

JOHN REBECCA PROPOSED PARK CONCEPT	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY RESPONSE
<p>Yes, I support the implementation of the proposed John Rebecca Park Plan - General Comments</p> <p>Of a JR Park plan, not necessarily this new plan.</p> <p>With modifications from previous question.</p> <p>Yes, with tweaks and concerns as raised by residents.</p> <p>I support as long as key recommendations from community are taken into consideration.</p> <p>This is a remarkable opportunity to create an important public space - it is not just another park. More thought and design is needed.</p> <p>Mostly yes, but change the pergola into a gazebo as on page 1. Add fine misting coolers as on page 1. Maybe add a smaller version of the George R. Robinson Gage Park Bandshell on the lawn facing towards to ice-rink, splash-spray park, and seating. Flip the sides of the grassy open area to the east, and put the splash-spray pad and seating on the west.</p> <p>We purchased a condo in [the neighbourhood] because of the "promised" park. We could not live with the high music noise from 77 so sold and moved to the back of the building because we like the location. The condo building has no outdoor space (balconies or patios). We desperately need some outdoor space. Beasley and downtown needs more parks WITH TREES, SHADE and BENCHES.</p> <p>It is much needed green space for local residents, and will help extend the success of the west end of King William St. further east.</p> <p>Urban parks enhance attractiveness of city. Traffic and parking should be integrated with this development.</p> <p>This park will be a very good addition to the downtown.</p> <p>Need something more downtown for parents to go with their children.</p> <p>It needs it for the area.</p> <p>More public spaces needed. Need to reduce surface parking! Club 77 not wanted in area.</p> <p>Reduces urban heat island. New public spaces. Public amenity for future development in area.</p> <p>As more people move downtown this will become I believe a popular respite from the commercial paid café type spaces and from the heat of concrete & asphalt & noise. As a resident, I look forward to this very much. My child said he can hardly believe the city would invest this beautifully in downtown! I hope you show him the dream will come true for his future!</p>	<p>No Comment</p>
<p>No, I do not support the implementation of the proposed John Rebecca Park Plan - General Comments</p> <p>Design does not account for future developments. Like [individual named] said, "Introverted". Tree placements!! Would prefer a park, not an urban plaza.</p> <p>I would be very upset if the park moves forward as proposed in the new concept. It would not be a place I would want to hang out in. I would definitely consider it a failure, and it would be a lost opportunity to create something meaningful. It would be sad to not see a more dynamic design for a park along King William as a contrast to the more traditionally axial design of Gore Park. We only get one shot at this, so let's do it right. Please please please let's do it right, let's have a public space all stakeholders can be truly proud of rather than quickly rushing a unexciting design through. These sentiments have been loudly expressed by the BNA in the public meeting. Please take these seriously and into consideration.</p> <p>I love the neighbourhood I live in and would hate to see the potential of this park go to waste</p>	<p>No Comment</p>
<p>General</p> <p>Very happy with the implementation :). I do support working with area developers to adjust the design.</p> <p>The park appears to have momentum again after years of stalling. Please capitalize and proceed with design and implementation as quickly as possible. Don't waste too much time with public consultation; we don't know WHAT we want!</p> <p>Great first go – needs revisions and a second draft.</p> <p>Good presentation. Interesting question and answer session.</p> <p>This should go to a Design Competition.</p> <p>Display boards are excellent, presentation.</p>	<p>No Comment</p>
<p>Design Composition</p> <p>New design lacks encouragement of motion throughout the park.</p> <p>Park fails to allow for diagonal foot traffic patterns.</p> <p>As you are aware, no doubt, central to planning the park itself is an understanding of what is surrounding the park; what is it that will draw people through the park? Central to planning park itself = understanding of what surrounds it = what is it that will draw people to/through the park? - Fountain feature.</p> <p>Space for individual groups seems lacking. Focus all towards centre while blocking view from streets by complete surround of trees.</p> <p>More open space for safety and visibility. [In order for the park to work, we need to] integrate sidewalks into the park so there are roadside trees.</p> <p>The proposed design very much places the street-facing sidewalks outside of the functional space of the park. I would advocate for a design in which the sidewalks are set back a few feet from the surrounding streets, and street trees are planted between the streets and the sidewalks. This would make the sidewalks part of the park (functionally if not administratively) and would create a better experience for people walking through this part of downtown.</p> <p>More open space for people to sit as opposed to all the trees. Benches for people to sit very important. Overall design of park I consider excellent - incorporates large trees and recreation areas.</p> <p>Love the lawn and pergola (vines), and spray pad/ice rink. Emphasis on trees, shade and beauty – Fantastic! Happy to have SOIL amid the concrete downtown. It's hard to get a sense of scale from the display but I feel like the lawn/square isn't large enough for potential programming. Potentially give it slightly larger footprint. Middle is over-programmed. Create a more formal space. Reflective.</p> <p>This is an urban park that I along with many residents, shoppers, and diners in the area will use. It would be great to see it function as a public square as well as a small refuge from the hardscapes around. I found the older concept more successful. Even though both concepts display similar features of an ice skating rink/splash pad, water feature, public art and trees, the arrangement of the elements in the newer concept is unsuccessful for a few reasons outlined below: - The overall design is very rigid and traditional and doesn't speak to the progressive nature of our downtown and the innovation we wish to attract. - There is very little room to lounge or hang out, especially in the shade. There is a small turf patch where only a few groups can gather. The majority of the real estate is taken up for the dense forest of trees.</p> <p>The older concept plan was more successful for the following reasons: 1. more open and dynamic design, modern, youthful, accessible, and progressive. forward thinking and looks at contemporary park designs and looks to the future rather than the past. 2. plenty of space for different kind of lounging: sitting on benches, bringing blankets to sit under trees, sitting in the shade, sitting in the sun, lounging near the water feature or under the trellis, lounging near the art, or walking skating and playing in the splash pad/ skating rink. 3. open sight lines to the street for security and to create interest.</p> <p>The central plaza is a promising public space with a couple of issues. The pergola is in the middle, encumbering the space. Also the park is designed to be separate from the adjacent streets - it should be more connected. The design of the woonerf, the park, and the Sonoma development should be carefully coordinated.</p>	<p>1) Urban Heat Island • Combination of tree canopy, plants, sod, shade structure and paving materials will help to reduce the urban heat island.</p> <p>2) Introverted Park / doesn't account for adjacent developments • Park setback allows inclusion of benches facing the street and generous larger pedestrian clearway. • Enough space for future streetscape enhancements such as street trees and bike racks. • Circular groves create multiple hard and soft openings into the park along the streetscapes with opportunities for curved bench seating facing both outward and into the park. • Park design balances a strong connection to street while creating pockets of protected tree spaces (multiple "urban oasis") providing protection from the bustle of downtown Hamilton. • Multi-use seating, grove benches and linear seating provide a variety of seating spaces for passengers of the John St. bus stop.</p> <p>3) Lacks encouragement of motion throughout the park / diagonal foot traffic • Variety of circular elements allow for pedestrians to cross the park in a path of their own choice. Pedestrians have the choice of weaving between the groves and play knolls, while also crossing directly through the open grass area, over the play knolls or through some of the tree groves. • Open entry points between the tree groves from the streetscape into the park. • Diagonal traffic still possible through plaza spaces and open lawn area. • The future entrance plaza at the corner of John and King William Streets is open, facilitating an unobstructed flow into the park which is expected to be the busiest entrance.</p> <p>4) What will draw people through the park / what surrounds and activates the park • The park provides a respite from the hardscape and traffic of the urban environment. • The park will include open lawn for sitting or games, shaded tree groves with benches, tables and chairs, a skating and spray pad with light features, seating in sun and shade and the expected programming that will come once the park is developed. • The park has been designed to be playful with various elements and materials that will have visual interest.</p> <p>5) Space for individual groups seems lacking • The variety of seating (refer to note 9) and open spaces provide active and passive areas for groups of all sizes.</p> <p>6) Visual site lines / open space for safety • There will be clear sight lines into and through the park between the tree canopy and ground. • Tree species will be chosen to allow for a min. clearance of 2.1m between the lowest branch and the ground. • Multiple entry points into the park have wide site lines.</p> <p>7) More open space • Open space areas include shaded and sunny plaza, shaded and sunny lawn, splash pad and ice rink for large events.</p> <p>8) Move shade structure north for more open space • The sun comes primarily from the south. Shifting the shade structure north will reduce the effectiveness of the shade structure to provide shade.</p> <p>9) Adjacent Developments • Woonerf along Rebecca Street is outside of current scope of work. The City will address the proposed woonerf through detail design and material selection along the northern edge of the park.</p>

JOHN REBECCA PROPOSED PARK CONCEPT	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY RESPONSE
<p>Design Elements</p> <p>I love the idea of the splash pad and skating rink. I think the splash pad area could be a little more bigger for the kids to run around.</p> <p>More features for children?</p> <p>I like the presentation and I like the tree groves for shade & cooling, noise barrier from the street, and love the idea of water, ice, lighting, grass & games playing as ideas for the park centres.</p> <p>Support the ideas for memorials for murdered men.</p> <p>[Newer concept considered unsuccessful because...]The trellis is also very rigid and is not in the most inviting location to sit in its shade The water feature along the north western corner is a very sad departure from the more prominent and animated water feature in the previous design.</p> <p>Instead of building a rain-admitting pergola, it would be better to build a re-themed and restyled gazebo-type building like the one at King St E at Ferguson Ave (north of Shakespeare's in the International Village) with gate doors as a rain and thunderstorm day shelter and marketplace. Also: Fine misting sprayers as used in the Southern U.S.A. (and Springrolls Restaurant near Ryckman's Corners) would be refreshing in June, July, August with the Global Warming Climate Change.</p>	<p>1) Rink Size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rink size is shown as 500 square meters. This is similar to examples found in Hamilton as well as other local municipalities. John Rebecca Park is meant to be a community park therefore the ice rink is meant to serve the local community as opposed to being a regional feature. <p>2) More Activities for Children</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Rebecca park is in close proximity to Beasley Park which will have amenities for children. John Rebecca is intended to be a different type of park and should not duplicate Beasley Park amenities. The spray pad/ice rink, bermed lawn, play knolls, games tables in plaza, multi-use seating offer opportunities for enjoyment by children and adults alike.
<p>Ice Rink</p> <p>If skating rink could be made bigger, that might make it more useable.</p> <p>The surface area proposed for the skating rink is likely too small to be usable. How does it compare with the surface area of other well-used urban outdoor skating rinks?</p> <p>The ice rink needs to be large – the lawn and patio area included. The rink can become a patio in summer. If the rink is its present proposed small size it will fail miserably. People travel to large downtown rinks, they will not for this small rink. If the park fails in the winter, it will fail to be a proper year-round destination.</p> <p>I do think the rink should have refrigeration under it like the Bayfront Pier 4 rink, otherwise the ice won't be usable in the uncertain climate of future winters.</p> <p>Ice rink is excellent concept.</p>	<p>1) Rink Size and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rink size is shown as 500 square meters. This is similar to examples found in Hamilton as well as other local municipalities. John Rebecca Park is meant to be a community park therefore the ice rink is meant to serve the local community as opposed to being a regional feature. The ice rink design will include a refrigeration system.
<p>Trees</p> <p>Really want to see trees lining the street between vehicle traffic and pedestrian traffic</p> <p>Re: Concept - Support lots of trees and shade.</p> <p>Tree groves should be inviting enough for people to enter and sit among the trees.</p> <p>It would be nice to have access to the ground under the tree groves, sitting/picnic/etc. Not blocked by barrier walls around the groves.</p> <p>Surround of trees will discourage many people from entering due to safety concerns.</p> <p>[Newer concept considered unsuccessful because...] The heavily forested corners are security issue completely sealing off sight lines. The layout of the trees is uninviting to sit in their shade.</p> <p>Tree placements look like they will make great homeless encampments.</p>	<p>1) Street Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street trees have been added along John, Rebecca and Catharine Streets. <p>2) Groves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City to look into making groves accessible with benches to protect trees. Tree groves will not block site lines. City will explore options for the surfaces under the trees such as mulching, planting, aggregates, or feature rocks. <p>3) Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree groves provide stormwater management services, reduce heat island effect and increase biodiversity. <p>4) Seating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of seating is available throughout the park. Shaded benches are found on the borders of the tree groves. The lawn allows for seating in the sun and shade. The option of a berm around the lawn will allow for amphitheater-like seating on the grass. Benches facing the streetscape allow pedestrians to sit and rest in the shade. Café-like seating in the plaza accommodates small groups or individuals and be reconfigured during large events where more open space is required. The pavilion offers shaded seating during the day and lighted seating at night. Benches integrated into the groves/islands as well as the spray pad/skating pad allow for easy access. Multi-use seating provides platform for potential impromptu performances during art walk events.
<p>Materials Selection</p> <p>[In order for the park to work, we need] permeable material for all hard surface areas.</p> <p>Could we have fully natural materials/paths?</p> <p>Suggestion: Park paths could be like cobblestone but very flat and stable, and flower beds.</p> <p>Suggestion - As little cement as possible!</p> <p>Permeable pavers should be used. Consider an "Eco Lawn" seed blend i.e. clover/yarrow/thyme. Diverse tree species. Consider seasonal shade perennials under tree areas. Perhaps hosta, Coral Bells, ferns. LAWNS ARE LAME.</p>	<p>1) Material selection / paths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City will explore opportunities for use of natural materials within the park and on the paths. Please note that all materials used for pathways would need to meet City of Hamilton and AODA accessibility requirements. Permeable materials will be explored as well as innovative ways to retain storm water runoff.
<p>Facilities</p> <p>[In order for the park to work, we need] bathrooms and fountains.</p> <p>Washrooms and at least one water fountain (drinking).</p> <p>Suggestion - washrooms and at least one water fountain.</p>	<p>1) Facilities - Washrooms / Water fountains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Washrooms did not form part of the original scope however there is opportunity within 77 King William should the City acquire this property. Dependent upon building acquisition. The City will explore the inclusion of a drinking fountain in the design. Water bottle filler can be included.
<p>Traffic Safety</p> <p>[In order for the park to work, we need] protected crosswalks on the two Rebecca St. intersections</p> <p>The park will be underused unless it is made more easily accessible to pedestrians. At present, two of the four intersections (King William & John, King William and Catharine) have full traffic lights, and two (Rebecca and John, Rebecca and Catharine) have two-way stop signs (in both cases along Rebecca St., with traffic on the cross streets John and Catharine having the right of way.) It is difficult for pedestrians on Rebecca to cross Catharine (which has three lanes of one-way traffic) and nearly impossible to cross John (which has busy two-way traffic.) Pedestrians trying to reach the park at King William and Catharine are forced to wait through a very long light cycle in an intersection with very little traffic on both streets.</p> <p>The sensible design for these intersections would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the full traffic signal at King William and John Add a full traffic signal at Rebecca and John Convert the traffic signal at King William and Catharine to an all-way stop Convert the two-way stop at Rebecca and Catharine to an all-way stop <p>With respect to the second suggestion, it should be noted that John St. has full traffic signals with nearly every cross street in Corktown neighbourhood (Jackson, Hunter, Haymarket, Augusta, Young) despite being a much busier street in Corktown than in Beasley.</p> <p>With respect to the last two suggestions, it should be noted that both King William and Catharine streets have all-way stops at their intersections with other low-volume local streets:</p> <p>King William with Hughson, Mary, Ferguson, Catharine with Jackson, Augusta, Young</p> <p>Implementing these design improvements at the intersections bordering the park would be consistent with existing practice in our city and would improve access to the park.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to put on the record that the heavily used HSR bus stop (on John, south of Rebecca) should be functionally integrated into the park.</p>	<p>1) Traffic Calming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree groves provide a visual cue of park area. Traffic calming is outside of the scope of work for the park. These concerns have been passed along to the appropriate staff members for review.
<p>Adjacent Developments / Land Uses</p> <p>The park's design is lovely, but parks do not succeed or fail on the basis of grass or trees but according to how they are used by people. I remain concerned about what will draw people to and through the area – based on its surrounding enterprises. Without strong incentives to visit the area other than/in addition to the park, I would be inclined to hold off on the park.</p> <p>Keep it open to Rebecca and new Sonoma development</p> <p>I am saddened by the news that Urban Core will be leaving.</p>	<p>1) Adjacent Developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woonerf along Rebecca Street is outside of current scope of work. The City will address the proposed woonerf through detail design and material selection along the northern edge of the park. <p>2) Permeability of edges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connection between park and street has been opened up between circular groves. The future entrance plaza is open, facilitating an unobstructed flow from the SW corner of the park, which is expected to be the busiest entrance. <p>3) Bus route along John Street - Address wayfinding / shelter / visual / access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Midblock plaza with a variety of seating elements provided in the area of the potential bus stop.
<p>Noise</p> <p>NB: Biggest concern is NOISE from the park Please NO Bandshell! We will hear the performances in our home across the street...and we have already put up with band noise for 7 years!</p> <p>*Must be careful about noise coming from performances.</p> <p>Will the park be manned to control fights, loud people noise and drinking???</p>	<p>1) Noise from Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berms and the existing building can help mitigate sound coming from the park. The park program will respect by-laws regarding event noise and timing. The park program will be focused to the middle of the park.
<p>Nightclub</p> <p>Incorporate green roof on top of existing club 77 building?</p> <p>Need a solution for Club 77.</p> <p>Club 77? Phase 2.</p> <p>*Concern – presence of club 77 – not suitable for the park.</p> <p>Noise and violence problem must be dealt with – will disturb using the park. City needs to enforce noise by-law if Club 77 continues.</p> <p>Existing building remains a concern. Can't see much historical significance associated. Presently it is badly disfigured by graffiti.</p>	<p>1) Existing Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Club 77 building is of cultural interest given the past industrial heritage of the site (metal foundry). The building presents an opportunity for public art: Current graffiti wall provides opportunity for a mural. Dependent upon building acquisition. The structure provides potential for further programming to the park including washroom facilities, gallery spaces, event spaces, skate rentals, concessions and shelter etc. Dependent upon building acquisition.