – learn from the current situation in Toronto where the number of parking spaces needed is decreasing because people are using transit successfully instead.

- The proposed rate of parking for each office is 2 per 100 square metres (current rate is 3.3).

- The current design plan includes 1422 parking spaces as a minimum.

- The proposed 3 phase development plan for Pier 7 + 8 will leave existing parking open and available for a longer term so parking needs can be monitored as development progressed.

- Form of parking – two options (integrated into each building or integrated with a centralized parking structure) were considered in the Urban Design Study. There are advantages and disadvantages to both options.

- IBI also studied a parking strategy for the entire waterfront area:

  - Challenges:

    - Parking along the rest of the waterfront will decrease from 452 spaces to about 338 spaces after development is complete due to the construction of the new market village on Pier 5 + 6.

    - The number of boat slips is planned to increase by approximately 300 (up to about 637 slips total). The additional boat slips will increase need for parking for boaters.
Marina parking needs were estimated by looking at other marinas in the GTHA – the marinas offer a very different range of parking spaces per slip (range is between 0.34 parking spaces per slip and 1.64 spaces) and most don’t experience parking difficulties at this rate of parking per slip.

Hamilton’s by-law currently requires 1 space per slip.

After reducing the rate of slips needed per slip and utilizing shared parking spaces, the number of estimated parking spaces needed is 759 spaces. Since the number of parking spaces in the area will be 338 spaces after development, there will be a potential parking shortfall of at least at least 421 spaces.

Alternative solutions will need to be considered to address the shortfall. None of the alternative options are a “silver bullet” – the recommended strategy is to do a little bit of everything.

City is currently reviewing the parking and traffic studies to determine which alternative solutions will be pursued.

Q&A

Question: Is there a way of getting direct feedback and responses on specific questions about the studies?

Answer: Email Edward John (City of Hamilton development planner) at Edward.john@hamilton.ca. Edward is holding drop in sessions to address questions about the technical studies and development application.

Comment: I support the use of TDM measures and strategies. The City of Hamilton should be a strong partner and promote TDM. Consider things like extend the free waterfront shuttle year round.

Question: Why wasn’t Wellington St at Burlington considered in the traffic study? The area currently is busy and unsafe.

Answer: IBI looked at strategies to move the bulk of traffic further east (such as move the light from Mary to Ferguson). More study is needed to determine if the redistribution works better than existing

Comment: When considering alternative parking structure locations, consider how easy it is for someone to find them. We don’t want visitors driving through residential areas because they don’t know the route to the parking structure.

Question: Why can’t the parking on Pier 5 + 6 be left as is instead of building a commercial/artisan village on the space and reducing parking?
Answer: The commercial village on Pier 5 + 6 was identified in the Rec Master Plan so IBI’s study was based on the details of the Rec Master Plan

Question: Who covers the cost of new parking structures?

Answer: The City of Hamilton would pay for these out of the capital budget because the structures will be on City owned lands.

Question: James St North is close to maximum capacity already. Did IBI consider intensification that is likely to occur in the neighbourhood and the additional traffic in the neighbourhood itself?

Answer: Yes, IBI estimated the amount of growth in the existing neighbourhood using the maximum allowed in the existing zoning bylaw. Intensification is regulated by the existing zoning which doesn’t currently allow for huge intensification but some growth in the existing neighbourhood has been considered in the study.

Question: How will LRT impact James St N’s capacity for the increase in traffic IBI estimated?

Answer: Since the LRT route on James St N will be shared, there will still be equal space for vehicles as there is today.

Question: Did IBI consider asking the rest of the city to determine their preferred mode for getting to the area?

Answer: Yes, people from outlying areas of the city probably will rely on vehicles to get to Pier 7 + 8 rather than use public transit. Their preferred mode of travel been taken into consideration in the study.

Question: With TDM, how do you influence behaviour to change modes?

Answer: TDM isn’t a silver bullet but can led to successes (on a smaller scale but still impactful) not just by telling people not to drive but by providing them with a viable alternative.

Question: Did you consider the demographics of the population? An aging population probably won’t shift from their preferred mode.

Answer: The numbers in the study are based on “full build out”. The plan allows for transitional parking that will provide us with flexible parking options for the next 10-15 years. So we’ll be able to make adjustments to the parking plan as development progresses and as we develop a better understanding of the demographics of the new community.
Question: Does that mean we need to wait 10-15 years until we reach full build out before we get to see the benefits of this plan (i.e. mature shade trees, adequate parking, alternative transit options, etc)?

- Answer: What we mean is change will take place gradually over time rather than all at once. This allows us to make adjustments to the plan as we get there.

Question: Is the number of parking required at the marina based on the 1 parking spot per slip requirement in the parking?

- Answer: Yes, shortfall is after the 1 parking spot per slip and is based on the number that will be needed after more slips are added (Rec Master Plan brings number of slips up to approximately 700) and resulting increase of traffic. The new bylaw (05-200) will come into force soon and will have a rate of 0.6 parking spaces for each slip so the study considered the new bylaw requirements as well.

Question: Are the boat clubs responsible to pay for some of the parking that their members/users need? Why is the burden on the City to provide?

- Answer: The City owns the Hamilton Yacht Club and Port Authority lands so the City is responsible for paying for the increased parking.

Question: Is there anything we know now that we didn’t know when the North End Traffic Management Plan was created? John St is the last street to have any of the traffic calming measures implemented and that is the one street where we’ve seen a considerable increase in traffic speeds. John street is often missed, particularly the sections just outside of the North End.

- Answer: many of the measures implemented by the North End Traffic Management Plan are currently pilot projects so we are still implementing the extent of these measures’ success. IBI’s assumptions were very similar to the assumption of the North End Traffic Management Plan but some estimates on some roads have increased since the Plan was created.

Question: Will parking be paid?

- Answer: We don’t know today the details of how the parking will operate (i.e. paid vs unpaid). We will manage the change over time as needed. For example, in the Rec Master Plan budget, there’s $30 million set aside for a parking garage so we know for sure that the garage will be built but we don’t know the details of how it will be operated. IBI has more work to do on the overall Waterfront Parking Strategy and paid parking will be looked at as part of that. A best practice is a modest rate for public parking so that people don’t abuse it.
o Question: Will the requirements for accessible parking go above what’s required in AODA?
  - Answer: Yes, AODA and the City of Hamilton’s Accessibility standards will be met or possibly exceeded

o Question: There are people with disabilities who use the marina – is there plans to provide accessible parking at the marina?
  - Answer: This detail can be added to the study

o Question: There are already significant parking shortfalls on event days. The base measurement needs to take current demand into consideration.
  - Answer: The study looked at the current demand and acknowledged that, yes, there is currently a shortfall. However, if more parking is built, there is potential that it will draw traffic into the areas of the neighbourhood where it shouldn’t be

o Question: There are a lot of illegal parking pads in people’s front yards which results in stormwater management issues and heating. The City should to take proactive measures to ensure this doesn’t happen anymore.
  - Answer: We’ll take this into consideration

o Question: Would it help to bring Catherine St through Eastwood Park to Dock Service road to ensure traffic doesn’t go through residential areas to get to the centralized parking structure?
  - Answer (from resident): This was strongly opposed by residents on Catherine Street during the Setting Sail discussions

o Question: Can you give an update on the other City-owned properties that were included in the Deloitte report?
  - Answer: Right now because we are waiting for more studies on each of the properties to be complete:
    - 500 MacNab – The building going through a full engineering assessment to determine what work needs to make it habitable again. The assessment is planned to be complete by the end of the year. So decisions will be made until after the study is complete.
    - Jamesville – City Housing Hamilton is currently looking at other properties where a new building could potentially be built. Questions about density (how much residential the property could support) are being studied.
• Barton Tiffany – an environmental assessment is currently being done to determine what condition the land is in.

  o Question: Is there a public consultation process planned to talk about where a new CHH development could be built?
    ▪ Answer: Not sure at this time. It’s difficult to release that information before any potential agreements/purchases are made because it could negatively impact the outcomes (for example, potential sellers might drive up their price since they know they’re being considered or they could try to influence the outcome some other way).

  o Question: When considering what properties to buy, it’s important to look at the other intangible value of the land and whether is an area where people who need affordable housing can live successfully.
    ▪ Answer: Yes, when we are ready to move forward, we will come back to community for feedback. We will invite Tom Hunter to come to a future meeting to give an update on CHH’s progress.

Closing Remarks

- Thanks Brian and thanks to all of you for coming out tonight. Don’t forget to talk to Sheri about voting for your favorite plan local solutions on your way out and we’ll see you at the Evergreen building on July 28.