1.0 Introduction

On March 26, 2019 the City of Hamilton hosted the first of two proposed Public Meetings regarding a new Master Plan for Sam Lawrence Park at 255 Concession St, Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented, summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting, and includes an analysis of feedback obtained through the collection of written responses.

The Public Meeting was held at the Concession Street Public Library at 565 Concession St, Hamilton, within approximately 1km of Sam Lawrence Park. Approximately 75 people attended the meeting.

The Public Meeting included:
- A formal presentation (refer to Attachment A) conducted by the City’s Project Manager, John Vandriel, of Landscape Architectural Services;
- Display Panels to facilitate discussion (refer to Attachment B);
- Open discussion; and
- Written comment sheets (refer to Attachment C – Sample).

2.0 What did we discover during open discussion?

During the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, members of the community shared many observations, anecdotal experiences and asked numerous questions. A description of the discussion is organized into themes to consolidate similar commentary. The comments or questions are provided along with the response provided.

Theme > The Master Plan Process

Question/Comment: How far along is the Master Plan Process?
Response: The study is in early stages. Public feedback is being pursued early to obtain information on what the community would like to see happen in the park. The conversation can include discussion on concerns and issues as well as opportunities and ideas related to the Park. It is expected that the final recommendations will be ready in approximately 12 months.

Question/Comment: Who is paying for the study?
Response: The Master Plan Study is being funded by the City of Hamilton. A budget of $250,000 is available to cover costs including design and technical consultants.
EVENT REPORT
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Public Information Centre No.1 // March 26, 2019

Question/Comment: What is the Master Plan for?
Response: A new Master Plan is needed to map out the limits and timing of various recommended improvements. Costing generated through the study will inform Council requests for capital funding. The Plan will also identify how to prioritize future park improvements.

Theme > Community Driven Process

Question/Comment: How is the City engaging the community?
Response: The City currently has planned a series of outreach events including a Jane’s Walk coming up in early May and a presence at various festivals throughout the summer. There will be a follow-up Public Meeting in this Fall, and in between a series of meetings with the Public Advisory Group. Anyone interested in participating in the Public Advisory Group can contact John Vandriel directly or indicate their interest on the available comment sheet. The City is also launching a Public Input Survey that will be live March 26, 2019 and will be placing signs in the Park containing information for the survey location. The survey can be accessed through the City’s Sam Lawrence Park website: https://www.hamilton.ca/samlawrencepark

Question/Comment: Can the City place summer students or staff in the Park during busy periods or during special events (ie. Sidewalk Sounds, Food Truck Days etc.) to speak directly to park users? Who is visiting the park? Where do they come from? What do they like to do there? Can the City note license plates of parked vehicles to indicate where people are coming from? Not everyone will participate in the online survey.
Response: The City has a Jane’s Walk planned for the first weekend in May. The City will consider other opportunities to place ‘pop-up’ engagement nodes in the Park or neighbourhood during special events and festivals. It may be possible to have City staff note license plate numbers.

Question/Comment: The day-to-day park users should have more say in what happens. This must be a community driven design to achieve support. Be clear on how public input will be carried through the master plan stages.
Response: The City recognizes that it is very important to obtain as much public feedback as possible before any Master Plan designs and options are prepared. The City will also utilize various media platforms (Twitter, Website, etc.) to broaden engagement. It is intended that community feedback will set the framework for developing various options and the evaluation criteria used to evaluate them.

Question/Comment: Noting license plates of parked vehicles may give some indication as to where people are coming from.
Response: This is a good idea that will be considered.

Theme > Connectivity

Question/Comment: It would be good to provide a better connection to Mountain Brow West Park – there is a gap that prevents through access. It is possible to better integrate adjacent streetscapes and the future Mountain Brow Trail?
Response: The City has recently completed the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study (2018). The project team will be reviewing and integrating applicable recommendations.
Question/Comment: There is currently no way to use the large grass median as it is cut off by the west lanes (also referred to as the “jug handle”) that allow for turning movements onto Concession Street. 
Response: The project team will be looking at the feasibility of reconfiguring this intersection to better connect the grass median to the rest of the park and to improve the pedestrian and cycling crossing experience.

**Theme > Maintenance**

Question/Comment: Maintenance has been poor or difficult to implement. New improvements should be designed to be more easily manageable and more resilient.
Response: One of the goals of park improvements is to ensure that maintenance can be carried out with a high level of success. The project team will consider levels of maintenance as part of the evaluation criteria.

Question/Comment: Consider developing corporate partnerships to assist in the cost of maintenance or the implementation of new park elements
Response: Comment to be considered.

Question/Comment: Overgrown trees and shrubs on the lower slopes are cutting off views, especially in the last two years. The City needs to trim and/or remove vegetation to maintain the views that are a key aspect of the Park.
Response: This information will be shared with Park operations and maintenance staff. It is anticipated that a strategy will be developed for treatment of escarpment vegetation as part of overall slope stability considerations.

**Theme > Safety**

Question/Comment: Better lighting is needed.
Response: Lighting of the park will be looked at as part of this study.

Question/Comment: Many kids and young adults use the lower path for socializing. They can’t be seen from upper levels or from below from the roads. The largest parties seem to be in June after graduation.
Response: The future of the lower path will be considered as part of this study. The project team will have access to the Hamilton Police CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) liaison through the Staff Advisory Group. This representative will provide necessary input into discouraging unlawful or undesirable activities.

Question/Comment: Policing doesn’t seem to be a problem, Police are often seen walking in the park during evening hours and when it seems something is going on.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: Crumbling escarpment is making some of the paths dangerous. The lower escarpment path not structurally safe.
Response: A geotechnical investigation was carried out on the lower path. The project team also includes a structural engineer who will provide opinion and recommendations on the future of the lower path.
Theme > Programming

Question/Comment: In the third Friday of every month in the summer, the Park is the location for ‘Sidewalk Sounds’. The event sets up at the top of the stairs in the west parking lot.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: City should allow not only wedding photos but also wedding receptions as an affordable alternate to reception halls. The east open lawn area would be well suited.
Response: Comment noted. This program element will be considered along with the suite of other noted program elements.

Question/Comment: Many young families in nearby community use the open lawn / park space for playing, picnics etc. Food trucks park in the west parking area from 5-8pm every Wednesday in the summer. Many families arrive with blankets and lawn chairs to enjoy.
Response: Comment noted. This current park use will be considered along with the suite of other noted program elements.

Theme > The Views & Park Character

Question/Comment: Panoramic views to the lower city are the parks most important feature. Park is all about the views, new improvements should not change the main character of the park. The park should remain a jewel in the Hamilton park system.
Response: Comment noted. 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 of proposed design concepts.

Question/Comment: City should not allow/approve construction of tall buildings in the lower city – they will eventually block views to the Bay.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: We don’t need a fancy tourist destination. The Park is mostly a neighborhood park that accommodates visitors during special events.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: People do visit the site from other cities, countries (ie. Holland, Italy). It is a good place to take out-of-town visitors. Family from Holland was visiting on their way to Niagara Falls.
Response: Comment noted.
Theme > Constructing on the Escarpment

Question/Comment: Technical issues with providing new public washrooms need to be explored as part of the study. The underlying rock formations, sub-grade instability may preclude some servicing such as sanitary or water.
Response: The project team will be reviewing the feasibility of new construction, including a potential new washroom and maintenance facility. Additional studies may be required to confirm subsurface conditions.

Question/Comment: The underlying escarpment and exposed slopes are unstable and eroding. A solution to this problem needs to be found before we can contemplate improvements and future plans for the Park. This is a higher priority project.
Response: As noted, the Master Plan project will identify the sequence/priority of projects and the requirements for additional studies. The project team will also be exploring the availability of existing escarpment stability investigations to determine the scope of any new investigations that may be necessary.

Question/Comment: There is a lot of Buckthorn growing on the escarpment slopes. How do we remove this invasive species while at the same time addressing slope stability?
Response: Is anticipated that a strategy will be developed for treatment of escarpment vegetation as part of overall slope stability considerations.

Theme > Business Development

Question/Comment: At Wentworth Stairs, signage (sandwich boards) pointing to nearby commercial retail areas was helpful in orienting people to find refreshments and food. City removed the signs as a by-law infraction. Would be good to allow business advertising in the Park to encourage visitors to explore more of Concession Street stores/businesses.
Response: Comment noted. This idea will be explored with the Staff Advisory Group.

Theme > Traffic & Mobility

Question/Comment: Traffic in the area is ‘locked down’ during special events such as Victoria Day and Canada Day fireworks. Intersection of Highcliff and Concession becomes dangerous during these events. Parking and circulation are an issue during special events including parking and circulation on side streets.
Response: Comment noted. The project team’s traffic consultant will be considering special event conditions including circulation and parking.

Question/Comment: Accommodating tour buses will cause significant problems with traffic in the area particularly during special events.
Response: Comment noted. The project team’s traffic consultant will be considering drop-off and pick-up functions for the Park with a focus on how this could be done during special events.
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Question/Comment: Crosswalk at Jolley Cut, Concession and Upper Wellington is very unfriendly and dangerous for families with young kids, seniors or anyone with mobility challenges. Intersection is very busy, vehicle speeds on the ‘on/off-ramps’ dangerous for crossing pedestrians.
Response: The project team will be looking at the feasibility of reconfiguring this intersection to better connect the grass median to the rest of the park and to improve the pedestrian and cycling crossing experience.

Theme > Barrier Free Design & Inclusivity

Question/Comment: Improving accessibility will be important – smoother pathways, ramps instead of stairs, wider paths. The Park is a multi-layer escarpment park. It does not all have to be accessible – people don’t expect it to be fully accessible. We should do the best we can.
Response: The project team will be applying best practices for barrier-free design, consistent with the City’s and the Province’s new accessibility mandate.

Question/Comment: Hamilton has a backlog of funding to implement the new AODA standards. Making the park as accessible as possible must be a priority.
Response: Comment noted.

Theme > Heritage

Question/Comment: The heritage of the original K.Matt Broman design should be respected/integrated into the plan. The existing original features should be inventoried. Interpretive signage should be included.
Response: Comment noted.

Theme > Interpretation & Education

Question/Comment: Park is nationally recognized through the ‘Project Bookmark Canada’ initiative. Initiative showcases Canadian authors. Only 20 signs across Canada, 2 are in Hamilton. One is in Sam Lawrence Park near the west parking lot; this is unique. Signs must be protected during construction and/or removed and reinstalled in same location.
Response: Comment noted. The continuation of this initiative within the Park space will be considered an objective.

Theme > Landscape & Design

Question/Comment: The Park and the Concession Street Streetscape should be considered together as a cohesive element. More shade trees along this edge would be good.
Response: Comment noted. This idea along with the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Pathway recommendations will be explored through the design concept stage.

Question/Comment: Many of the trees are mature, high quality species. Do everything possible to retain existing trees. Clear cutting must be avoided – consider a more balanced replacement and succession plan so that mature canopy remains in the park during all phases.
Response: Comment noted.
Question/Comment: How will native plants be integrated into the Plan?
Response: It is expected that environmental groups will be part of the PAG. City horticulture and forestry to also provide recommendations. Review will include integrating pollinator and slope stability species as well as management plan for reducing invasive species.

Question/Comment: Park improvements should be simple, clean and better quality so we are not upgrading again in 30 years. Its simplicity is its charm.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: Park design should be beautiful but not so desirable that it gets over-run.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: More litter containers and recycling containers are required. Too much garbage ends up on the ground and in the gardens.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: Just fix what is broken, worn out and leave the park as it is.
Response: Comment noted.

**Theme > Social Design**

Question/Comment: Who do we want to visit the park? Are there people we don’t want there? Regular visitors continually picking up garbage (Tim Hortons cups, beer/booze bottles, dime bags etc.). Plan should look at discouraging undesirable uses.
Response: Comment noted. The City’s mandate is to provide inclusive and welcoming park environments for everyone to enjoy. The project team will have access to the Hamilton Police CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) liaison through the Staff Advisory Group. This representative will provide necessary input into discouraging unlawful or undesirable activities.

**Theme > Amenities**

Question/Comment: New or improved features should only add to the life of the Park not change the character.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: Public washrooms are a good idea, will allow people to stay in the space longer. A playground and washrooms would be well used/appreciated by young families.
Response: Comment noted.

Question/Comment: Main issue with the pedestrian bridge over the Jolly Cut is that we would be providing opportunity for vandals to drop things on passing cars. In the 1990’s providing a net system was discussed as an option which is not that attractive.
Response: Comment noted. This concern related to the potential pedestrian bridge will be explored.
Question/Comment: Access to food and washrooms would be a good addition.
Response: Comment noted.
3.0 What did we learn from the written comments?

Who participated?

A total of 25 households provided written feedback and comments. Four households provided responses via email. Half of the respondents are residents of the local neighbourhood. The remaining respondents either did not acknowledge where they lived or are outside the local neighbourhood. One respondent is a member of a concerned agency/organization, however; they did not specify which one.

Process satisfaction

Overall the respondents were satisfied with the public consultation process and thought the material presented was clear. Only one claimed to be dissatisfied because the process seemed too short. When asked, “would you like to see this process improved?”, most respondents were either indifferent or disagreed. The respondents seeking improvement felt the meeting was not advertised well and/or they found out at the last minute. Some satisfied respondents still left suggestions to have someone survey users of the park.

Future Vision / Top 5 Changes

Respondents provided feedback regarding how they think Sam Lawrence Park can be improved. The types of responses can be broken out into three categories – long term vision, priority improvements and programming suggestions. Vison responses were categorized into themes. The top vision for the park, with 40% of respondents agreeing, was to strengthen and develop the park’s pathway system and connectivity. The priority improvements are noted based on the number of respondents who answered with the same response. In general, the respondents either did not rank the improvements or their ranking was unclear. The top priority improvements, with 36% of respondents agreeing, were the safety and security of the park and additional seating options (benches, group seating and covered seating). The respondents gave a variety of programming suggestions for consideration. Some questions were proposed that speak to the challenges of the park design:

1. How do we improve parking without taking away from park space?
2. How do we increase pedestrian connectivity without affecting traffic flow?

To see a Sample Comment Sheet, refer to Attachment C

To review the Tabulated Comments, refer to Attachment D.
Attachment A
Event Presentation
AGENDA

PUBLIC WORKS

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES – Landscape Architectural Services

Project Background
Purpose of the Meeting
Master Plan Process
Site Context
Site Assessment and Conditions Review
Next Steps
Questions / Comments
THE PROJECT

• An important first step in considering existing and future uses of the park.
• A Master Plan has not been undertaken in over 30 years
WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF A MASTER PLAN?

The Master Plan is an important planning tool for shaping our parks and provides the opportunity to:

- **Frame a planning vision**
- **Allow ideas to be heard**
- **Set a direction** for future works

Essentially ... A ‘blueprint’ for future park improvement projects and careful allocation of funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile inventory / analysis, existing conditions, site history</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate criteria for success</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish vision / goals / objectives</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and evaluate alternative design concepts</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select preferred Master Plan design concept</td>
<td>Summer / Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Master Plan report</td>
<td>Winter 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt the Master Plan (Public Works Committee)</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY OUTREACH

- Advisory Group Meetings
- Public Meetings
- ‘Pop-up’ Display at community events
- Surveys
- Website Updates
- Walking Tour
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COMMUNITY OUTREACH – PRELIMINARY FEEDBACK

PUBLIC WORKS
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES – Landscape Architectural Services

Add drinking fountains
Add a playground
More seating areas
Tourist destination

Enjoy the views
Wedding photos
Add native plants
New pathway connections

Patio with a view
Use native plants
Picnic tables
Pedestrian connection over Jolley Cut

Improve parking
Music in the park
Improve trail lighting
Dog park

Add drinking fountains
Add a playground
More seating areas
Tourist destination

Enjoy the views
Wedding photos
Add native plants
New pathway connections

Patio with a view
Use native plants
Picnic tables
Pedestrian connection over Jolley Cut

Improve parking
Music in the park
Improve trail lighting
Dog park
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The Master Plan report will include:

- **Guidelines** for open space planning and park management;
- Park *design concept*;
- **Action plans** to guide future capital improvements;
- High level capital project *cost estimates*
STUDY AREA / PLANNING CONTEXT

- 7.53 ha (18.6 ac) in size
- City-Wide park designation
- Cultural Heritage Landscape
- Straddles Wards 7 and 8
PARK FEATURES

Varying Topography

Not universally accessible
Horticultural Display Gardens
PARK FEATURES

Open Green Space

Underutilized open lawns

Hamilton

PUBLIC WORKS
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES – Landscape Architectural Services
PARK FEATURES

Bruce Trail Network Connections

Perceived safety concerns
Niagara Escarpment slope stabilization

Escarpmment Erosion
Deterioration of the multi-level pathway system

Failing walkway
Deterioration of the multi-level pathway system

Cracking / crumbling stone walls
Deterioration of other park features

Vandalized signage

Patched staircase
Assessment of existing facilities

Parking lot capacity

Pavilion use

Parking lot movement / circulation

Need for parks maintenance shed / washroom facilities?
Can we rethink the current intersection configuration?
OTHER ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Other issues to address

- New Facilities?
- Barrier-free Design
- Tourism / Tour Bus Parking?
- Park Safety
- Views / Vistas
- Parking / Vehicular Circulation
- Historic Integrity
- Active / Passive Open Space
- Wayfinding / Pedestrian Circulation
... we want to hear from you!
COMPLETE A USER SURVEY!

www.hamilton.ca/SamLawrencePark
NEXT STEPS

SPRING 2019:
- User survey
- Advisory Group meetings
- Park walking tour – early May

SUMMER 2019:
- Pop-up display booth at summer festivals
  - Review park design concept alternatives
  - Select a preferred park design concept
PARK SPACES

Park Segments

Lower City – Mountain Pedestrian Linkage

West Parking Lot / Open Lawn

Escarpe Pathways / Display Gardens / Open Lawn

Pavilion / East Parking Lot / Bruce Trail Connection

Grass Median
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Discussion Topics / Questions:

• Failure of walkways: inaccessible, safety concerns
• Escarpment slope stability: safety concerns, geotechnical concerns
• Park features (lighting, signage, furnishings) at end of life-cycle
• Does the park remain a park for ‘passive’ uses? Is there a need for more active uses? (playground, dog park, programmed field space?)
• Does the park need new facilities? (public washrooms, storage space, tour bus turning loop?)
• How can we better-connect spaces through pedestrian circulation?
• Can we rethink the Jolley Cut / Concession Street intersection?
Attachment B
Event Display Panels
Sam Lawrence Park is in need of rejuvenation and we invite you to be a part of the process!
Tonight’s Format

OBSERVE...
• Get introduced to this exciting project
• Watch a presentation from City staff – 6:00pm

PARTICIPATE...
• Share your thoughts / concerns / ideas on the park maps provided
• Ask questions to the project team

ENGAGE...
• Complete a survey that will help inform design decisions
• Sign up to be part of a mailing list and/or a Public Advisory Group
Why do a park Master Plan?

- The park’s aging features are in need of upgrades.
- There is an opportunity to examine existing and future uses for the park.
- A Master Plan will become the ‘blueprint’ for future park improvement projects and careful allocation of funding.

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Park Assessment & Conditions

- Failing walkways
- Poor accessibility
- Pedestrian connectivity concerns
- Vandalism
- Crumbling walls
- Need for washrooms?
- Underutilized space
- Erosion
- Aging lighting
- Parking capacity / circulation

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Park Assets

Panoramic Views

Display gardens

Geologic formations

Park pavilion

Bruce Trail access

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
What's Next?

**SPRING 2019:**
- Compile the information provided
- Advisory Group meetings
- Park walking tour early May

**SUMMER 2019:**
- Pop-up display booth at summer festivals
  - Review park design concepts
  - Select preferred park design concept
Tell us what you think!
Stay in touch!

VISIT: www.hamilton.ca/SamLawrencePark

- Project information and updates
- Link to a user survey
- Upcoming community consultation events

CONTACT US:
John Vandriel
Project Manager
905 546 2424 ext.3662
Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca
Attachment C
Sample Comment Sheet
SAM LAWRENCE PARK MASTER PLAN  
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE  
MARCH 26, 2019  
COMMENT SHEET

Please comment on any aspect of the undertaking, which you consider to be important. Either drop off your completed comment sheet at this meeting or send it to the contact below by April 5, 2019:

John Vandriel,  
Landscape Architectural Services  
City of Hamilton – Public Works Department  
Environmental Services  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3662  
Fax: 905-546-4515  
E-mail: Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca

AGENDA:
1. Welcome & Introductions  
2. Purpose of the meeting  
3. Master Plan process  
4. Site assessment and review  
5. Next Steps  
6. Questions / comments  
7. Review of open house material

1. I am a:
   - [ ] Resident in the local neighbourhood  
   - [ ] Resident outside of the local neighbourhood  
   - [ ] Business owner in the Concession Street area  
   - [ ] Business owner outside of the Concession Street area  
   - [ ] Elected Representative  
   - [ ] Member of a concerned agency/organization  
   - [ ] Other: ____________________________________________ (Please Specify)

2. I have reviewed the information provided and have the following comments:
   - [ ] I am satisfied with the process to identify issues within the park  
   - [ ] I am not satisfied with the process to identify issues within the park  
   - [ ] No Opinion

If you answered not satisfied please comment on any strengths or weaknesses in Sam Lawrence Park that were not discussed tonight? (Use additional sheets as necessary)

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

3. What is your vision for Sam Lawrence Park? If you went away and came back in 10 years, what changes would you like to see in the park?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
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4. Please list the top five changes you would like to see in Sam Lawrence Park and then rate the relative priority of each change as high, medium and low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Relative Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Other Comments:
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

6. How are we doing with this type of public engagement process?

Is the material clear to understand?  □ yes  □ No  □ Indifferent
Would you like to see this process improved?  □ yes  □ No  □ Indifferent

If you would like to see this process improved or if you answered that the material is not clear to understand please comment on how you would improve the process. (Use additional sheets as necessary)
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!

Comments and information regarding this proposal are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in determining the final park Master Plan. They will be maintained on file for use during the design process and may be included in report documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

PLEASE PRINT:  Your contact information: (optional)

Name:  
Organization / Interest:  
Mailing Address:  
Email Address:  

If you would like to be notified directly of any future meetings, please check off the most appropriate means of contact.

If you would like to be part of a Public Advisory Group, please check here.
• The group will meet about 3 times over the course of the project.  
• The first meeting will be April 9 at 6:30pm
Attachment D
Comment Sheet Tabulation
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SLP Master Plan - PIC #1 Comment Summary
March 26, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Term Vision</th>
<th>Supporters %</th>
<th>Priority Items</th>
<th>Supporters %</th>
<th>Programming Suggestions/ Space for...</th>
<th>Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen/ Develop Path System &amp; Connectivity</td>
<td>10/40%</td>
<td>Safety/ Security</td>
<td>9/36%</td>
<td>Restaurant/ Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities that Facilitate Community Events and Use</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Seating (Benches/ Picnic Tables/ Covered)</td>
<td>9/36%</td>
<td>Pop Up Art Gallery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Enhance Viewsheds/ Look Out Points</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Repairs/Replacement of Pathways, Walls, Gardens, etc.</td>
<td>7/28%</td>
<td>Off-Leash Dog Area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Woodland/ Increased Tree Canopy</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Accessible (AODA)</td>
<td>7/28%</td>
<td>No, Off-Leash Dog Area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/ Maintain Historical Significance</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Maintenance, More Garbage Receptacles</td>
<td>7/28%</td>
<td>Performance Space</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Plants/ Biodiversity</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Washroom Facilities</td>
<td>6/24%</td>
<td>Tobogganing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Gardens, Less Lawn</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>5/20%</td>
<td>Sobi Bike</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract Pollinators and Birds</td>
<td>4/16%</td>
<td>Improved Parking</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>Play Space</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-Round Activities/ Accessibility</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>Improved/ Maintained Traffic Flow</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>No, Water Play</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Improvements</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>Hydration Stations</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge/ Connection Over Jolley</td>
<td>3/12%</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update Gardens, Remove Invasive Species</td>
<td>2/8%</td>
<td>Movie Night</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Signage</td>
<td>2/8%</td>
<td>Traffic Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect Existing Ecology</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
<td>Built in BBQ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Facilities for Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope Stability</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
<td>Outdoor Skating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wedding Venue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Lawn for Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to improve parking without taking away from park space?
How to increase pedestrian connections without affecting traffic flow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation Process - Comments</th>
<th>Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey existing park users</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Advertisement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive experience at meeting, very informative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline seems rushed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better meeting room</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey preferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed informal conversation after meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Presented is Clear</th>
<th>Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent/ No Comment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation Process - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Supporters %</th>
<th>Process Needs to Be Improved</th>
<th>Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>14/56%</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion/ Comment</td>
<td>9/36%</td>
<td>Indifferent/ No Comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally Satisfied and Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disatisfaction came from process seeming too short and not the quality of information.

Inconsistency between answer to question and comments provided.
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.
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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 of proposed design concepts.
3) The heritage of the original K.Matt Broman design should be respected/integrated into the plan. Some areas of the planting design could be restored. If not, new areas should have regard for the Broman design intent.
Theme > Interpretation & Education

1) Future designs should maintain the ‘Project Bookmark Canada’ initiative and plaque near the west parking lot.

Theme > Landscape, Design and Programming

1) In the third Friday of every month in the summer, the Park is the location for ‘Sidewalk Sounds’. The event sets up at the top of the stairs in the west parking lot.
2) Food trucks park in the west parking area from 5-8pm every Wednesday in the summer. Many families arrive with blankets and lawn chairs to enjoy.
3) The Park and the Concession Street streetscape should be considered together as a cohesive element. More shade trees along this edge would be good. This idea along with the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Pathway recommendations will be explored through the design concept stage.
4) Do everything possible to retain existing trees.

Theme > Barrier Free Design (Social)

1) The City’s mandate is to provide inclusive and welcoming park environments for everyone to enjoy.
2) Park features should continue to be free-of-charge and available to everyone.
3) The project team will have access to the Hamilton Police CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) liaison through the Staff Advisory Group. This representative will provide necessary input into discouraging unlawful or undesirable activities.

Theme > Barrier Free Design (Physical)

1) The project team will be applying best practices for barrier-free design, consistent with the City’s and the Province’s new accessibility mandate.
2) It is understood that the Park is a multi-layer escarpment park and it may not be possible for all areas to be barrier-free.
3) A balance will need to be found between retaining the original Broman design and modifying the site to improve accessibility.

Theme > Traffic & Mobility

1) Pedestrian safety concerns crossing the turning channel ‘jughandle’ may warrant a closer look at how to improve pedestrian safety if the intersection remains as-is (ie. pedestrian cross-overs ‘PXOs’, or other measures).
2) The project team will be looking at the feasibility of reconfiguring this intersection to improve the pedestrian and cycling experience crossing while re-connecting the grass median to the rest of the park.
3) There is a desire by many to keep all areas of the park (including parking lots) free for the public; however, some people use the parking lots as a park-and-ride lot, commuting in to the Lower City each day. Limiting the duration of free parking in the lots is a way of addressing unintended uses of the parking lots, while keeping the park free to the public.

Images of the mark-up Display Panels in included as Attachment C to this report.
Attachment A
Event Presentation
Master Plan Process

Why do a Master Plan?

• The park’s aging features are in need of revitalization.

• There is an opportunity to examine existing and future uses for the park.

• This process is an opportunity to collect, analyze, and apply feedback from stakeholders and the public.

• A Master Plan will become the ‘blueprint’ for future park improvement projects and careful allocation of funding.
Master Plan Process

What are the key outcomes?

• An evidence-based preferred design concept.

• Guidelines for open space planning and park management.

• High-level project implementation cost estimates.

• Implementation action plans to guide future capital improvements and approvals.
Project Timeline

Inventory & Analysis of Existing Conditions (March 2019 – on-going)

Launch Online Survey (March 2019)

Project Initiation & Staff Advisory Group Meeting #1 (November 2018)

Public Meeting #1 (March 2019)

Criteria for Success Development (April 2019)
Project Timeline

- Public Advisory Group Meeting #1 (April 2019)
- Design Development of Concept Options (April-May 2019)
- Finalize Criteria for Success (April 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting #2 & Public Advisory Group Meeting #2 (May 2019)
Public Information Centre #1

EVENT SUMMARY:

March 26, 2019
Hamilton Public Library - Concession Street Branch
5:30 to 7:30 pm

✓ Presentation from City of Hamilton LAS
✓ Open discussion
✓ Question and answer period
✓ Online Survey launched
✓ Written feedback/comment collection initiated
PIC #1 Summary

Some of what we’ve heard so far…

“Better lighting is needed”

“Parking and circulation are an issue during special events”

“City should send people to the park to obtain feedback during events”

“Allow wedding receptions”

“Lower escarpment path not safe”

“Provide better connection to Mountain Brow West Park”

“No way to use the grass median”

“Overgrown trees and shrubs”

“Park is all about the views”

“Crosswalk…is very unfriendly and dangerous”
Online Survey – Snap Shot

- 89% Feel safe in the park
- 45% Visit at least once a month
- 43% Take about 10 minutes to get to the park
- 42% The park’s current amenities service the community well
- 56% Very important to retain existing unique features
- 74% Are very familiar with the park

257 Responses
Evaluation Process

Public & Stakeholder Consultation

Preferred Concept

Concept 1

Concept 2

Concept 3

Feedback & Review

Design Concepts

Develop Criteria for Success

Review Background & Site Analysis
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Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Group Exercise
Community Driven Design

- Data collection is objective, measurable, accessible and transparent
- Input is maximized (as much input as possible)
- Ensure objective analysis
- Data is applied to the development and evaluation of concept design options
Connectivity

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve pedestrian **access and connectivity** between the various park zones?
- Improve pedestrian **access into** the park?
- Improve the **sense of arrival** and facilitate **connections to transit and community nodes**?
Maintenance

Does the Design Concept:

- Utilize resilient and durable park elements? 
  (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)

- Consider the long term evolution of the park? 
  (e.g. ‘future-proofing’, escarpment stability)

- Provide for snow removal operations? 
  (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)

- Provide for garden maintenance operations? 
  (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)
Maintenance

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide **garbage/recycling** receptacles and access for operations?

- Provide adequate **servicing infrastructure** to support programming?

- Utilize **low-maintenance** vegetation in new plantings?
  (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation required)

- Provide a program to **manage slope vegetation** and **display gardens**?
Safety

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize conflicts** between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles?
  (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)

- Incorporate **clear and navigable** wayfinding?
  (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park)

- Improve the **lighting strategy** throughout the park?

- Improve the **structural stability** of paths and park edges?
Safety

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve **visibility**?
  
  (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED))

- Provide **access to** emergency services?
  
  (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons)

- Provide **access for** emergency services?
  
  (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)
Amenities

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide opportunities for both **formal and informal** social gathering? *(e.g. civic events, yoga)*

- Provide opportunities for **individual, group, passive and active recreation**, throughout the year?

- Provide **infrastructure** to facilitate programming? *(e.g. power supply, storage)*

- Allow **flexibility** for current programming and future opportunities?
Amenities

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize conflicts** between different user groups while maximizing flexibility?

- Ensure the **unique character** of the park is **enhanced** by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?
Character & Heritage

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain and **enhance the park’s heritage and historic features?**

- Retain and **enhance the views** to the lower city?

- Maintain a **diversity of spaces**?
  
  *(e.g. active areas and quiet areas)*
Character & Heritage

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain the unique heritage elements? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)
- Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?
- Integrate existing and proposed memorial benches?
Interpretation & Education

Does the Design Concept:

- Showcase and **enhance unique features?**
  
  (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)

- Provide **interpretive signage?**
  
  (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)

- Coordinate with **community initiatives/organizations?**
  
  (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)
Landscape & Design

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide **protection from the elements?**
  (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)

- Provide a variety of areas and elements for **resting/sitting?**
  (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)

- Integrate **Concession Street** into the park design?

- Retain **mature trees** and propose a succession/replanting/protection **strategy?**
Does the Design Concept:

- Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?
- Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?
- Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?
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)

- Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups?
  (e.g. negative uses or users to not dominate the space)

- Provide for all abilities and ages?

- Provide activities for different times of the day/year?

- Provide free/no cost access?
Barrier Free Design - Physical

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize** circulation barriers?
  
  (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)

- Provide **alternate paths** to key park features?
  
  (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)

- Incorporate the Urban Braille system?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve **access to, quality and location** of parking?
- Improve **vehicle access to the park**?
  (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)
- Improve the **pedestrian/cycling experience**?
  (e.g. crossing streets, intersections)
- **Minimize conflicts** between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?

- Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.?
  (e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)

- Rebalance the mobility focus?
  (e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)
Thank you for your participation!
Attachment B
Event Display Panels
## Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

### Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access into the park?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize resilient and durable park elements? (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. ‘future-proofing’, escarpment stability)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for snow removal operations? (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for garden maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation is required)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding? (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the lighting strategy throughout the park?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the structural stability of paths and park edges?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED])</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to emergency services? (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access for emergency services? (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

### Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Design Concept: Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow flexibility for current programming and future opportunities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between different user groups while maximizing flexibility?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Character & Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Design Concept: Retain and enhance the park’s heritage and historic features?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the views to the lower city?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a diversity of spaces? (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain the unique heritage elements? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing and proposed memorial benches?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpretation & Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Design Concept: Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Preliminary 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

- **Does the Design Concept:** 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

## 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

## 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
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Master Plan Process

- Site Analysis & Background Review
- Develop Criteria for Success
- Design Concepts
- Review & Feedback
- Preferred Concept

Public & Stakeholder Consultation

- Data collection is objective, measurable, accessible and transparent
- Input is maximized (e.g. as much input is collected as possible)
- Ensure objective analysis
- Data is applied to the development and evaluation of options
Attachment C
Marked-Up Display Panels
### Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

#### Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gatherings? (e.g. civic events, yoga)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow flexibility for current program opportunities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between user groups while maximizing flexibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Character & Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the park's heritage and historic features?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the views to the lower city?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a diversity of spaces? (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain the unique heritage elements? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing and proposed memorial benches?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interpretation & Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

---

#### 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

- Provide 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 key planting (e.g. little irrigation)
  - Yes
  - No

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

- Provide access to emergency services? (e.g. emergency bollards/beacon)
  - Yes
  - No

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

---

**Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan**

April 9, 2019 - SAG / PAG
# Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

## Landscape & Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide protection from the elements? (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a variety of areas and elements for resting/sitting? (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Concession Street into the park design?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain mature trees and propose a succession/replanting/protection strategy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Barrier Free Design - Social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social inclusiveness? (e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups? (e.g. negative uses or users do not dominate the space)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for all abilities and ages?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide activities for different times of the day/year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide free/no cost access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Traffic & Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the access to, quality, and location of parking?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve vehicle access to the park? (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience? (e.g. crossing streets)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.? (e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Barrier Free Design - Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize circulation barriers? (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternate paths to key park features? (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate the Urban Braille system?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

On April 9, 2019, the MBTW Group and the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) conducted the second Staff Advisory Group (SAG) meeting for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan project. The first SAG meeting was conducted by LAS on November 22, 2018. The meeting was held at City offices located at 77 James Street North Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented and summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting.

Meeting Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Atchison</td>
<td>Energy, Fleet &amp; Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Bender</td>
<td>Active Transportation, Transportation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Bingham</td>
<td>Transportation Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Brunton</td>
<td>Development Planning, Heritage &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Coit</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Cornwell</td>
<td>Transportation Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Decler</td>
<td>Transportation Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Guetter</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kiddie</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karissa Matson</td>
<td>Development Planning, Heritage &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Mendoza</td>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Molloy</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Stasiuk</td>
<td>Landscape Architectural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Vidovic</td>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wagner</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Wong</td>
<td>Crime Prevention, Hamilton Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Plant</td>
<td>Planning Public Art &amp; Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting No.2 focused on the presentation of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for review and discussion. 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.

SAG 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;
2.0 Preliminary Evaluation Criteria (Criteria for Success)

In addition to a brief update, the Staff 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 Advisory Group Meeting No.1;
- 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 Staff 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) Move wayfinding signage objective to this section
2) Directional (wayfinding) signage in the park (particularly along the Lower City – Mountain connection) to services or points of interest along Concession Street would be beneficial. Signs need to be general in nature (ie. they cannot reference specific businesses).
3) Utilize the outcomes of the Mountain Brow Trail Feasibility Study with linkages / connectivity to the park. While the study recommends a multi-use trail along the north side of Concession Street, there is opportunity to incorporate the trail within the park itself as a recreational corridor connection.
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4) Connectivity has become an increasingly important value over the years.

Theme > Maintenance

1) The City does not use recycling receptacles in parks. Remove wording in criteria.

Theme > Safety

1) A separate lighting criteria piece could also be included in the Character & Heritage or the Landscape & Design criteria, specifically regarding lighting design and illumination (directed downward to minimize impacts on wildlife).

Theme > Amenities

1) To reiterate from the previous SAG meeting, an off-leash, fenced-in dog park is not at all desired by staff. Dog owners are encouraged to use one of the formalized dog park spaces in other parks across the city. A dog park is not an appropriate fit in a signature park like Sam Lawrence Park. Reasons include, but are not limited to:
   - A fenced-in space creates mud;
   - It deters people to the park who do not like dogs;
   - There is conflict between dog types;

Theme > Character & Heritage

1) Lighting criteria (specifically, lighting design) should consider the effects on the natural environment and light pollution.
2) Views: should consider views from the Lower City to the park and not just from the park to the Lower City, as well as views of the park from other areas of the park itself.
3) There are opportunities to incorporate public art features and capitalize on views (both to the park and from within the park). The city has a minimum $100,000 budget for a public art component within the park.
4) Consider adding criteria that includes optimizing natural heritage features and cultural heritage features.

Theme > Interpretation & Education

1) Consider incorporating technology (apps with geocaching) as part of the interpretive / educational experience.
2) Consider building on the existing interpretive signage that educates people on different areas of the city from the top of the mountain.
**Theme > Landscape, Design and Programming**

1) Consider seasonality of the space and optimizing use of the various park spaces at different times of the year.

**Theme > Barrier Free Design (Social)**

1) Community garden spaces are opportunities to promote social interaction within the park.
2) Edible plantings (trees / plants) intermixed with the ornamental plantings are an opportunity to promote social interaction and education.

**Theme > Barrier Free Design (Physical)**

1) No direct commentary noted. Current city Barrier Free Design Guidelines to apply.

**Theme > Traffic & Mobility**

1) A parking assessment / study may need to be undertaken for this assignment.
2) Retaining traffic and transit movements at the Concession Street / Jolley Cut intersection will be important.
3) If the intersection configuration remains as-is (or with minimal modifications), there may be opportunity to examine traffic calming measures at the various crossings.
4) Consider adding more criteria that examines modal conflicts with each other (i.e. vehicle – vehicle conflicts, vehicle – pedestrian conflicts).
5) The left turn lane onto Concession Street will likely need to remain in any new intersection configuration.
6) Re: west parking lot location: The question becomes whether this park is a park intended for cars to drive in and admire the views or whether it should be a space that prioritizes pedestrians over cars (potentially relocating the west parking lot back).
7) The project team will bring possible configuration options to the transportation team in a separate meeting. Only viable options will be carried forward. Meeting date to be confirmed.

**3.0 Other Comments**

1) What is the underlying vision for the park?
2) Views / vistas are one of the most important features of Sam Lawrence Park. Consider making another separate category with these criteria.
3) How can the park be better-used in the future with regard to special events?

Images of the mark-up Display Panels in included as Attachment C to this report.
Attachment A

Event Presentation
Master Plan Process

Why do a Master Plan?

• The park’s aging features are in need of revitalization.

• There is an opportunity to examine existing and future uses for the park.

• This process is an opportunity to collect, analyze, and apply feedback from stakeholders and the public.

• A Master Plan will become the ‘blueprint’ for future park improvement projects and careful allocation of funding.
Master Plan Process

What are the key outcomes?

• An evidence-based preferred design concept.

• Guidelines for open space planning and park management.

• High-level project implementation cost estimates.

• Implementation action plans to guide future capital improvements and approvals.
Project Timeline

Inventory & Analysis of Existing Conditions
(March 2019 – on-going)

Launch Online Survey
(March 2019)

Project Initiation & Staff Advisory Group Meeting #1
(November 2018)

Public Meeting #1
(March 2019)

Criteria for Success Development
(April 2019)
Project Timeline

- Public Advisory Group Meeting #1 (April 2019)
- Design Development of Concept Options (April-May 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting #2 (April 2019)
- Finalize Criteria for Success (April 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting #3 & Public Advisory Group Meeting #2 (May 2019)
Public Information Centre #1

EVENT SUMMARY:

March 26, 2019
Hamilton Public Library - Concession Street Branch
5:30 to 7:30 pm

✓ Presentation from City of Hamilton LAS
✓ Open discussion
✓ Question and answer period
✓ Online Survey launched
✓ Written feedback/comment collection initiated
PIC #1 Summary

Some of what we’ve heard so far...

“Better lighting is needed”

“Parking and circulation are an issue during special events”

“City should send people to the park to obtain feedback during events”

“Allow wedding receptions”

“Lower escarpment path not safe”

“Provide better connection to Mountain Brow West Park”

“No way to use the grass median”

“Overgrown trees and shrubs”

“Park is all about the views”

“Crosswalk...is very unfriendly and dangerous”
Online Survey – Snap Shot

- **89%** Feel safe in the park
- **45%** Visit at least once a month
- **56%** Very important to retain existing unique features
- **43%** Take about **10 minutes** to get to the park
- **42%** The park’s current amenities service the community **well**
- **74%** Are very familiar with the park

257 Responses
Evaluation Process

Public & Stakeholder Consultation

Develop Criteria for Success

Design Concepts

Concept 1

Concept 2

Concept 3

Review & Feedback

Preferred Concept

Site Analysis & Background Review
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria
Group Exercise
Community Driven Design

- Data collection is objective, measurable, accessible and transparent

- Input is maximized (as much input as possible)

- Ensure objective analysis

- Data is applied to the development and evaluation of concept design options
Connectivity

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones?
- Improve pedestrian access into the park?
- Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes?
Maintenance

Does the Design Concept:

- Utilize **resilient and durable park elements?**
  (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)

- Consider the long term evolution of the park?
  (e.g. ‘future-proofing’, escarpment stability)

- Provide for **snow removal** operations?
  (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)

- Provide for **garden maintenance operations?**
  (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)
Maintenance

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide **garbage/recycling** receptacles and access for operations?

- Provide adequate **servicing infrastructure** to support programming?

- Utilize **low-maintenance** vegetation in new plantings?
  (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation required)

- Provide a program to **manage slope vegetation** and **display gardens**?
Safety

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize conflicts** between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles?
  (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)

- Incorporate **clear and navigable** wayfinding?
  (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park)

- Improve the **lighting strategy** throughout the park?

- Improve the **structural stability** of paths and park edges?
Does the Design Concept:

- Improve **visibility**?
  (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED))

- Provide **access to** emergency services?
  (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons)

- Provide **access for** emergency services?
  (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)
Amenities

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide opportunities for both **formal and informal** social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)

- Provide opportunities for **individual, group, passive and active recreation**, throughout the year?

- Provide **infrastructure** to facilitate programming?
  (e.g. power supply, storage)

- Allow **flexibility** for current programming and future opportunities?
Amenities

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize conflicts** between different user groups while maximizing flexibility?

- Ensure the **unique character** of the park is **enhanced** by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?
Character & Heritage

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain and **enhance the park’s heritage and historic features**?
- Retain and **enhance the views** to the lower city?
- Maintain a **diversity of spaces**?
  (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)
Character & Heritage

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain the **unique heritage elements?**
  (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)

- Adhere to **cultural heritage landscape requirements?**

- Integrate existing and proposed **memorial benches?**
Interpretation & Education

Does the Design Concept:

- Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)

- Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)

- Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)
Landscape & Design

Does the Design Concept:

- Provide **protection from the elements?**
  (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)

- Provide a variety of areas and elements for **resting/sitting?**
  (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)

- Integrate **Concession Street** into the park design?

- Retain **mature trees** and propose a succession/replanting/protection **strategy**?
Landscape & Design

Does the Design Concept:

- Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?

- Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?

- Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?
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)*

- Address **sensitivities/conflicts** between user groups?
  
  *(e.g. negative uses or users to not dominate the space)*

- Provide for **all** abilities and ages?

- Provide **activities for different times of the day/year**?

- Provide **free/no cost** access?
Barrier Free Design - Physical

Does the Design Concept:

- **Minimize** circulation barriers?
  
  (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)

- Provide **alternate paths** to key park features?
  
  (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)

- Incorporate the Urban Braille system?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve access to, quality and location of parking?
- Improve vehicle access to the park?
  (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)
- Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience?
  (e.g. crossing streets, intersections)
- Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?

- Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.?
  (e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)

- Rebalance the mobility focus?
  (e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)
Thank you for your participation!
Attachment B
Event Display Panels
# Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

## Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access into the park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize resilient and durable park elements? (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. ‘future-proofing’, escarpment stability)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for snow removal operations? (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for garden maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation is required)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding? (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the lighting strategy throughout the park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the structural stability of paths and park edges?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED])</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to emergency services? (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access for emergency services? (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

### Amenities

**Does the Design Concept:**
- Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)
  - Yes
  - No
- Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?
  - Yes
  - No
- Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)
  - Yes
  - No
- Allow flexibility for current programming and future opportunities?
  - Yes
  - No
- Minimize conflicts between different user groups while maximizing flexibility?
  - Yes
  - No
- Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?
  - Yes
  - No

### Character & Heritage

**Does the Design Concept:**
- Retain and enhance the park’s heritage and historic features?
  - Yes
  - No
- Retain and enhance the views to the lower city?
  - Yes
  - No
- Maintain a diversity of spaces? (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)
  - Yes
  - No
- Retain the unique heritage elements? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)
  - Yes
  - No
- Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?
  - Yes
  - No
- Integrate existing and proposed memorial benches?
  - Yes
  - No

### Interpretation & Education

**Does the Design Concept:**
- Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)
  - Yes
  - No
- Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)
  - Yes
  - No
- Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)
  - Yes
  - No
## Preliminary 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

### 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

### 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
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Master Plan Process

- Site Analysis & Background Review
- Develop Criteria for Success
- Design Concepts
  - Concept 1
  - Concept 2
  - Concept 3
- Review & Feedback
- Preferred Concept

Public & Stakeholder Consultation

- Data collection is objective, measurable, accessible and transparent
- Input is maximized (e.g. as much input is collected as possible)
- Ensure objective analysis
- Data is applied to the development and evaluation of options
Attachment C
Marked-Up Display Panels
## Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

### Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>q Yes</th>
<th>q No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and movement between the various park zones?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access into the park?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the sense of arrival and connectivity to transit and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>q Yes</th>
<th>q No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize resilient and durable park elements? (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. &quot;future-proofing&quot;, escarpment stability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for snow removal operations? (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for garden maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation is required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept:</th>
<th>q Yes</th>
<th>q No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding? (e.g. accessible signage at trailheads and throughout the park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the lighting strategy throughout the park?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the structural stability of paths and park edges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to emergency services? (e.g. emergency bollards/beacons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access for emergency services? (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The image includes various sticky notes with suggestions and comments.*
### Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

#### Escape & Design

**Does the Design Concept:**

- Protect vegetation from the elements (e.g., wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimates, 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 to compose a succession/reallocation plan?
  - Yes
  - No

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

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

- No CPF beach permitted

### Barrier Free Design - Social

**Does the Design Concept:**

- Integrate social inclusiveness?
  - Yes
  - No

- Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups?
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide for all abilities and ages?
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide activities for different times of the year?
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide free/no cost access?
  - Yes
  - No

- 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

### Barrier Free Design - Physical

**Does the Design Concept:**

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

- Retain or improve existing traffic and transit movement?
  - Yes
  - No

- Retain or improve the greenway at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.?
  - Yes
  - No

- Rebalance the mobility focus? (e.g., between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)
  - 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 speeds off and pick-up)
  - Yes
  - No

- Improve pedestrian/cycling experience? (e.g., crossing streets)
  - Yes
  - No

- Retain or improve existing traffic and transit movement?
  - Yes
  - No

- Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience?
  - Yes
  - No

- Retain or improve existing traffic and transit movement?
  - Yes
  - No
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

**Amenities**

- Does the Design Concept:
  - Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)
  - Yes
  - No

- Allow flexibility for current programming and future opportunities?
  - Yes
  - No

- Minimize conflicts between different user groups while maximizing flexibility?
  - Yes
  - No

- Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?
  - Yes
  - No

**Character & Heritage**

- Does the Design Concept:
  - Retain and enhance the views to the lower city?
  - Yes
  - No

- Maintain a diversity of species (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)?
  - Yes
  - No

- Retain the unique heritage (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)?
  - Yes
  - No

- Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?
  - Yes
  - No

- Integrate existing and proposed benches?
  - Yes
  - No

**Interpretation & Education**

- Does the Design Concept:
  - Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)
  - Yes
  - No

- Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)
  - Yes
  - No

- Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)
  - Yes
  - No

- \[ \text{Unreadable text} \]
  - Yes
  - No
EVENT REPORT
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

Jane’s Walk
Walking Tour
May 4, 2019
1.0 Introduction

On May 4, 2019, City of Hamilton, Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) hosted a “Jane’s Walk” through Sam Lawrence Park. Starting at the west parking lot, the group proceeded on a guided tour throughout most areas of the park. The tour guide, John Vandriel (LAS), presented information on the history of the park, the escarpment and posed questions about what the tour attendees think about the park and what changes they might like to see. Approximately 25 people joined in on the tour. A copy of the tour notes is included in Attachment A.

Thank you to all attendees for taking a chance on the weather!

2.0 Summary of Attendee Comments

The following is a summary of comments noted during the tour:

1. **Please keep the Project Bookmark Canada plaque in its current location; the specific location is significant to the text (poem).**
2. **Why don’t we designate a portion of the upper lawn as a dog park? So many people use it for that currently.**
   a. Response: We want to first carefully consider what we want this park to be/look like in the future. The City aims to have designated, fenced-in dog parks in each ward. If we fence a certain area, it will become a mud run. Do we want that look/use in this particular park, particularly one that’s a considered a signature park with landscaped areas?
3. **Do NOT put in a dog park here.**
4. **Consider including interpretive signage along the escarpment rock face that pinpoints the exact rock formations and when they were formed.**
5. **Has there been any consideration to put a playground in the park?**
6. **Could a children’s play area be incorporated into the upper east open area? It is well protected and out of the way.**
   a. Response: The inclusion of a playground has been mentioned in other engagement platforms. The project team will be considering this during the evaluation of different design elements.
7. **City should consider putting in a restaurant in the park. Precedent: Queenston Park, Niagara on the Lake.**
8. **If the area used for off-leash dog walking will be changed/redeveloped, it will be missed. There are a lot of people (and dogs) who use it.**
9. **A lot of people use the park for on-leash dog walking – people always there, in all weather.**
10. **Pet waste is an issue. People don’t scoop and/or the few litter containers overflow. Could the City provide bags and better disposal for off leash areas (if there continues to be one) and other areas of the park where people walk dogs on-leash?**
11. **There is nothing wrong with the main intersection, it works well. Why spend money on this intersection when you could put all the money into park improvements? What do you need the median for?**
   a. Response: The City is looking at whether there are opportunities to make the intersection safer.
12. **Music events in the park should not use amplifiers. Very loud music is not welcomed by the neighbourhood.**
13. Public washrooms are not a good idea as it will attract undesirable activities. It will be constantly vandalized, needing repairs.

14. People don’t stay in the park long enough to have to use a washroom. During events they could bring in pot-a-potties.
Attachment A

Walking Tour Notes
1. WEST PARKING LOT: INTRODUCTIONS
   - Introductions
   - Background on Jane’s Walk events
   - Identify any accessibility issues
   - Explore the history of the park, where it’s at today, and discuss where we want to go with this site
   - Explanation of the Master Plan project
   - Participants encouraged to solicit feedback during the walk:
     o Interesting points
     o Anecdotes / stories / experiences of using the space

2. FAR WEST END: PARK HISTORY
   - Quarry site
   - Founding of the park
   - Landscape Architect K. Matt Broman original park Master Plan
   - Park components: stone walls, gardens, interpretive signage, expansive lawns
   - Park underwent another upgrade in the early 1990s, but hasn’t been updated since then
   - Today, many of these park components are in need of repair, some at the end of their life cycle

3. VIEWING LOOKOUT (AT FLAG POLES): PARK’S CHARACTERISTICS
   - Park is most famous for its views
   - Park is popular with tourists and visitors from out of town
   - Niagara Escarpment geological landform
   - Low points here are due to the remnants of aggregate extraction from the former quarry
   - History of Hamilton’s urban development over the centuries

4. ABANDONED WATERFALL FEATURE / JOLLEY CUT
   - Waterfall was a feature planned during the first design,
     o Meant to emulate the ‘city of waterfalls’
     o Went as far as constructing concrete walls, then had to be abandoned due to slope failure
   - Jolley Cut / Traffic Island
     o Meant to alleviate traffic turning left and right, also for those heading into the Concession Street shopping district
     o However, the configuration of the street fragments the park
     o The Jolley Cut itself, fragments the park into different spaces, leaving certain areas like the island and the area where the park sign is located as being very underutilized.
5. DISPLAY GARDENS
- Perhaps the other most notable characteristic of the park
- Originally display gardens had a heavy emphasis on annuals
- The 1990s park upgrades shifted to more of an emphasis on perennial plantings
- A push for more native plants
- Exposed rock face allows for teaching / learning opportunities for geology students

6. UPPER LAWN AREA
- Used primarily for dog walking these days
- The space is accessible by one way in, one way out through the display gardens... The Jolley Cut really divides the park and that is evident here.
- The original design called for a pedestrian bridge over the Jolley Cut.
- The idea of connecting this space with Concession Street is now back on the table in the recent discussions

7. ESCARPMENT PATHWAYS
- Pathways are another defining characteristic of the park (against the Niagara Escarpment)
- Slope stabilization is an issue
- Failing walkways (including one closed to the public) as a result of safety concerns, spurred the need to investigate and ultimately conduct a Master Plan of the site.
- One of the only spaces in Hamilton where you can fully access the rock face and observe the geological formations of the Escarpment
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Meeting Notes

Facilities / Parks Operations / Forestry & Horticulture / Landscape
Architectural Services Coordination Meeting

Date:  Friday May 31, 2019 – 1:00pm to 2:00pm
Place:  Hamilton City Centre, 77 James St. N. Hamilton, Meeting Room 400 ‘B’

Attendance:
Lu-Ann Duxbury  Project Manager  Facilities
Marcia Monaghan  Superintendent  Horticulture
Rob Wagner  Superintendent  Parks South
Lawrence Stasiuk  Supervisor  Landscape Architectural Services (LAS)
John Vandriel  Project Lead  Landscape Architectural Services (LAS)

Purpose of Meeting:
Collect input from various City groups to determine the basic requirements needed for a potential park facility (parks maintenance building, possibly with washroom space).

Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introductions – Brief Project Overview &amp; Status Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Purpose of the Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Anticipated Building Needs for Parks Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Anticipated Building Needs for Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Other Park Facility Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Other Park Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item:

1. and 2. Welcome,  
   • [Refer to above section for purpose of meeting.]
### Introductions, Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Anticipated Building Needs for Parks Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Since much of the current park shed is used by Horticulture, Parks Operations would require only about 25% of the space if the park remained primarily for horticultural uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks Operations staff would require the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Mower;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A few trimmers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gator;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Janitorial space (cleaning supplies, etc.) if washroom was included;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Snow removal equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If new amenities were proposed in the park such as an amphitheatre, a new building would need to consider maintenance equipment / control panels for the new needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If a washroom was added to the park, Parks Operations would take over maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Anticipated Building Needs for Horticulture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Horticulture currently uses the park shed on site and would likely require about 75% of the space if the park remained primarily for horticultural uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Horticulture staff would require the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gator;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Locker space (for staff personal items);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wash-up station;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Kitchenette-type unit with sink / mini fridge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Microwave;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Seating area for eight (8) staff for breaks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Separate wash basin for clean up in the mud / dirt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Roll-up door for gator / mower accessibility;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Separate area / room that is vented for power tools and gasoline storage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A couple of storage racks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Power tools, wheel barrow;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hose bib considerations inside and outside of the building for clean up (would likely require floor drains);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Irrigation control;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bulletin boards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wifi capabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Winterized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The building would need to be decommissioned in winter and should have painted wall exterior surfacing to mitigate graffiti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eight (8) Horticulture staff are stationed in the park during the summer months: two (2) full-time staff, six (6) students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Other Park Facility Considerations

- Building needs from both groups assume that the park would function similar to how it does now. If other elements were added to the park that would significantly alter the overall maintenance, Horticulture and Parks Operations should be consulted to ensure that park needs are met.
- The Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) would expect a high level of involvement throughout all parts of the design development review process for siting a building, to ensure the structure would not be visible from the base of the escarpment ('skylining').
- A visual impact assessment would be required.

6. Other Park Items

- Horticulture and Parks Operations request that new pathways (particularly major circulation routes) be widened – enough for a crew cab to drive through.
- Horticulture also requests that new park pathways be made of concrete or asphalt, rather than unit pavers. Since the City removed the use of herbicides, there is a greater chance of weeds growing through pathways that have unit paver surfacing.

7. Next Steps

- LAS will inform the design consultant about the basic needs requirements of each group and will request that the consultant propose a building size that will accommodate these needs.
- The proposed size and location will then be circulated to Facilities, Horticulture and Parks Operations for review and comment before finalizing as part of the alternative design concepts in the Master Plan.

The preceding summary of the discussions of this meeting has been prepared to record comments and inform the project. Please advise the undersigned of any errors or omissions.

Prepared by:

John Vandriel
Landscape Architectural Services,
City of Hamilton
Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca

Distribution: All present, Project file
What We Heard - Online User Survey

We received 525 responses to the online user survey.

What do you think is special about the park?
1. Views
2. Gardens
3. Green Space
4. Trails & Walkways

What activities do you participate in when visiting the park?
1. Walking
2. Enjoying the Views
3. Visiting the Gardens
4. Photography
5. Relaxing

Which method of transportation do you use most often to get to the park?
1. Car
2. Walk
3. Public Transit

What time of day do you visit the park?
1. 5pm-9pm

What amenities are most important to you?
1. Expanded Pedestrian Connections
2. Expanded Gardens
3. Public Washrooms
4. Barrier Free Access

What time of day do you visit the park?
1. 5pm-9pm

Do you feel safe in Sam Lawrence Park?
1. Yes 88%
2. No 12%

Appendix “C” to Report PW18056(a)
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What We Heard - Concession Street Streetfest

A snapshot of ideas we heard from the community at the street festival on June 8, 2019

- food truck area
- incline railway
- safer cycling options
- drinking fountain
- washrooms
- safer cycling options
- keep escarpment pathway stairs
- writing paths
- barrier-free viewing access
- keep daffodil plantings
- more bike trails
- keep the Merchant Navy plaque near flag poles
- plan more trees
- black steel decorative fencing
- keep natural areas
- enhance display gardens
- fireworks displays
- maintain views
- improve park lighting
- pollinator garden
- more parking
- music in the park
- love the views
- gazebo
- more garbage bins
- water feature
- provide higher level of maintenance
- native plants
- plant more trees
- movies under the stars
- summer RVs use parking lot for picnics
- more seating areas
- lilac garden
- sidewalk safety along Jolley Cut
- improve park lighting
- park maintenance building
- bring back Old Strongman Road
- erosion control
- more greening
- 2 hour parking limit
- keep central lawn area
- park maintenance building
- bring back Old Strongman Road
- play equipment
- keep daffodil plantings
- more greenery
- fix escarpment walls
- keep daffodil plantings
- more greenery
- fix escarpment walls
1.0 Introduction

On August 15, 2019, The MBTW Group and the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) conducted the third Staff Advisory Group (SAG) meeting for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan project. The first SAG meeting was conducted by LAS on November 22, 2018 and the second meeting on April 4, 2019. The meeting was held at City offices located at 77 James Street North Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented and summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting.

Meeting Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Bender</td>
<td>Active Transportation, Transportation Planning, Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Brunton</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Coit</td>
<td>Placemaking Public Art and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Cornwell</td>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-Ann Duxbury</td>
<td>Facilities Management &amp; Capital Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kiddie</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Mendoza</td>
<td>Traffic Operations and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan Stewart</td>
<td>Landscape Architectural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wagner</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Plant</td>
<td>Placemaking Public Art and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Bari</td>
<td>BA Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting No.3 focused on the presentation of the preliminary concept options from the consulting team, before finalizing for public review. The presentation content included the proposed Jolley Cut/ Jughandle/ Concession Street intersection changes; three (3) preliminary concept options; and preliminary scoring for each concept, based on the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria established from the previous SAG meeting. The following sections provide a summary of the material presented, followed by the comments provided by the Staff Advisory Group.

The meeting material was presented to the group using multiple methods including a digital display and printed 11x17 booklets. The digital presentation provided supporting information regarding the proposed intersection changes, an overview of the big ideas proposed for each of the three (3) concepts and additional and master plan process. The printed booklets provided to each attendee gave a more detailed look at all the proposed park improvements for each concept.

The full presentation and booklet are included as Attachment A & B to this report.
Some initial comments were discussed during the meeting. However, with the vast amount of content to present within two (2) hours, the attendees were asked to review the digital presentation and booklet in more detail after the meeting. The Staff Advisory Group was asked to provide detailed comments to LAS within the following two (2) weeks.

SAG Meeting No.3 included:
- A brief introduction to the attendees of the meeting led by the City’s Project Manager, John Vandriel, of Landscape Architectural Services;
- An extensive presentation (refer to Attachment A) conducted by Jana Joyce, The MBTW Group, with support from Mohammad Bari, BA Group, for the proposed intersection changes;
- Printed 11x17 booklets detailing proposed park improvements (refer to Attachment B); and
- Periodic discussions related to the presentation material.

2.0 Proposed Intersection & Crossing Enhancements

After investigation of eight (8) possible intersection changes to improve the pedestrian realm without impeding on traffic and transit route times, four (4) were short listed to have preliminary review with LAS and Transportation staff. Two (2) of these options were deemed appropriate to carry-forward and undergo technical analysis in comparison to the existing condition. The results were reviewed by LAS and Transportation staff and one (1) option was approved to present in the concept design options.

Jana Joyce, The MBTW Group, with support from Mohammad Bari, BA Group, presented the recommended intersection changes. These included:

1. Formalize the pedestrian crossing at the Jughandle intersection, requiring the relocation of one (1) hydro pole; and
2. Remove the right lane channelization from both Upper Wellington and Concession Street. Involving the creation of a dedicated right turn from Concession Street that would require the relocation of three (3) hydro poles.

The consulting team also recommended a crossing enhancement in the way of line painting to the existing crossing from the traffic median, over the Jughandle, to the park.

The Staff Advisory Group engaged the consulting team in discussion over the proposed changes. It was noted that Transportation staff reviewed the cross-section of Concession Street and has determined that the creation of an additional dedicated right turn lane is unnecessary. The Concession Street cross-section can be reconfigured so that:

1. The eastbound approach would operate with a single shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive left turn lane.
2. The westbound approach would operate with an exclusive left turn lane, exclusive through lane and exclusive right turn lane.

These comments were repeated in the detailed comments provided by Traffic Signals after the meeting. The detailed comments also note that this reconfiguration would require new line markings on the road and not require an increase
in the width of the right-of-way. It was noted during the presentation that the proposed radii of 12m, that will replace the right lane channelization, could be reduced further to help shorten the pedestrian crosswalk length.

The discussion then shifted focus to the crossing enhancement proposed between the traffic median and the park. There is concern that line painting may give pedestrians a false sense of security and wrongfully anticipate that vehicular traffic would know to stop for them. As an alternative, it was recommended that reducing the width of the vehicular traffic lane would help facilitate faster crossing for pedestrians, without establishing a false sense of security. It was noted during the meeting and in subsequent comment after the meeting that the lane would have to be wide enough to allow for plough vehicles, fire services and HSR vehicles.

In the subsequent comments received from Transportation Planning/ Operations and Traffic Safety after the meeting, they requested reconsideration of maintaining the existing path through the median and the existing crossing between the traffic median and the park. The rational is that park enhancements will likely attract a higher volume of pedestrians and the existing crosswalk location will not be able to maintain a safe crossing, particularly for younger children. It was recommended that an alternative pedestrian connection to the park would be from the north west intersection of Concession Street and Vola Court.

### 3.0 Preliminary Concept Options

#### 3.1 Design Alternatives Overview

The design alternatives presented by The MBTW Group were based on feedback received from the community and various stakeholders. In the digital presentation the big ideas for each concept were presented and the Staff Advisory Group was encouraged to review the 11x17 booklet containing a more detailed description of the proposed park improvements. First, a schematic design was presented for the design concept that compared existing and proposed conditions and highlighted the big ideas. The finale of each design alternative was a rendered concept plan to show ground truthing of the schematic design and highlight key features with precedent imagery. The following sections provide a description of each option presented and their associated comments from the Staff Advisory Group.

#### 3.2 “Do Nothing”

There is always a “Do Nothing” option. In the case of Sam Lawrence Park, this option would require on-going maintenance to repair what is broken. This approach does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the proposed Mountain Brow Trail connection along Concession Street. It’s important to note that ‘do nothing’ does not mean no cost. The cost includes:

1. Remedial repairs to pavements, lighting, stairs, walls, etc.
2. Repairs do not contribute to site-wide rejuvenation.
3. Design aesthetic is not coordinated/ organized.
4. Increased maintenance.
5. Limited demonstrated response to community concerns.
3.3 “The Quick Fix”

“The Quick Fix” option maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Proposed intersection improvements and the multi-use path along the north side of Concession Street.
2. New maintenance facility building and location that is estimated to have a 20m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/change room.
3. Complete barrier free path connections throughout the park.
4. Naturalization of sloped areas for ease of maintenance.
5. Improvements to the Arkledun Avenue and Bruce Trail access node with a sense of arrival and amenities.

The Staff Advisory Group provided the following comments to LAS after reviewing the detailed information provided.

Natural Heritage supports the naturalization of slopes to provide foraging for birds and other wildlife, and the creation of pollinator gardens to provide foraging for bees and butterflies. The exploration of opportunities to plant additional trees should be considered for this option.

Transportation Planning notes that the multi-use path along the north side of Concession Street will require cycling markings and signal modification to include signal heads for bicycles. It is preferred that this condition of the multi-use path in this option be 3m wide asphalt paving in place of the existing city concrete sidewalk. This would be consistent with other multi-use paths installed as a part of the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study.

Facilities Management proposed that the Parks and Horticulture Department maintenance vehicles have driveway access/parking related to the proposed maintenance building location in this option, off Concession Street. The Parks Department does not favour layby/paid parking in front of this building as they would have a difficult time competing with the public for these spots.

Horticulture does not support the naturalized/pollinator gardens proposed in the traffic median as the aesthetic tends to be messy for such a visually prominent location in the park.

Placemaking Public Art and Projects provided suggestion on how to incorporate public art. As this design alternative proposed modest improvements, a small-scale public art piece would be appropriate in this concept. The artwork would be modest in gesture and detail, requiring close/intimate proximity on the part of the viewer to have impact. The artwork at this scale could involve a functional piece such as bench design.

Refer to section 3.6 for general comments related to all design alternatives.
3.4 “Bypass Link”

The “Bypass Link” option introduces a pedestrian bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, embeds the multi-use path, site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Shifting the east parking lot and relocating the existing pavilion to accommodate the bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, linking the east side of the park.
2. Embedding the multi-use path within park space.
3. Improvements to the traffic median that maintains the pedestrian connection for transit riders, crossing enhancement to the park over the Jughandle and pollinator/ naturalized gardens.
   a. After consideration of the comments received from staff, it was decided that relocating the pedestrian connection out of the median and proposing a Bosque instead of naturalized gardens is more appropriate.
4. New maintenance facility building and location that is estimated to have a 20m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/ change room.
5. Complete barrier free path connections throughout the park.
6. Naturalization of sloped areas for ease of maintenance.
7. Improvements to the Arkledun Avenue and Bruce Trail access node with a sense of arrival and amenities.

The Staff Advisory Group provided the following comments to LAS after reviewing the detailed information provided.

Natural Heritage supports the naturalization of slopes to provide foraging for birds and other wildlife and the creation of pollinator gardens to provide foraging for bees and butterflies. They also support the increase in canopy cover provided by the trees proposed along the multi-use path that is embedded in the park. They note that the amount of vegetation removal required for the installation of the bridge should be limited as much as possible.

Transportation Planning notes that it is preferred that this condition of the multi-use path in this option be 5m wide asphalt paving. This would be consistent with other multi-use paths installed as a part of the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study.

Facilities Management does not support the precedent image shown for the new maintenance building. It is not an accurate representation of what this building would likely become, and they do not want to give the public the wrong impression. Facilities Management is developing standard design specifications for all facility buildings to use durable, vandal proof materials (ex. block, brick, etc.) The use of glass shown in the image does not fit these specifications. The images shown in the other options provide a more accurate representation. The Parks Department does not support the proposed concrete area for portable washrooms due to the increase in maintenance.
Horticulture supports the introduction of a bridge to connect the east end of the park as it will improve access for maintenance activities. The inclusion of a new maintenance building and the relocated parking lot in proximity will also support these activities. They do not support naturalized/pollinator gardens proposed in the traffic median as the aesthetic tends to be messy for such a visually prominent location in the park. Placemaking Public Art and Projects provided suggestion on how to incorporate public art. As this design alternative proposed more than modest improvements but not the most ambitious, a medium-scale public art piece would be appropriate in this concept. The artwork would be proposed at a more human-scale, relating specifically to the site and/or neighbourhood. The artwork at this scale could incorporate a stand-alone gateway feature, interacting with pedestrians but also with drivers along the Jolley Cut.

Refer to section 3.6 for general comments related to all design alternatives.

### 3.5 “Enhancement”

The “Enhancement” option introduces a pedestrian bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, embeds the multi-use path, intersection improvements and new and expanded park features. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Shifting the east parking lot and relocating the existing pavilion to accommodate the bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, linking the east side of the park.
2. Embedding the multi-use path within park space.
3. New maintenance facility building and location that is estimated to have a 20 m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/change room.
4. Proposed intersection improvements and the multi-use path along the north side of Concession Street.
5. Replacing the east parking lot with on-street parking along Concession Street to accommodate the multi-use path, now linking the entire park from east to west.
6. New observatory deck in place of west parking lot.
7. Improvements to the traffic median that maintains the pedestrian connection for transit riders, crossing enhancement to the park over the Jughandle and designed gardens with environmental initiative structures.
   
   a. After consideration of the comments received from staff, it was decided that relocating the pedestrian connection out of the median and proposing a Bosque instead of naturalized gardens is more appropriate.
8. New completely barrier free garden destinations and the completion of barrier free path connections throughout the park.
9. Naturalization of sloped areas for ease of maintenance.
10. Improvements to the Arkledun Avenue and Bruce Trail access node with a sense of arrival and amenities.
The Staff Advisory Group provided the following comments to LAS after reviewing the detailed information provided.

Natural Heritage supports the increase in canopy cover provided by the trees proposed along the multi-use path that is embedded in the park. They note that the amount of vegetation removal required for the installation of the bridge should be limited as much as possible. They do not support the removal of naturalized of slopes and pollinator gardens, as proposed in the previous options, in favour of formalized gardens. They also note the addition of the observation deck is supported but should be reduced in size to allow for as much naturalized planting as possible on the slope below.

Transportation Planning notes that it is preferred that this condition of the multi-use path in this option be 5m wide asphalt paving. This would be consistent with other multi-use paths installed as a part of the Mountain Brow Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study.

Facilities Management proposed that this option include a public washroom as well as maintenance facility. This would allow the department to have a better understanding of potential future costs. It is to be noted that a new maintenance building for the park is not currently identified within Facilities’ 10-year Capital Plan. Facilities will review and assess the information and cost estimates received as part of the Master Plan study and prioritize the need accordingly.

Horticulture supports the introduction of a bridge to connect the east end of the park as it will improve access for maintenance activities. The inclusion of a new maintenance building and the relocated parking lot in proximity will also support these activities. The proposed barrier-free gardens in this option should consider a material that limits weed growth.

Placemaking Public Art and Projects provided suggestion on how to incorporate public art. As this design alternative proposed ambitious improvements, a large-scale public art piece would be appropriate in this concept. The artwork proposed would have a significant impact due to its size and ability to influence a location. The artwork at this scale could emphasize a significant gateway or be part of a large gathering place and be easily viewed from a distance with impacts on the surrounding area.

Refer to section 3.6 for general comments related to all design alternatives.

3.6 General Comments

The Staff Advisory Group provided the following general comments to LAS after reviewing the material provided from the meeting.

Natural Heritage supports the decommissioning of the lower path to protect the escarpment, pruning of vegetation to promote vistas and the management of invasive species. The proposed lighting strategy should aim to reduce light pollution directly adjacent to the escarpment to protect local fauna.

Design Engineering/ Asset Management confirms that road works for Concession Street have been completed up until the east leg of the Jolley Cut intersection. They note that the Arkledun Avenue bridge, over Claremont Access, is tentatively scheduled for reconstruction in 2027 as a part of their 10-year Capital Plan. At the time of reconstruction, the Jolley Cut will be closed. It could be optimal to coordinate schedule of works that require...
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Closure of the Jolley Cut at the same time. It is to be noted that any such works impacting the mountain access would be preferred to be completed upon completion of the LRT. Any asset improvement/enhancement as a result of the park development would require project funding from the Parks block allocation.

Transportation Planning does not support the enhancement of the existing traffic median to encourage lingering. Transportation Planning does not want to encourage cycling on concrete sidewalks. They propose that asphalt be strictly used for cyclist and limit concrete for pedestrian use only. If cycling access is desired into the park from the Jolley Cut upbound, the existing gated driveway access for maintenance could be modified. They would like bicycle parking and possible Sobi bike share station locations to be considered in detail design.

Facilities Management noted that all utilities would require assessment in order to accurately estimate the capital impact of the proposed maintenance facility building locations relative to existing utility locations.

The City’s HSR Transit and Transportation Operations provided comment related to traffic calming measures and crossing enhancement from the existing crossing from the traffic median, over the Jolley Cut, to the park. It is noted that formalized crossing is not supported here. To enhance safety of potential informal crossing, they support the reduction of vehicular traffic lane width if deemed appropriate. The remainder of Transportation Operation comments are presented in Section 2.0, Proposed Intersection & Crossing Enhancements.

Cultural Heritage Planning noted that existing stone heritage walls should be preserved as much as possible to retain a legibility of the original park design. If walls are removed, an effort should be made to reuse the material somewhere within the park. The relocation of the existing pavilion is acceptable, but as its current position marks the location of the old water tower, a new feature should mark the location in its place. Thought should be given on how to revive the aging heritage plaques. Consider presenting the information in a new form, potentially as a historical timeline along the central path. The timeline could include the geological formation/escarpment development, Indigenous use, early Hamilton use, introduction of Jolley Cut, 50s/60s park and today’s master plan. They also note Indigenous cultural history should be an aspect of the park design and could come in the form of an interpretive panel, garden design and ensuring Indigenous artists are included for the public art Call for Artists.

Horticulture noted that the rendered concept designs do not acknowledge or relocate the gateway floral traffic islands that currently exist on the south east side of the Jolley Cut. They noted these floral islands will require irrigation. The plantings should function as a gateway feature and could be located along the Jolley Cut or Concession Street. Horticulture also acknowledged concern related to the proposed naturalized and pollinator garden areas. They are anticipating concern from park users that the naturalized aesthetic will not meet expectations of how a park garden should look. They would like to maintain the naturalized areas as opposed to volunteers, as they typically have long gaps between maintenance. They recommend proposing native plant material in groupings rather than a mixed meadow style. As noted in concept specific comments, naturalized planting is not appropriate in prominent locations in the park due to their typically messy aesthetics. There is concern that certain native plants will seed and migrate to formal gardens within the park, increasing maintenance. It’s important to note that as many as four (4) horticulture maintenance vehicles will require parking on site from mid-April to end of August.
Placemaking Public Art and Projects noted that any public art initiatives that the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan identifies should align with the overall design intent of Hamilton’s Public Art Master Plan. Future phasing considerations of the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan should include relevant timing for the Public Art Call and implementation.

Detailed comments provided by the Staff Advisory Group are included as Attachment C & D to this report.

4.0 Preliminary Concept Evaluation (Criteria for Success)

Following the presentation of the three (3) concept options, the consulting team provided a brief overview of their scoring, using the Preliminary Concept Evaluation. The group was informed that this exercise was undertaken to assess the proposed questions against the concept design alternatives. Some modification to the wording of the questions were made. The Staff Advisory Group was informed that once the three (3) concept options and Preliminary Evaluation Criteria are refined, the major stakeholders will be asked to complete their own concept evaluation. The major stakeholders include:

1. Landscape Architectural Services,
2. The Staff Advisory Group, and

A subsequent Online Survey will launch after presentation to the Public Advisory Group and further refinement of the three (3) concept options. This will provide the general public a chance to review and comment on the design alternatives.
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1. Introductions
2. Master Plan Process ‘Refresher’
3. Project Timeline Update
4. Public Engagement & Stakeholder Update
5. What has the team been doing?
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7. Recommended Intersection Improvements
8. Discussion & Comments
9. Design Alternative Presentation Overview
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11. Design Alternative Presentation
12. Design Alternatives Evaluation
13. Discussion & Comments
14. Next Steps
Introductions

1. Please be sure to sign in on the sheet provided
2. Staff Advisory Group Attendees
3. Sam Lawrence Park City and Consultant Team
Master Plan ‘Refresher’

- Time for park rejuvenation
- Examining existing and future uses
- Engaging with stakeholders and the community
- Creating an evidence-based preferred design concept
- Developing high-level cost estimates for components
- Creating a Master Plan to assist in planning improvements, in managing funding and in scheduling approvals
Project Timeline

- Project Initiation & Staff Advisory Group Meeting #1 (November 2018)
- Public Meeting #1 (March 2019)
- Inventory & Analysis of Existing Conditions (March 2019 – on-going)
- Launch Online Park User Survey (March 2019)
- Criteria for Success Development (April 2019)
Project Timeline

- Public Advisory Group Meeting #1 (April 2019)
- Design Development of Concept Options (April-May 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting #2 (April 2019)
- Finalize Criteria for Success (April 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting #3 (Aug 2019)
Project Timeline

- Public Advisory Group #2 (Sept 2019)
- Online Survey Launch (Sept 2019)
- Finalize Option Evaluation (Oct 2019)
- Online Survey Close (Oct 2019)
- Develop Preferred Design Concept (Nov 2019)
- Public Meeting #2 (Nov 2019)
- Staff Advisory Group Review – Digital Submission (Dec 2019)
Public & Stakeholder Engagement Update

 ✓ Public Advisory Group Meeting - April 9, 2019
 ✓ Public Online Park User Survey Launched – March 26, 2019
 ✓ Janes Walk, Walking Tour- May 4, 2019
 ✓ Niagara Escarpment Commission Coordination Meeting – May 24, 2019
 ✓ CPTED Site Review – May 30, 2019
 ✓ Parks Operations, Facilities, Horticulture and LAS Coordination Meeting –
   May 31, 2019
 ✓ Concession Street BIA Streetfest Event - June 8, 2019
 ✓ Public Online Park User Survey Closed – July 2, 2019
 ✓ Transportation, Traffic, Transit Group Intersection Discussion Meetings -
   May 3 & Aug 2, 2019
What has the team been doing?

- Finalized Evaluation Criteria based on feedback
- Completed site inventory and analysis
- Exploration of intersection design options
- High level structural review of the walls and feasibility of bridge
- Electrical systems inventory and review
- Developed 4 design alternatives using feedback as a framework
- Preliminary look at functional program for potential new building
- Preparing Terms of Reference for high-level geotechnical study
What are we doing today?

- Present the recommended intersection design / improvements
- Present 4 concept design alternatives - the ‘Big Ideas’ today
- Review preliminary concept design alternative evaluations
- Asking for more thorough feedback within the next 2 weeks
Intersection Design Process

- Consulting team explored eight (8) possible options
- Shortlisted four (4) to have preliminary review with LAS / Transportation Staff
- Two (2) options deemed appropriate to carry-forward
- Technical analysis / comparison performed
- Second review with LAS / Transportation
- One (1) option approved / confirmed to carry-forward - shown in the various design concepts
- Other option is to “Do Nothing”
Intersection Recommendations
Intersection Recommendations

*Crosswalk line painting at pedestrian crossing from traffic median to park – enhance pedestrian crossing awareness without impeding traffic

*Existing hydro poles along Concession Street would be relocated for road works (coordinated with Alectra Utilities)
Design Alternatives Overview

- Alternatives based on feedback from the community and stakeholders
- Key moves highlighted today however encourage the group to review detailed material and provide comment
- “Big Idea” – Outlines key moves
- “Schematic Design” – Outlines site organization as a diagram and list of key projects
- “Concept Design” – Preliminary ground truthing and precedent imagery
Design Alternatives // Comparative Look

**Do Nothing** Fixes what is broken however does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the proposed Mountain Brow Trail connection along Concession.

**Quick Fix** Maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

**Bypass Link** Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

**Enhancement** Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, intersection improvements and new and expanded park features.
Do Nothing Concept
Do Nothing // Big Idea

- No concept to present, essentially just fix what is broken
- Includes Mountain Brow trail connection on north side of Concession Street.
- Does not mean ‘no cost’
- Cost of doing nothing includes (not limited to):
  - Remedial repairs to pavements, lighting, stairs, walls etc.
  - Repairs do not contribute to site-wide rejuvenation
  - Design aesthetic not coordinated, organized
  - Increased maintenance
  - Limited demonstrated response to community concerns, for example connectivity
The Quick Fix // Big Idea

• The “Quick Fix” maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

• Includes the “Quick Fix” Improvements to Intersections.

• Includes Multi-Use Path along the north side of Concession Street.
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

“Quick Fix” improvements to intersections

- Pedestrian crossing at Jug Handle
- Urbanize Jolley Cut right turn lanes

Appendix “C” to Report PW18056(a)
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

Improvements to traffic median

- Maintain connection for transit riders
- Crosswalk markings on roadway
- Pollinator/naturalized gardens
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

New maintenance facility building and location

- Approx. 20 m² footprint
- Incl. indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/ change room
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

Complete barrier free path connections

- Switch back ramps from west parking
- Connections to existing lookout areas/ amenity nodes
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

Naturalization/ planting of sloped areas

• Ease of maintenance
The Quick Fix // Schematic Design

Improvements to Arkledun Ave. and Bruce Trail access node

• Sense of arrival
• Amenities
Bypass Link // Big Idea

- Introduces the pedestrian bridge linking together the eastern park spaces over the Jolley Cut.
- Bridge provides opportunity to embed the Multi-Use Path within the park space linking the east to the west without having to cross traffic at grade.
- Includes site modification to accommodate the Multi-Use Path and also site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.
- Design provides east-west bypass for pedestrians and cyclists, reducing the need for intersection improvements.
Bypass Link // Schematic Design

Bridge connection over Jolley Cut, linking east side of park

- Shift parking west to accommodate bridge
- Relocate existing pavilion to accommodate parking shift
Bypass Link // Schematic Design

Embed multi-use path within park space, linking east and west

- Bypassing Concession reduces need for intersection updates
Bypass Link // Schematic Design

New maintenance facility building and location

- Opportunity to create landmark at park entrance with place making architecture
Improvements to traffic median

- Maintain connection for transit riders
- Crosswalk markings on roadway
- Pollinator/ naturalized gardens
Bypass Link // Schematic Design

Naturalization/ planting of sloped areas

- Ease of maintenance
Bypass Link // Schematic Design

Improvements to Arkledun Ave. and Bruce Trail access node
- Sense of arrival
- Amenities
Bypass Link // Concept Design
Enhancement // Big Idea

• Includes all the moves proposed in The Quick Fix and the Bypass Link.

• **Pedestrian bridge** over the Jolley Cut and **Multi-Use Path embedded** within the park space instead of running parallel to Concession Street

• Includes **“Quick Fix” Improvements to the intersection**

• Site modification to accommodate the Multi-Use Path and **site-wide improvements that** enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces

• HOWEVER, **adds** expanded gardens and new park features
Bridge connection over Jolley Cut, linking east side of park.

- Shift parking west to accommodate bridge
- Relocate existing pavilion to accommodate parking shift
Enhancement // Schematic Design

New maintenance facility building and location

- Opportunity to create landmark at park entrance with place making architecture
Enhancement // Schematic Design

“Quick Fix” improvements to intersections

- Pedestrian crossing at Jug Handle
- Urbanize Jolley Cut right turn lanes
Naturalization/ planting of sloped areas

- Ease of maintenance
Enhancement // Schematic Design

Improvements to Arkledun Ave. and Bruce Trail access node

- Sense of arrival
- Amenities
Embed multi-use path within park space, now linking entire park from east to west.
Enhancement // Schematic Design

Relocate west parking lot to on-street parking along north side of Concessions Street

- Create new cantilever observation deck in place of parking
Improvements to traffic median

- Maintain connection for transit riders
- Crosswalk markings on roadway
- Designed gardens
- Potential environmental initiative program, solar or wind collection
Create new, completely barrier free garden destinations

- Themed gardens including; Children’s Garden, Winter Garden, Prairie Garden, Sculpture Garden, Memorial Tree Grove, etc.
Design Alternatives // Comparative Look

**Do Nothing**  Fixes what is broken however does no rejuvenate park, address community concerns or include new improvements.

**Quick Fix**  Maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

**Bypass Link**  Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

**Enhancement**  Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, intersection improvements and new and expanded park features.
## Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones? (e.g. circuit like pathway system)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access into the park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the sense of arrival to the park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate and/or improve connections to transit and community nodes?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align with goals/ objectives of the City of Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan and Mountain Brow Multi-Use Pathway Feasibility Study?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. The proposed treatment to the traffic median may improve the sense of arrival to the park for transit riders, but does not address the other entrances as do options 2 & 3.

2. Option 2 does not improve the intersection of the Jolley Cut and Concession Street and therefore does not improve the connection between the nearby transit stops and Sam Lawrence Park.
## Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation is required)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. ‘future-proofing’; 1 escarpment stability, resilient/durable materials)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for snow removal operations? (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming? (e.g. hydro &amp; water connection, garbage receptacles)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1 Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.
## Safety

### Does the Design Concept...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the lighting strategy throughout the park while being sensitive to light pollution?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the structural stability of paths and park edges?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED])</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate access to emergency services? (e.g. wide paths, space to turn around)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1 Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.
# Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow flexibility for current and future programming opportunities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between different user groups within the park and with neighbours, while maximizing flexibility?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. Is this criteria relevant to the desired programming and inherent layout of Sam Lawrence Park?
## Character & Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept…</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the park’s cultural heritage and historic features? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the views to and from the lower city? (e.g. protected view corridors, visible landmarks)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align with goals and objectives of the City of Hamilton’s Mountain Brow Vista Study and Public Art Master Plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing and proposed memorialization programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

1. Option 2 & 3 disrupt the continuity of heritage masonry walls with the addition of the bridge over the Jolley Cut.
2. Option 1 only retains views and enhances existing views, unlike options 2 & 3 where new viewpoints are added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain mature trees and propose a succession/replanting/protection strategy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.
## Interpretation & Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider technological initiatives that could broaden the educational experience? (e.g. geocaching apps)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

[Image]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide protection from the elements? (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a variety of areas and elements for resting/sitting? (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a diversity of spaces? (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage year-round use of the park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate the Concession Street streetscape design into the park design? (e.g. design of the multi-use path along Concession Street)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
## Barrier Free Design - Social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social inclusiveness? (e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups? (e.g. negative uses or users do not dominate the space)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for all abilities and ages?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide activities for different times of the day/ year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide free/ no cost access?* 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

1. Parking is limited to 2 hours, if exceeded penalty fee is required.
2. Option 3 is the only concept that proposes amenities for all ages with the inclusion of a Children’s Garden. Though, there is the potential to include this feature in any option.
## Barrier Free Design - Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize circulation barriers? (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternate paths to key park features? (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate principles of the Urban Braille system?*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

* Only include if Urban Braille system is utilized or planned to be on Concession Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebalance the mobility focus? (e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve vehicle access to the park? (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up*)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the pedestrian/ cycling experience and minimize conflicts with vehicular traffic? (e.g. crossing streets, visual separate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.? (e.g. For vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for the continuous operation of the Concession Street/ Jolley Cut intersection during construction?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

* Drop-off and pick-up areas have not been included but have the potential to be in any concept.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Ranking Summary</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Character &amp; Heritage</th>
<th>Natural Heritage</th>
<th>Interpretation &amp; Education</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; Design</th>
<th>Barrier Free Design - Social</th>
<th>Barrier Free Design - Physical</th>
<th>Traffic &amp; Mobility</th>
<th>Total “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 “Enhancement”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Staff Advisory Group to review materials & provide feedback within the next 2 weeks

• Team to address comments and prepare for meeting with the Councillors and the Public Advisory Group meeting

• Team to prepare and launch second public on-line survey to obtain feedback on the design concepts

• Team to attend September 20 Sidewalk Sounds Event on Concession Street

• Team to begin work on preferred design concept
### Operations Function Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Office Space - Table, desk, internet/phone, first aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lunch Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Combined U-Washroom / Changeroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Combined U-Washroom / Changeroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Indoor or Covered Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mechanical Electrical Room (Gore PI)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Exterior Storage Area, Secureable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Porta-Potty Pad (1.2m x 1.2m per)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>150.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>162.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>188.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Gross Up</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>405.80</td>
<td>$81,159.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2029.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$405,799.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Addition of Public Washrooms - Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Universal Washroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Female - 6 Stall + 1 family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Male - 2 Stall + 3 Urinals + 1 family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What We Heard - Online User Survey

We received 525 responses to the online user survey.

How often do you visit Sam Lawrence Park?
- 42% Once a month
- 26% Once a year

What time of day do you visit the park?
- 71% 5pm-9pm

Do you feel safe in Sam Lawrence Park?
- 88% Yes
- 12% No

What activities do you participate in when visiting the park?
1. Walking
2. Enjoying the Views
3. Visiting the Gardens
4. Photography
5. Relaxing

What do you think is special about the park?
1. Views
2. Gardens
3. Green Space
4. Trails & Walkways

What other amenities should be included in the revitalization of the park?
1. Seating
2. Water Fountains
3. Trees & Gardens
4. Picnic Area
5. Pavilion / Gazebo
6. Enhance Views
7. Lighting Strategy
8. Pedestrian Bridge
9. Splash Pad

Which method of transportation do you use most often to get to the park?
- 56% Car
- 27% Walk
- 6% Public Transit

What amenities are most important to you?
1. Expanded Pedestrian Connections
2. Expanded Gardens
3. Public Washrooms
4. Barrier Free Access

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan August 1, 2019
What We Heard - Concession Street Streetfest

A snapshot of ideas we heard from the community at the street festival on June 8, 2019

- food truck area
- incline railway
- invest in small business
- pedestrian bridge
- safer cycling options
- keep escarpment pathway stairs
- washrooms
- tobogganung areas
- barrier-free viewing access
- keep natural areas
- drinking fountain
- walking paths
- No dog park or off-leash area
- keep the Merchant Navy plaque near flag poles
- enhance display gardens
- café
- design competition for pedestrian bridge
- maintain views
- park maintenance building
- bring back Old Strongman Road
- love the views
- more parking
- music in the park
- provide higher level of maintenance
- park more trees
- more seating areas
- lilac garden
- more garbage bins
- water feature
- summer RVs use parking lot for picnics
- fix escarpment pathways
- need to budget accordingly
- barrier-free design
- pop-up ice cream shop

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan  August 1, 2019
Preliminary Grading Exercise

Option 2 – Bypass Link

Option 3 – Enhancements
Thank you for your participation!
Attachment B
Event Booklet
Design Alternatives, Comparative Look

Concept ideation is based on all feedback collected to date and recognizes primary themes of Connectivity, Views and Gardens. Four possible options are proposed, three have been explored.

“Do Nothing”
Fixes what is broken however does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the proposed Mountain Brow Trail connection along Concession Street. Does not mean “no cost”.

“Quick Fix”
Maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

“Bypass Link”
Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

“Enhancement”
Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, intersection improvements and new and expanded park features.
### Proposed Park Improvements

**General Enhancements**
- Improved paving, where needed
- Improved lighting strategy
- Updated furnishings
- New signage and way-finding
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Servicing (water, hydro)

**Mobility**
- Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
- Urbanize the Jolley Cut and Jug-handle intersections
- Complete missing segments of the barrier free pedestrian pathway
- Improve sense of arrival for trail head
- Maintain food truck access

**Gardens & Open Space**
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New expanded garden areas
- Plant street trees along Concession Street
- Develop tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
- Naturalize steep slopes
- Pollinator gardens
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden

**Structures**
- Entry feature (signage and planting)
- Public art opportunities
- New facility building (maintenance)
- Existing pavilion to remain

---

**Legend**

- **ROADS & PARKING**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED GARDENS**
- **EXISTING TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTERED**
- **EXISTING TREES, STAND ALONE**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED NATURALIZED PLANTING ON SLOPE**
- **EXISTING SLOPED LAWN**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED FLAT LAWN**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (SLOPE < 5%)**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (STAIRS OR SLOPE > 5%)**
- **FUTURE MULTI-USE PATH (SLOPE < 5%)**
- **DECOMMISSIONED PATHWAY**

---
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“Bypass Link” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
- Improve paving throughout
- New lighting strategy
- Update furnishings
- New signage and way-finding
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Servicing (water, hydro, gas, sanitary etc.)

Mobility
- Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
- Maintain existing intersections
- All new barrier free pedestrian pathway
- Improve sense of arrival for trail head
- Maintain food truck access
- Relocate and increase size of east parking lot from 18 to 27 spaces
- Bus access

Gardens & Open Space
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New/expanded garden areas
- Plant street trees along Concession Street
- Tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
- Flat lawn and festival area
- Naturalize steep slopes
- Pollinator gardens
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden

Structures
- Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
- Entry feature (signage and planting)
- Public art opportunities
- New facility building (maintenance & space for portable washrooms)
- Existing pavilion to be relocated

Legend
- ROADS & PARKING
- EXISTING & PROPOSED GARDENS
- EXISTING TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTRED
- EXISTING TREES, STAND ALONE
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATURALIZED PLANTING ON SLOPE
- EXISTING SLOPED LAWN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED FLAT LAWN
- bridge with vehicular access
- existing & relocated pavilion
- new facility building
- existing and relocated park signage
- bus stop
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**Proposed Park Improvements**

**General Enhancements**
- Improve paving throughout
- New lighting strategy
- Update furnishings
- New signage and way-finding
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Servicing (water, hydro, gas, sanitary etc.)

**Mobility**
- Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
- Urbanize the Jolley Cut and Jug-handle intersections
- All new barrier free pedestrian pathway
- Improve sense of arrival for trail head
- Maintain food truck access
- Relocate and increase size of east parking lot from 18 to 27 spaces
- Replace west parking lot with on-street parking on north side of Concession St

**Gardens & Open Space**
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New expanded garden areas
- Plant street trees along Concession Street
- Develop tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views
- Children’s Garden
- Flat lawn and festival area
- Extended grove
- Naturalize steep slopes
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden

**Structures**
- Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
- Entry feature (signage and planting)
- Public art opportunities
- New facility building (maintenance & space for portable washrooms)
- Existing pavilion to be relocated
- Cantilever observation deck with amenities

**Legend**
- **ROADS & PARKING**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED GARDENS**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN WOODED WINDWAYS WITH AMENITIES**
- **EXISTING TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTERED**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (SLOPE < 5%)**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (STAIRS OR SLOPE > 5%)**
- **EXISTING SLOPED LAWN**
- **EXISTING & PROPOSED NATURALIZED PLANTING ON SLOPE**
- **FUTURE MULTI-USE PATH (SLOPE < 5%)**
- **DECOMMISSIONED PATHWAY**
- **BIDGE WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS**
- **EXISTING & RELOCATED PAVILION**
- **NEW FACILITY BUILDING**
- **EXISTING AND RELOCATED PARK SIGNAGE**
- **BUS STOP**

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
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"Enhancement" Concept Design

- Barrier Free Terraced Garden
- Observation Deck
- Multi-Use Promenade
- Relocated Pavilion
- Food Truck Access
- Way-Finding Signage
- Complete Path Circuits
- Improved Trail Head
- Existing Gardens
- Pedestrian Ramp
- Passive Open Space
- Improved Trail Head
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Detailed SAG Comments
## Comments Received from Staff Advisory Group #3 held on August 15, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Received from</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components of the City’s Natural Heritage System (Core Areas) have been identified within or adjacent to Sam Lawrence Park. Core Areas are the most important components of the Natural Heritage System in terms of biodiversity, productivity and ecological and hydrological functions. In this case, the Core Areas have been identified as the Hamilton Escarpment Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) and Significant Woodland. These features provide many different functions (contain significant species, continues the link of the Escarpment corridor) and are aesthetically important.</td>
<td>Melissa Kiddie, Natural Heritage Planning</td>
<td>August 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Natural Heritage Assessment contemplates the following:  
- retain mature trees and propose a succession/replanting/protection strategy?  
- incorporate Escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?  
- address the stability concerns at the Escarpment edge? | | |
| It is important to note that when evaluating the options, Natural Heritage includes a variety of habitats (not only trees). The Core Areas may provide foraging locations for birds and other wildlife. Options should consider how the revitalization of the park will reduce impacts on these features (introduction of invasive species, illegal dumping, informal access points, reduce light pollution). | | |
| Quick Fix | | |
| - support naturalized slope plantings in the areas proposed; this respects the recommendations of the Hamilton Natural Areas Inventory (naturalization to a meadow or thicket) to protect Escarpment ecosystems; provides foraging locations for birds and other wildlife  
- support pruning vegetation for vistas; replacement of invasive species with native low growing shrubs/perennials would be supportive  
- support decommissioning of pathway to protect the Escarpment  
- invasive species management; this should not be just limited to street trees; this should be undertaken in the entire park to protect the Escarpment  
- support pollinator garden since it provides foraging locations for birds and butterflies | | |
| Other notes:  
- reduce light pollution directly adjacent to Hamilton Escarpment to protect local fauna  
- pollinator garden-opportunities to connect with Hamilton Naturalists’ Club and Environment Hamilton through their Pollinator Paradise project  
  - education/awareness to ensure that people/councillor do not see this area as messy  
- if there are other opportunities to plant trees in the park it should be considered to increase canopy cover | | |
| Bypass Link | | |
| - support naturalized slope plantings in the areas proposed; this respects the recommendations of the Hamilton Natural Areas Inventory (naturalization to a meadow or thicket) to protect Escarpment ecosystems; provides foraging locations for birds and other wildlife  
- support pruning vegetation for vistas; replacement of invasive species with native low growing shrubs/perennials would be supportive  
- support decommissioning of pathway to protect the Escarpment  
- invasive species management; this should not be just limited to street trees; this should be undertaken in the entire park to protect the Escarpment  
- support pollinator garden since it provides foraging locations for birds and butterflies  
- support planting of trees along the pathway to increase canopy cover  
- amount of removal of vegetation (if necessary to accommodate the bridge) should be limited | | |
<p>| Other notes: | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Received from</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| o reduce light pollution directly adjacent to Hamilton Escarpment to protect local fauna  
 o pollinator garden - opportunities to connect with Hamilton Naturalists’ Club and Environment Hamilton through their Pollinator Paradise project  
   - education/awareness to ensure that people/councillor do not see this area as messy | Susan Jacob, Design Engineering | August 20, 2019 |
| Enhancement | Richard Andoga, Infrastructure Programming | August 20, 2019 |
|  • support pruning vegetation for vistas; replacement of invasive species with native low growing shrubs/perennials would be supportive  
  • support decommissioning of pathway to protect the Escarpment  
  • invasive species management; this should not be just limited to street trees; this should be undertaken in the entire park to protect the Escarpment  
  • support planting of trees along the pathway to increase canopy cover  
  • amount of removal of vegetation (if necessary to accommodate the bridge) should be limited  
  • support increased tree planting to increase canopy within the Grove area  
  • not in support of removal of pollinator garden and replacement with formal gardens; this removes foraging locations for birds, butterflies and bees  
  • not in support of formal garden areas adjacent to Jolley Cut; this space should be left as open space; may be an opportunity to add more trees  
  • not in support of the barrier free terraced garden; this removes the naturalized area and foraging locations for birds and other wildlife  
  • support area for observation deck; however not supportive that the amount of naturalized area is reduced; the observation area should be reduced to ensure plantings can occur | | |
| Other notes:  
 o reduce light pollution directly adjacent to Hamilton Escarpment to protect local fauna | | |
| Design Engineering / Asset Management | | |
| From the Master Plan presentations, I understand that Concession St/Upper Wellington intersection needs to be modified. The road works were completed up to the east leg of the intersection. Erika or Rick should be able to help you with the timing of planned Capital works to get this done.  
 Do you have a timeline for implementation?  
 Bridge 313 on Arkledun Ave (Jolley Cut), over Claremont Access is tentatively programmed for 2027 reconstruction within the roads 10 year capital budget. In doing so the access will be closed for the period construction. This may be the optimum timing to coordinate any such improvements that would impact the intersection and/or parkland.  
 2027 would be considered positive given the impact of the LRT. Any such works impacting the mountain access would be preferred to be completed upon completion of the LRT.  
 The presentation material paints a pretty picture however there is no consideration to the financial requirements. As with all master plans a financial plan is necessary to support the implementation plan. The same should also be considered within the scoring matrix along with the implementation timeline / phasing.  
 Any asset improvement / enhancement as a result of the park development would require project funding from the Parks block allocation. | Daryl Bender, Active Transportation | August 21, 2019 |
| Transportation Planning | | |
| A few brief comments about the 4 options – and great to see the bridge being proposed in two scenarios – excellent! | | |
1. Please do not enhance the jughandle island between Vola St and Upper Wellington to encourage more people to go there. Perhaps the best pursuit would be wild flowers to “fill” the space, and perhaps even some beehives to discourage people from walking into that area. As discussed at the meeting, we could narrow the street asphalt at the informal ped crossing at the northern tip, but formalizing this crossing with a ladder crossing, etc. should not be pursued.

2. Re: Quick Fix Option: If the existing sidewalk along the north curb of Concession St were to be converted into a multi-use path, we would want to replace the concrete sidewalks with a minimum of 3m of asphalt; we do not want to encourage cycling on concrete sidewalks. Intersections crossings would require cycling markings in addition to ladder crossings. Of course the crossings at intersections would require signal modifications to include signal heads for bicycles too, but I assume that has already been identified as an element required for this option.

3. Could bicycle parking and possible bike-share stations be identified on the plans. Could on-street parking be identified as a formal action for all of the options – it would be a means to increase auto parking capacity for the park. A note from both Traffic & Parking staff is requested as we may have restrictions to permitting parking usage along the frontage of a park.

4. On all options, an access from the upbound bicycle lane on the Jolley Cut to the park in the vicinity of the “existing garden” should be possible as there is a gate access there, so it is already “at grade”:

   ![Map](https://www.google.ca/maps/@43.2444153,-79.8622362,3a,75y,344.31h,85.21t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1svwSfUdTVsRjBSYw79QxkA12e0f7i13312f86656!7i13312!8i6656)

5. The multi-use trail through the park should be a minimum of 5m wide. Could we be strict using concrete for walkways and asphalt for multi-use trails/paths?

### Facilities

I feel the consultants did a great job and the presentation was well done. All three options are good, but I feel that a city wide gem like the Sam Lawrence Park is in need of the three options. Of course my primary concern is with the planning and final design of the Maintenance/possible future washroom facility.

As requested, please find a summary of comments below from Facilities on the recently presented Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan Options:

1. **Utilities / Services** - In the recent presentation meeting it was noted that the consultant had reviewed the electrical utilities within the park (for lighting considerations, etc.). Please confirm that all other utilities will be reviewed as part of the master plan investigations. Facilities would like to ensure the proposed locations of the buildings makes sense in proximity to existing water / sanitary / gas / fibre locations. Servicing the building may add substantial cost if utilities have to be increased / relocated. It would be ideal to have a handle on what will be required in terms of running services to the building (i.e. complete the due diligence investigations now) in order to get an accurate cost estimate for the future.

2. **Quick Fix Option:**
   a. Please incorporate considerations for a driveway access and parking off of Concession Street for Parks and Horticulture maintenance vehicles;
   b. As discussed in our meeting, Parks does not favour a layby / paid parking in front of the building as they would have a difficult time competing with the public for these spots.

3. **Bypass Link Option:**
   a. Please remove the current image shown for the ‘maintenance building’ as this is not an accurate representation of what the maintenance building will likely become. As previously discussed, there is no interest in a concession stand for this building nor any other type of facility use (for tourism, etc.). We don’t want to give the public the wrong impression with the glass curtain wall image shown. Facilities is developing standard design specs for all facility types, and park maintenance / washroom buildings will be built using durable, vandal proof materials (i.e. block / brick) and they will incorporate as little glass as possible. The images shown in the ‘quick fix’ and ‘enhanced option’ are more accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Received from</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Please do not enhance the jughandle island between Vola St and Upper Wellington to encourage more people to go there. Perhaps the best pursuit would be wild flowers to “fill” the space, and perhaps even some beehives to discourage people from walking into that area. As discussed at the meeting, we could narrow the street asphalt at the informal ped crossing at the northern tip, but formalizing this crossing with a ladder crossing, etc. should not be pursued.</td>
<td>(on behalf of Transportation Planning, Traffic Operations, Traffic Safety)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Re: Quick Fix Option: If the existing sidewalk along the north curb of Concession St were to be converted into a multi-use path, we would want to replace the concrete sidewalks with a minimum of 3m of asphalt; we do not want to encourage cycling on concrete sidewalks. Intersections crossings would require cycling markings in addition to ladder crossings. Of course the crossings at intersections would require signal modifications to include signal heads for bicycles too, but I assume that has already been identified as an element required for this option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Could bicycle parking and possible bike-share stations be identified on the plans. Could on-street parking be identified as a formal action for all of the options – it would be a means to increase auto parking capacity for the park. A note from both Traffic &amp; Parking staff is requested as we may have restrictions to permitting parking usage along the frontage of a park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On all options, an access from the upbound bicycle lane on the Jolley Cut to the park in the vicinity of the “existing garden” should be possible as there is a gate access there, so it is already “at grade”: <img src="https://www.google.ca/maps/@43.2444153,-79.8622362,3a,75y,344.31h,85.21t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1svwSfUdTVsRjBSYw79QxkA12e0f7i13312f86656!7i13312!8i6656" alt="Map" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The multi-use trail through the park should be a minimum of 5m wide. Could we be strict using concrete for walkways and asphalt for multi-use trails/paths?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the consultants did a great job and the presentation was well done. All three options are good, but I feel that a city wide gem like the Sam Lawrence Park is in need of the three options. Of course my primary concern is with the planning and final design of the Maintenance/possible future washroom facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As requested, please find a summary of comments below from Facilities on the recently presented Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan Options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Utilities / Services</strong> - In the recent presentation meeting it was noted that the consultant had reviewed the electrical utilities within the park (for lighting considerations, etc.). Please confirm that all other utilities will be reviewed as part of the master plan investigations. Facilities would like to ensure the proposed locations of the buildings makes sense in proximity to existing water / sanitary / gas / fibre locations. Servicing the building may add substantial cost if utilities have to be increased / relocated. It would be ideal to have a handle on what will be required in terms of running services to the building (i.e. complete the due diligence investigations now) in order to get an accurate cost estimate for the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Quick Fix Option:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Please incorporate considerations for a driveway access and parking off of Concession Street for Parks and Horticulture maintenance vehicles;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. As discussed in our meeting, Parks does not favour a layby / paid parking in front of the building as they would have a difficult time competing with the public for these spots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Bypass Link Option:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Please remove the current image shown for the ‘maintenance building’ as this is not an accurate representation of what the maintenance building will likely become. As previously discussed, there is no interest in a concession stand for this building nor any other type of facility use (for tourism, etc.). We don’t want to give the public the wrong impression with the glass curtain wall image shown. Facilities is developing standard design specs for all facility types, and park maintenance / washroom buildings will be built using durable, vandal proof materials (i.e. block / brick) and they will incorporate as little glass as possible. The images shown in the ‘quick fix’ and ‘enhanced option’ are more accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment | Received from | Date Received
--- | --- | ---

b. It is important to note that the concrete pad for outdoor portable washrooms was not favoured by the Parks team – again this becomes an ongoing maintenance expense if the porta potties are planned for long term use;

4. **Enhanced Option:**
   a. Is it possible to show the building as a full build out in this option (i.e. include the washrooms in addition to the maintenance portion) so Facilities can have a better understanding of potential cost for a “full build out.”

Please note that this building is currently not identified within the Facilities’ 10 year Capital Plan. Facilities will review and assess the information and cost estimates received as part of the Master Plan study and prioritize the need accordingly.

Thanks again for including Facilities within this master plan process, the options look fabulous!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit – HSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have attached some previous correspondence the HSR provided regarding traffic calming on transit routes. Specific to this location, we have concerns about transit vehicles stopping/starting on a grade, especially during winter. We are not in favour traffic calming at this location. The HSR supports the objectives of Vision Zero – making our streets safer through improved education, enforcement, engineering and evaluation. With respect to traffic calming measures intended to support Vision Zero, it is our experience that some solutions are preferable to others when implemented along transit routes. It is the HSR’s preference that traffic calming measures along transit routes be limited to horizontal solutions rather than vertical. Examples of this could include bump-outs, lane width reductions (provided the lane widths are sufficient for HSR vehicles), median islands, and installation of bicycle lanes or on-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Detmar, HSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Safety would request that the existing Cross-walk as I have illustrated on the attachment to be removed altogether.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Medoza, Traffic Operations and Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time it may be operating without incident, however all these new improvement which ever option is selected I am sure will attract a heavier volume of pedestrians and the cross-walk location is not a suitable one to maintain a safe crossing particularly for younger children. I think that an introduction of a “Walk-way” at the northwest corner of Vola Crt / Jolly Cut intersection would provide a better alternative to access the park for pedestrians from the west side of Upper Wellington Street that the existing cross-walk would not be necessary.
Comment | Received from | Date Received
--- | --- | ---
There have also been a high volume of resident complaints about cut through traffic in the neighbourhood to the south (Highcliffe Avenue, Knycet Avenue, and Bevidere Avenue). Will there be changes to the Concession Street road itself and will any traffic impacts and traffic generation studies be conducted for the surrounding neighbourhood and reviewed to mitigate and manage any new generated traffic to be expected as part of this project? | Jeff Cornwell, Traffic Signals | September 5, 2019

There are a few different options that could be implemented in order to eliminate the need to relocate the hydro poles, and these options could also increase on-street parking capacity. From a vehicular capacity perspective and operational perspective (which is what I comment on) we could have the eastbound approach operate as a single shared through/right lane with an exclusive left-turn lane if we were to install stop control at the jug handle, which would reduce the number of vehicles queued between Upper Wellington Street and the jug handle. The westbound side of Concession Street could then be marked with exclusive left/through/right lanes. All of this would require our design section to create a new marking plan for Concession Street between East 15th and Vola. I believe they would wait until this project was further along before creating a new marking plan, since it would take some time and require comments from parking, HSR, and possibly even the cycling group.

Cultural Heritage Planning

My preference is 2 or 3, or a mixture of both.

Heritage aspects to retain:
- I would suggest retaining, as much as possible, the stone walls that were part of the original as this will help with legibility of the old design. If not retaining all, consider reusing the materials within the new design.
- I am on board with moving the pavilion, but in its place it would be nice to have some form of commemoration of the old water tower (I finally found a picture, please see attached and look in the background of the photo). This could include a circle in the parking lot with an information sign as we discussed. Or a water fountain perhaps?
- It would be good to revive the heritage plaques. It may be worth considering presenting them as a ‘time-line’ along the central path (but slightly off from the path so people do not block the path when they go to read the sign, because that is just annoying). This way you can start at the geological time frame of the rock and escarpment development, to Indigenous use, to early Hamilton, to the Jolly cut, to the development of the 1950/60s park to today.

Indigenous aspects
- Possibly land acknowledgment?
- Indigenous artists be included as part the artists
- Include an indigenous perspective in the layout of the gardens, i.e. planting the three sisters, or other elements in the design that reflect cultural interests.

Extra info: Please follow the link below to see the information that I was able to pull together. There is not much, but a few things. The information includes maps that show the development of the park, and some information about the park that I randomly found in an information file just sitting on a shelf in the basement.
https://cityshare.hamilton.ca/s/99aAz64AXxkG0Yy

Horticulture

1. With the intersection re-construction, there is the loss of 2 large and important gateway floral traffic islands. Is there an opportunity to re-instate them along Concession somewhere close to this intersection? They will need to be irrigated
2. I like the pathway/bridge across the west leg of the Jolly Cut. This will improve access for maintenance activities

Marcia Monaghan, Horticulture | September 9, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Received from</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. I see all options include a maintenance building which is good. for the west option – will the lot size remain the same? Our staff park here from mid – April to the end of August, approx. 3-4 vehicles. I am working with Parking as there is new 2 hour limits to parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pollinator/naturalized gardens. While I understand the trend for these I struggle to see them as part of a groomed/manicured park. a. The naturalized 'look' does not meet all peoples needs/conception of how a park garden should look. We could be fielding many complaints regarding the appearance of this. b. I hope the intention is for Horticulture to maintain this rather than volunteers. With volunteers there are gaps in maintenance which again, we field the complaints for. c. If you go ahead with this, can you plan large groupings of each plant type. It has a better affect. Also, please use shorter type plants as I am sure I will receive complaints with taller types which some feel will obstruct views and also be unsightly when they fall over. Very windy here. d. As naturalized plants finish flowering, this could have the appearance of an abandoned field which again, is fine along the edge of a park or creek but I am not sure if this will work here. e. Having pollinators here will encourage bees and butterfly’s to move through traffic which can cause them to be killed f. As this is up-wind of the rest of the park, it will cause seed to blow in to non-naturalized areas in the remainder of the park. This will be a maintenance issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For naturalized areas please do not spec anything requiring deadheading or pruning. Ornamental grasses are good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East parking lot shifted slightly west – will it accommodate our staff parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Again – I like the bridge concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More gardens will require additional operational funding to be identified in Capital budget sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. For increased viewing areas across the escarpment – Forestry did a study a few years ago for increasing viewing vistas across the escarpment. Contact Caleb Gibbons for more info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Ken Coit / Meredith Plant, Public Art</td>
<td>August 27, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments provided in the meeting minutes from discussion with Placemaking Public Art and Projects, LAS and the consultant on August 27, 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D
Public Art Discussion
Meeting Minutes
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Meeting Notes

Public Art Discussion

Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 – 10:00am to 11:00am
Place: Hamilton City Centre, 77 James St. N. Hamilton, Meeting Room 400I, MBTW Group Office

Attendance:

City of Hamilton Public Art Staff:

Ken Coit Manager, Placemaking Public Art and Projects PED, City of Hamilton
Meredith Plant Senior Landscape Architect, Placemaking Public Art and Projects PED, City of Hamilton

Project Team:

Meghan Stewart Supervisor, Landscape Architectural Services PW, City of Hamilton
John Vandriel Project Lead, Landscape Architectural Services PW, City of Hamilton
Mandy Cadger Landscape Architectural Designer MBTW Group

Copies To:

Jana Joyce Principal MBTW Group

Purpose of Meeting:
Meeting with project design team and City of Hamilton Public Art group to identify how public art will be included in the alternative design concepts for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan. Scale, complexity and timing of future projects to be identified.

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions John Vandriel
2. Purpose of the Meeting
3. Discussion All
4. Summary & Next Steps All

Item Action
### 3. Discussion

- **Overview:** 2016 Public Art Master Plan elements pertaining to Sam Lawrence Park:
  - Public art ideas could take advantage of the views from the park and its visibility from the lower city to make a connection between the mountain and the lower city. Optimizing on the park’s rich history as a quarry could also provide an interesting theme for public art.
  - Identified as a priority project for 2017-2023.
  - Minimum budget of $100,000

- While the budget and park priority are indicated as such, they are flexible to change with the work that the Master Plan identifies, both in price and in timing.

- Any public art initiatives that the Sam Lawrence Master Plan identifies should align with the overall design intent of the Public Art Master Plan.

- Public art elements within Sam Lawrence Park should be commissioned through the Call for Artists policy, as described in the Public Art Master Plan.

- Staff would like to see public art incorporated / identified on the three design concepts presented at the Staff Advisory Group meeting. Scale and complexity of art could reflect that of each concept as well as guidelines from the scale and examples of Public Art, section 5.1, in the Public Art Master Plan pg 17.
  - **Quick Fix Concept:** Opportunity to incorporate some kind of functional piece(s), interacting with pedestrians, potentially reflecting on the park’s quarry history. Corresponding to a small-scale public art piece being modest in gesture and detail and requiring close (intimate) proximity on the part of the viewer to have impact ie: surface treatments or functional pieces such as benches.
  - **Bypass Concept:** Opportunity to incorporate a stand-alone gateway feature, interacting with pedestrians but also with drivers along the Jolley Cut. There is also potential for public art to be incorporated in an enhanced view platform. Art at this scale to correspond to a medium-scale public art piece at a more human-scale, relating specifically to the site and/or neighbourhood. Could be a single discrete work or potential to involve a number of smaller, related works.
  - **Enhanced Concept:** Opportunity to incorporate public art through a design competition of the design of the pedestrian bridge. Public art in the enhanced concept would correspond with a major-scale public art piece, art that would have a significant impact due to its size and ability to influence a location. The art work at this scale could emphasize a significant gateway or be part of a large gathering place and be easily viewed from a...
distance with impacts on the surrounding area. Major scale public art may involve broader (more abstract) themes.

- Staff would like to see the public art component highlighted in future public consultation. The design team will have a public art discussion with the Public Advisory Group and will ask for input related to public art from the general public on the online survey.
- Future phasing considerations of the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan should include relevant timing for the Public Art Call and implementation.

4. Summary & Next Steps

- LAS staff will vet the revised design concepts and any precedent imagery by Public Art staff, and/or public art examples provided by consultants prior to showing to the public at the upcoming Public Advisory Group and the online survey.

The preceding summary of the discussions of this meeting has been prepared to record comments and inform the project. Please advise the undersigned of any errors or omissions.

Prepared by: J. Vandriel, Landscape Architectural Services
Distribution: All present, Project file
EVENT REPORT
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

Public Advisory Group Meeting No.2
October 2, 2019
1.0 Introduction

On October 2nd, 2019, The MBTW Group and the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) conducted the second Public Advisory Group meeting for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan project. The meeting was held at the Seventh-Day Adventist Church located at 284 Concession Street, Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented and summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting.

The Public Advisory Group 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 10 people attended the meeting.

Meeting No.2 focused on the presentation of four (4) preliminary concept options prepared by the consulting team. The feedback from this meeting will guide the information presented in a second online survey. The intent of this online survey is to obtain feedback from the public on the design concept alternatives. The following sections provide a summary of the material presented, followed by the comments provided by the Public Advisory Group.

The meeting material was presented to the group through a digital presentation. The digital presentation provided supporting information regarding the proposed intersection improvements, an overview of four (4) possible concept options and the big ideas behind three (3) preliminary design concept alternatives. The first possible concept option is to “do nothing” which did not require presentation of a design concept. Display boards were posted for each of the three (3) design concept alternatives. One set of boards outlined detailed park improvements through schematic designs that compared existing and proposed features. The other set of boards displayed rendered plans and associated precedent imagery.

SAG Meeting No.2 included:
- A brief introduction to the attendees of the meeting led by the City’s Project Manager, John Vandriel, of LAS;
- An extensive presentation (refer to Attachment A) conducted by Jana Joyce of The MBTW Group;
- Discussion of the various park program elements proposed in the presentation led by John Vandriel of LAS;
- Display boards (refer to Attachment B).

2.0 Proposed Intersection & Crossing Enhancements

The Public Advisory Group was first presented with design goals that were set out by the consulting team and City of Hamilton LAS before investigating possible intersection improvements. These design goals included:

- Improve pedestrian and cyclist experience and safety,
- Reduce amount of park space used by intersection infrastructure, and
- Meet or exceed functionality of traffic and transit flow.
The group was then presented with the investigation process that the consulting team and City of Hamilton LAS carried out with City of Hamilton stakeholders. This process started with an investigation of eight (8) possible intersection changes to improve the pedestrian realm without impeding on traffic and transit route times. Four (4) of these possible changes were short listed to have preliminary review with City of Hamilton LAS and Transportation staff. It was decided that two (2) of these options were deemed appropriate to carry-forward and undergo technical analysis in comparison to the existing condition. The results were reviewed by City of Hamilton LAS and Transportation staff and one (1) option was approved to present in the design concept alternatives. A brief description of the eight (8) possible options were included in the presentation, however, the focus was on the approved option that is included in all the design concept alternatives. These intersection improvements include:

- Removal of channelized right turn lanes at the Concession Street/ Jolley Cut/ Upper Wellington Street intersection.
- Install formal pedestrian crossing and stop sign at the Concession Street/ Jolley Cut/ Vola Court intersection.

There was one concern raised by a member of the Public Advisory Group who questioned if cycling safety is truly enhanced by the proposed improvements. The consulting team responded by reassuring the public that the detailed design phase of the intersection would determine the most appropriate cycling infrastructure to promote safety.

3.0 Preliminary Concept Options

3.1 Design Alternatives Overview

The design alternatives presented by The MBTW Group were based on feedback received from the community and various stakeholders. The presentation provided a comparative look at four (4) preliminary concept options that included a “do nothing” option, before exploring the big ideas for each design concept alternative. The following sections provide a description of the four (4) preliminary concept options presented, followed by overall comments voiced by the Public Advisory Group during the meeting.

3.2 “Do Nothing”

There is always a “Do Nothing” option. In the case of Sam Lawrence Park, this option would require on-going maintenance to repair what is broken. This approach does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the already approved Mountain Brow Multi-Use Path along Concession Street and a small public art component. This option did not require a design concept or a series of big ideas to present, however, it’s important to note that “do nothing” does not mean no cost. The cost includes, but is not limited to:

1. Remedial repairs to pavements, lighting, stairs, walls, etc.
2. Repairs do not contribute to site-wide rejuvenation.
3. Design aesthetic is not coordinated/ organized.
4. Increased maintenance.
5. Limited demonstrated response to community concerns.
3.3 The “Quick Fix”

The “Quick Fix” option maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Proposes intersection improvements. Refer to section 2.0.
2. Multi-use path along Concession Street with two-way cycling infrastructure and separate pedestrian sidewalk.
3. New maintenance facility building and location close to Concession Street and the existing west parking lot. The building is estimated to have a 200m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/change room.
4. Complete barrier free path connections throughout the park.
5. Native gardens replace sloped lawns to ease maintenance and to support local ecological systems.
6. Improvements to the Arkledun Avenue and Bruce Trail access connection to Concession Street, including new trail head with amenities, native shade gardens, drainage improvements, pruning to open up views and new lighting.
7. Public art component to be small in scale, requiring close proximity on the park of the viewer to have impact.

3.4 The “Bypass Link”

The “Bypass Link” option includes all the improvements proposed in the “Quick Fix” option that will include site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces. However, now introduces a pedestrian bridge connection over the Jolley Cut that allows the multi-use path to be embedded within the park. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Shift the east parking lot and relocating the existing pavilion to accommodate the bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, linking the east side of the park. New entry plaza at south landing of bridge.
2. New maintenance facility building and location within the new entry plaza at the proposed bridge and Concession Street. The building is estimated to have a 200m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/change room.
3. Embed the multi-use path within the park. Multi-use path to a minimum of 5m wide to allow pedestrians and cyclist to share the space.
4. Improvements to the traffic median that relocates the pedestrian access out of the median and proposes a bosque of trees to reinforce park presence and increase the local tree canopy.
5. Public art component to be medium in scale, acting as a gateway feature for pedestrians and drivers and/or a landmark to be seen from downtown.
3.5  The “Enhancement”

The “Enhancement” option includes all the improvements proposed in the “Quick Fix” option that will include site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/ vistas and existing garden spaces. Like the “Bypass Link” option, it proposes a pedestrian bridge connection over the Jolley Cut that allows the multi-use path to be embedded within the park. However, now introduces expanded and new park features. The series of big ideas presented for this option included:

1. Shift the east parking lot and relocating the existing pavilion to accommodate the bridge connection over the Jolley Cut, linking the east side of the park.
2. New maintenance facility building and location within the new entry plaza at the proposed bridge and Concession Street. The building is estimated to have a 200m² footprint, including indoor storage, break room, office and washroom/ change room.
3. Embed the multi-use path within the park. Multi-use path to a minimum of 5m wide to allow pedestrians and cyclist to share the space.
4. Improvements to the traffic median that relocates the pedestrian access out of the median and proposes a bosque of trees to reinforce park presence and increase the local tree canopy.
5. Relocate the west parking lot with on-street parking along Concession Street to accommodate a new observation deck for pedestrians and cyclists. The old driveway could be converted into a pedestrian promenade.
6. New spaces for children throughout the park as play “moments”.
7. Introduce new barrier free garden destinations in underutilized park space. Gardens could be themed, for example winter garden, prairie garden, sculpture garden, etc.
8. Public art component to be large in scale, acting as a gateway or landmark feature associated with the new pedestrian bridge. Potentially involving a design competition.

3.6  General Comments

The Public Advisory Group gave support for the big ideas presented for each design concept alternative. The attendees unanimously voted the “Enhancement” as their preferred option. The group also noted they would be unsatisfied with the “Do Nothing” option. John Vandriel of City of Hamilton LAS led the Public Advisory Group in conversation to promote discussion on some of the features proposed in the options.

3.6.1  New Maintenance Building

The location proposed for the new maintenance building, in both the “Bypass Link” and “Enhancement” options, was questioned for it’s potential to be an eye sore within the proposed plaza space. It was also noted that its position interrupts the connection between the relocated east parking lot and south bridge landing.
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3.6.2 Multi-Use Path

The Public Advisory Group supports the multi-use path embedded in the park, noting that it would be enjoyed by leisure cyclists, however, it would not benefit commuter cyclists. The alignment proposed for the multi-use path along Concession Street seen in the “Quick Fix” option would best accommodate these commuters.

3.6.3 Tree Planting

The bosque of trees proposed for the traffic median in the “Bypass Link” and “Enhancement” options was supported by the Public Advisory Group, noting that it was a great use for the currently barren space. The group agreed that new trees should be native species and could be used to frame views within and out of the park.

3.6.4 Removal of West Parking Lot

There were no concerns from the Public Advisory Group regarding the removal of the west parking lot. This parking lot is often used for illegal activities because its current location makes it difficult to monitor. There was concern with the proposal to relocate this parking as on-street parking on Concession Street. The parked cars would be vulnerable to damage from passing cars, which is already an issue in the area.

3.6.5 New Features

The Public Advisory Group supports the new barrier free gardens to replace the existing central sloped lawn between the Jolley Cut and Concession Street. This space is underutilized due to its exposure to a high volume of traffic moving up and down the mountain. It was noted that trees would be a good way to mitigate noise from traffic and make the space more comfortable for users. The group also liked the idea of gardens in replace of the sloped lawn at the Arkledun Avenue and Bruce Trail east access to Concession Street. It was mentioned that it is very steep here and the proposed pathways may not be used.
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Meeting Agenda

1. Master Plan Process ‘Refresher’
2. Project Timeline Update
3. Public Engagement & Stakeholder Update
4. What has the team been doing?
5. What are we doing today?
6. Recommended Intersection Improvements
7. Discussion & Comments
8. Design Alternative Presentation Overview
9. Design Alternatives - Comparative Look
10. Design Alternative Presentation
11. Design Alternatives Evaluation – Time Dependant
12. Discussion & Comments
13. Next Steps
Master Plan ‘Refresher’

- Time for park rejuvenation
- Examining existing and future uses
- Engaging with stakeholders and the community
- Creating an evidence-based preferred design concept
- Developing high-level cost estimates for components
- Creating a Master Plan to assist in planning improvements, in managing funding and in scheduling approvals
Project Timeline

Spring 2019:
- Launch Online Survey (Park Users)
- Staff & Public Advisory Group Meetings
- Public Information Centre
- Park Walking Tour
- Develop Criteria for Success

Summer 2019:
- Pop-up Display at Festivals
- Close Online Survey (Park Users)
- Development of Concept Design Options
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting

Fall 2019:
- Pop-up Display at Festivals
- Public Advisory Group Meeting
- Launch & Close Online Survey (Evaluation of Design Alternatives)
- Evaluate Design Alternatives
- Develop Preferred Concept Design
- Public Information Centre

Winter 2019/Spring 2020:
- Staff Advisory Group Review
- Produce the Master Plan Report
- Master Plan for Council Approval

Where we are in the master plan process
Public & Stakeholder Engagement Update

- Public Advisory Group Meeting - April 4, 2019
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting - April 4, 2019
- Public Online Park User Survey Launched – March 26, 2019
- *Janes Walk*, Walking Tour- May 4, 2019
- Niagara Escarpment Commission Coordination Meeting – May 24, 2019
- CPTED Site Review – May 30, 2019
Public & Stakeholder Engagement Update

- Parks Operations, Facilities, Horticulture and LAS Coordination Meeting – May 31, 2019
- Concession Street BIA Streetfest Event - June 8, 2019
- Public Online Park User Survey Closed – July 2, 2019
- Transportation, Traffic, Transit Group Intersection Discussion Meetings - May 3 & August 2, 2019
- Staff Advisory Group Meeting – August 15, 2019
- Concession Street BIA Sidewalk Sounds Event – September 20th, 2019
What We Heard // Online User Survey

How often do you visit Sam Lawrence Park?
- Once a month: 42%
- Once a year: 26%

What time of day do you visit the park?
- 5pm-9pm: 71%

Do you feel safe in Sam Lawrence Park?
- Yes: 88%
- No: 2%

What activities do you participate in when visiting the park?
1. Walking
2. Enjoying the Views
3. Visiting the Gardens
4. Photography
5. Relaxing

What do you think is special about the park?
1. Views
2. Gardens
3. Green Space
4. Trails & Walkways

What amenities are most important to you?
1. Expanded Pedestrian Connections
2. Expanded Gardens
3. Public Washrooms
4. Barrier Free Access

What amenities should be included in the revitalization of the park?
1. Seating
2. Water Fountains
3. Trees & Gardens
4. Picnic Area
5. Pavilion / Gazebo
6. Enhance Views
7. Lighting Strategy
8. Pedestrian Bridge
9. Splash Pad

We received 525 responses to the online user survey.
What has the team been doing?

- Finalized Evaluation Criteria based on feedback
- Completed site inventory and analysis
- Exploration of intersection design options
- High level structural review of the walls and feasibility of bridge
- Electrical systems inventory and review
- Developed 4 design alternatives using feedback as a framework
- Preliminary look at functional program for potential new building
- Analyze results of Online Park User Survey
What are we doing today?

• Present the recommended intersection design / improvements
• Present 4 concept design alternatives – the ‘Big Ideas’ today
• Design alternative evaluation discussion – time dependant
Intersection Design Goals

• Improve pedestrian and cyclist experience and safety
• Reduce amount of park space used by intersection infrastructure
• Meet or exceed functionality of traffic and transit flow
Intersection Design Process

- Consulting team explored eight (8) possible options
- Shortlisted four (4) to have preliminary review with LAS / Transportation Staff
- Two (2) options deemed appropriate to carry-forward
- Technical analysis / comparison performed
- Second review with LAS / Transportation
- One (1) option approved / confirmed to carry-forward - shown in the various design concepts
- Other option is to “Do Nothing”
Existing 'Jughandle'

Channelized Right Turn Lane

Concession St.

Wellington St.

Upper

Bus Stop

Bus Stop

Bus Stop

Volta Crt.

Jolley Crt.

Existing
# Intersection Design Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Concept Option</th>
<th>Functional Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove ‘Jughandle’ Replace w/ One Left Turn Lane, Jolley Cut to Eastbound Concession St.</td>
<td>Requires private land acquisition. Vehicles would back-up onto hill at red light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove ‘Jughandle’ Replace w/ Two Left Turn Lanes, Jolley Cut to Eastbound Concession St.</td>
<td>Requires private land acquisition. Vehicles would still back-up onto hill at red light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove ‘Jughandle’ Replace w/ T-Intersection, Dead End Eastbound Concession St., West of Vola Crt.</td>
<td>Dead End not acceptable. Pedestrian and cycling experience is worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove ‘Jughandle’ Replace w/ T-Intersection, Realign Eastbound Concession St. to Meet South of New Intersection</td>
<td>Pedestrian and cycling experience is worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squeeze ‘Jughandle’ and Realign West to meet Vola Crt.</td>
<td>Vehicles would cut through neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Intersection (and ‘Jughandle’) w/ “Square”-about</td>
<td>Very confusing traffic signal timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Intersection (and ‘Jughandle’) w/ Roundabout</td>
<td>Pedestrian and cycling experience is worse. Takes up more park space than existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squeeze ‘Jughandle’ and Eliminate Traffic Median</td>
<td>Tested against existing timing and failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Channelized Right Turns Eastbound on Concession St. and add Formal Pedestrian Crossing at the ‘Jughandle’</td>
<td>Tested against existing timing and passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intersection Recommendations

- Remove channelized right turn lane
- Add dedicated right turn lane from Concession St. to Jolley Cut and remove eastbound lane to compensate
- Add formal pedestrian crossing and stop sign
- Potential vehicular lane width reduction
- Traffic signals/lights remain the same
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Design Alternatives Overview

• Alternatives based on feedback from the community and stakeholders

• Key moves highlighted today however encourage the group to review detailed material provided

• “Big Idea” – Outlines key moves

• “Concept Design” – Preliminary ground truthing and precedent imagery
Design Alternatives // Comparative Look

Do Nothing  Fixes what is broken however does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the proposed Mountain Brow Trail connection along Concession.

Quick Fix  Maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

Bypass Link  Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, site modifications and site-wide improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

Enhancement  Introduces pedestrian bridge with embedded multi-use path, intersection improvements and new and expanded park features.
Do Nothing // Big Idea

- No concept to present, essentially just fix what is broken
- Includes Mountain Brow Trail (multi-use path) on north side of Concession Street
- Funding still allocated for a small public art component
- Does not mean ‘no cost’
- Cost of doing nothing includes (not limited to):
  - Remedial repairs to pavements, lighting, stairs, walls etc.
  - Repairs do not contribute to site-wide rejuvenation
  - Design aesthetic not coordinated, organized
  - Increased maintenance
  - Limited demonstrated response to community concerns, for example connectivity
The Quick Fix // Big Idea

- The “Quick Fix” maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces.

- Includes improvements to the Jolley Cut and Concession Street intersections that enhance the pedestrian crossing experience.

- Includes Multi-Use Path along the north side of Concession Street.
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

Site Wide Improvements:

• Improved Paving
• New Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)
• New Lighting Strategy
• New Interpretive / Wayfinding Signage
• Repair Masonry Walls, Railings and Steps
• Update Servicing (as required)
• Prune Vegetation to Open Views
• Tree Succession Plan
• Invasive Species Management Plan
• Escarpment Slope Stabilization
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

Intersection Improvements

• Enhanced Pedestrian crossing experiences
• Remove channelized right turn lanes
Multi-Use Path along Concession St.

- Implement proposed Mountain Brow Trail Connection (multi-use path)
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

New Maintenance Building & Location

- Approx. 200 m² footprint
- Incl. indoor storage, break room, office, staff washroom & change room
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

New Barrier-Free Connections

- Switch back ramps from west parking
- Connections to existing lookout areas/ amenity nodes
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

Native Gardens on Slopes

- Ease of maintenance
- Supports local ecological systems
The Quick Fix // Design Concept

Improvements to Arkledun Ave. & Bruce Trail Access

- Sense of arrival and amenities
- Drainage improvements and new native understorey/shade garden
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Public Art

- Small scale, requiring close proximity on the part of the viewer to have impact or with functional value for park users.
- For example, the design of furnishings, pavement, wall treatment, etc.
The Bypass Link // Big Idea

- Includes the **site-wide modest or light improvements** that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces, proposed in the Quick Fix option.
- Introduces the **Pedestrian Bridge** linking together the eastern park spaces over the Jolley Cut.
- Bridge provides opportunity to **embed the Multi-Use Path** within the park space linking the east to the west without having to cross traffic at grade.
- Includes improvements to the Jolley Cut and Concession Street intersections that **enhance the pedestrian crossing experience**.
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

Site Wide Improvements:

- Improved Paving
- New Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)
- New Lighting Strategy
- New Interpretive / Wayfinding Signage
- Repair Masonry Walls, Railings and Steps
- Update Servicing (as required)
- Prune Vegetation to Open Views
- Tree Succession Plan
- Invasive Species Management Plan
- Escarpment Slope Stabilization
- **Quick Fix Option Improvements** (improved intersections, barrier-free connections, native gardens on slopes, improved Arkledun Ave. & Bruce Trail access)
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

Bridge Connection over the Jolley Cut

- Shift existing east parking lot to accommodate bridge landing and new entry plaza/amenity node
- Relocate existing pavilion to more park like setting
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

New Maintenance Building & Location

- Approx. 200 m² footprint
- Incl. indoor storage, break room, office, staff washroom & change room
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

Embed Multi-Use Path Within Park

- Introduce pedestrian and cyclist promenade through most of the park
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

Improvement to Traffic Median

- Relocate pedestrian access
- Introduce tree grove or Bosque
The Bypass Link // Design Concept

Public Art

• Medium scale, potential gateway feature enjoyed by pedestrians and drivers and/or with views of downtown

• For example a linear feature between pedestrians/ cyclists and vehicles
Enhancement // Big Idea

- Includes the *site-wide modest or light improvements* that enhance connectivity, views/vistas and existing garden spaces, proposed in the Quick Fix option.

- Includes both the **Pedestrian Bridge** over the Jolley Cut and **Multi-Use Path embedded** within the park.

- Includes improvements to the Jolley Cut and Concession Street intersections that **enhance the pedestrian crossing experience**.

- HOWEVER, **adds** expanded gardens and new park features
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Site Wide Improvements:

- Improved Paving
- New Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)
- New Lighting Strategy
- New Interpretive / Wayfinding Signage
- Repair Masonry Walls, Railings and Steps
- Update Servicing (as required)
- Prune Vegetation to Open Views
- Tree Succession Plan
- Invasive Species Management Plan
- Escarpment Slope Stabilization
- **Quick Fix Option Improvements** (improved intersections, barrier-free connections, native gardens on slopes, improved Arkledun Ave & Bruce Trail access)
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Bridge Connection over the Jolley Cut

- Shift existing east parking lot to accommodate bridge landing and new entry plaza/amenity node
- Relocate existing pavilion to more park like setting
The Enhancement // Design Concept

New Maintenance Building & Location

- Approx. 200 m² footprint
- Incl. indoor storage, break room, office, staff washroom & change room
- Potential future public washrooms
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The Enhancement // Design Concept

Embed Multi-Use Path Within Park

- Introduce pedestrian and cyclist promenade through the entire park
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Improvement to Traffic Median

- Relocate pedestrian access
- Introduce tree grove or Bosque
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Expansive Observation Deck for Pedestrians and Cyclists

- Remove existing west parking lot and replace with on-street parking along north side of Concession St
- Parking lot driveway becomes pedestrian promenade
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Space for Children

- Play moments throughout the park
The Enhancement // Design Concept

New Barrier-Free Garden Destinations

- Opportunity to introduce new themed gardens: Winter Garden, Prairie Garden, Sculpture Garden, etc.
The Enhancement // Design Concept

Public Art

• Large scale, bridge connection designed as a landmark/ gateway feature, potentially involving the work of artists (design competition)
Imagery // New Features
Next Steps

- Summarize feedback collected today
- Team to launch second public online survey to obtain feedback on the design concepts
- Team to complete design concept evaluations
  - LAS, MBTW and others
- Team to begin work on preferred design concept
Thank you for your participation!
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Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
- Improved paving
- New lighting strategy
- New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
- New interpretive/way-finding signage
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Update servicing as needed

Mobility
- Multi-use path w/cycling infrastructure
- Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
- Complete missing segments of barrier-free pedestrian pathways
- Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
- Maintain food truck access

Gardens & Open Space
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New gardens associated with new pathways
- Plant street trees along Concession St.
- Tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
- Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden
- Replace/relocate annual gardens

Structures
- Park sign
- New facility building (maintenance)
- Existing pavilion to remain
- Public art opportunities (small scale, paving or bench design)

Legend
- ROADS & PARKING
- EXISTING & PROPOSED TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTRED
- EXISTING SLOPED LAWN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (SLOPE < 5%)
The “Bypass Link” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
- Improved paving
- New lighting strategy
- New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
- New interpretive/way-finding signage
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Update servicing as needed

Mobility
1. Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
2. Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
3. New barrier free pedestrian pathways
4. Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
5. Maintain food truck access
6. Relocate & increase size of east parking lot (8 more spaces)

Gardens & Open Space
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New gardens associated with new pathways
- Plant street trees along Concession St.
- Tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Flat lawn (potential festival area)
- Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden
- Replace/ relocate annual gardens
- Bosque in traffic median

Structures
1. Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
2. Park sign
3. New facility building (maintenance)
4. Existing pavilion to be relocated
5. Public art opportunities (medium scale, gateway feature for pedestrians and drivers)

Legend
- Roads & Parking
- Existing & Proposed Gardens
- Existing Trees, Naturalized or Clustered
- Existing & Proposed Trees, Stand Alone
- Existing & Proposed Native Gardens on Slope
- Existing Sloped Lawn
- Existing & Proposed Flat Lawn
- Future Multi-Use Path (Slope < 5%)
- Decommissioned Pathway
- Bridge with Vehicular Access
- Existing & Relocated Pavilion
- New Facility Building
- Existing and Relocated Park Signage
- Bus Stop
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The “Enhancement” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
- Improved paving
- New lighting strategy
- New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
- New interpretive/way-finding signage
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Update servicing as needed

Mobility
- Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
- Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
- New barrier free pedestrian pathways
- Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
- New food truck access
- Relocate & increase size of east parking lot (8 more spaces)

Gardens & Open Space
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New gardens associated with new pathways
- Plant street trees along Concession St.
- Tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
- Flat lawn (potential festival area)
- Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes

Structures
- Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
- Park sign
- New facility building (maintenance and potential future public washrooms)
- Existing pavilion to be relocated
- Cantilever observation deck with amenities
- Play moments throughout park
- Public art opportunities (large scale, landmark seen from afar)

Legend
- ROADS & PARKING
- EXISTING & PROPOSED BUS STOP
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PARK SIGN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED BRIDGE WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHS WITH AMENITIES
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHS (STAIRS OR SLOPE > 5%)
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATIVE GARDENS ON SLOPE
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATIVE GARDENS
- EXISTING SLOPED LAWN
- DECOMMISSIONED PATHWAY
- BUS STOP
- EXISTING & PROPOSED FLAT LAWN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATURIZED WOODLAND
- EXISTING & PROPOSED GARDENS

Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden
- Replace/ relocate annual gardens
- Bosque in traffic median
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The nhw group
The “Quick Fix” Design Concept
The “Enhancement” Design Concept

- Pedestrian Ramp
- Passive Open Space
- Bosque in Traffic Median
- Play Moments Throughout Park
- Existing Gardens
- Complete Path Circuits
- Improved Trail Head
- Drainage Improvements & Native Shade Garden
- New Barrier Free Gardens
- On-Street Parking
- Observation Deck
- Multi-Use Path Embedded in Park
- Improved Crossings
- New Barrier Free Gardens
- Relocated Pavilion
- Food Truck Access
- Maintenance Building
- Bridge Crossing
What We Heard - Online User Survey Results (Fall 2019)

We received 170 responses to the online user survey.

Rank the design alternatives using a scale of 1 to 3. [1 = most favourite, 3 = least favourite]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Alternatives</th>
<th>The Enhancement</th>
<th>The Bypass Link</th>
<th>The Quick Fix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranked #1</td>
<td>Ranked #2</td>
<td>Ranked #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you like the proposed improvements to the intersection?

- Yes: 66.5%
- No: 33.5%

Do you like the proposed bridge over the Jolley Cut?

- Yes: 91.1%
- No: 8.9%

Do you prefer to keep the west parking lot or replace it with the proposed observation platform?

- Create observation platform: 60.7%
- Keep west parking lot: 39.3%

Do you like the idea of play “moments” throughout or do you prefer a traditional playground?

- Play “moments”: 84.2%
- Traditional playground: 15.8%
Design Concept Alternatives
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan - Design Alternatives

A comparative look at the Preliminary Concept Design Alternatives

**Do Nothing**
Fixes what is broken however does not address community concerns or include new improvements, except for the future Mountain Brow Trail connection planned along Concession Street.

**The Quick Fix**
Maintains the park’s quiet, garden-like character while proposing site-wide modest or light improvements that enhance connectivity, views/ vistas and existing garden spaces. Intersection improvements are proposed at Concession Street and the Jolley Cut.

**The Bypass Link**
Introduces a pedestrian bridge linking the east end of the park and embeds the multi-use path through much of the park. Site modifications and site-wide improvements are proposed that enhance connectivity, views/ vistas and existing garden spaces. Intersection improvements are proposed at Concession Street and the Jolley Cut.

**The Enhancement**
Introduces a pedestrian bridge linking the east end of the park and embeds the multi-use path through the entire park. New and expanded park features are introduced. Intersection improvements are proposed at Concession Street and the Jolley Cut.
The “Quick Fix” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
- Improved paving
- New lighting strategy
- New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
- New interpretive/way-finding signage
- Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
- Update servicing as needed

Mobility
- Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
- Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
- Complete missing segments of barrier free pedestrian pathways
- Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
- Maintain food truck access

Gardens & Open Space
- Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
- New gardens associated with new pathways
- Plant street trees along Concession St.
- Tree succession plan
- Invasive plant species management
- Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
- Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
- Maintain memorial daffodil garden
- Replace/ relocate annual gardens

Structures
- Park sign
- New facility building (maintenance)
- Existing pavilion to remain
- Public art opportunities (small scale, paving or bench design)

Legend
- ROADS & PARKING
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PARK SIGN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED FLAT LAWN
- EXISTING SLOPED LAWN
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (SLOPE > 5%)
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS (STAIRS OR SLOPE > 5%)
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATIVE GARDENS ON SLOPE
- EXISTING & PROPOSED NATIVE GARDENS OFF SLOPE
- EXISTING & PROPOSED TREE GROUP
- EXISTING & PROPOSED TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTERED
- EXISTING & PROPOSED BARRIER FREE PATHWAYS (SLOPE < 5%)
- EXISTING & PROPOSED BARRIER FREE PATHWAYS (SLOPE < 5%)
- EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN NODES WITH AMENITIES
- DECOMMISSIONED PATHWAY
- NEW FACILITY BUILDING
- EXISTING & RELOCATED PAVILION
- BUS STOP
- EXISTING AND RELOCATED PARK SIGNAGE

October 2, 2019
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
The “Bypass Link” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
• Improved paving
• New lighting strategy
• New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
• New interpretive/ way-finding signage
• Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
• Update servicing as needed

Mobility
• Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
• Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
• New barrier free pedestrian pathways
• Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
• Maintain food truck access
• Relocate & increase size of east parking lot (6 more spaces)

Gardens & Open Space
• Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
• New gardens associated with new pathways
• Plant street trees along Concession St.
• Tree succession plan
• Invasive plant species management
• Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
• Flat lawn (potential festival area)
• Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
• Maintain memorial daffodil garden
• Replace/ relocate annual gardens
• Bosque in traffic median

Structures
• Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
• Park sign
• New facility building (maintenance)
• Existing pavilion to be relocated
• New barrier free pedestrian pathways (slope < 5%)
• New barrier free pedestrian pathways (stairs or slope > 5%)

Legend
- Roads & Parking
- Existing & Proposed Gardens
- Existing & Proposed Pedestrian Wedges with Amenities
- Existing & Proposed Trees, Stand Alone
- Existing & Proposed Native Gardens on Slope
- Existing Sloped Lawn
- Existing & Proposed Flat Lawn
- Future Multi-Use Path (slope < 5%)
- Decommissioned Pathway
The “Enhancement” Schematic Design

Proposed Park Improvements

General Enhancements
• Improved paving
• New lighting strategy
• New furnishings (benches, bins, etc.)
• New interpretive/ way-finding signage
• Repair masonry walls, railings and steps
• Update servicing as needed

Mobility
1. Multi-use path w/ cycling infrastructure
2. Improvements to the Concession St. & Jolley Cut intersections
3. New barrier free pedestrian pathways
4. Improve sense of arrival for Bruce Trail at Arkledun Ave. access
5. New food truck access
6. Relocate & increase size of east parking lot (8 more spaces)

Gardens & Open Space
• Replace west parking lot with on-street parking (equal spaces)
• Rejuvenate existing gardens and plantings
• New gardens associated with new pathways
• Plant street trees along Concession St.
• Tree succession plan
• Invasive plant species management
• Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
• Flat lawn (potential festival area)
• Expand existing west tree grove
• Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
• Maintain memorial daffodil garden
• Replace/ relocate annual gardens
• Bosque in traffic median

Structures
1. Bridge connection over Jolley Cut
2. Park sign
3. New facility building
4. New pavilion
5. New facility building
6. Prune vegetation to open views and enhance surveillance
7. Flat lawn (potential festival area)
8. Expand existing west tree grove
9. Native gardens replace lawn on steep slopes
10. Maintain memorial daffodil garden
11. Replace/ relocate annual gardens
12. Bosque in traffic median

Legend
ROADS & PARKING
EXISTING & PROPOSED
GARDENS
EXISTING TREES, NATURALIZED OR CLUSTERED
EXISTING & PROPOSED
PEDESTRIAN NODULES WITH AMENITIES
EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS
( SLOPE > 5% )
EXISTING & PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS
( STAIRS OR SLOPE > 5% )
EXISTING SLOPED LAWN
FUTURE MULTI-USE PATH
( SLOPE < 5% )
DECOMMISSIONED PATHWAY
BUS STOP
NEW FACILITY BUILDING
EXISTING & RELOCATED PARK SIGNAGE
EXISTING & RELOCATED PAVILION
BRIDGE WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS
APPENDIX "C" TO REPORT PW18056A
The “Quick Fix” Design Concept

- Native Garden on Slopes
- Drainage Improvements & Native Shade Garden
- Complete Path Circuits
- Improved Trail Head
- Existing Gardens
- Pedestrian Ramp
- Improved Open Space
- Improved Crossings
- Maintenance Building
- Food Truck Access
- Native Garden on Slopes
- Multi-Use Path on Concession St.
- Improved Trail Head
- Existing Pavilion
- Barrier Free Connections
- Existing Gardens
- Improved Drainage & Native Shade Garden

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

October 2, 2019

Appendix “C” to Report PW18056(a)
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The “Bypass Link” Design Concept
The “Enhancement” Design Concept

- New Barrier Free Gardens
- Observation Deck
- On-Street Parking
- Food Truck Access
- Passive Open Space
- Complete Path Circuits
- Improved Trail Head
- Existing Gardens
- Play Moments Throughout Park
- Pedestrian Ramp
- Drainage Improvements & Native Shade Garden
- Relocated Pavilion
- Bridge Crossing
- Improved Trail Head
- Relocated Pavilion
- Improved Crossings
- Multi-Use Path Embedded in Park

Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
October 2, 2019
Evaluation Criteria For Success
## "Connectivity" Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 &quot;Quick Fix&quot;</th>
<th>Option 2 &quot;Bypass Link&quot;</th>
<th>Option 3 &quot;Enhancement&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones? (e.g. circuit like pathway system)</td>
<td><img src="false" alt="Yes" /> <img src="true" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian access into the park?</td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the sense of arrival to the park?</td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate and/or improve connections to transit and community nodes?</td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding?</td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align with goals/ objectives of the City of Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan and Mountain Brow Multi-Use Pathway Feasibility Study?</td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="true" alt="Yes" /> <img src="false" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

1. The proposed treatment to the traffic median may improve the sense of arrival to the park for transit riders, but does not address the other entrances as do options 2 & 3.

2. Option 2 does not improve the intersection of the Jolley Cut and Concession Street and therefore does not improve the connection between the nearby transit stops and Sam Lawrence Park.
## "Maintenance" Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation is required)</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the long term evolution of the park? (e.g. ‘future-proofing’, escarpment stability, resilient/durable materials)</td>
<td>No [●] Yes [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for snow removal operations? (e.g. adequate resources and space to accommodate winter programming)</td>
<td>No [●] Yes [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for maintenance operations? (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming? (e.g. hydro &amp; water connection, garbage receptacles)</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
<td>Yes [●] No [●]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

1. Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.
### “Safety” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept…</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles? (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)</td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the lighting strategy throughout the park while being sensitive to light pollution?</td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the structural stability of paths and park edges?</td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visibility? (e.g. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED])</td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate access to emergency services? (e.g. wide paths, space to turn around)</td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Yes.png" alt="Yes" /> <img src="No.png" alt="No" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.

---
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Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
## “Amenities” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for both formal and informal social gathering? (e.g. civic events, yoga)</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for individual, group, passive or active recreation, throughout the year?</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide infrastructure to facilitate programming? (e.g. power supply, storage)</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow flexibility for current and future programming opportunities?</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conflicts between different user groups within the park and with neighbours, while maximizing flexibility?  ◆</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
<td>Yes ☐️ No ☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the unique character of the park is enhanced by new amenities and components that support the desired programming?</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
<td>Yes ☑️ No ☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments
- ◆ Is this criteria relevant to the desired programming and inherent layout of Sam Lawrence Park?
### “Character & Cultural Heritage” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the park’s cultural heritage and historic features? (e.g. stone walls, gardens, landscape architecture)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and enhance the views to and from the lower city? (e.g. protected view corridors, visible landmarks)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align with goals and objectives of the City of Hamilton’s Mountain Brow Vista Study and Public Art Master Plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to cultural heritage landscape requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing and proposed memorialization programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments

1. Option 2 & 3 disrupt the continuity of heritage masonry walls with the addition of the bridge over the Jolley Cut.
2. Option 1 only retains views and enhances existing views, unlike options 2 & 3 where new viewpoints are added.
## “Natural Heritage” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Quick Fix”</td>
<td>“Bypass Link”</td>
<td>“Enhancement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain mature trees and propose a succession/replanting/protection strategy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?¹</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

¹ Subject to geotechnical study, pending completion.
# “Interpretation & Education” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept…</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showcase and enhance unique features? (e.g. geology of the Niagara Escarpment, gardens)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interpretive signage? (e.g. ecology, history, geology, geography, landmarks etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider technological initiatives that could broaden the educational experience? (e.g. geocaching apps)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
### “Landscape & Design” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide protection from the elements? (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a variety of areas and elements for resting/sitting? (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a diversity of spaces? (e.g. active areas and quiet areas)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage year-round use of the park?</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate the Concession Street streetscape design into the park design? (e.g. design of the multi-use path along Concession Street)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Yes" /> <img src="image" alt="No" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
### "Barrier Free Design - Social" Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social inclusiveness? (e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups? (e.g. negative uses or users do not dominate the space)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for all abilities and ages?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide activities for different times of the day/year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide free/no cost access?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. Parking is limited to 2 hours, if exceeded penalty fee is required.
2. Option 3 is the only concept that proposes amenities for all ages with the inclusion of a Children’s Garden. Though, there is the potential to include this feature in any option.
### “Barrier Free Design - Physical” Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize circulation barriers? (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternate paths to key park features? (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate principles of the Urban Braille system?*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments

* Only include if Urban Braille system is utilized or planned to be on Concession Street.
## "Traffic & Mobility" Concept Design Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Design Concept...</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebalance the mobility focus? (e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve vehicle access to the park? (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up*)</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience and minimize conflicts with vehicular traffic? (e.g. crossing streets, visual separate)</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at the Jolley Cut/Concession St.? (e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for the continuous operation of the Concession Street/ Jolley Cut intersection during construction?</td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="red.png" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="green.png" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

1. Drop-off and pick-up areas have not been included but have the potential to be in any concept.
## Concept Design Evaluation - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation &amp; Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape &amp; Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier Free Design - Social</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier Free Design - Physical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total “Yes”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 “Quick Fix”</th>
<th>Option 2 “Bypass Link”</th>
<th>Option 3 “Enhancement”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent to:</th>
<th>John Vandriel, Landscape Architecture Services, City of Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca">Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>July 02, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Jana Joyce, The MBTW Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose:</td>
<td>Outline of Discarded Intersection Options at Jolley Cut and Concession Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc:</td>
<td>Steve Crossey, BA Group / <a href="mailto:Krossey@bagroup.com">Krossey@bagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammad Bari, BA Group / <a href="mailto:bari@bagroup.com">bari@bagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Summary

The MBTW Group has been retained by the City of Hamilton to prepare a Master Plan for Sam Lawrence Park. Included within MBTW’s consulting team is the BA Group, who are responsible for preparing options for the Jolley Cut / Concession Street Intersection reconfiguration. On Friday May 3, 2019, The BA Group hosted a Webex meeting to present a series of intersection options to the City of Hamilton staff and project team. A total of four options were presented and discussed.

Please refer to the May 23, 2019 meeting minutes for more information on the above.

In preparation for May 23 meeting, The MBTW/BA Group team did explore a series of other options that were not presented at the May 23 meeting. To complete the documentation/decision making process, a memo from the MBTW/BA team was requested to outline the other options and to provide the rationale as to why they were not pursued further. This memo and associated attachments provide the noted outline.

2.0 Discarded Intersection Options

The following is a summary of the series of options developed by the MBTW/BA team that were discarded / not presented at the May 23 meeting – refer to Memo Attachments for full option explanation.

- Option 1A – Roundabout (Attachment A)
- Option 1B – Roundabout (Attachment B)
- Option 3 - Addition of Dual Left Turn Lane (Attachment C)
- Option 5 – Re-Aligned Intersection with Removal of West Leg (Portion of Concession Street) (Attachment D)
- Option 7 – Re-Aligned Intersection with Two Separate T-Intersections (Attachment E)

END OF MEMO
MEMO
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Attachments
NOTE:
- FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
- NOT A FULL FUNCTIONAL PLAN
- FEASIBILITY OF ROUNDABOUT FURTHER REQUIRED

Reas ons for Discard of Option:
- Does not improve pedestrian and cycling circulation through intersections - makes circulation more difficult.
- Requires a minimum outside diameter of 60m to accommodate 2 lanes and articulated bus traffic.
- Requires a 2 lane roundabout which increases the footprint of traffic infrastructure - takes land away from park.
- Transit stop locations will require reassessment.
- Significant disruption anticipated during construction.
- Significant costs related to regrading, retaining walls, depth disturbance to cap-rock, etc to provide level plateau and approaches.
- Option to connect Vila and East 11th to Concession or dead-end to simplify intersections.

July 02, 2019 Memo
ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOTE:
- FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
- NOT A FULL FUNCTIONAL PLAN
- FEASIBILITY OF ROUNDBOUGHT FURTHER REQUIRED

Reasons for Discard of Option:
- Does not improve pedestrian and cycling circulation through intersections - makes circulation more difficult.
- Creates a five-leg roundabout which is not an ideal roundabout configuration.
- Requires a minimum outside diameter of 60m to accommodate 2 lanes and articulated bus traffic.
- Requires a 2 lane roundabout which increases the footprint of traffic infrastructure - takes land away from park.
- Transit stop locations will require re-assessment.
- Property acquisition may be required south of Concession to properly align two south legs of intersection.
- Significant disruption anticipated during construction.
- Significant costs related to regrading, retaining walls, depth/disturbance to caprock etc. to provide level plateau and approaches.
- Option to connect Vola and East 11th to circle or deadend to simplify intersections.

Date Plotted: June 25, 2019     Filename: J:\6697-02\BA\Functional Design\2019\6-June 25-19\BA-SAM LAWRENCE-FD-R06-6697-02.dwg

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION
PURPOSES ONLY
Reasons for Discard of Option:

- Addition of dual left turn lanes on the north side of the intersection would require road widening on the south side of concession to align north-south lanes.
- Would require private property acquisition on the east side of Upper Wellington.
- Signal timing and queuing would have to be carefully studied to function does not decrease from existing conditions.
ATTACHMENT D

July 02, 2019 Memo

Reasons for Discard of Option:
- Intersection re-aligned and configured into a T-Intersection.
- Removes segment of vehicular movement between Upper Wellington and Vola Ct.
- Removes Jug-Handle.
- East 11th Street very close to new signalized intersection - north bound left turn movements compromised.

Appendix "C" to Report PW18056(a)
Reasons for Discard of Option:

- Intersection re-aligned and configured into a T-Intersection.
- West leg of intersection re-aligned to create separate T-Intersection which would be stop controlled. East bound left turns onto Jolley Cut would be compromised during periods of high volume.
- East 11th Street very close to new signalized intersection - north bound, left turn movement is compromised.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent to:</th>
<th>John Vandriel, Landscape Architecture Services, City of Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca">Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>July 08, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Jana Joyce, The MBTW Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose:</td>
<td>Outline of Intersection Options at Jolley Cut and Concession Street – to Carry Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc:</td>
<td>Steve Crossey, BA Group / <a href="mailto:Krossey@bagroup.com">Krossey@bagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammad Bari, BA Group / <a href="mailto:bari@bagroup.com">bari@bagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Summary

The MBTW Group has been retained by the City of Hamilton to prepare a Master Plan for Sam Lawrence Park. Included within MBTW’s consulting team is the BA Group, who are responsible for preparing options for the Jolley Cut / Concession Street intersection reconfiguration. On Friday May 3, 2019, the BA Group hosted a Webex meeting to present a series of intersection options to the City of Hamilton staff and project team. A total of four options were presented and discussed.

Please also refer to the May 23, 2019 meeting minutes for more information on the above.

To complete the documentation/decision making process, a memo from the MBTW/BA team was requested to outline the options that were considered to have merit for carrying forward in the master plan study. This memo and associated attachments provide the noted outline.

2.0 Intersection Options to Carry Forward

The following is a summary of the options developed by the MBTW/BA team that were recommended for consideration at the May 23 meeting – refer to Memo Attachments for option drawings.

- “The Quick Fix” Option (Attachment A)
- “Squeezed Jug Handle Option (Attachment B)

END OF MEMO
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Attachments
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jana Joyce, Mandy Cadger – MBTW Group
FROM: David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.
DATE: 11 July 2019
PROJECT: Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
PROJECT NO: 190155

RE: Condition Assessment of Guards in Sam Lawrence Park

Blackwell was retained to provide a condition assessment of the guards throughout the Sam Lawrence Park located at 255 Concession Street in Hamilton Ontario. Our detailed findings are outlined in our Site Investigation Report and a brief overall summary is provided herein.

In general, the existing stone walls throughout the park are in good condition and we are of the opinion that they do not pose any structural concern at this time. Improvements to the existing stone walls may be undertaken to enhance the overall visual appearance. Such means could include for example the repointing of mortar joints and replacing broken or missing stones.

Similarly, the steel guards are typically in good condition and only exhibit minor signs of surface rusting and are not of structural concern at this time. One area at the approximate middle of the park on a middle-tiered pathway exhibited significant deformation which is a result of regression in the escarpment. This pathway should either be modified to accommodate the escarpment movement or the guard replaced with a similar system. Furthermore, minor remedial work including reinstatement of anchor bolts, reattachment of broken top rails and replacement of a few corroded elements should be completed. The reader is referred to the Site Investigation Report prepared by Blackwell and dated 11 July, 2019 for additional information.

We trust that this is suitable for your current needs. Should you have any questions, feel free to contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.

Blackwell
Site Investigation Report

TO: Jana Joyce, Mandy Cadger - MBTW Group
FROM: David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.
DATE: 11 July 2019
PROJECT: Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
PROJECT NO: 190155

RE: Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan Site Investigation

At the request of Jana Joyce, we visited the Sam Lawrence Park located at 255 Concession Street, Hamilton, Ontario on June 7, 2019 to review the existing guards and stone walls throughout the park. Our findings are as follows:

Observations:

Our site investigation report is divided into 5 separate segments to discuss the various types and locations of guards throughout the park. A plan view of the specific areas is attached at the end of this report for reference.

1. Stone Walls at the West Parking Lot Entrance
   a. The stone wall at the west parking lot entrance runs the full length of the parking area and serves as a barrier from the adjacent sloped topography.
   b. Overall, the existing wall is in a good-to-fair condition. Deterioration and spalling of mortar joints was observed in many areas throughout.
   c. It was observed that some areas of the existing stone walls have been repaired/repointed at some point in the past.

Photo 1.1: View of the existing stone wall at the west parking lot entrance

Photo 1.2: Visible deterioration and spalling of mortar joints
Photo 1.3: Top segment of stone wall exhibiting deteriorated mortar joints

Photo 1.4: Top of stone wall exhibiting signs of deteriorated mortar joints

Photo 1.5: Existing stone wall which has been repaired/repointed

Photo 1.6: Existing stone wall which has been repaired/repointed (left side) adjacent to a section of wall which has not been repaired (right side)
2. Steel Guardrails with Stone piers
   a. The steel guardrails and stone piers begin at the west end of the park and extend to about the mid-point and serve as separation between the walking path and sloped escarpment below.
   b. The steel guards span between the stone piers and are supported on concrete piers below. The rails of the guard are embedded into the stone piers at each end.
   c. The stone piers throughout are in good condition exhibiting minor to no signs of mortar joint deterioration and spalling.
   d. The steel guards are generally in good condition with only a few areas exhibiting minor signs of surface rusting and corrosion.
   e. The inner splice tube for the top rail was observed to be missing and/or broken at one location. Refer to photo 2.3 for additional information.
   f. Anchor bolts used to connect the steel guardrail to the concrete piers were missing at a few locations. Refer to the photo 2.4 for additional information.
Photo 2.3: Inner splice tube for the top rail connection is broken/missing, mid rail is still connected.

Photo 2.4: Anchor bolt missing from the base of the railing to concrete pier connection
3. **Steel Guardrails**

   a. The existing steel guardrails are located throughout the central section of the park along a middle tier of the walking trail.

   b. The guardrails are on concrete piers.

   c. Overall, the steel guardrail is in good condition with only minor visible signs of surface rusting.

   d. One area was observed to have sustained damage. Based on our review of supplemental geotechnical reports and our site observations, it appears that the regression in the escarpment resulted in a severe displacement and permanent deformation to the guard. Refer to Photos 3.2 through 3.4. Temporary fencing has been erected in the area to restrict access to the damaged guardrail.
4. **Steel Pipe with Stone Piers**

   a. A small section of existing guards in the northeast area of the park are constructed using (3) – steel tubes which are embedded into stone piers.

   b. The existing stone piers are in good condition exhibiting minimal to no signs of deterioration, delamination or cracking.

   c. Minor surface rusting and corrosion is visible on the existing steel pipes.

   d. One location was noted to have excess corrosion resulting in the steel pipe being loose from the stone pier (reference photo 4.2).
5. **Stone Walls**
   
a. Stone walls are present throughout the park. Although the overall style and appearance vary slightly, they have been constructed using similar materials and methods. Refer to the park plan drawings for additional information for the location of the stone walls.

b. Overall, the existing stone walls are in good condition. Little to no spalling or deterioration was observed in mortar joints.

c. There were a few locations where split or missing stones were observed.

d. Refer to photos 5.1 through 5.8 for additional information.
Conclusions / Recommendations:

1. Stone Wall at West Parking Lot Entrance
   a. There are currently no structural concerns regarding the condition of the existing stone walls at the west parking lot entrance.
   b. If an increased visual appearance is desired, the stone wall can be repointed in a similar fashion to what was done to select areas in the past. Refer to photos 1.5 and 1.6 for repointing which was previously completed.
2. **Steel Guardrails with Stone Piers**
   a. The missing anchor bolts should be replaced/reinstated.
   b. The broken inner splice tube should be reinstated or the top rails adequately fastened together to ensure continuity of the top rail of the guard.
   c. The remainder of the steel guardrails with stone piers are in good condition and do not exhibit any structural concerns at this time.
   d. The missing stone cap can be reinstated if an overall increased visual appearance is desired.

3. **Steel Guardrails**
   a. The damaged area of existing steel guardrails should be removed and replaced with a similar guard system or the walkway modified such that further deformation is mitigated in the short term. It is important to note that as the escarpment continues to regress, this likely occur again in the future.
   b. The remainder of the steel guardrails are in good condition and exhibit no structural concerns at this time.

4. **Steel Pipe with Stone Piers**
   a. The one steel pipe that has experienced excess corrosion and is loose from the stone pier should be repaired or replaced to mitigate any further deterioration.
   b. The remainder of the guard does not exhibit any structural concerns.

5. **Stone Walls**
   a. The existing stone walls throughout the park are in good condition and do not exhibit any structural concerns at this time.
   b. A few localized areas of deteriorated mortar joints or split/missing stones were found and could be repointed if an improved visual appearance is desired.

We trust that this is suitable for your current needs. Please contact our office with any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,

David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.

Blackwell
ARKLEDUN AVE
JOLLEY CUT
CLAREMONT ACCESS
CONCESSION ST

MASONRY WALLS TO BE DECOMMISSIONED
MASONRY WALLS TO BE INSPECTED
GUARDRAILS WITH MASONRY COLUMNS TO BE INSPECTED
GUARDRAILS TO BE INSPECTED

Steel Guardrails with Stone Piers
Stone Walls at West Parking Lot
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Jana Joyce, Mandy Cadger – MBTW Group
FROM: David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.
DATE: 12 July 2019
PROJECT: Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
PROJECT NO: 190155

RE: Proposed Pedestrian Bridge over the Jolley Cut

We understand that a pedestrian bridge is being proposed to link the two segments of the Sam Lawrence Park in Hamilton Ontario. The proposed bridge is to span over the south end of the Jolley Cut and provide access to the elevated main tier of the Sam Lawrence Park from the parking area located off Concession Street between E 12th and 13th streets.

Blackwell was provided with a series of reports, studies and assessments of the Jolley Cut. These reports were prepared by geotechnical engineers with a primary objective in outlining the geological makeup of the escarpment, stability and to evaluate various events which occurred – rock falls for example. Most of the information within these reports is limited to the northern edge of the Sam Lawrence Park (north section of the Jolley Cut) where regression of the escarpment seems to be more of a concern. There has however also been some minor investigation and analysis on the southern section of the Jolley Cut which forms the basis of our review and recommendations for the proposed pedestrian bridge.

Based on our review of the existing geotechnical assessments, we are of the opinion that a pedestrian bridge is feasible to span across the existing Jolley Cut in the proposed location. The existing borehole information (reference Borehole No. 10 from Peto MacCallum Ltd. Report number PML-09HF065 dated 5 April 2010) indicates bedrock to be approximately 600 mm below the top of road surface in this area. Moreover, based on the reports, studies and assessments provided for our review, the regression of the escarpment appears to predominately be occurring on the northern edge of the Jolley Cut where a series of retaining and bin walls are located, rather than the southern portion.

The overall span of a pedestrian bridge would need to be on the order of approximately 55-60 m. As such it is recommended that the pedestrian bridge be segmented into 3 separate spans. Two isolated piers could be located between the rockface of the cut and the northern/southern limits of the roadway shoulder. Abutments would be located at the existing parking lot and the current grassed area of the upper tier of the park. Based on the reports provided, the two piers located within the cut would likely be on sound competent limestone bedrock material. It is believed
that rock anchors, drilled concrete caissons or some combination thereof would be required at the abutments to ensure adequate bearing and overall stability of the bridge is achieved.

We would recommend that additional geotechnical investigations, studies and testing be conducted in the direct area of the proposed bridge. These studies should include at minimum the advancement of new boreholes both in the Jolley Cut and the proposed locations of the northern and southern abutments. Likewise, a more detailed study, analysis of the rock formations and overall escarpment stability for this southern section of the Jolley Cut should be completed by an experienced geotechnical engineer. This will assist in better understanding of potential risks currently unknown based on the information available.

We trust that this is suitable for your current needs. Should you have any questions, feel free to contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

David M. Vrljic, P.Eng.

Blackwell
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1.0 Authorization

Authorization to proceed with this investigation was received via a signed Purchase Order, P.O. ID. 92724, from the City of Hamilton (“City”) on September 30, 2019. The scope of services authorized were as per the Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, a division of Wood Canada Limited (“Wood”) proposal PSCB197695, dated September 13, 2019 which was prepared in response to the City’s Request for Quotation (RFQ) dated September 6, 2019.

2.0 Introduction

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, a Division of Wood Canada Limited (‘Wood’) has been retained by The City of Hamilton (City) to conduct a Geotechnical Feasibility Study at Sam Lawrence Park (SLP) in support of a proposed Master Plan for the park improvement and expansion.

Sam Lawrence Park is a 7.5 hectare City park. The park is bounded by Concession Street on the south side and the Niagara Escarpment to the north, surrounding the Jolley Cut access. The context map of the project area along with an aerial overview supplied by City are provided in Appendix A, Figures A1/7 and A2/7.

A Master Plan is currently under development for SLP. The following design elements are being proposed as part of the park master plan alternative design concepts:

- Upgrading the pathway network, including:
  - Integration of a potential multi-use trail through the site;
  - Addition of universal accessibility measures such as ramps, switchbacks;
  - Assessing the lower escarpment walkway, and possibly decommissioning it in future years.

- Reconfiguration (and potential relocation) of the west parking lot;

- Shifting the existing east parking lot and existing park pavilion westward;

- Addition of a new park maintenance building, potentially close to Concession Street. The new building may include washroom facilities;

- The potential reconfiguration of the Jolley Cut / Concession Street intersection.

The City’s request includes a desktop study of the available relevant information to determine the geotechnical feasibility of the preliminary concepts listed above (and also shown on Figure A4/7 in Appendix A, excerpted from the RFQ) augmented with a site reconnaissance by Wood’s engineering staff and recommendations for further investigations that may be required to implement the proposed works.

The most recent Google site plan and main rock slope side views are included in Appendix A on Figures A5/7 to A7/7.
3.0 Review of Background Information

The following background information was reviewed for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peto MacCallum Ltd. 2010, Geotechnical Investigation Jolley Cut, Hamilton Ontario, Ref. 09HF065, Rep.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peto MacCallum Ltd. 2016, Geotechnical Consultations Sam Lawrence Park-Concession Street, Hamilton Ontario, Ref. 16HF006, Rep.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of select information considered relevant to the current feasibility study is provided below from each of the quoted references.

Reference #1. AMEC Earth and Environmental 2010

The report presents the results of a visual inspection of a total of 3,056.15 m of retaking walls in the City of Hamilton, including the bin walls along the Claremont Access and Jolley Cut (Appendix B, Figure B1/37). It is noted that the base plans of the walls are identical with those used in a previous investigation (Reference #8 Philips Engineering 2004) which is useful for the assessment of changes which may have occurred between the two inspections.

The report describes the structural deteriorations observed and provides suggestions for rehabilitation along with the associated cost estimates (Appendix B, Figures B1/37 through B6/37).
Reference #2. AMEC Earth and Environmental 2012
The report presents a review of the Claremont Access bin walls that experienced a sudden collapse on February 22, 2012 around 2:30 pm. This collapse included the entire upper wall section and approximately 60% (top part) of the lower section. A total width of 8 panels (80 feet – 24.4 m) was affected by this collapse (Appendix B, Figures B7/37 and B8/37). Of note, the previous inspections in 2004 (Reference #8) and 2010 (Reference #1) did not indicate wall distress in the area of the collapse (around Sta. 140) with the exception that in 2010 the wall face was covered by vegetation while the 2004 inspection does not mention the presence of vegetation in the failure area.

A review of the balance of the remaining bin walls was determined to be consistent with the findings in 2010 along Claremont Access. A reiteration of the areas with severe distress was provided.

Recommendations for temporary safety measures for the traffic are provided (jersey barriers, rock mesh protection, etc.)

Reference #3. Blackwell Structural Engineers, 2019
The report presents some observations made by the authors during a site visit on June 7, 2019 with the purpose of reviewing the existing steel guards (or handrails) and stone walls (or parapets). Select photographs are provided along with a site trail map outlining the inspected guardrails and some walls and piers. For convenience, the map of inspected trails is provided in Appendix B, on Figure B9/37. The authors conclude that “In general, the existing stone walls throughout the park are in good condition and we are of the opinion that they do not pose any structural concern at this time”.

With respect to the above statement regarding the condition of the stone parapets, according to the wall layout plan a portion of those walls along the lower trail were not included in the scope of the inspection. It is noteworthy that during Wood’s site reconnaissance on September 26, 2019 it was identified that some of the “stone walls” are also acting as retaining walls and some of them show an advanced level of deterioration and tilting (more details in Appendix C, Photos 26, 29,30, 32, 33 and 36– Site Reconnaissance Survey”).

In relation with the proposed pedestrian bridge over the Jolley Cut, the memorandum of July 12, 2019 indicates the study was based on investigations by others and concludes that: “The overall span of a pedestrian bridge would need to be on the order of approximately 55-60 m. As such it is recommended that the pedestrian bridge be segmented into 3 separate spans.” And further: “Based on the reports provided, the two piers located within the cut would likely be on sound competent limestone bedrock material. It is believed that rock anchors, drilled concrete caissons or some combination thereof would be required at the abutments to ensure adequate bearing and overall stability of the bridge is achieved”.

Reference #4. Golder Associates 2017
The scope of the report covers a stability and condition assessment of the rock slopes and retaining structures within an approximately 900 m long section of Claremont Access. Only the eastern half of this entire section of slopes and walls form the north border along the west half of the SLP (Appendix B, Figure B10/30).

The work was based on a desktop review augmented with a visual inspection in September and November 2016.
Apparently, all the steel facing walls were built in late 1960's. The steel bin walls were built later but the construction date is not known. A detailed description of the structural arrangement of the walls and rock preparation behind the wall is provided based on a review of the available construction drawings. The walls are tied back into the rock walls by slightly (10°) dipping #10 (32 mm), 2.4 m to 3.0 m long anchors spaced at 1.2 m distances. However, in consideration of the facing thickness and gap to the bedrock, the anchor embedment would be at the most 1.8 m, but more often as little as 0.5 m beyond the face of the rock. An archive photograph during walls construction in 1968 is provided in Appendix B on Figure B10/37.

The bin walls have a similar structural arrangement as the steel facing walls, however they are designed as gravity structures backfilled with several types of materials, imported and native.

The report lists additional wall failures occurred after the February 2012 described in Reference #2 above, sometime between March 2012 and May 2015.

Rock slope stability is not considered to be a concern from the standpoint of a global instability. However local/shallow raveling from erosion and weathering is an ongoing / active process with a risk rating from low to very high in terms of combined probability of occurrence and consequences of such failures.

Recommendations for mitigation of the risks in areas of the walls and exposed slopes are provided, including wall rehabilitation with more durable alternatives and options to mitigate the risks with the rock slopes by different strategies such as rockfall hazard avoidance, slope/rockfall stabilization, rockfall protection measures.

Regular inspections, monitoring and maintenance are components inherently associated with areas of public activity located within region characterized by natural slope hazards.


The report presents an assessment of several rock slopes within the City of Hamilton transportation corridors, including Claremont Access and Jolley Cut. The assessment was based on visual inspection augmented with a review of subsurface information where available. No subsurface logs are included in the SLP area.

For the sections of the Claremont Access and Jolley Cut, the report states:
- No significant distress in the escarpment slopes along Claremont Access, but severely oxidized and deteriorated bin walls.
- Severe rock fall and pavement distress on Jolley Cut
- Recommendation for ongoing maintenance of ditches and pavement, examination of the structural integrity of the retaining structures and program to monitor the ongoing performance of the exposed rock slopes

Reference #6. Peto MacCallum Ltd. 2010, Geotechnical Investigation Jolley Cut, Hamilton Ontario, Ref. 09HF065, Rep.1

The report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation to support the preliminary design of the maintenance works planned to improve the long-term performance of the rock slope in the upper section of Arkledun and along Jolley Cut. The objectives of the study included:
• Evaluation of the rock slope condition and recommendations to minimize rock falls
• Recommendations to minimize further degradation of the exposed rock slope along the south side of the Arkledun / Jolley Cut road (slope side along the north and east of SLP)
• Determine the depth to and quality of the bedrock near the north face of the bin wall
• Evaluation of the pavement distress in the uphill lane near the top of road (east and south border of SLP)
• Investigate the subsurface conditions below the blocked catch basin (CB) on the north side of the road about 225 m east (uphill) of the bridge abutment (CB at the north edge of Arkledun Ave. – distance measured from the north abutment of the Claremont Access overpass)
• Provide engineering recommendations to minimize degradation and lateral regression of a short section of the rock slope adjacent to the footing that supports the road platform retaining wall near the blocked catch basin.

The investigation included a visual site reconnaissance survey carried out in November 13, 2009 and 16 sampled boreholes (10 boreholes drilled in November 2009 and six (6) boreholes in March 2010). All boreholes were located within the north and south edges of the pavement along Arkledun Ave. and Jolley Cut (Appendix B, Figure B14/37). Select photographs of the exposed rock slopes along the south and west edge of Jolley Cut taken in 2010 are reproduced in Appendix B15/35 to 20/37.

As expected for the area of the roadway located within the escarpment slope, the majority of the boreholes encountered shallow bedrock covered by pavement materials. At a few locations the pavement structure was placed over approximately 2 m to 4 m of well compacted backfill. At one location only, near the east abutment of the bridge on Arkledun (Claremont overpass) one borehole (BH 101) encountered a deposit of stiff clayey till intermixed with red shale slabs.

Short-term groundwater was observed in two boreholes at the elevations of 160.5m and 162.4 m.

The report concludes:

• Rock slope along the north border of the SLP would experience ongoing regression at an estimated rate of 50 to 100 mm per year for about next 50 years until a “stable” inclination of about 1 Horizontal to 1 Vertical (1H:1V) is achieved.
• The above regression may be controlled by the implementation of various alternatives of stabilization such as series of retaining walls, retained soil systems, promotion of vegetation, etc.
• The selected stabilization measures should account for an estimated depth of weathering penetration of to 2.0 to 2.5 m behind the exposed rock face.
• Rock slope along the curved section of Jolley Cut containing an increased proportion of more competent limestone/dolostone layers would downgrade in a lower extent but the rockfall would continue due to the faster weathering of the weaker interlayers of shale and loosening / undermining the stronger layers. A face scaling by removal of the resulting rock overhangs and face back slopping to “0.2V:1H” (likely a typographic error and the authors meant 0.2H:1V) or flatter is recommended.
• Geotechnical design recommendations are provided for a potential “soldier pile and lagging” type of retaining structure that was considered at that time to be placed in front (north side) of the deteriorated bin walls existing along a portion of the SPL north rock slope.
• Conceptual recommendations for the protection of the rock slope at the north edge of Arkledun Road.
Inspection at the blocked CB suggested that significant groundwater seepage occurred through the fill below the basin and below the sewer with potential for settlement and loss of solids (soil piping).

Pavement distress within the lower portion of Jolley Cut would be caused by inadequate subdrainage combined with the aging of the pavement surface.

Reference #7. Peto MacCallum Ltd. 2016, Geotechnical Consultations Sam Lawrence Park-Concession Street, Hamilton Ontario, Ref. 16HF006, Rep. 1

In relation with the City’s safety concerns associated with a failure that occurred along a section of the middle escarpment pathway (trail) manifested by loose and falling rocks, downslope bowing of the handrails and cracking and distress of the trail pavement, the scope of the investigation included a literature review, a site reconnaissance survey and assessment for further investigation.

The report references three of the older Peto MacCallum investigation reports one of them being Ref#6 discussed above plus the following two documents not available to us at this time:

- Geological Assessment of Terrain Features for Hamilton Mountain Stability Investigation, PML Ref.: 62116, dated September 20, 1962
- Geotechnical Consultation, Sam Lawrence Park, Concession Street, Hamilton, Ontario, PML Ref.: 08HF042, Report: 1, dated June 17, 2008

The report quotes from the Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines information about an historic 7 m deep limestone and sandstone quarry in an area near SLP.

A review of various historic aerial photographs starting with 1934 are provided and for convenience are included in Appendix B, Figures B21/37 to B25/37 of this report. The authors overlapped the main trail network on these photographs identifying potential “hot spots” related to unusual subsurface conditions due to historical activity at the site. These historic photos were used to identify the former access to the plateau area before the Arkledun and Jolley Cut were built, after 1950 (Appendix A, Figure A5/7).

Two photos at the failed middle pathway were extracted from the report and included in Appendix B, Figure B26/37.

A list of the observed middle trail failure and distress is provided in the report.

The engineering discussion addresses some of the potential causes for trail failure, such as:

- Increased water infiltrations from deficient storm drainage and irrigation of the flower gardens
- Natural regression of the steep exposed rock slopes
- Instability of the residual overburden (where present) on top of steep rock slopes.

Recommendations to address the concern include:

- Realignment of the middle trail
- Improvement to the site drainage
- Reconstruction of the retaining walls and handrails
- Recommendations for periodic inspections (annually) and maintenance, including rock scaling as required
- Consideration of an option of trail closing to public access with regrading and vegetating
In the case the middle escarpment pathway is to be repaired and upgraded, recommendations are provided for further field investigation, including:

- Detailed survey with accurate 3D rendering
- Borehole investigation program


The report presents results of visual inspections carried out in 2000 and 2004 of several retaining walls in Hamilton area totaling 2,791.8 m in length, including two walls along Claremont Access and Jolley Cut for a total length of 1,204 m (Appendix B, Figure B27/37). The inspection revealed various degrees of deteriorations from light rusting to major structural failures. A mapping of the observed wall deteriorations is included in Appendix B, Figures 28/37 to 32/37.

A recommendation to replace the metallic bin walls with a more durable and cost effective system was made.


The investigation and assessment were directed on the rock slopes and retaining walls along the Claremont Access, as illustrated on Figure B33/37 in Appendix B. The identification of the walls is according to a previous investigation by Golder Associates (Reference # 4 above). The focus of the investigation was on Walls 3 and 4 considered to have the highest priority. However, the investigation area covered in the program was confined to about 1.6 ha in the west portion of the SLP between the exit ramp off Jolley Cut to Concession St and the west end of the park (Appendix B, Figure B34/37).

A geological brief at the site indicated that the cap rock layer (Lockport Formation) may have been largely removed in the area of the park by the historical quarry (photo from 1890 included in Appendix B Figure B37/37) and construction of the Jolley Cut in late 1950 so that the only exposed rock faces would correspond to the Clinton - Cataract Group. A representative geologic section was provided in the referenced report and is included in Appendix B along with supplemental annotations (in red) to facilitate further engineering observations on rock slope stability.

The report lists several events in 2010 and 2012 reviewed and / or supervised by Amec E&IS (a predecessor of Wood) as follows:

- Repair of anchors at 79 posts locations and repair of 12 bulges (Walls #4B, #4A, and #4)
- Part of Wall #4B was under construction for replacement during this time (2010);
- Replace anchor bearing plates and install erosion control measures (Walls #3B and 3A);
- Remove yard waste being thrown from above (Wall #1); and
- Replace damaged guiderail & lower panels (Walls #2 and #2A)
- Review of February 2012 "collapse" (presumably portions of retaining Wall#3 and Wall#4) and recommendations for scaling of loose rock, installation of rockfall protection fencing and temporary jersey barriers.
The report relates Golder Associated findings in 2017 (Ref#4) with respect to additional failures and their risk ranking in the following decreasing order:

- Wall failures
- Slope / Bench Failures
- Rockfall

For the limited study area (about 1.6 ha) of the SLP, the report identifies two main points of surface drainage S1 and S2 (Appendix B, Figure B34/37) where the runoff would converge prior to discharge directly on to the escarpment. The report identifies these two points with the locations where the wall panel in Walls 3 and 4 have been removed following the previous failures (“collapse”).

Two boreholes, approximately 40 m deep and each paired with a shallow borehole, were advanced at the locations shown in Appendix B on Figure B34/37. The boreholes encountered up to 5 m of fill underlain by bedrock.

A detailed geological logging of the rock samples was provided and a conceptual geological profile was developed (Appendix B, Figure B35/37).

A rock hazard assessment was conducted based on a matrix of rock face properties (such as rock formation and strength, bedding, bedrock face slope, vegetation, scree material and potential of failure) gaged from visual inspections of the exposed rock slopes in December 2018 and May 2019 that revealed several minor failures along Claremont Access with the rockfall and scree that managed to pass through or by the protective fences and jersey barriers. The results of the hazard assessment were summarized in a risk table developed for the Claremont Access face only where there were identified four (4) zone types of rock formations with potential and severity of failures increasing from Type I to Type IV as follows:

- Zone Type I - Little risk to the roadway
- Zone Type II-III – Low to high potential of rock failure / rockfall but low-to-moderate impact on the roadway.
- Zone Type IV- The most hazardous area with high impact on roadway prone to falling of large slabs and boulder size rockfalls from stronger rock cap undercut by weaker shales.

The hydrogeological component of the study included:

- Monitoring of the drilling water (temperatures, rates of injection, rates of head fluctuations)
- Packer testing with constant and falling head
- Long-term well monitoring
- Survey of surface and groundwater discharge locations along the Claremont Access slopes at various periods in the year (dry-late fall, mid-winter, dry spring and wet post-freshet spring).
- Hydrogeological monitoring (Appendix B, Figure B36/37) or the groundwater table.

Some selected conclusions and recommendations:

- Rock support strategies (such as reinforced shotcrete with bolted wire meshes) are necessary primarily of the friable Grimsby and Cabot Head formations that are susceptible to freeze-thaw cycles
- Overlying Thorold and above formations may require bolted meshes without shotcreting
Most of runoff is directed to the ridge favoring erosion and regression and should be controlled.

4.0 Site Reconnaissance

A site reconnaissance survey was conducted by the author on September 26, 2019. The reconnaissance began with an overview presentation of the project and site tour guided by the City representative. Following the tour, a more in-depth visual survey was carried out along the lower and middle escarpment pathways/trails.

The weather during the survey was sunny, about 18°C. Light rainy weather occurred the night before the visit.

Appendix C presents a commented photographic record of the site visit along with the approximate mapping of the locations of the photos.

5.0 General Subsurface Conditions within the SLP Area

Except for the two boreholes completed early in 2019 as part of the Wood 2019 investigation, there is no other site specific subsurface information provided in the available background information discussed above. Nevertheless, the site morphology and its arrangement along the top of the escarpment ridge suggest that the site is underlain by bedrock covered by relatively shallow overburden (up to a few meters thick) consisting mostly of fills and little, if any, residual and minor colluvial deposits from the parent bedrock.

In some areas, such as the slope supporting the main west parking lot (Appendix C Photos 9 through 12 and 14), the fill may have been engineered to a certain extent (e.g., controlled material placed in a controlled manner and compacted). There could also be areas of uncontrolled backfilling, such as within portions of the suspected historical quarry (Appendix B Figure B37/37) that has been reported to have been located in the bowl-shaped area (Appendix C Photo 17) east of the west parking and within all the “brown” areas of the site as observed on the historic aerial photographs (Appendix B, Figures B17/37 thru B21/37). The uncontrolled fills may contain rubble, waste, and other foreign materials.

The hydrogeological study (Reference #9) suggests the shallowest groundwater table would fluctuate around the elevation of 179 m (Appendix B, Figure B32/37). Since the majority of the park area lies above elevation 182 m, groundwater control is not expected to be a significant concern for shallow temporary construction excavations. An exception is at the very north-east corner of the property where the ground slopes down below the elevation of 180 m around the outside edge of Jolley Cut junction with Arkledun Ave. Intermittent groundwater seepage in the form of springs or ponding may be an issue in this area.

According to the geological logging, the near surface bedrock may consist of a relatively strong Lockport deposit with an upper Ancaster member of thinly bedded and fractured dolomite underlain by an even stronger Gasport Formation of thicker bedded and less fractured Gasport Member of dark-blues medium-to-coarse grained dolostone. However, within the northern half of the SLP plateau most of this stronger rock cap had been removed by human activity (or via a natural erosion such as plucking by glaciers) exposing the lower and weaker Decew argillaceous dolostone or even weaker Rochester shale. Based on the very limited number of boreholes in the park area, the surface of the bedrock is assumed to be around the elevations of 188 m to 189 m (Appendix B, Figure B31/37). The upmost two boreholes B9 and B10 at the upper portion of the Jolley Cut curve (Reference #6 and Appendix B, Figure B10/37) are located within a rock cut at the elevations of 180 m and 183 m.
The “weakness” rating mentioned above relates more with the intrinsic strength of the rock mass and its resistance to erosion and weathering when exposed to elements. However, for foundation support of regular structures (such as maintenance buildings, kiosks, observation decks, and even light bridges, etc.) any of the above rock materials will provide suitable foundation conditions in terms of bearing capacities and settlements.

### 6.0 Buffer / Setback Zones

Buffer or setback zones from the existing edge of the escarpment / ridge will depend on several factors:

- **a)** Actual stratification
- **b)** Actual condition of the existing rock slope protection against its natural regression
- **c)** Intended strategy and methods of rehabilitation, and / or upgrading, and / or expanding of the rock slope protection
- **d)** Intended type of development (nature, loading size, drainage management, etc.) at the top of ridge.
- **e)** Nature of the specific hazards anticipated at this project
- **f)** Applicable bylaws

Items a) through c) above pertain mainly to mechanics of failures and the engineering design to ensure stable slope. Item d) combines aspects of slope engineering with regulatory provisions, while Items e) and f) are mostly regulatory in nature.

The background information documents numerous past and active occurrences of rock slope instability, primarily limited to shallow / localized failures leading to a persistent ridge regression. The existing rock fall protection system has been constructed to control rock fall hazards in the area, and does not address deep seated global stability. The existing rock slope protection system appears to be in an advanced stage of deterioration, requiring on-going repairs and maintenance.

In the absence of a comprehensive engineering investigation and analysis local guidelines for the setback may be considered. We are not aware if the Hamilton Conservation Authority has developed their own guidelines in this respect. Other jurisdictions, such as the Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVC) has developed the guideline below (Fig. 6.1) for the determination of the setbacks.
Fig. 6.1 Regulatory Setbacks for Slope Instability Hazards
From a cursory assessment of the CVC guidelines, it seems that the buffer zone requirement would restrict the development of a large area of the park. Even if the toe of the slope is considered to be at the south edge of the Arkledun Ave, which is not the actual physical toe since the rock slope continues down for tens of meters below the road surface (probably down to the switch back curve of Sherman Access and East Claremont Access). Hence, according with the above guidelines, for an unprotected slope against erosion, and assuming the prevalence of shale bedrock, the setback from the toe at Arkledun Avenue would be...
about 30 m height times 1.4 plus 5.0 m assumed erosion allowance resulting in a total of 47 m measured back from the toe line. If some type of erosion protection is provided, the setback would be reduced to 42 m. This assessment suggests the buffer zone established from these guidelines would extend to, or even overlap with the middle trail alignment.

According to PML (Reference #6), the exposed rock slope along the south edge of Arkledun Ave (north edge of the SLP), from the junction with Jolley Cut to the east limit of the bin walls, presents an approximate slope gradient in the red shale layer of about 0.6H:1V and near a vertical slope within the formation above (Clinton group). A natural regression of 50 mm to 100 mm per year is believed to affect this portion of the slope such that eventually the erosion process would stop at an overall “stable” gradient of 1:1. Accordingly, the setback from the slope toe (assumed at Arkledun Ave.) of 30m, or less (in line with the dropping height “H” of the slope toward the east above the toe) in conjunction with measures of preventing long-term slope erosions would be recommended.

Along the western side of Jolley Cut (inside curve), where the height of the exposed rock slope decreases to less than 10 m and the rock material is mostly the stronger rock cap (Upper Clinton Formation and even Lockport formation where present) and the slopes are near vertical, The PML report (Reference #6) recommended back scaling the slope face to bring it to about “0.2V:1H”. As mentioned earlier, the noted gradient is inferred to be a typographic error and the intent was to recommend a 0.2H:1V slope. Assuming this correction, the setback would reduce to 2.0 m, or less, if some measures of long-term erosion control are implemented.

In our opinion, we concur with the general conclusion formulated in the background studies that a global instability of the rock slope at the site is not a concern (Reference #6). However, we could not find any indication that a positive analysis was carried out for the global stability along any of the major sections “A-A” and “B-B” depicted in Fig. 6.2a above. Notwithstanding, assuming the global stability is not a factor of concern, the ongoing slope weathering and erosion will eventually lead to a “stable slope” condition. In order to facilitate the decision with respect to the design buffer and any other potential activities to control the slope performance, the definition of the “stable slope” may need some additional qualifications to assist in the process of design decisions on the treatment of the slope, such as:

a) **The risks of global instability are controlled.** Such failures can be described as dislodging and sliding of significant volumes of soil and rock masses along slip surfaces daylighting at the toe or downstream of the toe and at the tableland at significant distances back from the slope crest. The depth of the dislodged solid mass is comparable to the height of the slope. A schematic presentation is shown in Fig 6.2b.

Typically the global instability is being addressed by conventional slope stability analysis to demonstrate an overall factor of safety usually near 1.5. For the rock slopes at this site, this condition is most likely met with the current slope configuration, although, as mentioned earlier, the slope portion running below Arkledun Ave (Section B-B in Fig.6.2a) was only marginally studied with no definitive recommendations.

b) **The risk of localized/shallow failures are controlled.** Such failures can be described as dislodging of measurable wedges of soil and rock along more confined slip surfaces daylighting between the toe and the crest of the slope (Fig. 6.2b), or at small distances on the table land behind the crest. The thickness of the sliding wedge is usually limited to the depth of weathering and is only a fraction...
of the slope height. In this case depth of weathering was estimated to 2.0 to 2.5 m behind the exposed rock face (Reference #4). These type of failures usually occur during wet seasons and spring freshet when the groundwater flow intensifies. Flattening the slope gradient reduces the risks of these type of failures, but even at very gentle slopes they still may occur. More effective mitigation is obtained by improvement of the surface and near surface drainage, by protection against weathering, etc. Obviously, flattening of the slope only to mitigate the localized failures would increase the factor of safety against global failure much beyond the usual “1.5” is uneconomical.

c) The risks of rockfalls are controlled. The mechanics of rockfalls may be by sliding, rolling and dropping from overhangs. On an exposed/unprotected slope the latter occurs typically when stronger rock layers are underlain by weaker and more erodible rock. Sliding and falling are in principle prevented if the rock face is being graded all the way at a slope angle dictated by the weakest layers. Usually, this “safe” slope is equal to the friction angle of the weakest mineral of the heavily weathered and degraded bedrock. In the case of rocks at this site consisting of shales and argillaceous dolomites, a friction angle of about 35° is expected. Accordingly, the “stable slope” from this standpoint would be at 1.4H:1V, which coincides with the guidelines presented by the Credit Valley Conservation (and other jurisdictions). A slope at this grade would lead to a factor of safety against global failure likely much greater than 1.5. However, it will not be sufficient enough to prevent rockfalls (or any other random objects) by rolling down the slope. Hence, some type of slope face treatment, preferably natural vegetation, benching, etc. should be implemented to impede the debris rolling.

The rockfall may be pre-empted by different types of treatment of the rock face. In which case the gradient of the slope face may be steepened significantly. Parts of the rock slopes at the site have been treated with rock protections systems (bin walls, anchored sheets and or rock meshes, etc.). Their failure to entirely prevent the ongoing rockfall is attributed to the insufficient design (e.g. some anchors too shallow or too few, or not enough slope surface coverage, etc.), possible construction deficiencies (e.g. missing anchor plates, nuts, missing drainage, etc.) and their deterioration due to aging (mostly rusting).

d) The risks of costly maintenance are controlled. Any slope within the areas accessed by the public requires periodic maintenance. The maintenance effort increases at least proportionally, if not accelerated, with the increased overall steepness of the finished slope. Therefore, this criterion creates incentives to flatten the slope to reduce maintenance requirements.

e) The risks to public activity on and in close vicinity of the slope are mitigated. Such criterion has the highest priority and may dictate the slope design. However, this does not necessarily mean the slopes must be flattened to its safest friction angle. Instead, the access to the slope may be restricted by physical barriers placed at strategic locations.

Based on a preliminary examination of a few select sections in the available survey plan (Appendix A3/7) the average slope along the major north boundary slope measured from the toe at Arkledun Ave to the ridge crest would vary from about 0.625H:1V to 1.6H:1V along the lower trail, and from 1H:1V to 1.4H:1V along the middle trail.
Some of the park interior slopes between the top and middle trails, and between the middle and lower trails also measure gradients of 1:1, or locally even steeper, including grade changes supported by retaining walls. From this standpoint, conditions of “unstable slopes” with respect to local failures, and rockfalls of the three types defined above, have posed significant risks to the public in the past and seem to be a continuing concern. Application of a full buffer zone to these areas (e.g. clouded areas in Appendix A3/7) would virtually exclude a significant section of the developable area of the park. Therefore, consideration should be given to using landscape-friendly mitigation measures to improve the stability of the slope surface in these areas to optimize the park area available for development and use by the public. Additional details are discussed in Section 8 of the report.

### 7.0 Foundations Conditions of Proposed Major Structural Elements

The following major structural elements are being considered (see also Appendix A4/7)

- Pedestrian bridge across the south curve of Jolley Cut
- Maintenance Building at the west of south bridge abutment
- Relocated east parking lot at the west of the maintenance building
- Relocated Pavilion at the west of the relocated parking lot
- Repurposing of the existing west parking lot into an Observation Area

As mentioned in Section 3.0 above except for two boreholes completed early in 2019 during the Wood 2019 investigation, no other subsurface information is provided in the available background information. Nevertheless, the site morphology and its arrangement along the top of the escarpment ridge suggest that the site is underlain by bedrock covered by a relatively shallow layer of overburden (up to a few meters thick) consisting mostly of fills and little, if any, residual and minor colluvial deposits from the parent bedrock.

The final foundation design should be carried out only after the foundation conditions at the proposed structure locations are determined by adequate subsurface investigations by means of test pits, sampled boreholes and any other appropriate in-situ testing methods.

In general, conventional spread footings are feasible for all the proposed structures at this site if placed on bedrock, or on engineered fill over the bedrock. For preliminary design purposes, a factored geotechnical resistance at ULS of 300 kPa may be used for footings placed on weathered Lockport group bedrock, or on the upper portion of the Clinton Group bedrock. If the footings are placed on fresh (unweathered) bedrock of the same origin, a factored geotechnical resistance at ULS of a minimum of 600 kPa may be used for preliminary design purposes. The settlements of foundations constructed on the bedrock are expected to be negligible and the ULS values will determine the foundation design. The bedrock subgrade should be flat, inspected, and, if required, repaired using “dental” concreting. Bedrock subgrade sloping at grades steeper than 6H:1V should be benched. Alternatively, shear keys and/or dowels should be used.

Heavily weathered or shattered portion of the rock should be stripped, if present after the stripping of the overburden.

Footings placed on engineered fills consisting of well-graded sand and gravel placed on bedrock described above, and compacted to at least 98% of the Standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD), may be designed using a factored geotechnical resistance of 225 kPa at ULS and a geotechnical reaction at SLS of 150 kPa, for 25 mm of settlement.
In general, the subgrade supporting the footings in unheated areas should be protected against freezing by 1.2 m thick soil cover, or equivalent synthetic insulation. According to OPSD 3090.101 the depth of frost penetration at the site is closed to 1.2 m.

In the absence of in-situ identification of the shear wave velocity within at least 30 m below the foundation grade, the site should be considered for the purposes of the seismic design as Class C – Very dense soil or soft rock. An upgrade to Class B is anticipated, but according to the Building Code, this upgrade is subject to the positive determination in the field of the wave velocity profile.

Slab-on-grade (SOG) and pavements are feasible after stripping of the topsoil, loose residual and colluvial soils (such as heavily weathered bedrock left in place or transported at the toe of the slopes) and any random fills identified to contain unacceptable foreign materials (such as scrap metals, timber, rubber, waste, etc.). The exposed subgrade surface should be proof-rolled, or in place compacted to at least 95% SPMDD. The design grades can be restored using Granular B Type 1 (OPSS 1010) placed in maximum 200 mm thick lifts and compacted to at least 95% SPMDD.

The interior SOG for regular office and service areas should be placed on a minimum of 100 mm of Granular A (OPSS 1010) compacted to 100% SPMDD. The thickness of the granular base should be increased to 150 mm, or 200 mm in the shop and heavy vehicle areas. In areas depressed below the finished grades the insertion of a capillary barrier (typically 100 mm thick of 20 mm minus crushed granular retained on Sieve #4) and a vapor barrier directly beneath the concrete slab may be necessary.

Exterior SOG should be placed on sufficient rigid insulation to prevent the freezing of the subgrade. The insulation should be placed over a granular base of a minimum of 200 mm Granular A compacted to 100% SPMDD. A subdrainage system below the granular base and below the depth of frost penetration is recommended. For preliminary evaluation, 25 mm thick rigid insulation is equivalent to about 250 mm thick soil cover.

The subgrade for parking lots for light vehicles (cars, small trucks and maintenance vehicles) should be prepared in a manner similar to the SOG. Once prepared, the pavement structure according to the City guidelines for local urban roads and parking areas may be used.

Alternatively, the following minimal design may be considered:

- 40 mm HL3 or HL4 asphalt
- 50 mm HL8 asphalt
- 300 mm Granular A compacted to 100% SPMDD.

A subdrainage system below the granular base should be incorporated to ensure the granular base is fully drained at all times.

In case of reconfiguration of the upper end of Jolley Cut, the pavement structure should incorporate at a minimum:

- 40 mm of HL4
- 120 mm of HL8 placed in 3 lifts
- 150 mm of Granular A compacted to 100% SPMDD
- 300 mm Granular B Type 1 compacted to 100% SPMDD
A reliable subdrainage system should be installed below the subbase.

The subgrade must be inorganic competent material proven by proof-rolling with heavy tire trucks. In case of bedrock subgrade, the Granular B subbase may be eliminated and the Granular A base should be increased to 200 mm minimum. The subgrade surface should be crowned with cross falls at 2% towards the road shoulder equipped with roadside drains.

8.0 Upgrade of Pathway Network and Landscaping

Upgrading the pathway network and landscaping would include:

- Integration of a potential multi-use trail through the site, addition of universal accessibility measures such as ramps, switchbacks;
- Assessing the lower escarpment walkway, and possibly decommissioning it in future years;
- Review of existing display garden irrigation system to mitigate the potential impacts on the surficial geology and long-term slope stability.

8.1 Trail Network Development

Permanent trails should be placed on inorganic competent subgrade and should incorporate a compacted granular base layer drained at all times, and a surface layer.

The longitudinal grading of the subgrade will need to be flatter than 12H:1V for wheelchair-friendly access. Cross-fall grading should be at least 1%, preferably at 2%, toward the trail-side ditches or swales to be implemented at the inside edge (slope toe side) of the trail.

The granular base should consist of at least 100 mm of Granular A compacted to 98% SPMDD. In case of multi-use trails, including trail to be accessed by light motorized vehicles, the granular base thickness should be increased to at least 150 mm.

In cases where the subgrade is proven by tests or well compacted (e.g. CBR >6.0) or is fresh to moderately weather rock, the granular base may be reduced for all trails to 75 mm.

The trail surface will depend on the intended purposes and architectural considerations, and may include:

- Gravel surface consisting preferably of a trail-mix aggregate (TMA) of well graded 10 mm minus sand and gravel, and fines passing Sieve#200 in a proportion of 5 to 10% of the mix mass. The material should be placed in 100 to 150 mm loose lift and compacted at the optimum moisture content using heavy rollers (pavers). A target of a minimum final thickness of 75 mm is recommended.
- Paving stones, typically over a 25 to 50 mm thick levelling course of uniform “mortar” sand, or as required by the stone manufacturers.
- Asphalt, typically 40 mm minimum of HL3 or HL4 over the granular based preferably primed with bituminous emulsions.
- Concrete surface, preferably synthetic or structural fiber mix design of 75 mm minimum
thickness Portland cement concrete. A transverse broom finish or turf drag is recommended. Sawcut joints at spacing of about 20 to 25 times the thickness of the concrete slab will be required.

Other proprietary materials for trails and observation decks may be considered and in these cases to supplier’s guidelines should be followed.

8.2 Lower Trail

Portions of the existing lower trail cross through wooded areas and are less accessible for maintenance due to the rough and steep terrain at the south side of the trail. There are three perceived safety hazards along the lowest trail:

- Significant grade changes along the trail involving several stair flights
- Localized slope failures and small rockfalls on the trail from the rock and residual soil slope along the south edge of the trail
- Social risks such as vandalism, loitering, etc. due to the more secluded and poorer supervision capabilities of these areas.

A further potential hazard is associated with the placement of this trail within the “stable slope” buffer zone of say 1H:1V defined with respect to the global, local and slope erosion/regression mechanism. As discussed earlier in Section 6, this type of slope failure is long-term in nature (likely over 50 years if the erosion and weathering are left entirely uncontrolled) and as such this type of hazard is considered of a lesser concern.

Mitigations methods for the abatement of the risks associated with all the above hazards are considered feasible without excessive efforts. From a geotechnical standpoint, the most stringent hazard is the rockfall and local instability of the trail side slope. These type of issues can be mitigated by various means of slope surface landscaping consistent with the natural appearance of the area such as: rock berms, slope reinforcement by live cutting or brush layers, wattle fencing, etc.

Ramping and universal access could be more expensive, likely requiring cut-and-fill benching into the rock slope. If this effort is not considered, these trail portions could be identified by signage and barriers as not being accessible to persons with physical impairments.

Closing of the lower trail, if desired, may consider some of the following approaches:

- Barriers to access by means of some landscape obstacles (such as armorstone walls, earth dykes, etc.) leaving the space between the accesses to naturalize.
- Regrading by cut-and-fill most of the entire area of the decommissioned trail, including the demolished portion of the stone walls.

In principle, the regrading / cut-and-fill option should first consider the clearing, grubbing and stripping of the areas followed by the removal of the loose soils and debris. Then, based on the detailed topographic survey and cross sections, the stable finished grades and the related earthworks (additional subgrade cut and benching to safely support the backfill finish, backfill characteristics and placement specifications, etc.) will be determined. The detailed mapping of the current site topography is critical for the development of the engineering approach to the proposed finished grades, downslope and upslope extent of the regrading.
and selection of the safe construction approaches.

Site drainage should be improved to ensure the drainage of the abandoned area is adequately integrated with the entire rock slope drainage and protection system to Arkledun Avenue, and below.

8.3 Garden Irrigation

While in principle any uncontrolled runoff water on the tableland near the crest of the slopes is undesirable, the contribution of the garden irrigation system to the deterioration of the slope face and stability is believed to be minor when compared to surface runoff from natural precipitation. Notwithstanding, a quantitative review of the irrigation rates applied on the landscaped areas will be worthwhile to assist with a more accurate evaluation of its incremental contribution to the balance of runoff at the site.

To illustrate some probable order of magnitudes, the capacity of porewater storage within a 150 mm thick layer of dry topsoil should be about 0.05 m³ per 1.0 m square of irrigated surface. This is equivalent of a 50 mm rain over the same area. The storage capacity will decrease as the saturation level of the soils increases. In the same time a significant portion of the irrigation water is dissipated by evapotranspiration. The remaining of the applied irrigation will contribute to the runoff and groundwater flow. Landscape specialists should be able to make more accurate evaluations of this nature. Such quantitative information may then be used to decide the implementation, if required, of mitigation measures such as: confinement of the irrigation areas with subdrainage lines and buried cut-offs, reduction of the irrigation rates and / or irrigated areas, gaging the soil moisture to optimize the irrigation volumes, etc.

9.0 Requirements for Further Geotechnical Investigation

The section provides recommendations for additional geotechnical investigations for different stages of the project.

To Support Development of the Conceptual Designs:

- Completion of a detailed site survey covering the area of at least from Concession Rd. at the south to Claremont Access and ramp to Sherman Access at the north within the approximate limits shown in Fig. 9.1 below. Digitized maps with elevation contours at 0.25 m intervals should be developed. The survey should also identify based on existing information and available records the existing utilities, active and abandoned, relics of older structures (e.g. footings of the historic water tower reportedly existing at the site of the current pavilion)
Detailed visual reconnaissance survey of all the rock slopes, retaining walls and surface drainage features (rock slope seeps, ditches, culvert outlets, weeping tile discharges, etc.) and assessment of changes compared to the previous surveys. Consideration should be given to the use of drone surveys and detailed mapping of the rock slopes in areas not accessible by foot that have not yet been examined. Slope cross sections at frequent intervals (20 – 25 m spacing) should be developed in order to support a detailed assessment of the global and local stability and the developments of the most optimal mitigation measures.

Completion of comprehensive rock slope hazard assessments. Previous investigations covered only select portions of the exposed slopes. No such analyses are available for the eastern portion of the Arkledun Ave and for the entire rock slope form the top of the plateau to Sherman Access and eastern half of Claremont Access (east of the Arkledun overpass). A conventional slope stability assessment against the risk of global failure should also be considered.

To Support Preliminary Designs

- Test pits at the locations of proposed buildings, parking lots, pavilions / gazebos. Additional tests pits should be considered at locations suspected to have been occupied by structures and other historic works currently removed. Some examples in this direction are the historic quarry, old access road benched into the SLP north slope, old water tower, etc.
- Sampled boreholes and rock cores to at least 5.0 m below the bedrock surface at the bridge abutment areas.
To Support the Detailed Design and Construction

- Once the preliminary design is completed, additional focused investigations may be required. In particular, depending on the type of solutions for slope protection, or bridge structure, rock coring and testing to sufficient depths below the rock surface will be required especially if rock anchors are intended for the bridge.
- The completion of a geophysical survey to develop profiles of seismic wave velocities to at least 30 m depth below the ground surface should also be considered. The areas of the seismic surveys are especially important along the proposed bridge alignments and of any other structures requiring earthquake resistant designs.

The development of the detailed investigation program in this direction along with a plan for instrumentation and monitoring during construction and long-term facility operation will be better optimized after the design concepts were determined and advanced to near completion.

10.0 Conclusions

Based on the information studied and acquired to date we note the following main geotechnical aspects related to park development:

a) The global stability of the escarpment slopes would not be a concern at this project location. However, the previous investigations did not review in a comprehensive manner the entire slope height and length from the top of the tableland to its physical toe estimated to be somewhere near the south edge of the ramp from Claremont Access to Sherman Access.

b) The exposed rock slopes and existing structural slope protection show an active state of deterioration and erosion.

c) The most prevalent form of hazard seems to be the rockfall from the north side of SLP onto the western portion of Claremont Access and eastern portion of Arkledun Avenue and northern end of Jolley Cut.

d) For a design period of 50 years, or more, the requirements to increase buffer zones for the escarpment trails with pedestrian, bicycle, scooter and similar activity are considered to be moderate to minor. Due diligence with guardrails at offsets similar to the current rails seem reasonable, in conjunction with periodic quantitative monitoring of the slope performance (measurements / survey of movement, erosion and regression) and some better controlled and more reliable slope protective measures.

e) The lower and middle trails, and the slopes in between, need remedial action to improve the local stability and pre-empt the potential of rockfall on the trail.

f) Buffer zone limits of 5.0 m for weathered/weathering unprotected slopes, and 2.5 m for protected slopes may be considered for preliminary design purposes.

g) Buffer zones where there will be high surcharge loads or structural loads should be increased adjacent to 1H:1V or gentler for slopes that are higher than 10.0 m, and are in the Grimsby shales, and to 0.8H:1V or gentler for slopes in the Clinton Formation.
11.0 Closure

Attached following the text of this report is our Standard Limitations to Geotechnical Reports which is intended to clarify the scope and assumptions used in the preparation of this study.

We trust that this report is complete within our present terms of reference. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Yours very truly,

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions,
a division of Wood Canada Limited

Prepared By: 
Dan Dimitriu, PhD., P.Eng.
Principal Geotechnical Engineer

Reviewed By: 
Ty Garde, M.Eng., P.Eng.
Principal Geotechnical Engineer
Limitations to Geotechnical Reports

The work performed in the preparation of this report and the conclusions presented herein are subject to the following:

a) The contract between Wood and the Client, including any subsequent written amendment or Change Order duly signed by the parties (hereinafter together referred as the “Contract”);

b) Any and all time, budgetary, access and/or site disturbance, risk management preferences, constraints or restrictions as described in the contract, in this report, or in any subsequent communication sent by Wood to the Client in connection to the Contract; and

c) The limitations stated herein.

2. **Standard of care**: Wood has prepared this report in a manner consistent with the level of skill and are ordinarily exercised by reputable members of Wood’s profession, practicing in the same or similar locality at the time of performance, and subject to the time limits and physical constraints applicable to the scope of work, and terms and conditions for this assignment. No other warranty, guaranty, or representation, expressed or implied, is made or intended in this report, or in any other communication (oral or written) related to this project. The same are specifically disclaimed, including the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

3. **Limited locations**: The information contained in this report is restricted to the site and structures evaluated by Wood and to the topics specifically discussed in it, and is not applicable to any other aspects, areas or locations.

4. **Information utilized**: The information, conclusions and estimates contained in this report are based exclusively on: i) information available at the time of preparation, ii) the accuracy and completeness of data supplied by the Client or by third parties as instructed by the Client, and iii) the assumptions, conditions and qualifications/limitations set forth in this report.

5. **Accuracy of information**: No attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of any information provided by the Client or third parties, except as specifically stated in this report (hereinafter “Supplied Data”). Wood cannot be held responsible for any loss or damage, of either contractual or extra-contractual nature, resulting from conclusions that are based upon reliance on the Supplied Data.

6. **Report interpretation**: This report must be read and interpreted in its entirety, as some sections could be inaccurately interpreted when taken individually or out-of-context. The contents of this report are based upon the conditions known and information provided as of the date of preparation. The text of the final version of this report supersedes any other previous versions produced by Wood.

7. **No legal representations**: Wood makes no representations whatsoever concerning the legal significance of its findings, or as to other legal matters touched on in this report, including but not limited to, ownership of any property, or the application of any law to the facts set forth herein. With respect to regulatory compliance issues, regulatory statutes are subject to interpretation and change. Such interpretations and regulatory changes should be reviewed with legal counsel.

8. **Decrease in property value**: Wood shall not be responsible for any decrease, real or perceived, of the property or site’s value or failure to complete a transaction, as a consequence of the information contained in this report.

9. **No third party reliance**: This report is for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed unless expressly stated otherwise in the report or Contract. Any use or reproduction which any third party makes of the report, in whole or in part, or any reliance thereon or decisions made based on any information or conclusions in the report is the sole responsibility of such third party. Wood does not represent or warrant the accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for purpose or usefulness of this document, or any information contained in this document, for use
or consideration by any third party. Wood accepts no responsibility whatsoever for damages or loss of any nature or kind suffered by any such third party as a result of actions taken or not taken or decisions made in reliance on this report or anything set out therein, including without limitation, any indirect, special, incidental, punitive or consequential loss, liability or damage of any kind.

10. **Assumptions:** Where design recommendations are given in this report, they apply only if the project contemplated by the Client is constructed substantially in accordance with the details stated in this report. It is the sole responsibility of the Client to provide to Wood changes made in the project, including but not limited to, details in the design, conditions, engineering or construction that could in any manner whatsoever impact the validity of the recommendations made in the report. Wood shall be entitled to additional compensation from Client to review and assess the effect of such changes to the project.

11. **Time dependence:** If the project contemplated by the Client is not undertaken within a period of 18 months following the submission of this report, or within the time frame understood by Wood to be contemplated by the Client at the commencement of Wood’s assignment, and/or, if any changes are made, for example, to the elevation, design or nature of any development on the site, its size and configuration, the location of any development on the site and its orientation, the use of the site, performance criteria and the location of any physical infrastructure, the conclusions and recommendations presented herein should not be considered valid unless the impact of the said changes is evaluated by Wood, and the conclusions of the report are amended or are validated in writing accordingly.

Advancements in the practice of geotechnical engineering, engineering geology and hydrogeology and changes in applicable regulations, standards, codes or criteria could impact the contents of the report, in which case, a supplementary report may be required. The requirements for such a review remain the sole responsibility of the Client or their agents.

Wood will not be liable to update or revise the report to take into account any events or emergent circumstances or facts occurring or becoming apparent after the date of the report.

12. **Limitations of visual inspections:** Where conclusions and recommendations are given based on a visual inspection conducted by Wood, they relate only to the natural or man-made structures, slopes, etc. inspected at the time the site visit was performed. These conclusions cannot and are not extended to include those portions of the site or structures, which were not reasonably available, in Wood’s opinion, for direct observation.

13. **Limitations of site investigations:** Site exploration identifies specific subsurface conditions only at those points from which samples have been taken and only at the time of the site investigation. Site investigation programs are a professional estimate of the scope of investigation required to provide a general profile of subsurface conditions.

The data derived from the site investigation program and subsequent laboratory testing are interpreted by trained personnel and extrapolated across the site to form an inferred geological representation and an engineering opinion is rendered about overall subsurface conditions and their likely behavior with regard to the proposed development. Despite this investigation, conditions between and beyond the borehole/test hole locations may differ from those encountered at the borehole/test hole locations and the actual conditions at the site might differ from those inferred to exist, since no subsurface exploration program, no matter how comprehensive, can reveal all subsurface details and anomalies.

Final sub-surface/bore/profile logs are developed by geotechnical engineers based upon their interpretation of field logs and laboratory evaluation of field samples. Customarily, only the final bore/profile logs are included in geotechnical engineering reports.
Bedrock, soil properties and groundwater conditions can be significantly altered by environmental remediation and/or construction activities such as the use of heavy equipment or machinery, excavation, blasting, pile-driving or draining or other activities conducted either directly on site or on adjacent terrain. These properties can also be indirectly affected by exposure to unfavorable natural events or weather conditions, including freezing, drought, precipitation and snowmelt.

During construction, excavation is frequently undertaken which exposes the actual subsurface and groundwater conditions between and beyond the test locations, which may differ from those encountered at the test locations. It is recommended practice that Wood be retained during construction to confirm that the subsurface conditions throughout the site do not deviate materially from those encountered at the test locations, that construction work has no negative impact on the geotechnical aspects of the design, to adjust recommendations in accordance with conditions as additional site information is gained and to deal quickly with geotechnical considerations if they arise.

Interpretations and recommendations presented herein may not be valid if an adequate level of review or inspection by Wood is not provided during construction.

14. **Factors that may affect construction methods, costs and scheduling:** The performance of rock and soil materials during construction is greatly influenced by the means and methods of construction. Where comments are made relating to possible methods of construction, construction costs, construction techniques, sequencing, equipment or scheduling, they are intended only for the guidance of the project design professionals, and those responsible for construction monitoring. The number of test holes may not be sufficient to determine the local underground conditions between test locations that may affect construction costs, construction techniques, sequencing, equipment, scheduling, operational planning, etc.

Any contractors bidding on or undertaking the works should draw their own conclusions as to how the subsurface and groundwater conditions may affect their work, based on their own investigations and interpretations of the factual soil data, groundwater observations, and other factual information.

15. **Groundwater and Dewatering:** Wood will accept no responsibility for the effects of drainage and/or dewatering measures if Wood has not been specifically consulted and involved in the design and monitoring of the drainage and/or dewatering system.

16. **Environmental and Hazardous Materials Aspects:** Unless otherwise stated, the information contained in this report in no way reflects on the environmental aspects of this project, since this aspect is beyond the Scope of Work and the Contract. Unless expressly included in the Scope of Work, this report specifically excludes the identification or interpretation of environmental conditions such as contamination, hazardous materials, wild life conditions, rare plants or archaeology conditions that may affect use or design at the site. This report specifically excludes the investigation, detection, prevention or assessment of conditions that can contribute to moisture, mould or other microbial contaminant growth and/or other moisture related deterioration, such as corrosion, decay, rot in buildings or their surroundings. Any statements in this report or on the boring logs regarding odours, colours, and unusual or suspicious items or conditions are strictly for informational purposes.

17. **Sample Disposal:** Wood will dispose of all uncontaminated soil and rock samples after 30 days following the release of the final geotechnical report. Should the Client request that the samples be retained for a longer time, the Client will be billed for such storage at an agreed upon rate. Contaminated samples of soil, rock or groundwater are the property of the Client, and the Client will be responsible for the proper disposal of these samples, unless previously arranged for with Wood or a third party.
18. **Effect of iron minerals**: This report does not address issues related to the discovery or presence of iron minerals, such as pyrite, or the effects of iron minerals, if any, in the soil or to be used in concrete. Should specific information be required, additional testing may be requested by the Client for which Wood shall be entitled to additional compensation. *(Optional clause, inserted for use in Quebec, can be deleted if not applicable to project)*

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions,  
a Division of Wood Canada Limited
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Plans and Photographs of Sam Lawrence Park
APPENDIX A – Preliminary Park Concept
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Escarpment development buffer?

Decommission existing pathway

Relocated parking to street

Relocated parking lot

New pedestrian / cyclist bridge structure

New building structure
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APPENDIX B - Bin Wall Inspections (Ref#1 Amec E&IS, 2010))

Wood Comments:
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004 - see Ref#8- Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of the wall distress.
APPENDIX B - Bin Wall Inspections (Ref#1 Amec E&IS, 2010)

Wood Comments:
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004 - see Ref#8- Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of the wall distress.
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004 - see Ref#8 - Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of the wall distress.
Wood Comments:
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004
-see Ref#8- Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of
the wall distress
APPENDIX B - Bin Wall Inspections
(Ref#1 Amec E&IS, 2010)

Wood Comments:
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004 - see Ref#8- Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of the wall distress.
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APPENDIX B - Bin Wall Inspections

Wood Comments:
This 2010 inspection includes same structures previously inspected in 2004 - see Ref:8 Philips Engineering and provides indications on the evolution of the wall distress.

Appendix "C" to Report PW18056(a)
Comments based on site review
March 10, 2012
Photos from 2010

SKETCH 1

APPENDIX B - CLAREMON ACCESS BIN COLLAPSE
Re#92 Amec E&IS, 2012

Temporary bolting required
Comments based on site review March 10, 2012
Photos from 2010 Except for the collapsed portion
Masonry Walls to be decommissioned

Masonry Walls to be inspected

Guardrails with masonry columns to be inspected

Guardrails to be inspected

Steel Guardrails with Stone Piers

Stone Walls at West Parking Lot

Steel Pipe with Stone Piers

Masonry Walls to be demolished (not reviewed as part of this investigation)
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CLAREMONT ACCESS, HAMILTON
Rock Slope and Retaining Wall Assessment
Overview Section III

FIGURE A-3

Walls at mid-section; view from Arkledun Avenue (looking SE)

East End of Inspection Area
(Lower End of Claremont Access)

End section of Wall No. 4B: bin wall replaced with concrete post and panel wall (replacement between 2010 and 2012)

Walls at mid-section with Failure D area (looking S)

Failure D with broken steel panels and run out of backfill material (looking S)

Failure C; broken steel panels removed in 2016; view towards west end of Section III

DATE: April 07, 2017
PROJECT: 1657221

failure areas

Failure Areas
Wall No. Wall Numbering as per drawings from 1968

Facing Walls: Wall No. 3A and 4A
Bin Walls: Wall No. 3B and 4B
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APPENDIX B - BOREHOLE LOCATION MAP
(Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Wood Comments: All Boreholes located within the roadway Arkledun-Jolley Cut system.

REFERENCE:
PLAN PRODUCED FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH RETRIEVED FROM GOOGLE EARTH ON DECEMBER 1, 2009

NOTE:
BOREHOLE ELEVATIONS PROVIDED BY THE CITY OF HAMILTON IN EMAILS DATED DEC. 24, 2009 AND MARCH 29, 2010

THE INFERRED STRATIGRAPHY REFERRED TO IN THE REPORT IS BASED ON DATA FROM THESE BOREHOLES, SUPPLEMENTED BY GEOLOGIC EVIDENCE. THE ACTUAL STRATIGRAPHY MAY VARY FROM THAT SHOWN, AT OTHER POINTS BETWEEN THE BORING.

CITY OF HAMILTON
JOLLEY CUT
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

BOREHOLE LOCATION PLAN

Wood Comments: All Boreholes located within the roadway Arkledun-Jolley Cut system.
APPENDIX B - Rock Slope Face Arrangement along the south boundary of SLP plateau with Jolley Cut
(Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Photograph 1 – View northeast of rock slope on the north side of the road near the top of the escarpment.

Wood comments:
The background view with several cedars is in the east plateau area of the SLP considered to house the SPL-side abutment of the proposed pedestrian bridge
APPENDIX B - Rock Slope Face Arrangement along the south boundary of SLP plateau with Jolley Cut
(Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Photograph 2 – Close up of photograph 1, near end of curve at the top of the slope. Note the inclined talus material in the lower part of the slope and the ‘overhanging’ rock in the upper part of the slope.

Photograph 3 – Close up of photograph 2.

Wood Comments:
The top of slope is at the east edge of the east plateau area of the SLP considered to house the SLP-side abutment of the proposed pedestrian bridge
APPENDIX B - Rock Slope Face Arrangement along the east boundary of SLP plateau with Jolley Cut (Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Photograph 4 – View northwest of rock slope along the curved section (south part) near the top of escarpment. Note large blocks and thin ‘slabs’ of overhanging rock.

Photograph 5 – View west at centre of curve near the top of the escarpment.

Wood Comments:
While relatively close (approx 200 m distance along the Jolley Cut curve) from the the location in previous photos, the bedrock composition and texture within the upper exposed portion of the slope suggest a more advanced level of weathering.
APPENDIX B - Rock Slope Face Arrangement along south boundary of SLP (Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Photograph 6 – View south east of rock slope in the tangent road section prior to the curve at the top of the access. Note the near vertical ‘slabby’ overhanging rock in the upper part of the slope above the red shale and the limy bands within the red shale in the lower part of the slope.

Photograph 7 – Close up of photograph 6.
Photograph 8 – View southwest of rock slope on south side of road between the top of the tangent section before the curve near the top of the access and the binwall.

Photograph 9 – Close up of the rock slope below Sam Lawrence Park.
APPENDIX B - Rock Slope Face Arrangement along the east side of Jolley Cut
(Ref#6 Peto MacCallum, 2010)

Photograph 12 – View east of rock slope along east side of road around the curve near the top of the access.

Photograph 13 – View east of rock slope along east side of road around the curve near the top of the access.

Wood Comments:
The exposed ridge forms the north-east border of the tentative area to house the southeast abutment of the proposed pedestrian bridge.
APPENDIX B - Historic Aerial Photographs
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)

Wood Comments: To compare with the current layout in Appendix A5/7
APPENDIX B - Historic Aerial Photographs
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)

Wood Comments: To compare with the current layout in Appendix A5/7
APPENDIX B - Historic Aerial Photographs
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)

Wood Comments: To compare with the current layout in Appendix A5/7
Wood Comments: To compare with the current layout in Appendix A5/7

APPENDIX B - Historic Aerial Photographs
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)
APPENDIX B - Historic Aerial Photographs
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)

Wood Comments: To compare with the current layout in Appendix A5/7
APPENDIX B - Reconnaissance Survey
(Ref#7 Peto MacCallum, 2016)

Geotechnical Consultations, Sam Lawrence Park
PML Ref.: 16HF006, Report: 1, Concession Street, Hamilton
August 2016, Page 1

Photograph 1 – General view of middle walkway area experience pavement distress and bowing of the handrail

Photograph 2 – Tension cracks and distortion in pavement

Wood Comments: To compare these photos with the recent September 2019 photos in Appendix C
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- Grimsby Formation - ~ 5.6 to 5.7 m thick
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- Whirlpool Formation - ~ 6.2 m
  light tan to grey fine grained sandstone, medium, thick bedding
- Queeston Formation - ~ up to 335 m
  red fissile, micaecous and calcareous shale
- Cabot Head Formation - ~ 15.1 to 15.5 m thick
  grey-green with minor red shales interbedded with fine grained limestones and sandstones, thinly bedded
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Figure 3: Quarry Near Head of Jolley Cut; View of Proposed Beckett Mountain Drive, 1890s (Source: Hamilton Public Library)
Appendix C
Site Reconnaissance
September 2019
1. Main west parking. East stonewall parapet with some dislodged stoned and spalled joint mortar.

2. Main west parking. Looking North. NE downstairs look to edge (lower) trail through flower garden.
3. Main west parking. Looking west along top of stone wall parapet and retaining wall. Occasional joint mortar spalling. Occasional sidewalk cracks
4. As above. More sidewalk damages. Visible also distortions and cracking to pavement.

5. Westward trail from the west end of the parking lot. Looking west. Some pavement distress.
6. Most western lookout / terrace. Looking N-W. More trail pavement distress. Paving stone on the deck in relative good conditions with few minor depressions

7. Most western lookout. West face of rock ridge. Visible weathering of weaker bedding and local rock face gouges trending to future rockfalls
8. Most western lookout terrace. Details of minor distortions of the paving stone likely caused by the tree roots.

9. Looking east along the escarpment trail. Well-manicured slope at the north side of the west parking lot. Probably the slope is made of controlled “engineered” backfill over bedrock.
10. Looking east along the escarpment trail. Occasional backwardly leaned tree, pavement patching, side slope, toe wall at the “engineered” slope abutting the north of the west parking lot. Missing stone cap of the masonry rail column. Tree leaning probably caused by a local shallow rotational slide of overburden and/or weathered portion of bedrock. Patching of the trail possibly due to a depression from localized washouts of solids from the subgrade.

12. Same manicured “engineered” slope and flower garden at the NE end of the parking lot. Looking southwest. Manhole and 2 valve or cleanout flushmount casings (see zoomed below)
13. As above. Closeup view of the red encircled area with manhole and probable water valves
15. As above. Looking N-E. Minor bulging of paving stone at rail post, likely leftover from frost heave.

16. As above. About 3 m buffer to slope crest.
17. Area of suspected former quarry. Looking south from the main lookout platform.
18. First set of stairs flights east of the main lookout. Looking east. To note the beginning of the stone parapet wall along the escarpment trail. Minor chipping at the stone finish (encircled)
19. Stone wall at the lower stair flight. Some cracks and spalling of the joint mortar.

20. First lower lookout terrace east of the main terrace. The parapet wall becomes also retaining wall since the ground outside the parapet drops for at least 2.2 m below the deck level.
21. As above. Slopping ground at the toe of the retaining-parapet wall. Looking east along wall. To note dry outlets of weeping tiles (red circles) in spite of the rain ending early in the morning. Also no signs on ground of old seeping.
22. As above, at the east end of the wall. Looking down to the toe. Visible rock and concrete patch debris from wall.
24. As above, but the north face of the parapet wall. Joint mortar partially spalled.

25. Looking east along lower trail to the left and bifurcation to middle trail to the right.

27. Lower Trail 1st landing east of bifurcation. Typical condition for slope up to middle trail. Looking N and NE. Steep mix rubble rock, soil debris and dead branches. Tilted dead and live trees.
28. Two unidentified concrete retaining walls at about 15 m and 20 m north of the lower trail. Looking N.

29. Lower Trail. Counterfort at the north face of retaining wall at the first stair flight east of bifurcation. Significant structural deterioration west of counterfort. Details in next photo.
30. As above. Closeup view of wall deterioration. Remarkably dry weeping tile and clean drop pad area.

32. As above. Closeup of crumbled repair.

33. Same parapet. Typical wall damage to the north face. Looking SW.
34. Lower Trail- second landing east of bifurcation. Looking south to drain from under the Middle Trail with discharge on distorted gabion mattress.
35. Lower Trail. Down-slope leaning parapet at the 3-rd stair flight. Possibly due to top of slope creep. Looking west. Left photo- south side of the parapet wall. Right photo: top and slope side of the parapet. It is noticeable there is no meaningful earth pressure acting on the parapet.

36. Lower Trail. West end of the lowest level lookout terrace. Looking N.
37. Lower Trail – Last eastern terrace. Slope to middle trail (looking SE). Note soil and rock debris talus and frequent overhangs of rock slabs
38. As above. Close-up of rock debris makeup near the toe of slope.
39. Middle Trail. First resting terrace west of the east merger of Lower and Middle Trails. Looking west. Manhole in circled area.
40. Middle Trail. Tension crack, leaning handrail toward failed edge of trail beyond construction fence. Looking west.
41. Middle Trail. Failed slope edge & broken leaning handrail. Looking NW through the protection fence.

42. Middle trail. Exposed vertical and overhanged rock slope to upper trail. Looking south and south-west. Possibly Rochester or Thorold formations of grey and pinky limestone and shale beds. The info table indicates Grimsby formation, but the elevation level (180 m and up) is not consistent with the reddish Grimsby encountered at this site below about El. 175
Lighting & Electrical Systems Assessment Report
SAM LAWRENCE PARK
CITY OF HAMILTON

LIGHTING AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT REPORT

We have completed our field review of the exterior lighting and electrical systems at Sam Lawrence Park in the City of Hamilton in order to provide our assessment and evaluation of the current state of the existing lighting and electrical distribution/control equipment located at this facility. Our assessment included a daylight review of the physical condition and characteristics of the existing lighting assemblies and related components as well as the existing electrical servicing within the park. The quality of the existing lighting equipment deemed an after-dark performance review redundant.

OBSERVATIONS

ELECTRICAL SERVICING AND CONTROLS

The existing 200 amp, 1-phase, 3-wire, 120/240 volt metered electrical service to the main body of the park (meter #HZN7129737) is supplied underground from the Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities) low-voltage power distribution system located to the south, on either Concession Street or the Jolley Cut. The main service distribution and site lighting control equipment is situated within a concrete block maintenance building on the west side of the park which services the main, physically contiguous portion of the facility located north and west of the Jolley Cut. The secondary service appears to have been rebuilt relatively recently, perhaps within the last five years. The main service distribution equipment consists of a Schneider-Square D, 60 circuit, QO Series, service-entrance rated combination panelboard with a 200 amp main breaker. There is a large amount of excess capacity within the panelboard with thirty-eight (38) branch circuit spaces currently available.

Apart from the existing base building loads (interior lighting, receptacles and an electric unit heater), the main service panelboard also supplies four (4) 15 amp, 120 volt exterior lighting circuits within the park which are controlled by a lighting contactor within the building and a button-type photocontrol located on the exterior of the south wall. A time switch controls seasonal signage located exterior to the building and is currently supplied with a portable cable strung across the ceiling.

A concrete base mounted, sheet metal, special events power pedestal located within a planting bed directly south of the existing flagpoles is supplied underground from the main service panelboard. The pedestal itself is relatively new and in good condition, however, the padlocking mechanism is quite inferior and simple to bypass with a standard 1” shackle padlock installed. Inside of the pedestal are located three (3) 15/20 amp, 125 volt GFCI and one (1) 40 amp,
125/250 volt NEMA 14-50R receptacles. A small hinged door at the base of the pedestal is designed to allow cords to be passed through the enclosure while keeping the main door closed.

A concrete base mounted, sheet metal, special events power pedestal located within a planting bed further south of the existing flagpoles is also supplied underground from the main service panelboard. The pedestal itself is relatively new and in good condition, however, the padlocking mechanism is quite inferior and simple to bypass with a standard 1" shackle padlock installed. Inside of the pedestal are located four (4) 15/20 amp, 125 volt GFCI receptacles. A small hinged door at the base of the pedestal is designed to allow cords to be passed through the enclosure while keeping the main door closed.

A concrete base mounted, sheet metal, irrigation control pedestal located within a wooded area on the east side of the park is also supplied underground from the main service panelboard. The pedestal appears to be approximately thirty years old but is in fair condition with a solid vault-type padlocking handle. Inside of the pedestal is located one (1) 15 amp, 125 volt GFCI receptacle along with a Rain Bird irrigation controller and related accessories. All of the irrigation system control wiring enters the bottom of the enclosure and is terminated on the Rain Bird controller.

There are two (2) distinct unmetered electrical supplies servicing the area of the park located south and east of the Jolley Cut and north of Concession Street. The west end of this section of the park is supplied from a street lighting service pedestal located on the north side of Concession Street. The east end is supplied from an Alectra Utilities distribution pole located on the north side of Concession Street as well.

PARK SITE LIGHTING

There are two (2) main types of site lighting fixtures currently utilized within the park, all serviced below grade and from different points of supply. None of the existing parking lots are currently illuminated.

42 inch high, cast aluminium, concrete base mounted, 100 watt HPS, illuminated customized bollards manufactured by Toronto Fabricating (model #719-LB) are located along the main walkway by the flagpoles in the west end of the main park, by the rock garden in the east end and directly adjacent to the park signage located between the Jolley Cut and Concession Street. These bollard lights appear to be approximately thirty years old and all have suffered various degrees of damage with cracked housings; broken, retrofitted or missing luminaires and delaminated paint finishes. Graffiti and other signs of vandalism are also present, a situation not uncommon for this type of low-level lighting located in a municipal park. Some of the concrete bases appear almost non-existent as the concrete itself has deteriorated to the point where it has receded below the bollard and is no longer visible. The underground branch circuit wiring is relatively small gauge (#10 AWG) stranded copper with TW-75 insulation.

12 foot high, cast aluminium, concrete base mounted, customized pole and luminaire assemblies are located sporadically in various areas of the park – along the east and west walkways and one (1) at the extreme west end of the main park; two (2) next to the pavilion and two (2) next to the parking lot located between the Jolley Cut and Concession Street and a long
stretch along the walkway north from Concession Street located at the extreme east end of the park east of the Jolley Cut. All of the poles (except for one located along the latter long stretch of walkway which is a replacement Rab Lighting cast aluminium model) are of the same age as the bollards and also manufactured by Toronto Fabricating (model #719P). The existing luminaires consist of a mixture of Moldcast Lighting ‘ContraCline’ 150 watt HPS post-top and Cooper Lighting ‘Tribute’ 150 watt HPS arm-mounted fixtures. The Moldcast product is original to the park and represents the majority of the existing lighting stock while the ‘Tribute’ fixtures are located essentially within the east end of the main park and have clearly been used as replacements due to vandalism and/or as a result of replacement parts no longer being available for the Moldcast luminaires. Without exception, all of these lighting assemblies have suffered various degrees of damage with broken or leaning pole housings; missing, broken or askew fixtures and deteriorated paint finishes. Most concrete bases appear to be intact, however, some do not extend above finished grade and are not visible. Most of the underground branch circuit wiring is relatively small gauge (#10 AWG) stranded copper with TW-75 insulation.

In addition to the above lighting fixtures and illuminating both sides of the park signage located between the Jolley Cut and Concession Street are two (2) Kim Lighting, metal halide, flush-mounted, in-ground floodlights with concrete surrounds. These floodlights appear to be of similar age to the other original fixtures within the park and there is condensation visible inside the glass lens of one of them.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ELECTRICAL SERVICING AND CONTROLS

The existing main service and distribution equipment is relatively new and in excellent condition with plenty of excess capacity. New or replacement circuit breakers are readily available for any potential expansion as well as for maintenance purposes. Unless park programming is significantly enhanced, this existing distribution equipment would be adequate to accommodate any future redevelopment of the main, physically contiguous portion of the park located north and west of the Jolley Cut, without the need for upgrade. The existing lighting control equipment is significantly older, however, it is also quite limited in nature. While still in adequate condition for reuse, any potential reconfiguration of the site lighting system would most likely necessitate the installation of newer components in any event. The two (2) special events pedestal are in good condition and should be suitable for reuse, assuming that they continue to possess adequate amounts of power for the programming contemplated within the park. Modification of the padlocking systems to make the enclosures more vandal resistant should be considered and the suitability of their branch circuit supplies confirmed. The existing irrigation control pedestal is not only well situated with remaining service life, it is also adequately serving its limited purpose and so could be maintained.

Electrical servicing within the area of the park located south and east of the Jolley Cut and north of Concession Street is currently limited and only suitable for the provision of lighting. Replacement and/or enhanced lighting systems should still be adequately accommodated within this space, with the continued approval of the City’s street lighting department and Alectra Utilities. Should any non-fixed electrical loads be contemplated for this area (such as special events power), new servicing would need to be designed and established in consultation with Alectra Utilities. The unmetered electrical servicing to the existing light standard located at the
far west end of the main park should be decommissioned during any reconstruction of the park and any required power be provided from the existing metered main service so that the source of electrical supply within the main park is unified and obvious to maintenance personnel.

PARK SITE LIGHTING

The existing bollard, pole/luminaire and in-ground lighting assemblies within Sam Lawrence Park have reached the end of their effective life cycle. They are all relatively inefficient luminaires which operate with technology that is rapidly becoming obsolete and the degree of illumination they provide is quite limited. None of them possess anything in the way of modern photometry or light distribution, with many having been modified in the field in some way. Light is not directed discretely and efficiently along the walkways and hard surfaces but rather haphazardly and in all directions. Many of the concrete foundations and virtually all of the die cast aluminum structures have physically and aesthetically deteriorated. Replacement parts are not readily available to provide the needed maintenance and repair. Any suitable components that are able to be obtained would require long lead times and come at a significant cost premium. The existing underground branch circuit wiring is quite limited in size and its overall insulating properties are questionable. Regardless, under any proposed revitalization, the reconfiguration of existing walkways and related amenities will ensure that the current site lighting configuration will be unsuitable, rendering this wiring redundant.

It is our recommendation that the current site lighting systems be decommissioned, removed and disposed of in their entirety as part of any future redevelopment of the park. Replacement with properly designed LED luminaires on decorative precast concrete poles with lifetime warranties would be the preferred method as they provide heightened vandal resistance by virtue of their composition with a light source kept well away from any potential abuse. Bollard lighting is not recommended for such municipal park spaces due to their susceptibility to vandalism as well as their general ineffectiveness as a tool for lighting. The existing site lighting system within the park is quite limited and arbitrary. The walkways are not continuously illuminated between parking lots and sidewalks, effectively offering no safe passage for pedestrians who wish to traverse the park at night. Most areas appear to be under-illuminated with the lighting unevenly distributed and would most certainly not meet the current lighting design criteria for such applications. Given the park’s location and drawing power due to its spectacular view of the Hamilton skyline, properly designed parking lot lighting should seriously be considered for the large number of commuters it surely attracts. The introduction of current LED lighting technologies offers many advantages such as reduced hydro consumption and extremely long service life with limited maintenance required. There is no salvage value or any expectation for recycling of any of the lighting related components on this site. There will be a cost for the safe environmental disposal of some of the lighting components.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment of Sam Lawrence Park, located at 255 Concession Street in the City of Hamilton, has been carried out in support of a Park Master Plan to guide redevelopment of its existing facilities. The assessment entailed consideration of the proximity of previously registered archaeological sites, the original environmental setting of the property, and its nineteenth- and twentieth-century development history.

This research has led to the conclusion that there is no potential for the presence of significant archaeological resources that may be impacted by site preparation or construction activities necessitated by any proposed redevelopment within the park. Accordingly, this report recommends that Sam Lawrence Park be cleared of any further archaeological concern, with the proviso that the appropriate authorities must be notified should deeply buried archaeological or human remains be encountered during any future work on the property.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was retained by City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment of the proposed redevelopment of Sam Lawrence Park at 255 Concession Street in the City of Hamilton (Figure 1). The subject property encompasses approximately 7.53 hectares and is located on the brow of Hamilton Mountain at the Jolley Cut. The City of Hamilton Archaeology Management Plan, implemented under guidance provided by the Ontario Planning Act’s 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, identifies the property as being of archaeological potential (CoH 2016).

This assessment, required to inform the City’s development of a Park Master Plan, was conducted under the project management and direction of David Robertson (P372-0067-2019). All activities carried out during this assessment were completed in accordance with the terms of the Ontario Heritage Act and the Ministry of Tourism and Culture’s (now Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industry) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011).

Permission to access the subject property and to carry out all activities necessary for the completion of the assessment was granted by the City of Hamilton on November 8, 2019.

2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

Southern Ontario has been occupied by human populations since the retreat of the Laurentide glacier approximately 13,000 years before present (BP). Populations at this time would have been highly mobile, inhabiting a boreal-parkland similar to the modern sub-arctic. By approximately 10,000 BP, the environment had progressively warmed (Edwards and Fritz 1988) and populations now occupied less extensive territories (Ellis and Deller 1990).

Between approximately 10,000-5,500 BP, the Great Lakes basins experienced low-water levels, and many sites which would have been located on those former shorelines are now submerged. This period produces the earliest evidence of heavy wood working tools, an indication of greater investment of labour in felling trees for fuel, to build shelter, and watercraft production. These activities suggest prolonged seasonal residency at occupation sites. Polished stone and native copper implements were being produced by approximately 8,000 BP; the latter was acquired from the north shore of Lake Superior, evidence of extensive exchange networks throughout the Great Lakes region. The earliest evidence for cemeteries dates to approximately 4,500-3,000 BP and is indicative of increased social organization, investment of labour into social infrastructure, and the establishment of socially prescribed territories (Ellis et al. 1990, 2009; Brown 1995:13).

Between 3,000-2,500 BP, populations continued to practice residential mobility and to harvest seasonally available resources, including spawning fish. The Woodland period begins around 2500 BP and exchange and interaction networks broaden at this time (Spence et al. 1990:136, 138) and by approximately 2,000 BP, evidence exists for macro-band camps, focusing on the seasonal harvesting of resources (Spence et al.
1990:155, 164). By 1500 BP there is macro botanical evidence for maize in southern Ontario, and it is thought that maize only supplemented people’s diet. There is earlier phytolithic evidence for maize in central New York State by 2300 BP - it is likely that once similar analyses are conducted on Ontario vessels of the same period, the same evidence will be found (Birch and Williamson 2013:13–15). Bands likely retreated to interior camps during the winter. It is generally understood that these populations were Algonquian-speakers during these millennia of settlement and land use.

From the beginning of the Late Woodland period at approximately 1,000 BP lifeways became more similar to that described in early historical documents. Between approximately 1000-1300 Common Era (CE), the communal site is replaced by the village focused on horticulture. Seasonal disintegration of the community for the exploitation of a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson 1990:317). By 1300-1450 CE, this episodic community disintegration was no longer practised and populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et al. 1990:343). From 1450-1649 CE this process continued with the coalescence of these small villages into larger communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). Through this process, the socio-political organization of the First Nations, as described historically by the French and English explorers who first visited southern Ontario, was developed. By 1600 CE, the communities within Simcoe County had formed the Confederation of Nations encountered by the first European explorers and missionaries. In the 1640s, the traditional enmity between the Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat (and their Algonkian allies such as the Nippissing and Odawa) led to the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat.

Samuel de Champlain in 1615 reported that a group of Iroquoian-speaking people situated between the Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat were at peace and remained “la nation neutre”. In subsequent years, the French visited and traded among the Neutral, but the first documented visit was not until 1626, when the Recollet missionary Joseph de la Roche Daillon recorded his visit to the villages of the Attiwandaron, whose name in the Huron-Wendat language meant “those who speak a slightly different tongue” (the Neutral apparently referred to the Huron-Wendat by the same term). Like the Huron-Wendat, Petun, and Haudenosaunee, the Neutral people were settled village agriculturalists. Several discrete settlement clusters have been identified in the lower Grand River, Fairchild-Big Creek, Upper Twenty Mile Creek, Spencer-Bronte Creek drainages, Milton, Grimsby, Eastern Niagara Escarpment and Onondaga Escarpment areas, which are attributed to Iroquoian populations. These settlement clusters are believed by some scholars to have been inhabited by populations of the Neutral Nation or pre- (or ancestral) Neutral Nation (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990).

Between 1647 and 1651, the Neutral were decimated by epidemics and ultimately dispersed by the Haudenosaunee, who subsequently settled along strategic trade routes on the north shore of Lake Ontario for a brief period during the mid seventeenth-century. Compared to settlements of the Haudenosaunee, the “Iroquois du Nord” occupation of the landscape was less intensive. Only seven villages are identified by the early historic cartographers on the north shore, and they are documented as considerably smaller than those in New York State. The populations were agriculturalists, growing maize, pumpkins, and squash. These settlements also played the important alternate role of serving as stopovers and bases for Haudenosaunee travelling to the north shore for the annual beaver hunt (Konrad 1981).

---

1 The Haudenosaunee are also known as the New York Iroquois or Five Nations Iroquois and after 1722 Six Nations Iroquois. They were a confederation of five distinct but related Iroquoian–speaking groups – the Seneca, Onondaga, Cayuga, Oneida, and Mohawk. Each lived in individual territories in what is now known as the Finger Lakes district of Upper New York. In 1722 the Tuscarora joined the confederacy.
Shortly after dispersal of the Wendat and their Algonquian allies, Ojibwa began to expand into southern Ontario and Michigan from a “homeland” along the east shore of Georgian Bay, west along the north shore of Lake Huron, and along the northeast shore of Lake Superior and onto the Upper Peninsula of Michigan (Rogers 1978:760–762). This history was constructed by Rogers using both Anishinaabek oral tradition and the European documentary record, and notes that it included Chippewa, Ojibwa, Mississauga, and Saulteaux or “Southeastern Ojibwa” groups. Ojibwa, likely Odawa, were first encountered by Samuel de Champlain in 1615 along the eastern shores of Georgian Bay. Etienne Brule later encountered other groups and by 1641, Jesuits had journeyed to Sault Sainte Marie (Thwaites 1896:11:279) and opened the Mission of Saint Peter in 1648 for the occupants of Manitoulin Island and the northeast shore of Lake Huron. The Jesuits reported that these Algonquian peoples lived “solely by hunting and fishing and roam as far as the “Northern sea” to trade for “Furs and Beavers, which are found there in abundance” (Thwaites 1896-1901, 33:67), and “all of these Tribes are nomads, and have no fixed residence, except at certain seasons of the year, when fish are plentiful, and this compels them to remain on the spot” (Thwaites 1896-1901, 33:153). Algonquian-speaking groups were historically documented wintering with the Huron-Wendat, some who abandoned their country on the shores of the St. Lawrence because of attacks from the Haudenosaunee (Thwaites 1896-1901, 27:37).

During the 1690s, some Ojibwa began moving south into extreme southern Ontario and soon replaced the Haudenosaunee by force. By the first decade of the eighteenth century, the Michi Saagig Nishnaabeg (Mississauga Nishnaabeg) had settled at the mouth of the Humber, near Fort Frontenac at the east end of Lake Ontario and the Niagara region and within decades were well established throughout southern Ontario. In 1736, the French estimated there were 60 men at Lake Saint Clair and 150 among small settlements at Quinte, the head of Lake Ontario, the Humber River, and Matchedash (Rogers 1978:761). This history is based almost entirely on oral tradition provided by Anishinaabek elders such as George Copway (Kahgagahbowh), a Mississauga born in 1818 near Rice Lake who followed a traditional lifestyle until his family converted to Christianity (MacLeod 1992:197; Smith 2000). According to Copway, the objectives of campaigns against the Haudenosaunee were to create a safe trade route between the French and the Ojibwa, to regain the land abandoned by the Huron-Wendat. While various editions of Copway’s book have these battles occurring in the mid-seventeenth century, common to all is a statement that the battles occurred around 40 years after the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat (Copway 1850:88, 1851:91, 1858:91). Various scholars agree with this timeline ranging from 1687, in conjunction with Denonville’s attack on Seneca villages (Johnson 1986:48; Schmalz 1991:21–22) to around the mid- to late-1690s leading up to the Great Peace of 1701 (Schmalz 1977:7; Bowman 1975:20; Smith 1975:215; Tanner 1987:33; Von Gernet 2002:7–8).

Peace was achieved between the Haudenosaunee and the Anishinaabek Nations in August of 1701 when representatives of more than twenty Anishinaabek Nations assembled in Montreal to participate in peace negotiations (Johnston 2004:10). During these negotiations, captives were exchanged and the Iroquois and Anishinaabek agreed to live together in peace. Peace between these nations was confirmed again at council held at Lake Superior when the Iroquois delivered a wampum belt to the Anishinaabek Nations.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century to the assertion of British sovereignty in 1763, there is no interruption to Anishinaabek control and use of southern Ontario. While hunting in the territory was shared, and subject to the permission of the various nations for access to their lands, its occupation was by Anishinaabek until the assertion of British sovereignty, the British thereafter negotiating treaties with them. Eventually, with British sovereignty, tribal designations changed (Smith 1975:221–222; Surtees 1985:20–21). According to Rogers (1978), by the twentieth century, the Department of Indian Affairs had divided the “Anishinaubag” into three different tribes, despite the fact that by the early eighteenth century, this large Algonquian-speaking group, who shared the same cultural background, “stretched over a thousand miles
from the St. Lawrence River to the Lake of the Woods.” With British land purchases and treaties, the bands at Beausoleil Island, Cape Croker, Christian Island, Georgina and Snake Islands, Rama, Sarnia, Saugeen, the Thames, and Walpole, became known as “Chippewa” while the bands at Alderville, New Credit, Mud Lake, Rice Lake, and Scugog, became known as “Mississauga.” The northern groups on Lakes Huron and Superior, who signed the Robinson Treaty in 1850, appeared and remained as “Ojibbewas” in historical documents.

In 1763, following the fall of Quebec, New France was transferred to British control at the Treaty of Paris. The British government began to pursue major land purchases to the north of Lake Ontario in the early nineteenth century, the Crown acknowledged the Mississaugas as the owners of the lands between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe and entered into negotiations for additional tracts of land as the need arose to facilitate European settlement.

The eighteenth century saw the ethnogenesis in Ontario of the Métis, when Métis people began to identify as a separate group, rather than as extensions of their typically maternal First Nations and paternal European ancestry (Métis National Council n.d.). Métis populations were predominantly located north and west of Lake Superior, however, communities were located throughout Ontario (MNC n.d.; Stone and Chaput 1978:607,608). During the early nineteenth century, many Métis families moved towards locales around southern Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, including Kincardine, Owen Sound, Penetanguishene, and Parry Sound (MNC n.d.). Recent decisions by the Supreme Court of Canada (Supreme Court of Canada 2003, 2016) have reaffirmed that Métis people have full rights as one of the Indigenous people of Canada under subsection 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867.

The subject property is located within an area alienated by the British from the native Mississaugas through a provisional treaty made at Niagara on May 22, 1784. This land purchase was confirmed or ratified by Treaty No. 3—the “Between the Lakes Purchase”—signed by the Mississaugas and Sir Frederick Haldimand at Navy Hall at Niagara on Dec. 7, 1792. This treaty transferred to the Crown all of the land between Mississauga Point near the west bank of the Niagara River westward to the “Washquarter” (Burlington Bay), and from thence to the River La Tranche (Thames) and then along Catfish Creek until it reached Lake Erie. The price which the British paid for this large tract of land amounted to just £1,180.7.4 (Anonymous 1891 volume 1:5-7).

2.2 Barton Township and Hamilton

Between 1784 and 1791, this part of southern Ontario formed a part of the Nassau District in the judicial District of Montreal in the Province of Quebec. The capital for the district was situated in the Town of Newark (Niagara) after 1787-88. In 1791, the old Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada, and in 1792 the old District of Nassau was renamed as the Home District of Upper Canada (Armstrong 1985:137ff).

Barton Township comprised part of the West Riding of York in the Home District which was administered from Niagara between 1792 and 1800. Plans were made for York to be the capital of Upper Canada in the winter of 1796, but it was not until February 1798 that it was selected by the Duke of Portland as the “seat of Government on mature deliberation.” On January 1, 1800, the Home District was elevated into a separated administrative jurisdiction from Niagara and governed from the Town of York (Toronto). In March 1816, parts of the West Riding of York and portions of Lincoln County and the County of Haldimand were separated to form the Gore District. The new district included two new counties (Wentworth and Halton) and Hamilton was selected as the district town. Following the abolition of the
districts in 1849, the Gore District was succeeded by the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton. This judicial union was dissolved in 1854-1855 when Halton was elevated to the status of a separate County. This was succeeded by the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth in 1973-1974 (12 Vic. c. 81; Firth 1962:47; Armstrong 1985:138-141, 170-172). The city and local municipalities within the Region were amalgamated in 2001, creating the City of Hamilton.

Barton Township was named in 1792 after Barton-upon-Humber, a town in Lincolnshire, England. Wentworth County is thought to have been named in honour of Sir John Wentworth who was the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia between 1792 and 1808, and the friend of some of the members of the governing elite at the Town of York. His sister, Annabella, was the wife of Francis Gore, who was the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada at the time when the county was established (Gardiner 1899:266, 261; Armstrong 1985:33).

The first township survey was undertaken ca. 1791 and a copy of a patent plan for Barton prepared by Augustus Jones was dated in October of that same year. An office copy of the plan was prepared for Thomas Ridout of the Surveyor General’s office in January 1812 (Winears 1991:464; Armstrong 1985:141).

The early gazetteers of the province refer to the location of Barton Township on Burlington Bay. The bay was described as “perhaps as beautiful and romantic a situation as any in America.” One of these gazetteers refers to a “small town laid out” at the Head of the Lake, “about fifty miles west from Niagara…public stores are building, being a central place between Newark, York, and Detroit.” Since the author does not provide the name of the town it is uncertain whether he was referring to Ancaster, Hamilton, or Dundas (Smith 1799:52; Boulton 1805:48, 52).

Barton was described as having “generally good” soil, although “light” near the bay and lakeshore. In 1846, approximately 58% of the available land in the township was under cultivation with an assessed value of £13,873. The township was primarily timbered with hardwood (maple, black walnut, beech and oak) with a small amount of pine. Barton then contained one grist mill and five sawmills. The population in 1842 (exclusive of Hamilton) was 1,434. (Smith 1846:8).

The earliest plans of subdivision for Hamilton were laid out around 1815 by George Hamilton “from whom it derived its name.” The commerce and population of the town greatly increased following the opening of the Burlington Canal (constructed between 1823 and 1832) which thereby provided Hamilton with direct access to Lake Ontario and other market towns around the lake. The settlement was also linked to other parts of the province by various roads, and after 1853-1857 by the Great Western Railway. Visitors to Hamilton remarked upon the well-laid out streets in the town, and on the number of fine stone shops and houses that had been built there. The Gore District Court was first held in Hamilton in 1822, and a post office was established there in 1825 when W.B. Sheldon was appointed to serve as the first postmaster. The settlement was incorporated as a police village in January 1833, and the place was elevated to city status in June 1846. The population of the town in 1845 was estimated to number 6,475. Directories and gazetteers published during the 1840s and 1850s show that Hamilton was a thriving place, and these sources listed the various businesses, trades, and public institutions that had been established (Smith 1846:75-77).\(^2\)

\(^2\) For more comprehensive histories of Hamilton, refer to standard works such as Johnston (1958), Katz (1975), Weaver (1982) and others.
2.3 The Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Development of the Subject Property

The subject property comprises parts of Lots 12 and 13, Concession 3, in the former Township of Barton, County of Wentworth. These two 100-acre (40.47 ha) lots were first claimed by Lieutenant Caleb Reynolds in the late eighteenth century, but ultimately were patented by Richard Springer on June 20, 1801 (Burkholder and Woodhouse 1958).

Both Reynolds and Springer were former members of Butler’s Rangers who settled in southern Ontario at the conclusion of the Revolutionary War.

Reynolds was born in Plainfield, Connecticut, around 1757, and was the son of a farmer. He served for seven years in Butler’s Rangers, attaining the rank of second lieutenant in Captain Peter Hare’s company. He was a resident at Niagara from before 1783, until at least the fall of 1787. He was named as a single man in the provision lists of 1786, living in Niagara Township. He had settled permanently in Barton Township with his wife, Rachel, before April 1793 (Powell 1956:72; Johnston 1958:333).

Springer was born in September of 1757 in Albany, New York. His father, a Methodist minister, was killed by revolutionary troops and the rest of the family fled to Newark (Niagara-on-the-Lake), where Richard enlisted. Springer married Sarah Boyce in 1786 and they had moved to Hamilton by 1791, where he became a prominent Methodist preacher (Johnston 1958:94-95).

Richard Springer’s son, David, acquired Lot 12 in 1828 and the process of subdivision began shortly thereafter; early purchasers of parcels that include the subject property above the escarpment included Hutchison Clarke, Tristram Bickle, Tristram Bickle, and William Fieley (McKenzie 1837). The 1851 Map of the City of Hamilton in the County of Wentworth by Marcus Smith (Figure 2) shows that by that time several of the lots had been further subdivided and two streets, Belmont Street and Belmont Terrace had been laid out. Further subdivision and an expanded network of minor streets by the end of the 1850s are indicated on Robert Surtees’ 1859 Map of the County of Hamilton (Figure 3). The basic configuration of the Lot 12 potions of the subject property appears unchanged on the map of Barton Township in the 1875 Page & Smith Wentworth Historical Atlas (Figure 4).

By 1820, the Lot 13 portion of the subject property was in the possession of Richard Bull (Greer 1820), who accumulated extensive land holdings in Hamilton. It remained in his possession until at least 1859 (Figures 2-4), but it appears not to have been developed in any significant way during this period, with the exception of a house occupied by William Springer on the east side of the lot (Figure 2).

Travel between the mountain and the more densely settled city had always been challenging and the subject property was the location of a number of engineering works to overcome this problem, in the form of the various routes forming part of the John Street access or Mountain Road of the 1840s and 1850s, some of the route of which represent forerunners of in the present Arkledun Avenue-Jolley Cut switchback, which is a major feature of the subject property (HHI 2005). These engineering projects—which continued into the early twentieth century as routes were repaired following episodes of collapse and erosion, or were modified or realigned—required extensive excavations along the brow of the escarpment, the scale of which is revealed in the topographic mapping produced by the Department of Militia and Defence (Figures 5-6, 8) and period aerial photography (Figure 7, 9), which reveal that the entire subject property had been affected by quarrying by 1930.

The quarry, which was operated by G.F. Webb, was described in 1912 as “situated on the mountain side at the head of Victoria St. The opening is about 200 feet long and has been worked back 50 feet. The present
stripping is about 5 feet thick, but it will increase as the quarry is enlarged. About 200 feet in from the present face the vertical cliff of the overlying limestones will make further operations impossible except by actual mining…. The practice is to quarry with ball drills and black powder and to break all of the output into rubble; a great deal of good stone is thereby destroyed” (Parks 1912:143).

The city acquired the former quarry in 1944 and it was restored through filling operations over subsequent years to create new parkland (Figure 9) in conjunction with reconfiguration of the Jolley Cut to its present general form (Figure 10). The major elements of the original park were designed by landscape architect K. Matt Broman in the 1950s and 1960s.

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

3.1 Physiographic Setting

The subject property is located on the edge of the Niagara Escarpment, overlooking the Iroquois Plain (Chapman and Putnam 1984), which is the former bed of glacial Lake Iroquois.

The Niagara Escarpment physiographic region extends from the Niagara River to the northern tip of the Bruce Peninsula, continuing through the Manitoulin Islands (Chapman and Putman 1984: 114-122). Vertical cliffs along the brow mostly outline the edge of the dolostone of the Lockport and Amabel Formations, while the slopes below are carved in red shale. Flanked by landscapes of glacial origin, the rock-hewn topography stands in striking contrast, and its steep-sided valleys are strongly suggestive of non-glacial regions. From Queenston, on the Niagara River, westward to Ancaster, the Escarpment is a simple topographic break separating the two levels of the Niagara Peninsula. In general, the base follows the 100 m ASL contour while the top of the cliff reaches almost 200 m.

The forests that stood above the Niagara Escarpment, prior to nineteenth-century clearance were likely dominated by maple (Acer sp.) and beech (Fagus sp.), with frequent associates of oak (Quercus sp.), pine (Pinus sp.), basswood (Tilia americana), and elm (Ulmus sp.), black ash (Fraxinus nigra) and cedar (Thuja sp.) (Hills 1958; Burgar 1993).

3.2 Previous Archaeological Research

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for the subject property and surrounding area, three sources of information were consulted: the site record forms for registered sites housed at MHSTCI; published and unpublished documentary sources; and files located at Archaeological Services Inc.

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MHSTCI. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada is divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 km east to west, and approximately 18.5 km north to south. Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a Borden block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The subject property is located in Borden block AhGx.
No archaeological sites have been registered within the limits of the subject property. Nine sites have been registered within a one kilometre radius of the property’s boundaries (Table 1), seven of which are related to the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century development of the City of Hamilton, although two of these sites also have Indigenous components. The remaining two sites represent precontact Indigenous activity of undetermined date or character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-224</td>
<td>Whitehern</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>ASI 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-493</td>
<td>Auchmar Estate</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>HHI 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-672</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>TMHC 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-673</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>TMHC 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-683</td>
<td>Loretto</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>AWI 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-736</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>GAL 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-763</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>DCL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-765</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>DCL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGx-788</td>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>AECOM 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASI=Archaeological Services Inc. AWI=Archeoworks Inc. DCL=Detritus Consulting Ltd. FAC=Fisher Archaeological Consultants GAL=Golder Associated Ltd. HHI=Historic Horizons Inc. TMHC=Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants

The western portion of the subject property was considered during the Stage 1 archaeological assessment conducted as part of the H3 Water Pressure District Servicing Upgrades Class EA (HHI 2005), which noted that landscape alterations related to the development of Arkledun Avenue/Jolley Cut, the High Level Reservoir and Samuel Lawrence Park had removed archaeological integrity within the area under consideration as part of that project (HHI 2005:14).

ASI has no record of any other property-specific assessments that may have been conducted on or within 50 metres of the subject property.

### 3.3 Modelling Indigenous Archaeological Resource Potential

Water is arguably the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in southern Ontario after the Pleistocene era, proximity to water can be regarded as the primary indicator of archaeological site potential. Accordingly, distance to water is one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modelling of archaeological site location.

The Provincial 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MTC 2011:17-18) stipulate that undisturbed lands within 300 m of primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, etc.), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps, etc.), ancient water sources, and the shorelines of extant or former waterbodies are considered, at a generic level, to exhibit archaeological potential. A variety of other criteria that may indicate potential are also identified in the *Standards and Guidelines*, however, they are not relevant to the subject property or cannot be reconstructed given the urban context in which the property occurs.

The generic *Standards and Guidelines* distance to water potential model has been refined for the City of Hamilton, as part of the City’s Archaeology Management Plan (CoH 2016), undisturbed lands within 200 m of an extant or former first order watercourse, or within 300 m of a second order water source, have
potential for the presence of precontact Indigenous archaeological sites. In addition, potential is defined within 100 m of distinctive landform features, such as escarpments, moraines, drumlins, areas of well-drained soils, etc. that may have influenced past land uses (CoH 2016:Appendix D).

No extant watercourses flow within this portion of the city today, nor does the available historical mapping indicate the presence of any former creeks or streams within the immediate vicinity of the subject property (Figure 2). The early Department of Militia and Defence topographic sheets (Figures 5-6, 8) show that a tributary of Red Hill Creek lay approximately 500 metres to the south of the subject property, flowing east-southeast towards the main channel of the creek.

3.4 Existing Conditions

A property inspection was conducted on December 9, 2019, in order to refine the basic understanding of the archaeological potential of the subject property (Figure 11) and to determine the degree to which development and landscape alteration may affect that potential. The property was inspected when weather and lighting conditions permitted satisfactory visibility of features.

The property is a heavily landscape park, consisted of lawns, rock gardens, areas of tree plantings, pedestrian paths, parking pads, servicing of various types and other park amenities. It is bisected by the Jolley Cut. The present landscape bears no resemblance to its original form as the park was created following the closure of the Webb quarry. Extraction of limestone during the quarry operations extended across the entire property.

4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the possibility for the survival of any archaeological resources of potential cultural heritage value must take into account a number of taphonomic considerations in addition to the basic historical sequence of developments, demolitions, and general patterns of change in property use outlined in Sections 2.0 and 3.0.

4.1 Archaeological Resource Potential

The property falls within a zone of general potential for the presence of precontact or early contact period Indigenous sites as defined by the City of Hamilton Archaeology Management Plan by virtue of its location on the edge of the Niagara Escarpment. Likewise, its location relative to Concession Street, which is the original road allowance between Concessions 3 and 4 of Barton Township, place it within a nineteenth-century Euro-Canadian potential zone.

However, the potential for the survival of any archaeological resources of any type on the subject property is nil. The entire property was a quarry in the early to mid-twentieth century, resulting in the removal of all original surficial topography/landscape features. The destructive effects of quarrying have been compounded by construction of the Jolley Cut along several different alignments of the years, massive filling and landscaping required for the creation of the current park. These conclusions are consistent with the statements concerning the removal of archaeological potential ("disturbance") outlined in Section 1.3.2 of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Industries’ 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:18).
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the findings of the Stage 1 assessment research, the following recommendation is made:

1. Sam Lawrence Park, located at 255 Concession Street, may be considered free of further archaeological concern. No further archaeological assessment is required.

Notwithstanding the results and recommendations presented in this study, Archaeological Services Inc. notes that no archaeological assessment, no matter how thorough or carefully completed, can necessarily predict, account for, or identify every form of isolated or deeply buried archaeological deposit. In the event that archaeological remains are found during subsequent construction activities, the consultant archaeologist, approval authority, and the Cultural Programs Unit of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industry should be immediately notified.

The documentation related to this archaeological assessment will be curated by Archaeological Services Inc. until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner(s), the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industry, and any other legitimate interest groups.

6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

The following advice on compliance with legislation is provided:

- This report is submitted to the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological field work and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

- It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological field work on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- The Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33, requires that any person discovering or having knowledge of a burial site shall immediately notify the police or coroner. It is recommended that the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services is also immediately notified.
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Plate 1: View east along edge of escarpment.

Plate 2: View south to rock garden.

Plate 3: View east along edge of escarpment.

Plate 4: View southeast to rock garden.

Plate 5: View southwest to rock garden.

Plate 6: View southwest across open lawn area.
Plate 7: View east across rock garden.

Plate 8: View northwest across rock garden.

Plate 9: View southeast from rock garden.

Plate 10: View northeast to rock garden.

Plate 11: View east across open area.

Plate 12: View west across open area.
Plate 13: View northeast from Concession Street and Wellington Street North intersection.

Plate 14: View northwest from Concession Street and Wellington Street North intersection.

Plate 15: View northwest from Concession Street and Viola Court intersection.

Plate 16: View west along Concession Street.
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See following pages for detailed assessment mapping and figures.
Figure 2: The subject property on the 1851 Smith Map of the City of Hamilton.

Figure 3: The subject property on the 1859 Surtees Map of the County of Wentworth.

Figure 4: The subject property on the 1875 Page & Smith map of Barton Township in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth.

Figure 5: The subject property on the 1867 Department of Militia and Defence Grimsby topographic map.

Figure 6: The subject property on the 1923 Department of Militia and Defence Grimsby topographic map.

Figure 7: The subject property on the 1934 Royal Canadian Air Force aerial photography.

Figure 8: The subject property on the 1938 Department of Militia and Defence Grimsby topographic map.

Figure 9: The subject property on the 1950 Royal Canadian Air Force aerial photography.

Figure 10: The subject property on the 1963 Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Mount Albion topographic map.

Appendix "C" to Report PW18056(a)
Figure 11: Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment of Sam Lawrence Park, 255 Concession Street – existing conditions and assessment of archaeological potential.
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan
Meeting Notes

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Audit with Hamilton Police Service (HPS) / Landscape Architectural Services (LAS)

Date: Thursday May 30, 2019 – 8:30am to 10:30am
Place: Sam Lawrence Park, 255 Concession Street, Hamilton

Attendance:
Hamilton Police Service
P.C. Ray Wong  CPTED Officer  Hamilton Police Service

Project Team
John Vandriel  Project Lead, Landscape Architectural Services  City of Hamilton

Purpose of Meeting:

Site visit to identify existing areas of safety concern within the park, and recommend design measures to improve park safety through the Master Plan design.

Field notes were taken, identifying specific areas of the park. The attached maps include notes detailing the analysis and specific site recommendations.

Below is a summary of general notes from Hamilton Police Service for the design team’s consideration to inform park design and maintenance.

Future park designs should consider the three (3) basic overlapping principles for crime prevention, as stated in HPS’s CPTED principles, also attached to this document.

1. Natural Surveillance: provide opportunities to see and be seen.
   Example: trimming trees / shrubs to improve sight lines into and out of the park space.

2. Access Control: create both real and perceptual barriers to entry and movement.
   Example: gardens, pathways to guide movement through a site.

3. Territorial Reinforcement: used to design private, semi-private and public space. Defining the space creates a sense of ownership and provides cues about who belongs in a place and what they are allowed to do.
   Example: strategically placing markers, flowerbeds, low fencing, walls, and signage.

The preceding summary of the discussions of this meeting has been prepared to record comments and inform the project. Please advise the undersigned of any errors or omissions.

Prepared by:
John Vandriel
Landscape Architectural Services,
City of Hamilton
Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca

Distribution: All present, Project file
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, or CPTED, examines crime problems and the ways various features of the environment afford opportunities for undesirable and unwanted behaviours. CPTED strives to eliminate criminal opportunities in and around your property by identifying problem areas and effecting change. Where these techniques have been applied to problem settings, crimes of opportunity have decreased by as much as 90%.

**HOW CAN I MAKE MY PROPERTY SAFER?**

CPTED simply involves three basic and overlapping principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Surveillance</th>
<th>Access Control</th>
<th>Territorial Reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities to see and be seen. Most Criminals try to find a way into an area where they will not be easily observed.</td>
<td>Create both real and perceptual barriers to entry and movement.</td>
<td>Used to define private, semi-public and public space. Defining private space creates a sense of ownership and provides cues about who belongs in a place and what they are allowed to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A NATURAL SURVEILLANCE REVIEW**

Start by taking a fresh look at your property’s natural surveillance potential. Ask yourself:

- Are the views of your property obscured from the street or your neighbours?
- Are there any adult-sized hiding spots around your doors or windows?
- Are there areas of contrast and shadow where intruders can linger undetected?

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, natural surveillance needs to be improved. Consider adding motion activated lights, trimming up trees, trimming back bushes or altering fencing so that intruders can be kept under observation. Windows and furniture placement can also support observation.

**ACCESS CONTROL REVIEW**

Next, take a fresh look at your property’s access control. Ask yourself:

- Do people routinely violate my property and/or fence lines?
- Can this be done in an inconspicuous manner?
- Do people access my property in ways other than I intended?
- Do any existing access routes lack natural surveillance?
- As a result of the placement or existence of outdoor furniture, equipment and/or utilities, is there potential to access an otherwise inaccessible window, door or opening?

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, your property’s access control needs to be improved. Consider the following:

- Better control of undesired movements onto and within your property.
- Install landscaping, fencing or barriers to increase the visibility of anyone breaching a boundary.
- Reinforce an existing boundary that’s already been subject to trespass.
- Driveways, sidewalks, paths and gardens guide movement through a site.
- Gates and doors limit entry to a site or building.
- When selecting landscaping materials, consider choosing species with thorns.
- Where possible, keep furniture, equipment and/or utilities, away from otherwise inaccessible windows, doors or openings. Strong access control decreases crime opportunity.
A TERRITORIAL REVIEW

Finally, take a fresh look at your property’s territoriality. Ask yourself:

- Do strangers regularly trespass on my property?
- Is my property being used as a short cut?
- Does my property have an un-lived in or un-kept look?
- Are there under utilized sections of my property where the public is invited and people loiter?

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, your property’s territoriality needs to be improved. To rectify this, create or extend a sphere of influence around your property by:

- Strategically placing markers, flowerbeds, low fencing, walls, hedges, and signage.
- Better and/or more timely maintenance.
- Where the public is invited, assign a purpose to “leftover spaces”.
- Create an “illusion of occupancy” (Keep your lawn maintained, driveway shovelled and pick your mail. Have someone check on your property and use lights with time.)

INTERIOR APPLICATIONS

CPTED is equally effective when applied to building or store interiors. Studies have shown that the application of CPTED techniques reportedly decrease security problems by up to 50% and increased sales by as much as 33%.

MAXIMIZING CPTED BENEFITS

CPTED provides the opportunity to design in crime prevention and design out crime. For maximum benefits, CPTED should be applied at the design or planning stage when these benefits can be achieved at little or no cost.

SECURITY AUDITS


Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies are effective when applied to building or store interiors. Studies have shown that the application of CPTED techniques may reportedly decrease security problems by up to 50% and increase sales by as much as 33%. Hamilton Police Service Crime Prevention Officers can conduct a thorough assessment of your business environment.

For further information on this service please contact the Crime Prevention Office at 905-546-4900

DON’T FORGET ABOUT TARGET HARDENING

For maximum crime prevention benefits, target hardening should be implemented alongside CPTED principles.

Keep all doors and windows locked and secured!

Content of this fact sheet is provided courtesy of Peel Regional Police Service.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON THIS SUBJECT OR OTHER CRIME PREVENTION TOPICS PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT WWW.HAMILTONPOLICE.ON.CA OR PLEASE CONTACT:

HAMILTON POLICE SERVICE – CRIME PREVENTION
155 King William Street, Hamilton, Ontario Phone: 905-546-4900 Fax: 905-546-4720
Maintenance Building Schematic Design
Note 1: building occupancy for operations to be confirmed
Note 2: Room dimensions are based on precedent research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations Function Only</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Office Space - Table, desk, internet/phone, first aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lunch Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Combined U-Washroom / Changeroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Combined U-Washroom / Changeroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Indoor or Covered Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mechanical Electrical Room (Gore PI)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Exterior Storage Area, Securable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Porta-Potty Pad (1.2m x 1.2m per)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>150.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1623.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25% Gross Up</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>405.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2029.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition of Public Washrooms - Options</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Universal Washroom (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Female - 6 Stall + 1 family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Male - 2 Stall + 3 Urinals + 1 family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>