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The Stadium Precinct Community Park Feasibility Study has been prepared to illustrate the preliminary design solution generated through the consultation and investigation process commencing in May 2019 through to December 2019.

Strasman Architects Inc and Dillon Consulting Limited were retained by the City of Hamilton to complete a feasibility analysis for the implementation of a multi-use sports stadium and park facility at lands purchased by the City at 43 Lloyd Street which formerly housed the Dominion Glass manufacturing plant. The report contains summaries of the project decisions and the information generated through the studies and design exercises. Drawings, diagrams and illustrations have also been included as appendices to support the narrative as a suitable reference for the compiled study documentation. Full size drawings and relevant CAD files have been generated as part of the study and will be provided separately as further support to the document.

The report incorporates information generated previously from third parties pertaining to the existing site conditions and environmental investigations.
2.0 Introduction

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Purpose of the Study was to facilitate a design solution for the park that incorporated the primary mandate from the City of Hamilton to accommodate a new stadium to replace the displaced Brian Timmis Field, as well as the secondary mandate to provide public green space in a park setting. The solution is intended to support further planning for the project and to capture the scope of work based on the City’s recreation and landscape mandates and programs and uses identified by the community. The design documentation has been developed to support a Level D cost estimate for the site works and vertical structures in the park design.

Through consultation with the internal stakeholders at the City as well as external stakeholders in the community, program elements are identified in support of the playing field functions, the park amenities and the recreational activities planned for the site. In addition, the design is intended to illustrate an engineering solution that considers the environmental site conditions and the existing physical characteristics of the property.

BACKGROUND WORK COMPLETED

Prior to SAI and Dillon being retained for the feasibility study, Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) were undertaken by WESA in 2014. A Phase 1 ESA was also completed in 2016 by WSP and the subsequent information inputted into the design solution. Boreholes and monitoring wells have been installed on-site in support of a subsequent Phase 2 ESA.

An initial test diagram was prepared by the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services to illustrate the primary program elements on the site. The initial layout indicated the playing field adjacent to Gage St. with a central parking area accessed off of Lloyd St and an adjacent field house structure. An associated site constraints analysis diagram was prepared by City of Hamilton Public Works to stakeholder and public involvement.

Stadium Precinct Community Park Preliminary Concept

Site Constraints and Preliminary Fit
STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The consultation process incorporated numerous review meetings with the internal stakeholder groups with the City of Hamilton including:

- Landscape Architectural Services
- Facilities
- Sport Services
- Recreation Planning
- Parks Operations

Additional external stakeholders were consulted including

- Canadian National Railway
- Hamilton Forge Football Club

The meetings were held in conjunction with the scheduled project initiation and design review meetings involving the key project stakeholders from the City. The intent was to ensure that input was received relative to operations, maintenance, functionality and consistency with existing City assets. The content of the meeting discussion and the related decisions are summarized in the minutes included under the appendices.

Public consultation was also conducted through online surveys and Public Information Centres completed at two separate milestones in the study process: once at the programming phase to gather input into the park elements and uses, and the second to respond to the proposed design configuration. The input gathered from both of these consultations was used to develop the final program requirements and the associated design solution developed by the consulting team.
Scope and Methodology

The origins of the proposed re-use of the brownfield site stems from the displacement of the Brian Timmis Field in order to accommodate the new Tim Horton’s field located two blocks to the south of the site. The displaced programming elements included:

1. Artificial turf playing field with spectator bleachers
2. On site parking
3. Field house to support recreational use

These displaced functions became the core committed programs for the proposed development of the site and the priority mandate of the project. The initial facility fit tests completed by the City demonstrated that the site could support additional programming beyond the committed programming. As such, new green space could be accommodated.

PARK AND OPEN SPACE

The scope of the study pertains to the analysis of the existing site conditions and the subsequent development of an initial design solution, documented via drawings, diagrams and illustrations. The consulting team reviewed the site access options from both Gage Ave N and Lloyd St via Chapple St. The analysis considered pedestrian and vehicle access requirements and fire route access as per municipal standards. Consideration was given to public safety and security on the site, as well as opportunities for establishing a community presence within the park boundaries.

PLAYING FIELD AND FIELD HOUSE

In conjunction with the development of the park program, the playing field and field house design was developed to accommodate the anticipated event capacity within the stadium as well as multi-use programmable functions within the public park areas. Priority was given to maximizing the flexibility and adaptability of the supporting structures to accommodate a wide variety of community functions. Planning considerations also included the impact from the adjacent rail corridor, potential impact on neighbouring residential properties, environmental impacted areas and access to services.

SERVICING AND GRADING

The review of existing and proposed services has been done in accordance with City of Hamilton requirements and as per the City’s engineering development guidelines. The site grading and soil management follows industry standards for slopes and protected heights to meet the needs of safety and maintenance requirements. The grading has been developed to avoid the need to remove material from the site where possible. The need for clean imported material is driven by environmental restrictions placed on the development.

The design process entailed the generation of several options for the site organization in order to test the established priorities for program layouts. The options were reviewed by the internal stakeholders for compliance as well as the quality of space inherent in the design. A preferred option was identified and then refined to ensure that the site opportunities were maximized for subsequent future development. Documentation through drawings, diagrams and technical descriptions was prepared and submitted for costing by the City’s third party quantity surveyor.
DOMINION GLASS MANUFACTURING FACILITY

The original Dominion Glass manufacturing facility was built in 1912 with subsequent additions being added to expand the operations. The property was acquired by the City of Hamilton in 2014 with the intent of converting the use to park lands. The site is approximately 4.6 ha. in size and is bounded by residential and commercial to the south, CN Rail lands to the north, Gage Avenue to the east, and industrial lands to the west. The site was acquired to replace Brian Timmis field which was lost due to the realignment of Tim Horton’s Field. Additionally, the site provides opportunity for neighbourhood parkland amenities in a community that is highly deficient.

The manufacturing plant has been mostly removed through demolition and materials stockpiled on site. The basement structure of the plant remains intact with large extents of concrete floor slab exposed on the north eastern side of the property. The remaining area of the site is paved and covered in concrete, rendering the property almost entirely covered with impermeable structures. Some salvaged items have been stored on site including heavy timber members, large glass boulders and portions of the steel smoke stacks. There is no existing green space currently on the site.

The available site area is used primarily for parking, storage and as staging area for movie and television production. Security remains a current problem with transient occupancy as make-shift shelters.
5.0 Summary of Existing Conditions

SUMMARY OF EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS, SITE SERVICING AND SITE ACCESS LOCATIONS

The existing site is a partially demolished former industrial facility with a number of potable water, sanitary, and storm services. The vehicular access to the site is from the south property limit along Chapple Street. Vehicular access is via an access easement over a former railway property which is currently privately owned. The existing services to the site are all assumed to be at end of service life and would be abandoned and replaced as part of the park development.

Work done by others (AECOM) hired directly by the City has determined that the site has been impacted by previous uses and environmental measures must be put in place to protect the public. There is a portion of the site for which guidance was provided to avoid any occupied building due to the need for gas venting. Details of these items, including calculations and figures, can be found in the technical memo appended to this report.
The program area for the project was determined over several consultation meetings with internal and external stakeholders as well as input from the community. The final program was established as follows:

**Playing Field**
1. Artificial Turf Playing Field. Area to accommodate both soccer and football events, with sufficient area allocated to sidelines and end zones for operations during tournament play. Full area to be secured.
2. Bleachers. Seating for 2500 persons with a press box incorporated
3. Storage for field equipment
4. Vehicle access to field for EMS or maintenance vehicles

**Field House and Parking**
1. 5 Change Rooms with shower and washroom facilities
2. 2 referee change rooms with shared washroom.
3. Staff room
4. Secure Entrance to Playing Field
5. Multi-use room with capacity for future concession stand
6. Public washrooms: Male, Female and Universal
7. Enclosed storage for Forge FC
8. First Aid Room
9. Maintenance Garage
10. Pump Room to support spray pad
11. Parking Area for 50 cars. 2 Barrier Free spaces
12. Bus Drop Off zone (2 Buses)

**Park and Open Space**
1. Senior and Junior Playground(s)
2. Open green space with tree planting for shade
3. Horticultural displays and areas for natural habitat
4. Sun shelter
5. Spray pad
6. Multi-use court
7. Skateboarding dots
8. Entrance feature
9. Drinking water fountain
10. Picnic area
11. Community gardens
12. Looped pathway for walking / running
13. Adult fitness equipment
14. Seating
15. Community art and event space
**01 Playing Field**
In analyzing the site, the team determined that the artificial turf playing field could be accommodated on the western most edge of the site. This allowed for a high degree of visibility to connect the open space with the public realm along Gage Ave to facilitate security. This also allowed for the most direct connection between the arrival driveway and the playing field entrance.

**02 Open Space**
The open space spreads across the eastern half of the site, bordering Gage Ave to the east and the CN rail corridor to the north which is separated by a 2m high berm. Two pedestrian access points connect Gage Ave to the park. This location on the site provides for the greatest opportunity for planting and natural surface materials given the lower level of environmental impact in this location.

**03 Park Amenities**
The play structures, multi-use court and spray pad are centrally located to connect both with the open space as well as the parking and public washroom amenities. They are also adjacent to the public plaza area for interconnection to community events.
04 Field House
The building is oriented in a north/south direction along the edge of the playing field, forming a screen to the back of the bleachers. The structure is separated into two main blocks that frame the central entrance to the playing field.

05 Vehicle Access
Chapple St is extended into the site to facilitate the main vehicle access and connects to the double loaded parking lot via a 6m wide driveway loop. A bus loading and unloading area is preserved alongside the field house.

06 Pedestrian Circulation
A network of connected multiuse trails are provided for across the site, oriented to connect the amenities with another and with the surrounding road network at both Gage and Lloyd.
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CONCEPTUAL PLAN
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT – PARK PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Stadium Precinct Park concept plan addresses the facility fit, the committed recreational programming and organization of the preferred park site amenities. It provides a design approach that creates a contemporary and inviting park facility for residents. The park concept plan identifies the recreational and social needs and desires of the community, and establishes a clear strategy for the revitalization of this site.

The plan recognizes the requirements and concerns expressed by the community and park users through a consultation process with the public and stakeholders and integrates these comments and ideas within a practical solution.

The committed recreational programming and park facility recommendations include:
- Artificial-turf soccer and football field with stadium seating and lighting
- Field house building
- Parking lot and entry road.

Park programming informed through public and stakeholder consultation includes:
- Senior and Junior Playground(s)
- Open green space with tree planting for shade
- Horticultural displays and areas for natural habitat
- Sun shelter
- Spray pad
- Multi-use court
- Skateboarding dots
- Entrance feature
- Drinking water fountain
- Picnic area
- Community gardens
- Looped pathway for walking / running
- Adult fitness equipment
- Seating
- Community art and event space
KEY PARK AMENITIES

MAIN PLAZA AND EVENT SPACE

The concept design approach was to create a central gathering and focal point to the park. This gathering space has been centrally located to function as a primary destination within the park. Several park amenities are proposed within this area creating multiple spaces and uses. These key amenities include: the main park pavilion, a larger paved area for gathering with seating and decorative planting, a junior and senior playground and a new spray pad.

The combination of these spaces creates a dramatic terminus within the park, allowing for a peripheral view of all the parks facilities from this central feature, creating a much more visible and safe arrangement. This arrival plaza is cited adjacent to a larger open space for passive recreation such as picnicking with a walking and fitness trail loop.

SPRAY PAD

The proposed spray pad facility will be incorporated into the main plaza within proximity to the new Field House to allow for storage of the spray pad mechanical system. The spray pad is also strategically located within proximity to the new junior and senior playgrounds to the east, as children typically move back and forth between each play facility. It is also situated so that it’s in direct and universal access to the parking lot.

Parental seating edges will be incorporated through a combination of benches and decorative concrete seatwalls.

Off the shelf products should be thematically designed, with reference to the history of the site. These creative themes may extend into the paving materials through the surface finishes, paving colours and paving geometry. The spray pad and playground features will be in accordance with City of Hamilton standards, with the technical resolution of the spray pad components to be developed through the next phase of design development.

MULTI-USE COURT

The multi-use court is proposed to the south of the central activity node and placed where it poses minimal disturbance to nearby residents and to minimize conflict between adjacent recreational uses, such as the spray pad and playgrounds. The multi-use court will be equipped to allow for multiple sports activities such as basketball and ball hockey. The multi-use court needs to be clearly visible and accessible from main pedestrian routes and the parking lot. The placement maximizes the use of space and is easily accessed from the adjacent parking lot and walkways. The court will not be lit to discourage evening activities and loitering but located to take advantage of ambient light from the parking lot.

[Image 01] Angus Glen Community Park, Town of Richmond Hill. Photo From Dillon Consulting
[Image 03] Argos Park, City of Hamilton. Photo From City of Hamilton
PARK PAVILION (SUN SHELTER)

The proposed open-air park pavilion will function as a place for gathering and can serve as an event platform during special events. The pavilion should be constructed to have a presence in the landscape, with materials that reflect the sites’ history, and an ‘off-the-shelf’ prefabricated structure should be modified to express a design language that has a unified character with that of the built form of the Field House.

SKATEBOARD DOTS

The park proposes to incorporate Skate Dots into the east side of the park, at the interface of Gage Ave. North, maximizing its visibility inward from Gage. The Skate Dots are proposed to be single skate elements within a mini-plaza area located off the main walking trail loop. The Skate Dots could be flat edges from a ledge wall, flat rails or a bench. Skill ranges for this would attract users from the neighbourhood but not likely expert skill levels. The design of the Skate Dot area is to be consistent with the recommendations outlined in the City of Hamilton 2017 Skateboard Park Study.

OPEN SPACE

An open space area has been proposed at the east side of the site. The open space area will be sodded with native deciduous canopy trees. The open green space will be well suited to sustain public uses supporting flexible and passive recreational activities, picnicking and special events.
GRASSED AMPHITHEATER

Integration of an informal outdoor grass amphitheatre is proposed to the north of the open space area. The amphitheatre will be carved out of the natural topography of the new berm and may include terraced stone seating in a curvilinear form. The amphitheatre will provide informal seating for viewing recreational activities in the open space or programmed performances. Provisions for a power supply may be required if outdoor performances are programmed.

SITE FURNITURE AND SITE FEATURES

Site furniture and site features (e.g. seatwalls) will have a consistent character and appearance throughout the park. Site features shall reinforce the overall design language of the park design using complementary materials, where possible.

- Site furniture shall be consistent with and complement the style and materials used for the Field House and pavilion and other site features.
- Site furniture would include, but not necessarily be limited to benches, garbage and recycling receptacles, bike racks, bollards, tree grates in the plaza (where applicable), and picnic tables for the open space area (optional).
- Benches and trash/recycling receptacles will be located along the main walkways with benches at regular intervals (on average every 100-400 metres), and located within the main plaza space;
- The site furniture shall be low-maintenance, vandal-resistant, and easily replaceable.

PLAYGROUND

A Senior and Junior/Tot playground is proposed within the main activity node.

Design considerations of the playground shall include:
- Universally accessible surfaces shall be provided for both play areas.
- Structures and play components shall provide for a range of disabilities among users, including those with mobility, sensory and learning disabilities.
- The senior playground should be physically separated from the Junior/Tot play to minimize conflicts between age groups.
- The playground shall be thematically designed and consistent with the built form of the site.
- Native, deciduous trees are proposed to be planted at the playground’s perimeter to provide shade for the playground and for caregivers.

[Image 07] 0 Prest Park, East Boston. Photo Source: Web source
[Image 09] McLennan Park, Kitchener. Photo from: Jaykilo, What did she Say Blog
SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY

The park design will promote safety and universal accessibility by incorporating design principles that will increase natural surveillance, utilizing the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and will be designed to meet the current accessibility guidelines for Ontario (AODA). The park design and park programming will promote social interaction and will make the park attractive to users and visitors throughout the day. This will result in more “eyes on public space”, creating a greater sense of security, making it a place less conducive to illicit behaviour.

Sight lines into and throughout the park will be addressed through minimizing site features that could obstruct views such as dense shrub planting beds or playground structures with partially enclosed spaces.

Proposed materials will be visually connected to the overall design and reduce physical barriers as required.

PARK ENTRANCE AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

The primary approach to the proposed park circulation was the functional aspects that address personal safety and visibility, allow for ease of operations, provide vehicular access off Lloyd Street, promote continuous pedestrian circulation and connections to the surrounding community, and provide the best, most efficient layouts for facility fit and access.

WALKWAYS

The walkway network shall reinforce a pedestrian experience, prioritizing accessibility and safety for all park users. A main, 3.0m wide multi-use walking and fitness trail loop is proposed around the open green space, which will connect to activity areas, the Field House and main plaza and the parking lot. The trail loop will also support fitness stations along its perimeter. The walking trail loop should be a hard surface treatment such as asphalt, fully accessible. The design of the trail loop and general park paths should be consistent with the City of Hamilton standards.

PARK ENTRANCES

The park concept plan proposes a main park entry off Lloyd Street to the south. This park entrance will be defined by a park sign with feature planting and a main pedestrian walkway connecting from Lloyd Street into the park to the Field House and Main Plaza area, providing a clear delineation of the park’s main access route.

Another park entrance is proposed at the south-east and north-east ends of the site off Gage Avenue North. Both functioning as pedestrian park entrances, they will serve people coming from the communities to the north-east and south-east. The south-east park entry will consist of a park sign, horticultural plantings, a main pedestrian walkway, seating and space to incorporate a gateway feature through a public art piece or thematic element in the landscape.

PARK IDENTITY

GATEWAY ENTRANCE FEATURES AND PARK SIGNAGE

These features would include City of Hamilton standard park signage, horticultural displays and/or an identity marker such as using remnant artifacts from the Dom Glass factory incorporated as part of the park entrance feature to express the history of the site.
SERVICING REQUIREMENTS

Based on servicing requirements, it has been determined that the development can be serviced with a 150mm water service running along the vehicular access at the south of the site, connecting to an existing watermain on Lloyd Street at Chapple Street. The proposed 200mm sanitary service for the development would follow a similar route as the water service and connect to an existing 300mm diameter combined sewer on Lloyd Street at Chapple Street. Based on Hamilton requirements, there is a need to store up to 437m³ of run-off onsite with a metered discharge. The storm servicing for the site is broken up into two systems as shown on the proposed servicing drawings. A system to the south would have 140m³ of storage and discharge at 50L/s via a 375mm storm connection, connecting and following the same route as the service above. A separate system at the north of the site would have 300m³ of storage and would discharge via a 600mm diameter storm connection with a maximum controlled flow of 611L/s.

CUT/ FILL ANALYSIS

The Cut/Fill analysis was completed with a goal to have all material stay onsite, import as little material as possible, match existing grades to adjacent properties and meet the environmental requirements. Existing building components and void space was accounted for in the analysis and where possible, existing materials were re-used as resources for the development of the site grading. Overall, there is a net need for imported clean material to the site, primarily due to the environmental restriction for a minimum of 1m of clean material over soft surfaces. There is a net overall need for clean fill of approximately 19,700m³ to meet the grading needs of the site.

RECOMMENDED STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS FOR CONSTRUCTION ON SITE TO ACCOMMODATE SUB-SURFACE AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

The structural foundation systems for the field house and bleacher will require further investigation and development to account for the sub-surface conditions. Due to the depths of the existing glass plant basement structure and foundations, piles and grade beams may be required to reach adequate bearing depths. An insulated slab on grade or potentially a raft foundation may be used depending on the final sub-surface conditions. Due to the impacted soils conditions, no basement or crawl space is proposed.
## 5. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

### A - Site Preparation Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$1,621,000.00</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>$1,621,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$129,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$1,785,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Pricing Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$178,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Allowance</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$2,042,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Allowance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$102,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,145,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B - Stadium Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813 m2</td>
<td>8,750.55</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>$7,114,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$569,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$153,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>813 m2</td>
<td>$9,639.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Pricing Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$783,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Allowance</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$344,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>813 m2</td>
<td>$11,027.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Allowance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$448,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>813 m2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,579.09</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C - Park Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$2,616,200.00</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>$2,616,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$209,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$2,882,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Pricing Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$288,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Allowance</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$126,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>1 Sum</td>
<td>$3,297,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Allowance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$164,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,461,900.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost (A + B + C)** | **1 Sum**    | **$15,020,700.00**                       |
FIELD HOUSE AND BLEACHERS

The proposed field house configuration supports the primary mandate related to the playing field organized sports activities as well as the open public uses pertaining to the park. The massing of the field house has been oriented parallel to the bleachers to screen the underside from view and to provide a welcoming façade for the stadium. The building is separated into two main components. One half housing the players change room facilities, maintenance garage and referee rooms and the other housing the public washrooms, concession room, staff room and first aid room. Connecting these blocks is the main playing field entrance. A raised steel framed structure above the entrance clearly identifies the entrance on the site and supports a celebrated arrival experience for players and visitors alike. This entrance feature uses channel glass as a cladding system around the structure, referencing the historical function of the site as a glass manufacturing facility. Potential lighting systems could illuminate the structure in a variety of colors to serve as a beacon, signalling sports events or community gatherings. A retractable gate will allow for security at the entrance when the facility is closed, and provide the potential for fully accessible circulation when open.

A canopy is provided along the front face of the building to act as a ‘public porch’ offering a sheltered gathering area at the transition between park and stadium. At the southern end, a maintenance garage is proposed, with overhead door access from the driveway loop as well as onto the playing field. The public washrooms are located across from the spray pad and public plaza with a configuration to provide full privacy with the doors in the hold open position. Drinking fountains are proposed adjacent to the washroom entrance, and super graphics incorporated into the building elevation for ease of wayfinding to the public washrooms.

The building structure is composed of steel, cast-in place concrete and load bearing masonry. Interior partitions will be composed of painted concrete masonry units and the exterior cladding at ground level is proposed to be large format porcelain panels for durability and resistance to graffiti and vandalism. The roof assembly is anticipated to be pre-cast concrete slabs with insulation and a TPO membrane roofing system. The full building will be insulated with minimal heating during the off season to maintain a temperature between 5-10 degrees to avoid freeze thaw damage.

The public washrooms are sized to accommodate the maximum bleacher capacity of 2500 people. A universal barrier free washroom is also provided, with direct access from the public plaza.

The Bleachers are proposed to house 2500 people and are anticipated to be a prefabricated aluminum and steel system. Storage areas will be incorporated into the bleachers under the back end to achieve a minimum 2150mm height clearance.
FIELD HOUSE: MATERIAL PALETTE

WOOD SOFFIT

STACKED CONCRETE BLOCKS

SINTERED STONE PANELS
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FIELD HOUSE: VIEW LOOKING WEST
Field House: View from Playing Field

Field House: View from Public Plaza
Field House Aerial View to South East
Supported by a very positive response from the community, the park program mandate for the site has been incorporated into a proposed site layout and initial design. The level of detail developed enable the solution to be tested for feasibility and costed for budget compliance. We see that the proposed program can be effectively accommodated on the site with key adjacencies, program areas and functionality achieved.

The design illustrates the means for the site to achieve the stated project objectives, however further development on subsequent stages of the project will determine the final park configuration and the architectural expression.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General meeting overview</td>
<td>INFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Initiation meeting was conducted at the City of Hamilton facilities at 77 James Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally, the order of the discussion was per the organization of the report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Background and current site condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background and current site condition</td>
<td>INFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site condition: the site currently has existing basement remains and site debris.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 ESA is currently being completed by the environmental consultant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPU recommendation is for 2 parcels - to reduce requirement and restrictions against - do not have to legally split the property - just a survey delineating the areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation required for the CN Line is used to serve industrial - not high speed. A protection berm will be required along the extent of the corridor in compliance with CN guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Void space currently located within the raised slab can be used for storage of contaminated material. Crushed concrete as substrate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety on the site - pathways and pedestrian connections. The precinct development is currently in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>INFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The priority is to have a secured gated/fenced artificial turf for soccer and football that is not open to the public. Refer to the architectural language of the Tim Hortons Field fence. This will be used as a practice field by Forge FC (Premier FC League team) as the Ti Cats use the Tim Hortons Field to practice. The field will be programmed and it is expected to be occupied during evenings and weekends. The ancillary space will also likely be occupied during evenings and weekends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The field will need to be illuminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basketball courts/multi use courts (basketball, ball hockey, volleyball, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skate Park Dot to be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field house</td>
<td>INFO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminated paved parking. Size will be determined. The site is currently being used as a parking site to accommodate overflow for the Tim Hortons Field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection berm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational hub - but also as public park for neighbourhood - green space, playground, skate park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for the future properties - use for the surplus lands for parking - or potential for alternate program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building footprint - how program is used. Security is paramount. Will the building and seating be combined? Berm requirements to be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site continues the existing site impact for recreation and green space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustrative presentation to engage the public. Prompt the response for certain items. Open house format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is anticipating development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings will be conducted over the summer with external stakeholders (Forge FC, TiCats, etc.) to determine the building program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement for displaced baseball diamonds is a potential issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT and traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional lands are not on the table for PIC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for off site parking. The site is currently being used as a parking lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater management on the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Artificial ice and no splashpad. Water amenity is provided within catchment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate concessions for the stadium inside the building. Ideally one building on the stadium side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday - Internal stakeholders - PIC meeting at second.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General meeting overview

Sarah Eakins provided a brief background of the project. The goal of the project is to create a community park in Ward 3 on what is currently a brown field site previously owned by Dominion Glass Factory. CN Rail line borders the North side of the site. There are required recreational elements that have to fit into the park. An agenda for the open meeting was to discuss the requirements for the recreational elements and other features that could be considered.

One of the required recreational elements identified for this space is a replacement field to the Brian Timmis field. This field will have artificial turf that is suitable for professional grade soccer and football with a secured perimeter, stadium seating, an associated Field House and a parking lot. The park will also function as a neighbourhood park complete with a playground area and possibly a sun shelter.

Generally, the order of the discussion was per the organization of the report:

- Part 1: Park Components
- Part 2: Approach for the PIC
- Action Items

Part 1: Park Components

The Field

The field is a fenced multi-sport field with regular bleacher seating type similar to Heritage Green Sports Park. It will be used by Forge FC for practice purposes and not for tournaments. High school-level games may take place on this field and will require security lighting. The field will have a North-South orientation with a minimum dimension that follows the CFL playing field dimensions which is 100 m long and 59.4 m wide with 18.3 m deep end zones.

Seating capacity will match the number of seating that was available in Brian Timmis Stadium. Rental bleachers could be used to further furnish the field if additional seating is required in the future.

The field will not be covered with a roof.

Concessions will not be incorporated in the field or fieldhouse design. Food trucks that could be situated on site for certain events could satisfy this need.

A berm may be applied to the site to comply with the setback requirements set by CN Rail. Berm requirements and potential alternates to be confirmed with CN Rail.

Washrooms will not be accessible from inside the fenced field.
The Fieldhouse

The fieldhouse will be similar in size and function as the amenity building in Heritage Green Sports Park.

The fieldhouse will have four locker rooms: one designated to Forge FC (secured access with showers), one designated to the Ti-Cats (secured access with showers) and the remaining two will be available for public use. The William Connell Park whose field house is equipped with enough locker rooms is a good model.

The fieldhouse will have washrooms attached to the lockers and separate washrooms available to the public.

Storage for maintenance and equipment is also important.

Exterior drinking fountains will be available.

A vehicle dropoff feature that accommodates team buses could use up a considerable amount of space on the property.

Splash pads, outdoor ice rinks and dog parks will not be featured in the park.

Parkland Elements

Some if the parkland elements to be incorporated are:

- A neighbourhood level skatepark dot no larger than 2000 square feet.
- A multi-use court for basketball, ball hockey, lacrosse and other recreational activities.
- A community size playground with a rubberized surface.

Parking

80-100 spots per field.

Part 2: Approach for the PIC

Potential Items to be presented to the public:

The PIC is an opportunity to inform the public of our intentions and obtain their feedback and recommendations. One option is to set up boards with different lists and stickers representing priorities for the park. Participants could use the stickers to express what they feel is important for the park to have. It could be a good activity that makes expectations more realistic.
Another option is to present an aerial photo with the property line along various elements that could be placed on the site such as a soccer field, basketball courts, bleachers, etc. This could provide participants a sense of scale.

Instead of demonstrating what could be included within the site’s perimeter in terms of dimension, the PIC could be an opportunity to obtain the public’s programming recommendations and primarily allowing them to present their priorities.

Another option is to show the existing conditions of the impacted site and its potential. This could be an opportunity to present precedents or “success stories” for similar sites.

Another option is to show the site in relation to other landmarks such as the Tim Hortons Field and its proximity from other parks/green areas. Providing the public an idea of how many minutes it would take to walk from the site to other landmarks or recreational amenities that the park may lack (such as baseball diamonds) is also important.

The public is mostly aware of the condition of the site and that remediation is required to make it safe to be converted into a park. Showing scenes of inhabited park spaces as part of the precedents is important to represent the intention for the site.

Conducting a short online survey could also be an effective tool to obtain feedback from the public. It is also an opportunity to present a “story” about the site, how it is impacted, how it will be carefully remediated and how it could be converted into a park with the amenities that will benefit the immediate neighbourhood. Generating a positive outlook and excitement about the project is important.

4  Content for the PIC

The PIC format is open house.

Standard PIC panels with the City of Hamilton logo will be shared for graphics cohesiveness. Plans and other visual representation elements are to be placed within the templates.

**Process map:** a general process map showing where the project came from and where it is going without showing any specific dates. Illustrate the potential and benefits of a green open space in this particular location.

**Context map:** show the site's location and its walkability feature to landmarks and adjacent parkland.

**Key message:** State that the site was purchased as a replacement for Brian Timmis Field. Present the features that typical neighbourhood parks contain. Indicate that knowing the public’s priorities is important.

Show examples of required recreational programs and
precedents/success stories. Address existing conditions and how the site will be remediated (a before and after imagery). Present the Required/Scheduled areas both the sports amenities (recreation) and passive amenities (open space).

Present a wishlist section or “nice-to-haves for both recreation and open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension for the Field to be confirmed/provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seating capacity for Brian Timmis Field to be confirmed/provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Process Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Context Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Existing - Remediation - success stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Wish List - Program ideals and selected items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations boards need to be assembled for July 13th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF MINUTES
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The meeting involved the review of approximately 6 design options, and the pros and cons of each option. Re-capped key decisions that were made in previous meetings (committed recreation programs/park amenities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General meeting overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The meeting involved the review of approximately 6 design options, and the pros and cons of each option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-capped key decisions that were made in previous meetings (committed recreation programs/park amenities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2    | Design options |
|      | • Richard Shaw presented three design options to the group. |
|      | • Along with the options developed by Dillon, there were six options altogether. Some of them overlap as the ideas are a combination of the sketches/input from Kate Preston, Martina Braunstein and Denis Viens and the SAI team. The options have different priorities while some are derived from the same thinking with a slightly different configuration. All the options are built around the idea that the football field will be built on the west end of the site. The main benefit for doing so is the opportunity to place hardscape on top of the contaminated area on the site. Placing the fenced football field along Gage street also fences the whole park off from public access. The options also took into account CN’s requirements as well as the official dimensions of the field. |
|      | • Other prior decisions established: access will be through Chapple and the multi-use natural green turf will be placed along Gage Ave. |
|      | • The goal was to draw out the key relationships and priorities and from that, to generate a design option and a subset option. |
|      | • Identify key elements/priorities such as circulation (vehicle and pedestrian arrival to the site) – close off discussion regarding vehicular access from Gage (one-sided street access) and the other larger component pieces. |
|      | SAI’s Option 3 |
|      | • Derived from one of Kate’s sketches. Features parking as the centre and drop off. Organizes the site around the stadium - it has that priority for the stadium and the relationship between the field house and the stadium. The parking acts as the buffer/defined zone between the green space/play space (non-stadium programs) and the Stadium side with the bus drop-off. The layout provides a clear delineation. The parking lot “spine” in the centre allow visitors to park in close proximity to the natural turf without having to cross the drive aisle. This layout also shows how the bus circulation is
going to work. A long linear parking that acts as the bus circulation route could also reduce the amount of asphalt required.
• The multi-use courts in the north central part of the site reinforces the idea of placing hard cap over the contaminated area.
• The field house runs parallel to the stadium with the central circulation access right through the middle, creating a plaza-type space in relationship to the bus drop-off area.
• Picnic area is presently placed below the fieldhouse but could be further developed. It was originally placed south of the natural turf along Gage but was moved to accommodate the requirement to have the skate park placed along Gage.
• Drawback of the layout: dislocation of the field house amenities from the playground and spray pad. Combining the pump room and field house is not feasible in this scenario.
• The benefit of having two main programs clearly delineated would be to split up the functions of the field house as well. The field house could thus be incorporated with the stadium – elevate the status of the stadium to semi-pro – full access from the change rooms to the field. The field house could also be tucked underneath the bleachers.
• The functions of the public washrooms, pump house, recreational equipment storage could be placed in a second building. These services could be better associated to the natural turf, picnic area and spray pad with a second building.
• The parking layout could be configured: a lay-by instead of a loop so that bus stacking could be taken out of the drive aisle.

• Locate hardscape together. A 1m fill where soft material is will be required.

SAI’s Option 2

• Keeping the vehicular traffic contained in the south side of the site/in one spot is not mandatory but it keeps vehicles from driving into the park.
• Drawback: users will be crossing the drive aisles to get to the other portions of the park.
• The pathway along Gage street sidewalk – rather than having two separate walkways, is a re-working/expansion of the Gage Ave curb to incorporate a cycling path or skate dots an option? Designing the edge condition between the sidewalk and the open green space and how one enters the park is important as this communicates how permeable the site will be.

SAI’s Option 1

• Denis Viens mentioned that from a transportation point of view,
the approach of having a drop off entirely separate from the parking area could be efficient.
• Such layout may be confusing for park users according to Sarah, especially because buses will not be using the feature often (only for game days).

The Red Area/Contaminated Zone

• Sarah Eakins reiterated that avoiding the red area on the site plan and moving services south of it is ideal. On-going monitoring will be required and will be more costly to the city (vapor monitoring).
• Keeping out of the contaminated zone could be a design issue according to Richard, specifically around the relationship of the 50 yard line, to the seating and to the field house.

Dillon’s Option 1

• The parking is placed in a linear fashion on the south side of the site. This allows for the components to be pulled back into the centre of the site. This enhances visibility/site lines across the fields.

Dillon’s Option 2

• Green areas provide a relief from the urban, industrial environment.
• Design highlights importance of having the fieldhouse in close proximity to the spray pad (change rooms, washrooms, drinking water stations).
• Void between components creates a plaza behind the field house.

Dillon’s Option 3

• Public space in front of the fieldhouse and a plaza next to the multi-use field creates connectivity/a boulevard that connects the two portions separated by the central parking lot.

3 Comments from the site visit prior to the meeting (with Leanne Turner):

• The concept of developing two buildings instead of one was discussed: a fieldhouse dedicated to the stadium and a smaller
building for other park amenities. While the idea of having two buildings instead of one was discussed, there is currently no approval for such an option. The disadvantages for such an option are higher construction and maintenance cost.

• The idea of running the parking along the south boundary of the site - linear along the spur side – was also discussed. This is illustrated in Dillon’s Option 1.

• The stadium and integrated field house could support semi-professional level games, as suggested by Leanne.

Comments during the meeting

• Pathways: skate dots can be incorporated along the multi-use pathway rather than a full skate park. Creates an activated edge.
• Skate dots have to be placed along Gage Ave. Dots are generally perceived as beginner level. These could be arranged as linear and integrated with the fitness trail.
• As the multi-use court was determined to be a low priority for the residents from the last PIC, one court could be incorporated to the design instead of two.
• Any open/landscaped space in the park requires 1 metre of clean fill. How we meet grade at street is one of the design challenges.
• Denis and Martina: Berms could also be applied to the south side of the site – a naturalized buffer. It shields the homes from the park: it create a vegetative buffer and a strategy to mitigate noise as well.
• An issue that could come up with the south buffers is that the residential properties next to the site will likely be part of the site sometime in the future and the buffers may exclude these areas.
• Materials (glass remnants, large timber, etc.) salvaged from the old factory that may be used for the new design such as the gateway.
• Denis: a berm that is 2m tall with a 2m flat top, 3:1, will consume 1400 cubic metres of space.

• Main entrance: Chapple will be used primarily by vehicles. The majority of park users will be reaching the site by cycling or on foot and will be accessing the park from Gage Ave. A gateway feature will likely be more effective if placed at the pedestrian entrance off Gage Ave. Such program will be compatible with whatever happens with the adjacent land, it provides future opportunity for integration or expansion with a fixed element. It starts to organize the site; it picks up a circulation route at the end of the open field.

Ideas to accommodate CN Rail recommendations/requirements

• Use the fence, netting and lighting foundations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Program confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="SPCP comments on layout options 19080" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="SPCP program August 2019.pdf" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Engineer a single solution across the back wall rather than two different.

Develop 2 options for the week of August 19, 2019.

Two options:
- One with the stadium shifted down and the berm condition continuous across site.
- Place the building outside of contaminated/red area if possible.
- One with a focus on the skate park vs. one with a focus on multi-use courts.
- Integrate bus loop/lay-by with the parking lot.
- Configure parking lot with access to green space.
- Community garden next to water source - i.e. building.
- Vehicle access from Chapple and pedestrian access from Gage Ave.
- Determine building materials for the field house.
- Building connected to the secured stadium area.

END OF MINUTES
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Distribution: Attendees above plus:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | **General meeting overview**  
  - Dillon and SAI presented two design options.  
  - Discussed potential strategy that would determine the grading.  
  - Preferred Option determined.  
  - Concerns for existing tunnels and building within the site.  
  - Preparation for the upcoming internal stakeholder meeting and PIC 2. | INFO |
| 2    | **Design options**  
  - Dillon and SAI collaborated to develop two options with a consistent parking layout, the building footprint and park thresholds.  
  - Kate Preston presented two design options.  
  - In both options, some of the active recreation features were consolidated since there is not a lot of real estate/space. In further developing the layout, instead of having two multi-use courts, a multi-use court could be eliminated and the picnic area/plaza/event space could be expanded.  
  - Both options have the skate dot(s) along Gage Ave N.  
  **Dillon: Option 1**  
  - Follows a fluid geometry - the trail loops around the multi-use field.  
  - The skate dot along Gage Ave is in one consolidated skating area. With a smaller multi-use field, the skate dot could be expanded/modified.  
  - Fitness stations loop around the trail.  
  *Comments:*  
  - The main axis that runs northwards from the parking lot and through the building highlights the multi-use courts which is not the focus for the park.  
  - The multi-use field is not dedicated to soccer games and it could be configured as an open area with no rigid dimensions - Sarah will confirm this as this could allow the multi-use field to be reduced in size or/and have a more organic shape.  
  - This option consolidates the visual barriers within the park.  
  **Dillon: Option 2**  
  - Shows an open lawn that extends into the pavilion. This could be a more flexible space and act as a plaza for events such as art festivals | INFO |
and markets.
• A space is dedicated for the community gardens (along Gage Ave).

Comments:
• Provides an opportunity for different activities to happen in different pockets of the site, creating an internal park space.
• The mid-north portion of the site is enclosed on three sides.
• One multi-use court could be placed in the park rather than two but a full-size multi-use court is required (no half-courts).
• Rename picnic areas as “open lawn areas.”
• There is a long wait list in the community for community gardens. Build the garden and people will come.

The event space could be as simple as a dedicated plaza space, the area where spectators could be rather than the actual event. Not too large as it could become an unused void in the park when there are no stadium-related events. This could also be incorporated into the berm on the north boundary (a lawn area that is terracing into the berm).

• Richard Shaw presented two building design options.
• From a site circulation and architecture orientation perspective, the difference between the two layouts/approach are:
  - Option 1 is built around the stadium, the stadium is the priority and everything functions in accordance to how the stadium works. The driving loop and the fieldhouse are oriented and in support of the stadium’s functions.
  - Option 2 is split between the stadium and the park and the building could be perceived as a pavilion. The stadium and the park have equal priority and the orthogonal layout amplifies the integration between the architecture, circulation, field and park.
• The element of safety: for Option 1, security observation of the park could be achieved by circulating the parking lot loop, which acts as the site’s internal street. In Option 2, the traffic is separated and lacks an internal street. It provides a sense of place but the park elements are more internalized.

SAI: The Fieldhouse Option 1

• The premise is having two components within the same building. The change rooms, storage and concession are grouped on one side. Circulation is a single-loaded corridor underneath the stands. This may impact the design of the stadium and stands having an aluminum prefab bleachers structure on top of a building might be prohibitive. This is part of the secured area.
• Washroom count is predicated on OBC’s requirements for 2400
users: 1 universal, 21 female, and 11 male.
• 5 showers are incorporated per locker room with the barrier-free requirements addressed.
• A fieldhouse entrance is placed on or close to the ends of the corridor/circulation space.
• Double car garage space is used as a placeholder for maintenance (final dimensions to be determined).
• Door for the pump room facilitates a clear view of the spray pad.
• Washrooms are placed next to the stadium entrance with access visible from the rest of the park.
• Dramatic entrance into the stadium.

Comments:
• The building hides half of the backside of the bleachers which would otherwise create a long wall on the site.
• The secured area could be moved up the west edge of the building and this will still allow the washrooms and concession to be accessible to the public even if the secured area is locked.
• Lockers in the changing rooms are not required – modify the plan to show only benches.
• Place the housekeeping room at the end of the corridor to maximize space.
• Add two referee rooms (with a shower, toilet and sink).
• Add an emergency exit to the north-east fence of the field.
• Relocate maintenance room with garage doors facing the field.

SAI: The Fieldhouse Option 2

• A more efficient option in terms of the building’s square footage.
• Compared to Option 1, this option celebrates the architecture of the fieldhouse in terms of its presence in the site – a pavilion where all sides visible. All sides will require a degree of finish and aesthetic.
• The canopy that extends over the plaza is both a sun shelter and pavilion, the space provides opportunities for events and public art.

Comments
• The backside of the bleachers creates a long undesirable wall on the site.
• The part of the building that is present in the middle of the plaza lacks significant program (concession would be more appropriate in this portion of the building rather than storage and washrooms).
• Wood salvaged from the old building could be incorporated into the sun shelter design. This material could also be used in other elements in the site such as benches.

| 3 | Direction: Option 1 (modified version) is the preferred option | INFO |
• Kate and Richard provided an in-situ sketch to determine if the orientation of the filedhouse shown in Option 1 could be paired with the parking layout shown in Option 2.

• Preference is for a modified version of Option 1. The dropoff zone on top of the parking will be aligned on axis with the stadium entrance, freeing up more space to the north. The parking will be slightly wider, double loaded on both axes with the drop off on the north. The 2 barrier-free parking stalls will be placed on the north-west corner of the parking lot in close proximity to the fieldhouse.

• In terms of park amenities relative to these modifications, accommodate the plaza working for an event space. The Commons: some degree of flexibility for a formal soccer-sized pitch, this could accommodate informal play and other program elements could encroach/overlap this area.

• The astro turf football field to be shifted 5m towards the west boundary. A 5m buffer between the playing field and the face of the bleachers will be maintained.
• The south-east corner of the football field fence to be converted into an arc/rounded corner.

• If the grade is higher for the stadium compared to the rest of the park, a retaining wall which will be visible from the park entrance on Chapple St. could be integrated into the design. This could be gateway feature, or the wall could have a mosaic design - there are creative ways to integrate it to the overall design.

4 Grading and concerns around buried tunnels/structure.

• Void/ Tunnel underground Chapple. If there is a tunnel in the way, it would have to be demolished and have the ends capped.
• The site will have 2 metre grade rise, not 2 metre of fill. 1 metre of clean fill on top of the site surface is required.

• We are building a grading and a proposal around a whole series on unknowns that ultimately is dealing with cost. To remove everything is possible but the budget could dictate this. To determine the cost for remediation, we could work our way backwards and start from a design perspective to determine the final field elevation. With the preferred option, an estimate of how much cut and fill needed could be determined.

• The concrete on the site can be crushed and used as clean fill. Under the parking lot, the “contaminated” materials can be used. The clean fill or crushed concrete could be used elsewhere such as
to build up the berm.

- To get a better idea for the grade, Denis requires the following information:
  1. The estimated void space that is existing on site.
  2. The estimated volume of concrete that they can expect to recover from the demolition.
  3. The estimated volume of the stockpiles.
From this information he can estimate the amount of clean material that can be derived and reused and with the void, the amount of material to be hidden. The excess material can also be estimated and determine where this could be hidden.

- Run services up through Chapple entrance into building:
With the presence of lots of grass areas in the park, much of stormwater mitigation services could be avoided. Stormwater services could be focused on building, parking lot and splash pad. If general low swales could be created near Gage with two catch basins, not much else underground is required to be built. For irrigation, water sources are located near Gage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare the preferred option’s next iteration and have it ready for upcoming Internal stakeholder meeting (September 9th, The Monday after Labour Day weekend).</td>
<td>INFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leanne will assemble the base plan drawings for the existing building to determine extent of basement and potential heights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sarah to confirm if the size and outline of multi-use field (currently represented with soccer field dimensions) could be configured as an open area with an organic shape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SAI will issue the updated CAD file for the site incorporating the playing field, parking and field house. Modifications for Option 1’s fieldhouse to be completed (add two referee rooms, eliminate the lockers, etc). Modifications for Option 1’s parking lot to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Distribution:
Attendees above plus:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>General meeting overview</strong></td>
<td>INFO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sarah Eakins provided a brief background of the project process to date. The current design was presented by Dillon and SAI and the general order of discussion was as follows:
- Park Layout and Elements
- Site Servicing
- Playing Field, Parking and Site Circulation
- Field House

| 2    | **Park Layout and Elements** | INFO |

**Comments**

The skatedot has been identified as a low priority item due to the minimal response from the public surveys. This may be due to the demographic of the responding community members and may not reflect future use.

Multi-Use Courts. A planting screen is recommended between the courts and the adjacent houses to maintain privacy for the backyards.

Junior Playground. Suggestion was to locate the junior playground adjacent to the spray pad.

The fence on top of the berm structure was noted to be cast iron for durability and aesthetic purposes. Care should be taken to avoid overly wooded spaces on the site that may encourage squatting and undesirable activities.

The berm slope and layout should anticipate winter use for tobogganing. Potential obstacles such as integrated seating should be accounted for. The ideal target slope is 4:1. Seating at the amphitheatre will need to be spaced to allow for mower maintenance.

Community gardens. The program has not been confirmed, and may require the area to be constructed as open green space with potential future garden bed installation. A hose bib and tool storage will be required at the north end of the field house adjacent to the garden area.

Recommended that the open commons have permeable perimeter planting for access and visibility. Clear open area and connections to the surrounding paths should be maintained.

Planting beds at the pedestrian entrance feature off Gage St will require contribution from horticulture as they will be maintaining decorative planting.

Playgrounds should have rubberized surface.
### Site Servicing

Site servicing will be from both Lloyd and Gage based on the available capacity and site requirements. The intent is to provide service from Lloyd to the field house to reduce the length of pipe runs.

Stormwater retention on the site will be constrained for quantity and will be managed through underground storage systems and surface bioswales. Specified storage systems should be located for ease of maintenance and repair, preferably under open green space. Bioswales should not be planted if included with the open commons.

Site grading incorporates the cut and fill strategy for maintaining impacted materials on site in the berm and raised playing field. Significant clean fill materials will be required to achieve the 1m clean topping across the site. The open commons will maintain a an approx. .7% slope towards Gage St.

### Playing Field, Parking and Site Circulation

The playing field was identified as the future home field for the Bernie Custis Secondary School.

Emergency exiting from the field will need to be addressed through one way exit gates. Final width of the central entrance passageway to be tested in detailed design for pedestrian capacity. Suggestion is to accommodate additional crush space on the field side.

Emergency vehicle access to be accomodated for the field. A curb cut should be provided from the parking lot to allow emergency vehicles to enter the field area.

Bollards and ramps should be incorporated to protect the plaza area from adjacent vehicle traffic. The plaza should be designed to facilitate adequate crush space for exit of large events.

The central passageway should have a high access to be able to accommodate a boom truck accessing the playing field.

The playing field elevation is anticipated to be approximately 1m above the existing grade. This will require a cast in place concrete retaining wall around the north, west and south perimeters with integrated foundations for light standards and ball net structure.

Additional storage capacity within the secure field area should be accounted for. Recomendation to utilize the area beneath the bleachers for storage.

The parking area and the paved trails will be plowed and salted. Snow storage should be allowed for in the design and materials should be resilient to salt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Field House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concession area will likely be a leased space with outside provider, or available for event booking. Area can be reduced and a staff room provided in the adjacent space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A second garage door is required to access the maintenance area from the parking lot side, with a curb cut and removable bollards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Players seating on the field will be on the west side of the playing field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The building should be designed for three season operation, from spring through to Nov. No climate control systems are intended for the space, however, means for passive cooling should be incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A multi-use room would be preferential for staff use, in the area currently planned for concession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking fountains and water bottle refilling stations should be incorporated into the exterior public side of the field house building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIC # 2 is scheduled for October 28th. Materials should be prepared for circulation 3 weeks prior for online survey distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Format for the PIC is for an introduction with the design introduced by the consulting team, and then questions following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costing submission requirements are to be provided by the City for document generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation will be provided for the equipment storage requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further information on the existing basement structures on site will be provided from the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF MINUTES
CONTEXT MAP

Site Map

- Site
- Tim Hortons Field & Bernie Morelli Recreation Centre
- Parks
- Parking
- Site Access
- Rail Corridor
- Bike-Friendly Roads & Dedicated Lanes

Bus Routes
- Bus 2 & 3
- Bus 1/1A & 10

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK

June 2019
SUCCESS STORIES

Jackie Washington Park, Hamilton
Capped industrial site

Bayfront Park, Hamilton
Built over landfill

Red Hill Trail, Hamilton
Built over landfill

Cherry Beach Sports Fields, Toronto
Former industrial site

Kay Drage Park, Hamilton
Built over landfill

Jerome Park, Hamilton
Capped snow dump and stockpile site

McLennan Park, Kitchener
Built over landfill

Landschaftspark, Germany
Decommissioned steel plant

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK
COMMITTED PROGRAMS

- Artificial Turf Sports Field
  - Photo Credit: Rutherford Contracting

- Playground w/ Swings

- Parking + Vehicle Drop-Off
  - Photo Credit: Prachee Saran, Toronto Botanical Gardens

- Green Space w/ Planting

- Sun Shelter

- Field House

- Spectator Seating
  - Photo Credit: Fairhart Equipment Company

- Paved Walkways

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK
ADDITIONAL AMENITIES

Multi-Use Courts
Skatepark
Open Natural Field
Play Structure

Leave a dot to select your top 3 amenity opportunities for the park!
ADDITIONAL AMENITIES

Leave a dot to select your top 3 amenity opportunities for Precinct Park!

Other Items
(Leave a Sticky Note)
TONIGHT'S FORMAT

OBSERVE...
· Get updated on the project’s progress
· Watch a presentation from the project team - 7:00pm

PARTICIPATE...
· Share your thoughts/ concerns/ ideas on the park concept
· Ask questions to the project team

ENGAGE...
· Fill out a comment form
· Complete a survey that will help inform design decisions for the design concept
**Process Map**

**Project Goals**

**Recreation**
Replace Brian Timmis Field which was lost due to the realignment of Tim Hortons Field.

**Park Amenities**
To provide opportunities for neighbours to play, relax and socialize in a community that has a lack of parkland.

**Green Space**
Introduce green space for a variety of outdoor activities.

**Timeline**

- **2012**
  - City of Hamilton acquired the 43 Lloyd St. property.

- **2013**
  - Demolition of Don's City buildings.

- **2014**
  - Environmental reporting and Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks approvals and analysis.

- **2015**
  - PIC #1 Identify priorities for the park as well as stakeholder groups.

- **2018**
  - Concept development and stakeholder consultation.

- **Spring 2019**
  - PIC #2 Presentation of the Park Concept, Monday, October 28

- **Summer 2019**
  - PIC #3 Detailed design of park and field house, including environmental mitigation measures, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks approval and permits.

- **Fall 2019**
  - Possible start of park construction.

- **2019-2022**

- **2022**

---

**Stadium Precinct Community Park** September 2019
WHAT WE HEARD

June 2019 data collected from:
- 86 online survey responses
- 11 comment sheet responses (all from residents within the park area)
- PIC "dot-mocracy" voting boards

How Will People Get to the Park?
- Walk
- Bike
- Bus
- Public Transit
- Drive
- Other

How Often People Anticipate Using the Park?
- Daily
- A few times per week
- A few times per month
- Less than once per month
- Never

Support for the Stadium Precinct Community Park
- Yes
- No (not sure)

Park Amenity Priorities Ranked from most desired (1) to least desired (5)

- Playground
- Open green space
- Skate park
- Multi-purpose court(s)
- Sports field

Park Amenity Suggestions
- Spray pad
- Planting
- Public washrooms
- Off-leash dog area
- Drinking water
- Picnic area
- Community gardens
- Walking / running track
- Adult fitness equipment
- Seating
- Archery space
- Baseball diamonds
- Ice rink
- Swimming pool
- Water feature
- Bike storage
- Bike paths
- Water play

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK
PARK AMENITIES

PROGRAM AREAS BREAKDOWN

- Amenities
  - Skateboard Dot
  - Community Gardens
  - Spray Pad
- Playground
- Sun Shelter
- Paved Walkways
- Green Space
- Artificial Turf
- Sloped Park Buffer with Tree Planting
- Parking
- Field House

Committed Rec. Programs are Outlined

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK

September 2019
FIELD HOUSE

Park Building Precedents

Field House Components

**Staff Areas**
- Storage for Hamilton Forge F.C.
- Storage and Mechanical Rooms for Staff

**Public Areas**
- Universal Washroom
- Women's Washroom
- Men's Washroom
- Drinking Fountain

**Player Access**
- Player Access Rooms Including:
  - Change Rooms
  - Washrooms
  - Showers

STADIUM PRECINCT COMMUNITY PARK  

September 2019
STAY IN TOUCH!

VISIT: http://www.hamilton.ca/StadiumPrecinctPark

Project information and updates
Link to a user survey
Track the progress

CONTACT US:
John Vandriel
Landscape Architectural Services
905 546 2424 ext.3662
Johnathan.Vandriel@hamilton.ca
1.0 Introduction

The proposed site for Stadium Precinct Community Park (Precinct Park) is located in Hamilton, Ontario and is bounded by Gage Avenue North to the east, a CN Rail line to the north and industrial complexes to the south and southwest and residences to the southeast. The proposed site includes an artificial turf stadium field with a viewing area, a plaza area with a parking lot, an open space area with walkways, playgrounds, a multi-use court, open green space, community gardens and a spray-pad.

This memo outlines the preliminary investigation of the site based on the current conditions. The investigation includes:

- A estimate of existing material to be re-used, material to be hauled off-site, and fill material to bring onsite based on the proposed site-plan subject to environmental restrictions, and
- A preliminary servicing plan to accommodate the proposed site-plan.

2.0 Existing Site Material Condition

Existing material on the site was categorised into two types, clean and environmentally impacted material. Quantity calculations of volume of each material type was determined based on area (measured using topographical survey and Google Earth satellite images) and assumptions on depth, height or thickness. The existing site was broken down into different areas based on the survey and imaging. Material quantities of these areas were calculated using volume calculations based upon geometric shapes. Assumptions of thickness and depth of the existing structures were based on common conventions and site observations.

Assumptions of Material Quantities Type:

- Clean material included concrete pads and foundations slab, which can be crushed and re-used.
- Rubble concrete stockpiles were considered as clean material to be crushed and re-used.
- Structures with basements were calculated with 10ft (3.048m) basements heights.
- Basement structures and material removed offsite generates onsite void space requiring fill.
- Geometric shape calculations were used to estimate volume (Area x Height, Pyramid with 3:1/2:1 side slope, triangular wedge, etc.).
- Impacted material included concrete used as fill and unknown material in the elevated building foundation. Impacted material can will be used as fill on the property.
- Asphalt is removed offsite as it is a resource with a higher value than regular fill.
Calculations were made to quantify the volume amount of clean material, impacted material, existing void space present and voids left due to materials removed offsite or cut to meet the proposed site grading. The table below summarizes the volume of materials estimated based on existing conditions relative to a planar level site surface matching grades at property lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Type</th>
<th>Volume (m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean Material</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted Material</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Void Space</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Material Quantity of Proposed Site Plan

Studies by others for the site have identified the need for one of two surface profiles, a hard surface, or a soft surface with a minimum of 1m of clean material at surface. Due to the type of impacted material that exists below the surface, the proposed green space area was assumed to require the minimum 1.0m of clean material inclusive of any topsoil or granular material. Proposed hard surfaces such as pavement or asphalt, do not require clean material aside from the materials required to construct the pavements or other profiles. Hard surfaces include the building, asphalt road, parking lot, event plaza, stadium entrance and multi-use court area. Soft surfaces which require the minimum of 1m of cover include the turf field, berm area, and open common area. The table summary below lists the assumptions of subsurface profile requirements exclusive of environmental requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Land Use</th>
<th>Required Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thicknesses (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stadium Field</td>
<td>500mm (Field Profile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Event Plaza + Stadium Entrance</td>
<td>200mm (concrete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking Lot</td>
<td>120mm (asphalt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grass / Berm area</td>
<td>300mm (topsoil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed site can be divided into a west and east section. The west half of the site consist primarily of the hard surfaces listed above and the east primarily of soft profiles. This west section is to be raised 1.0m above existing elevation to manage the impacted materials onsite. The overall elevation profile for the western half is considered relatively flat and plateau-like. The east half of the site, is mainly grass and open space. The elevation profile across the east section is proposed to match existing elevations
along Gage Avenue and maintain a gentle slope to match the hardscape elevation that is raised 1.0m above existing around the centre of the site.

Assumptions of Required Material Calculations:

- The existing surface profile is assumed planar and generally level across the site for preliminary calculations;
- The Stadium Field, Event Plaza, and Parking Lot are considered box prisms of 1.0m in height, volume is estimated using area x height;
- The Grass/Open Space and Berm area is required to match existing elevations at the east limit at Gage Ave, and match 1.0m elevated profile at the west section hard surfaces, and match a 2.0m retaining wall at the north limit;
- At the east limit to match existing, 300mm of topsoil plus 700mm thick of clean fill is required to maintain the 1.0m clean material requirements;
- The Open space/Commons is considered a box prism of 1.0m height. An average cross-slope was calculated across the surface matching existing elevations;
- The berm at the north limit was assumed as a trapezoid at various cross-sections. The north portion is to match a proposed 2.0m retaining wall as separation from the rail-line. The berm was calculated with a flat top and a 3:1 slope was assumed to match elevations at the open space/common, and
- The volume of material for the berm was calculated using an “End-Area Method” based on various cross-sections.

4.0 Site Material Balance

Calculations were made to quantify the volume amount of clean/impacted material, topsoil, granular material, asphalt, and overall fill required for the proposed site works. Any cut below the existing surface generated additional material which required management. The following table summarizes the volume of material required for the post-development conditions, rounded to 100m$^3$ increments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Type Required/Generated</th>
<th>Volume (m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean Material (non-type specific)</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Material</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Asphalt</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted Material Generated</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted Material to use as Fill</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Material balance for the proposed development can be calculated by comparing the values summarized in the table above and from Section 2.0. The overall material balance can be summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clean Fill Required</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Impacted Material (Ex. Impacted Material + Impacted Material Generated)</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total On-site Storage for Impacted Material (Void Space to Fill + Impacted Material to use as Fill)</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Existing Clean Material needed for void space (3. – 1.)</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Existing Clean Material as Fill for Proposed Site (Clean Fill in Section 2.0 – 4.)</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clean Material To Import (1. – 5.)</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, the proposed site requires clean material to be imported. All disturbed material that is unusable as clean material can be used onsite as material to bring the site up to proposed elevations below the clean materials or pavement profiles. The grading can be refined during detailed design to reduce the amount of clean material brought to site.

5.0 Preliminary Site Servicing

There exist site services (water, storm, and sanitary) from the previous land-use prior to demolition. Based on the proposed development, the existing services will not be used for the proposed site due to age, condition, location, etc. The Site can be serviced by the existing sewers and watermain that exist on Gage Avenue North and Chapple Street at Lloyd Street.

Potable Water Service

Potable water service can be supplied from the existing 150mm diameter watermain on Lloyd Street, through Chapple Street, at the south of the site. The proposed site is expected to require a minimum 150mm service which will provide water to a 150mm diameter fire main, two (2) hydrants and a 100mm diameter domestic service, complete with a meter chamber as per City of Hamilton standards.

Preliminary Sanitary Servicing

The proposed site will require a sanitary sewer service for the Stadium building. There exists a 300mm diameter combined sewer along Lloyd St where proposed sanitary sewers can connect and discharge into. The sanitary sewer alignment is based on the proposed road layout and flows south on Chapple
Street to connect into the existing sanitary manhole on Lloyd Street. It is expected that a 200mm sanitary service is sufficient to service the stadium and associated infrastructure. Confirmation of sufficient receiving capacity in the existing sewer to be confirmed during detailed design.

**Preliminary Storm Servicing**

The preliminary design for storm servicing was based on the City of Hamilton Criteria, whichever was the more conservative option of either:

1. Controlling discharge of Post-Development 100-Year Storm to Pre-Development 2-Year Storm, or
2. Not exceeding the capacity of the existing services.

Given the second criteria, the discharge flow is most restricted and a greater storage requirement was needed. Storm connections can be serviced from the existing storm sewers that exist along Lloyd Street and Gage Avenue North. The total allowable storm discharge release rate from the proposed site is 661 L/s. This flow rate was determined based on storm services that exist onsite as indicated by an SUE investigation provided by the Client and assumptions of slopes being consistent with adjacent sewer within the City ROW.

**6.0 Storage Calculations**

On-site storm water storage was calculated using a modified Rational Method. Storage was based on the difference between accumulation of peak flow rainfall and the allowable release rate. Calculations were based on the 100-year IDF parameters (Mount Hope Airport).

| Table 1. Mount Hope Airport IDF Parameters |
|------------------|-----|-----|-----|
|                | a   | b   | c   |
| 100-year       | 2317.4 | 11  | 0.836 |

The Run-off Coefficient (C) was calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area (ha.)</th>
<th>C x A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Space (Assume C=0.25)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Surface (Assume C=1.0)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average C</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The peak required storage using the Rational Method was calculated to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Storm (minutes)</th>
<th>Intensity (mm/hr)</th>
<th>Peak Flow (m³/s)</th>
<th>Peak Flow Vol. (m³)</th>
<th>Release Rate Vol. (m³)</th>
<th>Required Storage (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>162.61</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>952.143</td>
<td>515.58</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Rational Method was calculated at increments of 1.0 minute. The total required storage on-site is 437m³ and occurs at 13 minutes. The proposed site plan can be divided up into the different site land-
uses listed in Section 3.0. Using the Rational Method with a Time of Concentration (Tc) of 10 minutes, the runoff can be calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Land Use</th>
<th>Area (ha.)</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Run off Q100 (L/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stadium Field</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>641.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Event Plaza + Stadium Entrance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>127.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking Lot</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>159.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grass / Berm area</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>340.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the runoff generated by the proposed site plan, preliminary calculations have confirmed that storage requirements can be met while restricting flow to the allowable discharge rate. The types and means of on-site storage will be determined during detailed design.

### 7.0 Discharge to Existing Sewers

Storm discharge to existing sewers on Lloyd Street was calculated based on the following assumptions:

- Flow in pipes was calculated using Manning’s Formula.
- Flow (Q) of ex 525mm dia. at 0.2% at 85% capacity = 141.7 L/s
- Flow (Q) of ex 600mm dia. at 0.2% at 85% capacity = 233.4 L/s
- Storm contribution from properties on Lloyd St for pipe size increase = 92.3 L/s
- Therefore max flow to upstream Lloyd Street sewer: 141.7 L/s − 92.3 L/s = 49.4 (50 L/s)
- The approximate maximum allowable Q5 from proposed site into Lloyd Street Storm Sewers = 50 L/s

Based on the capacity calculations on the existing storm sewers on Lloyd Street, a 375mm diameter sewer at 0.20% can convey a flow rate of 50 L/s. The remainder of the storm discharge will be to Gage Avenue North.

### 8.0 Conclusion

The preliminary investigation on the feasibility for the development of Precinct Park concluded the following:

- The proposed work requires an additional 19,700m³ of clean fill material for the site to be raised 1.0m at portions of the site.
- Water and Sanitary service is available using Chapple Street, connections to be at Lloyd Street.
- On-site storage of 437m³ is required. The required storage capacity can be met from the runoff generated by the components of the Site.
- Storm service is available on Lloyd Street and Gage Avenue. Flow rates will be restricted for downstream capacity. Overall Storm discharge is required to be restricted to approximately 661 L/s, to meet City of Hamilton development criteria.
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