



## **PIER 8, BLOCK 16: RESIDENTIAL TOWER DESIGN OPTIONS**

**Public Feedback Report from  
Community Meeting held  
March 8, 2022**

Prepared by:  
Independent Facilitator Sue Cumming,  
Cumming+Company



April 8, 2022

This Community Meeting Feedback Report has been prepared by the Facilitator. It includes the questions and responses that were noted at the Community Meeting held on March 8, 2022, It includes verbatim comments, questions and responses. Further comments and questions can be forwarded to the City of Hamilton, Municipal Land Development Office at [westharbour@hamilton.ca](mailto:westharbour@hamilton.ca) and to Development Review Planner at [Mark.Kehler@hamilton.ca](mailto:Mark.Kehler@hamilton.ca)

# PIER 8, BLOCK 16: RESIDENTIAL TOWER DESIGN OPTIONS COMMUNITY MEETING (WEBINAR) held March 8, 2022 Feedback Report

## About This Report

The city has initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments on lands identified as Pier 8, Block 16 located at 65 Guise Street. The applications propose a 45-storey residential building consisting of approximately 429 units. A special design review process is being followed which involves public consultation and input through a Design Review Panel. A Community Meeting (Webinar) was held on Tuesday, March 8 from 6:30 to 9:00 p.m. The meeting was hosted by the City of Hamilton Municipal Land Development Office and Waterfront Shores Partners to provide information about three tower design options for Pier 8, Block 16.

The purpose of the Community meeting was to:

- Provide an overview the design review process.
- Present three tower design options that address innovation in three areas: sustainability, quality of life and design excellence.
- Receive feedback from the public on the tower design options and answer questions.

This report, prepared by Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company, includes what was heard from the public at the Community Meeting. This report is intended to provide a record of what was heard and responses from the Project Team. The comments and questions included are verbatim. It should be noted that the meeting held on March 8, 2022, was a community meeting and not the Public Meeting as required by the Planning Act (i.e., the “statutory public meeting”). The first Public Meeting was held on February 15, 2021. The second Public Meeting will occur at a later date and will be advertised by the city.

## Table of Contents

1. About the Virtual Community Meeting Details .....	2
2. What Was Heard - Comments and Questions Raised	
Table A: Planning History of Block 16 and Pier 8 Development .....	3
A.1. About the planning history of Block 16 .....	3
A.2. About the application process and public consultation .....	5
A.3. About Pier 8 and the overall development plans .....	7
A.4. About traffic, parking and transit for Pier 8 and north end neighbourhood .....	9
A.5. About public use of the waterfront.....	10
A.6. About servicing .....	11
Table B: Residential Tower Design Options .....	12
B.1. About design excellence .....	12
B.2. About the height of the residential tower .....	15
B.3. About the tower becoming a precedent for other towers at the waterfront.....	17
B.4. About accessibility .....	19
B.4. About parking for the residential tower .....	19
Table C: Sustainability .....	20
C.1. About climate change considerations .....	20
C.2. About environmental sustainability and energy efficiency .....	21
C.3. Other sustainability comments.....	22
Table D: Quality of Life and Family Housing .....	22
D.1. About quality of life .....	22
D.2. About affordability and family housing .....	22
Appendix 1 - Comments Received by March 24, 2022.....	23

## 1. VIRTUAL COMMUNITY MEETING INFORMATION DETAILS

Given restrictions related to public gatherings, the Community Meeting was held by way of an online **WEBINAR on March 8, 2022, from 6:30 to 9:00 p.m.** Participants registered in advance of the meeting. 190 participants registered and 124 connections participated at the meeting. Some of these may have included more than one individual.

The format included live presentations from City Staff and representatives from Waterfront Shores Development Corporation following by questions and answers. Presenters included:

<b>City of Hamilton</b>	Jennifer Roth, Planning and Economic Development Department Chris Phillips, Municipal Land Development Office
<b>Waterfront Shores Partners</b>	Bruce Kuwabara of KPMB Luka Matutinovic of Purpose Building

Those who wanted to share a comment or questions were able to do so by typing into these into the Q and A question box. Comments and questions were then read aloud by the Independent Facilitator and answered live by the presenters. Individual names were not read aloud when the questions were asked. Participants could ask multiple questions.

Mark Kehler, Development Planner, City of Hamilton attended. A number of the Design Review Panel Members also attended to hear the discussion.

Throughout the Question-and-Answer period, 172 comments and questions were received. 54 individuals asked at least one question. A number of participants asked multiple questions. One individual had 19 comments and questions and 3 others asked more than 10. The majority of the questions included in the Q and A were read aloud. All the comments and questions are included in this feedback report.

Following the meeting, the PowerPoint Slide deck and recording of the presentation were posted on the Block 16, Pier 8 website and further comments were encouraged to be sent to the Municipal Land Development Office for inclusion in this report or to Mark Kehler the City of Hamilton Development Review Planner for review as part of the processing of the applications. Additional comments received by the Municipal Land Development Office by March 24, 2022, are including in Appendix 1 to this report.

## 2. WHAT WAS HEARD - COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS NOTED

This summary is intended as a record of “What was Heard” – public comments and questions raised at the March 8, 2022, Community Meeting. It includes verbatim questions that were noted in the Q and A and responses provided. The questions and comments are grouped by topic. Personal identifying information i.e., the name of the individuals asking questions is not included.

All of the feedback is being considered by the City of Hamilton Municipal Land Development Office and Waterfront Shores Partners in their review of the proposed development project for Block 16. A summary of the feedback on the design elements was prepared and provided to the Design Review Panel for their first meeting held on March 10, 2022.

**Table A – What was Heard about the planning history of Block 16 and the Pier 8 Development**

The following table includes the verbatim comments and questions about the planning History of Block 16, the application process and overall, Pier 8 Development. Each bullet point is a different person’s comment or question.

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)</b>
A.1	<b>About the planning history of Block 16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have we abandoned the idea that Block 16 is to be the signature institutional building providing a key public anchor at the waterfront?</li> <li>• How did this change from institutional to residential? Who exactly suggested that a 45-story tower be considered in the Minutes of Settlement? Was it the City or the Harbour West Neighbourhood Association or individual?</li> <li>• If the zoning of Block 16 was changed from Institutional to Residential Mixed Use in 2020, why do all of the City's public document still say its Institutional?</li> <li>• Please clarify - what does the 'institutional' label mean on the block we are talking about tonight? And was that modified in the LPAT approved zoning?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from City Planner from Sustainable Communities: There was an appeal on the zoning that was put in place, and through the LPAT settlement discussions, there was consideration for changing the land use on this specific block. It is a deviation from the original concept of institutional on Block 16. The applications are being processed and this meeting is part of that process. The determination as to whether the land use changes to residential to permit this development will be up to City Council. and is part of this process. The institutional designation will remain on the block until such time as Council decides on the Official Plan and Zoning Application. It will still show as Institutional until the decision is made.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does removing the signature institutional building in the Pier 8 Plan help build a place for people?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: Part of negotiated settlement between the parties which included two community groups within the neighbourhood who were actually participants and lead to that settlement. It is important to also review two contextual pieces for what is happening within the Pier 8 neighbourhood. (1) Council has just recently approved a visioning process to the Discovery Centre building which is currently institutional and that will be out for consultation (2) and there are two new public buildings being planned for Piers 6 and 7. This idea of institutional is still important and part of the area development. Additional planned as opposed to eliminating it on this one block.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why was this building not part of the original design rather than introduced part way through the approval process?</li> <li>• I believe that Setting Sail said no buildings taller than 8 floors but this awful two apartment building.</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<p><b>About the planning history of Block 16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city also sent out an RFP for this site. There was a community voting process. None of the proposals included 40+ storey towers. When did this change? I understand there may be a desire for density carriers, but why wasn't this studied in the initial RFP? It makes that voting and RFP process seem quite disingenuous.</li> <li>• This new tower looks nothing like the plans presented during the RFP. Why the change from what was presented?</li> <li>• Can anyone clarify this section of the minutes? "The Parties agree that the City shall direct staff to bring forward for Planning Committee and Council's consideration and approval, in its sole and unfettered legislative discretion, an amendment to Setting Sail (the "OPA") that would redesignate the existing Institutional block ("Block 16") to permit residential or mixed use in a mid-rise or high-rise form" is the City required to consider both mid- and high-rise buildings?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: When the city went out for the RFQ and RFP process (of which Waterfront Shores was the successful proponent), the city had undergone the planning approvals on the site which did have a 8-storey height limit on the overall site and included institutional on Block 16. As mentioned, there were several appeals made on the planning for the Pier 8 including an industrial owner in close proximity to the Pier 8 and two community groups that were in the north end neighbourhood. It was during this process under appeal that the idea of factoring in different element and looking at the rezoning of this site and specifically the objective of looking at more family units on the site that the change from Institutional to residential for Block 16 was contemplated. The process for considering this change to residential was agreed to by two community groups, the industrial owners and City Council. That process involves the current applications which are before the city for review and will be determined by City Council.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was not sufficient public consultation to change the original plans that were in place and voted on by the community. The land is city owned which is funded by public dollars. This is unacceptable. Have you done sufficient consultation to know what percentage of the north end neighbourhood is in support of this tower? There absolutely should be a real estate assessment to protect folks who own property in the area considering this will obscure views.</li> <li>• Has a survey or broad public response been done to determine how many people in Hamilton are in favour or not of a tower is this location?</li> <li>• North End Neighbours and other groups don't speak for the northenders, so we need to get this clarified.</li> <li>• North end residents should get to vote on building height changes. It was changed from 4 to 8 stories without our acknowledgement. Big surprise to many people.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: When the Minutes of Settlement went to Council there was public debate on the settlement. This is part of the public consultation on the change of use for Block 16 and as was noted earlier, the land use has not changed from</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
	<p><b>About the planning history of Block 16</b></p> <p><i>Institutional to Residential and that change would be before Council for their decision.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many questions and there should be further public consultation before this goes forward.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from City Planner from Sustainable Communities: There are two Design Review Panel meetings that are advertised on the website and the public can register to observe these. Comments can be received at any time through submission to the Municipal Land Development Office for the Development Planner at the City, Mark Kehler. There will be statutory public meeting held and the public can register to speak and send comments. When the statutory public meeting occurs, there will be notice in the newspapers, to the mailing list and signs of the property. Residents can also reach out to their Councillors to provide their feedback.</i></p>
A.2	<p><b>About the application process and public consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city spent time and money developing a new Urban Official Plan. What is the point of that process if the city is appealing its own bylaws?</li> <li>• Is the height of the tower a "done deal"? At 45 stories this will be an absolute eye sore, blocking out the view for many. Will look like the Toronto - skyline with access to view extremely limited.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from City Planner from Sustainable Communities: The tower is not a done deal. The application is still before the city for review. The only thing that has been completed to date is the Opportunities Study which resulted in Urban Design Guidelines which will be used to review these applications against. Within the Guidelines a 45-storey cap was established. There was consultation done at that time and they were endorsed by Planning Committee. No land use changes have been done at this time and that is still in the process.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the process for this application?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from City Planner from Sustainable Communities: The application is submitted by Municipal Land Development Office in partnership with Waterfront Shores Partners. The application received by development planning division in the planning department. The planner who is reviewing the application is Mark Kehler. It was received in January and the application has been deemed complete. Given the uniqueness of the application, the City held a Statutory Public Meeting in February. You may have seen the public notice signs on the site, the newspaper notices or received a mail chimp blast about the February meeting.</i></p> <p><i>A report went to City of Hamilton Planning Committee and Council recommending continuing the processing the applications through an enhanced consultation process which includes the establishment of a Design Review Panel and direction to the applicant to hold a community meeting. This is that Community meeting.</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<p><b>About the application process and public consultation</b></p>	<p><i>Information is available on the city web site and comments can be forwarded to Mark Kehler. Eventually a staff report with a recommendation will go forward to Planning Committee and Council for decision.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I did not receive notice of the public meeting in February. How many people attended that meeting?</li> <li>• There are clearly many questions and concerns about this tower. Further public consultation needs to occur before this moves forward.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from City Planner from Sustainable Communities: For the February Statutory Meeting, there was notice in the newspaper and there was a mail out (physical notices) and notices to mailing list and signs placed on the property. The minutes of Planning Committee are available on the city's website.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the mailouts please include the entire North end. I did not receive one for the meeting in February and I live in the area.</li> <li>• I too have found the public notice lacking.</li> <li>• These meetings seem to be clandestine. All my neighbours in Westdale knew nothing of this meeting. How are you advising the public in general, especially those without access to electronic devices?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: Waterfront Shores: Meeting notices are always difficult. This project has garnered some significant attention and media attention, we did provide a notice in the Spectator. We have a data base of names that were part of the community engagement we did several years ago. We have a mailing list and any one can sign up on the website and receive direct notification. This also went to Planning Committee and that was advertised. There was also notice in the North End Breezes for this meeting. I wouldn't think the word clandestine isn't really a fair acknowledgment as we have been very public about this including posting reports and information.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we possibly get a copy of tonight's presentation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Facilitator: The recording for the presentation and the slide deck will be posted on the city webpage by March 10. Additional comments that are forwarded to Waterfront Shores up to March 24, 2022, will also be included in the meeting feedback report. This feedback will be considered by the Municipal Land Development Office and the Design Review Panel and will be included in future City Staff reports to Planning Committee and Council. Comments can be forwarded to the City Development Review Planner, Mark Kehler at any time and would be considered as part of the review of the applications. Contact information in on slide.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a webinar not a consultation. I would expect a dedicated session for discussion and Q&amp;A in order to be considered public consultation. This is just a bunch of buzz words. This was meant to be a public consultation to have our questions answered. There are</li> </ul>

Topic		Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
	<b>About the application process and public consultation</b>	<p>currently only 4 minutes remaining. I would expect a follow-up session to allow for actual discussion and questions to be answered to fulfill the public consultation process.</p> <p><i>Response from the Facilitator: In response to the pandemic, virtual meetings have become the way to provide information and receive input. This type of webinar meeting with a presentation followed by Q and A has been used for many City of Hamilton projects. We know that some people prefer in-person meetings. This format does enable for there to be lots of questions asked – so far, we have over 140 and we do find that it provides the opportunity for people to ask questions, hear responses and learn about other individual's questions. There are other ways to provide input as well and everyone is encouraged to view the online material on the city website and to forward comments to Waterfront Shores and to the City's Development Planner whose name and contact information has been provided.</i></p>
<b>A.3</b>	<b>About Pier 8 and the overall development plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I understand the need to build taller buildings to increase density. I support density, and I worked to Stop Sprawl. My question is why the additional units were not simply added to another floor or two for the other buildings considering Pier 8 is being considered a single site. There was obviously a plan to keep this a mid-rise development in the original plan. That could have been kept if there was an extra floor on each of the other blocks</li> <li>• If the number of units remains the same across the Pier 8 development, will other buildings be shorter, slimmer, and have more commercial?</li> <li>• Will this shift in units just allow for more floors of commercial/office space in other buildings rather than diminishing the height of the other buildings?</li> <li>• What are the changes to the other buildings on pier 8 that will allow units to be shifted to this building?</li> <li>• Are we locked in to 1,645 units no matter what? Could this be managed by a lower rise building instead of 45 storeys?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: The 1645 is the maximum on the on the overall site and it is what is in the zoning and embedded in the LPAT minutes of settlement. The total number of units is a hard number and is the total regardless of if there is tower on the site.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While I think the site can accommodate a landmark tower, 45 storeys seem too high given the scale of planned built form surrounding the proposal on the rest of Pier 8. Could some of this height not be re-distributed more evenly across the other development blocks?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: No, that would not be allowed. The Minutes of Settlement do not allow any change in height on the other blocks in Pier 8.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you have alternative location in mind, should this location not be approved for a building this high?</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<p><b>About Pier 8 and the overall development plans</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is stopping developers changing the other blocks to high rise 45 storey or more or less from developing if this goes through?</li> <li>• What stops a variance going through to change the heights? My comment: Usually it's just about the money.... If someone pays it will go through</li> <li>• Block 1 is blocked from any westerly entirely. Will this devalue these smaller properties?</li> <li>• Is there a reason this tower can't be built at the Strachan/James St block? Why at the waterfront where it will add to congestion and block views for many folks.</li> <li>• The overall Pier 8 development is planned to be phased if I recall correctly. Has the developer determined at which point in the project this tower element would be built?</li> <li>• The neighbourhood association (NENA) has reviewed and continues to review the proposed signature / landmark tower as a single development for the waterfront. This will allow the remaining site to remain lower and have greater connection of the new development into existing schools, retails, churches and people.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: At the start of the presentation, we overviewed the plans for Pier 8 and how the development is proceeding for the other blocks. For the entire development, 1645 units is allowed on this site maximum whether there is tower on Block 16 or not. As stated, it is a firm maximum number – it is in the zoning by-law and in the contractual agreement between the city and Waterfront Shores.</i></p> <p><i>With respect to a variance for the height of any buildings in Pier 8, in the city agreement with Waterfront Shores, they are not allowed to apply for any variance in height unless the city agrees. We are not anticipating any changes to the other blocks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much money/profit is being generated by this project? Who are the stakeholders, and why are developers dictating the design, and the number of floors? Is this not a cash grab?</li> <li>• The more units the more profit for those involved. So, the hard sell is moot.</li> <li>• This sounds as if this is a done deal. We are probably all wasting our time listening to this. I predict this so-called presentation is for marketing only. Let's hear it for corporate greed!</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: The city is actually the landowner and all of the capital investment that have been made down there already and capital upgrades continuing on are being paid for by this communal development. From a tax and land sales perspective, the city is reaping financial benefit not just the developers. All of the city's proceeds of that are being pumped back into all of the fantastic public amenities that we are building that Council has already committed to – over 100 million dollars of investment in the West Harbour area.</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)	
	<p><b>About Pier 8 and the overall development plans)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's nice that the city owns the land. The builder has a monetary stake in this. Are they building for free? I don't understand your statement regarding profit.</li> <li>• So, builder is building for material costs and no profit. This makes no sense.</li> <li>• The city invested in the industrial area in its history and is now paying for its clean up. The city owes it to its citizens to not make any mistakes in its future. Don't tell us that we are garnering revenues from this. Short term thinking is not appreciated.</li> <li>• Will that financial benefit be reinvested into the north end? There is nothing to guarantee that. Public funds historically are invested elsewhere. Roads, parks etc. in this area have historically been neglected. I understand that the waterfront is being invested in now but what about the other roads, parks etc. in the rest of the north end?</li> </ul>
<p><b>A.4</b></p>	<p><b>About traffic, parking and transit for Pier 8 and north end neighbourhood</b></p>	<p><b>Comments about public parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is everyone going to park? Is it all street parking? Where is the public parking? What about public coming to the skating rink or for a walk on Promenade?</li> <li>• Where is the public parking?</li> <li>• Where is the public parking? For example, when the tugboat docked, there were families with small children coming from all over the city. You cannot expect parents to load kiddies and their paraphernalia by public transit and come to enjoy the waterfront.</li> <li>• Parking and infrastructure in the north end have not been upgraded. The Councillor still wants to black top Eastwood Park to ease parking. City talks green space; this is more concrete and asphalt than green space. Why are they not looking at the brownfields that the city exhumed for a stadium that never happened that sits empty on Stewart St. I think Hamilton must be for keeping our waterfront green for the people and the wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: The public parking would not change because of this development. The city conducted traffic studies and analyses. Because there is no increase in density for the site, the maximum number of units remains the same at 1645 regardless of where these units are built. The traffic impacts are no different if there is a tower on Block 16.</i></p> <p><i>There will be some parking in the Pier 8 development for some of the commercial uses. The city is now working on long term plan for the entire area.</i></p> <p><b>Comments about public transit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More of a comment than a question: please consider working with HSR and Council to make the free 99 Waterfront Shuttle year-round to draw people to the water in all seasons! Maybe a corporate partnership could help pay for it.</li> <li>• Does anyone know if HSR service will go through this development with connections to West Harbour and Go Transit and of course downtown connections?</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)	
	<p><b>About traffic, parking and transit for Pier 8 and north end neighbourhood</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be increased public transit to the area?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: We can't speak for HSR on their plans and services. Certainly, as the area develops over time, transit service would be something that HSR continues to look at.</i></p> <p><b>Comments about traffic in the area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can 1600 additional units on site not increase traffic on a main tributary.? With over 1600 units planned how many cars do you expect will be added to the current traffic flows?</li> <li>• Do you expect that there will be a need to expand existing roads because of additional traffic?</li> <li>• With respect to Transportation Background, The Official Plan and Setting Sail have probably addressed the question but has there not been any information as to how this has been addressed for such increased developments of the pier lands. There is presently limited traffic and truck access to these lands. It would be informative to have some background information as to how existing roads will be suitable to handle all this development.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office; The West Harbour webpage (Hamilton.ca/westharbour) has an online data room and all of the information including traffic, transportation and parking, all of the studies that have been done are all there for public viewing. This was a significant issue for the neighbourhood groups both in the lead up to the RFP process as well as since and as part of the settlement discussion. It is important to recognize that the total number of units zoned for the site is 1645. The transportation studies looked at the uses on the site and the total number of units. These applications for a tall building on Block 16 are not adding any additional units. The total number of 1645 remains the same and there are not anticipated to be any changes to the traffic and parking because of the tall building. The transportation findings do not change and are still relevant.</i></p> <p><i>Response from the City Planner from Sustainable Communities: When the city did the Opportunities Study that resulted in the Urban Design Guidelines for Block 16, the City's transportation planning staff did review whether an updated traffic management study would be required, and they concluded that it would not because institutional uses are a higher generator for traffic and higher parking and trips per vehicles and that this would potentially be an improvement.</i></p>
A.5	<p><b>About public use of the waterfront</b></p>	<p><b>Comments about public use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the goal for the Hamilton Waterfront as per presentation description of the 40-year plan is "Pure Public Access" isn't there a more suitable place near but not on the waterfront for a giant building which will create a wall on the waterfront, not access to the waterfront. The combination of this building and the Harbourside Way Roadway leave very little usable space for "public access".</li> <li>• No towers along the waterfront! The waterfront belongs to all the citizens of Hamilton, and we need to keep the view free from vertical</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<p><b>About public use of the waterfront</b></p>	<p>obstructions. If you allow 1, you'll set precedent and you'll be allowing 100. Make the right decision along with the smart decision. Keep up the good work!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need clean water, we need clean water edge, we need clean green public space, and then low rise residential to mid rise residential to high rise residential evolving away from the lake.</li> <li>• The presentation is lovely, but where is the public space that a large crowd for special occasions will gather?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: Many of the public amenities are either there now or are under construction. The new Copsps Pier Promenade Park stretches all around Pier 8. We are about to take the construction fence down for permit public access. It was designed through an international competition. There is a new one-kilometer boardwalk being built now on Piers 6 and 7 that is just being built right now. Plus, the whole area of Piers 6 and 7 is being converted from surface parking and boat storage to an new open public area with access from James Street. And another gateway park at the entranceway to this. The city is investing in significant public spaces at the Waterfront.</i></p>
<p><b>A.6 About servicing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much will it cost the city for garbage pickup.? Who will eat the costs for these additional services? i.e., for waste pickup, sewer, water etc.?</li> <li>• Can the city handle the flushing from 1645 toilets? Was an infrastructure study done and when?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: We have done lots of infrastructure studies and infrastructure work and there were no services for Piers 5, 6, 7 and 8 and the city has done a lot of work to put in the services – upfronted all this including a pumping station. There is ample servicing capacity down here. There won't be any issues with servicing the 1645 units. These studies are all in the data room at <a href="http://Hamilton.ca/westharbour">Hamilton.ca/westharbour</a>.</i></p>

**Table B – What was Heard about the Residential Tower Design Options**

The following table includes the verbatim comments and questions about the Residential Tower Design Options. Each bullet point is a different person’s comment or question.

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
<p><b>B.1</b></p> <p><b>About design excellence</b></p>	<p><b>Considerations for the design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have heard a lot about this being a beacon, an icon of the community. The top portion of this building should be a lookout for the public. If this is to be a civic landmark, with this height will there be a viewing platform on top for the public and not just residents?</li> <li>• If this is to be a civic landmark, with this height will there be a viewing platform on top for the public and not just residents?</li> <li>• There will only be panoramic views for the people that can afford to live in this building. That is not a draw for the neighbourhood unless the building will be public access. If not, this tall building will in fact prevent panoramic views for the rest of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Will there be the inclusion of architectural lighting features? i.e., a lit crown, lighting on the podium, lighting throughout the tower?</li> <li>• On inset balconies vs. wraparound balconies, has there been thought re: ensuring the elegant appearance is maintained? Glazing on the tower slab edge was envisioned as very clean; are there plans to avoid spandrel panels and messy window wall interfering with the design so that appearance can be achieved? Is higher quality unitized curtain wall potentially on the table?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: These are all really specific design considerations for the exterior of the building. Specific to how to get the building to be legible, how it is composed, how it reads. Glazing vs. solid ratios. These are good considerations. We are at a starting place and there is more to come on this. We are at the first design review panel, and these are consideration that may be discussed at Design review panel 2 in April.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wind says go cylinder.</li> <li>• I vote for the Lily.</li> <li>• I think the Lily design option (option 3) is the most interesting and best showcases the landmark nature of the site.</li> <li>• The design looks beautiful, and I would be interested in selling my place to live on this new landmark.</li> <li>• In the first part of the presentation, it was mentioned that the building should be part of the neighbourhood and the city not something that stands alone, yet the scale/height of the building and the goal of making it a regional landmark speaks more to it standing out/alone - wondering if anyone can expand on this?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: I think that you want to be part of the neighbourhood and stand out –because it is an exceptional site. I think that we are doing both, both fitting in supporting the mews, the greenway, the shape of site. As Haida Avenue turns onto Harbourside Way, into the marina, there obviously the lighthouses, there are metaphors of markers like this and standing out. This is a complex site and I think that this is addressing all of these issues at different scales.</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
<p><b>About design excellence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What effect will the "wave" design have on the light coming into the residential spaces?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: I think it has more perimeter because of the in and out play of the wave design and if that were a preferred direction, we would study the lighting. There is a lot more work to be done but yes, absolutely it is like bays that go out and in and convex and concave surfaces of that design as opposed to the cylinder.</i></p> <p><b>Bird friendly design considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this building be bird friendly to minimize bird strikes?</li> <li>• This is an important bird migration and habitat location. How can you minimize bird strikes?</li> <li>• I don't believe that a tower can be bird friendly. I didn't hear anything tonight that indicated that it would be.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Yes. It will have bird-friendly mitigation. We have done buildings on flight corridors and waterfronts where there is an application of a pattern for having birds avoid hitting the building and it is effective. This is an important design consideration that is accounted for, and mitigation built in.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see usable green space on the rooftop of any of these designs. Will that be the case?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Yes, that is why we expanded the podium which did two things, it provided very comfortable areas for residents on the third floor behind the glass screens. There will be planted areas there. Then the site itself there will be green edges. All these are being worked on. There will be different green amenities on different levels of the building.</i></p> <p><b>Differentiation of design options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3 design options presented are more like 3 variations on 1 design option. Would like to see you come back with 3 distinct options that are significantly different from each other.</li> <li>• Each design iteration is a repeating extrusion of one floor plate. Earlier in the presentation, you showed a building that were much more dynamic with non-uniform floor plates. Will you explore different types of tower shapes that aren't simply an extrusion of one floor plate shape?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: I think that it is three very beautiful variations on one intelligent design option based on the aerodynamics and the analysis of the wind. It is not such a big site as you can see by the site plan. There were other options which were rectangular and a diagonal slab that were presented in the Urban Design Guidelines which recommended or pushed forward as a demonstration an oval shape building. We purified it and rotated that plan. The floor plates sizes are controlled and are very small – 650 and 850 square metres was written</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
<p><b>About design excellence</b></p>	<p><i>into the Urban Design Guidelines. All three options actually work within those Guidelines. There can be variations on them. definitely depending on the direction for taking one of the tower forms further the podium and the base, the townhouses elevation. What is important is the integration and the harmony between the tall, medium, and lower form and all things consideration. So, it is all things considered and pushing forward. There is a lot more work to do and there will more iterations based on the comments.</i></p> <p><i>There is an inherent energy and material efficiency that is built into a circular form. It is a compact. It is a very small amount of surface area that encloses the condition volumes and the addition of inset balconies. Less material and less heat loss. It all works together to achieve all of these different objectives.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to an earlier question about the 3 different options - a comment was made that the circular form is inherently efficient. Let's call "a spade a spade" the desire for the formal move of having a tall tower that anchors the West Harbour is trumping the desire for sustainability - towers are inherently less efficient in surface area, structural material efficiency.</li> </ul> <p><i>Comments were noted.</i></p> <p><b>Cost-effectiveness of different designs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is one of the designs more cost effective to build than the others?</li> <li>• Do the 3 designs have different long-term exterior maintenance considerations?</li> <li>• What will be used for exterior cladding material - is it the same for all 3 designs?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: All three share an interest in having long-term maintenance consideration. That is what goes into the criteria for decision-making and will go into the quality of the building.</i></p> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: For the exterior cladding, it could be a material that is called GFRC which is a fibre reinforced concrete. It could be pre-cast concrete. It could be metal. These are decisions that have not been made. I believe that it should not be dark and should be a lighter material.</i></p> <p><b>Comments about the townhouse portion of the building design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the townhouses stacked? Is the idea of the townhouse to walk out onto the grass?</li> <li>• How will the townhouses fit into the development including views, walk out areas, landscaping areas and the use of more organic brick materials.</li> <li>• Why would someone in a townhouse want their view blocked by a monster building.</li> <li>• Would like to see street level as organic brick townhouse type construction not blocky modern glass (like Toronto).</li> </ul>

<b>Topic</b>		<b>Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting</b>
	<b>About design excellence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townhomes facing east will have a view of the Stelco lands and foundry. Hardly enticing.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: The townhouses are not what I would call stacked. They are two story townhouses along the Mews and there are not very many of them. Townhouses are required in the urban design guidelines and the drawing show a what we think is a good approach for providing these. With respect to the views from the townhouses, the townhouse views are facing east and facing away.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who do you anticipate living at this site – do you expect it to be Hamiltonians or people coming in from the GTA?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: It would likely be a mix – a broad mix of people. We expect a wide range, if the tower is approved there will be a lot of family units and we expect that people will come from Hamilton and the surrounding areas.</i></p> <p><b>Other comments about the building design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please do not put the same cover as the newer Waterdown library which is out of place.</li> <li>A building this large does not cater to our needs to meet housing requirements except for those who will be able afford what these units will cost. Sad.</li> <li>Balconies are stacked. I am concerned about the marijuana stench on the balcony below.</li> <li>It seems as though the back-of-house functions like loading and parking access take up a very prominent portion of the building's frontage along the waterfront and public promenade. Has the team studied whether these functions could be incorporated along the south or east sides of the building, to ensure more active and outward facing uses are achieved along this frontage?</li> <li>Do all the elevators go to the basement as well?</li> <li>How much extraordinary engineering is required to build a building of this height on a pier? Were detailed wind studies done to model effects of any of the designs?.</li> <li>Is there a cost study? Is one of the designs more cost-effective than the others?</li> <li>Was a detailed vibration assessment done? Will the floors shake?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: No, for sure the floors are not going to shake. it will be structurally engineered to the highest degree.</i></p>
<b>B.2</b>	<b>About the height of the residential tower</b>	<p><b>Comments about the height of the residential tower</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a beautiful building, but I truly believe it is in the wrong place. It reminds me of Montparnasse, a single tall tower out of place on the Paris skyline.</li> <li>The concept is too bright and out-of-place. The goal of making it a regional landmark speaks more to it standing out/alone that being part of a neighbourhood.</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
<p><b>About the height of the residential tower</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept is too bright; similar to out-of-place newer Waterdown library whose design does not fit in with Waterdown Victorian Village promotion.</li> <li>• I do not like the apartment towers at all.</li> <li>• I do not want tall towers on the site at all.</li> <li>• These towers are too high and out of place. Hamilton has always had a small/big town feel. 45 storeys are way too big for the area.</li> <li>• Believe me I'm very sensitive to the fact that you have put a lot of talent, time, imagination, and passion into the design, but I would be fundamentally opposed to allowing it to be built on Pier 8.</li> <li>• I also have concerns about the height issue. We do not need a signature building.</li> <li>• How is this monstrous building going to be engaging with the existing community? Will the local community be able to engage with this building or is it just another condo? It looks like a silo and self-contained structure standing out and not contributing to any community engagement. A giant eye sore really.</li> <li>• The building will be 147 metres tall--the escarpment is 90 metres. Does this not make the tower disproportionate to the landscape? Does the city still have height limits shaped by our unique geography?</li> <li>• With respect I can see that a lot of passion has gone into this design, but it sounds like the architect is in love with this plan for his legacy and that it can be seen from all directions ... not for what Hamiltonians want for this location.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: The beauty of the building itself – it is quite an exceptional site, and our job is to try to drive the design, quality of life and sustainability to be exemplary. We don't see it as a monster, we think that we are doing everything we can to really make a building that responds to its environment to create a great public realm around it that related to the lower building to the left and to relate to the fabric of Pier 8.</i></p> <p><b>Comment about views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No towers along the waterfront! The waterfront belongs to all the citizens of Hamilton. And we need to keep the view free from vertical obstructions.</li> <li>• Not completely sold on this concept. Was there just today and I've been looking at the sight from the Mountain Brow. Very concerned about the city approving more tall towers. I don't want the view of the Bay blocked by a tower.</li> <li>• To me the point that it can be seen from all those different points mentioned – RBC, the Skyway, La Salle Park, High Level Bridge etc. is irrelevant. If a landmark building was further back toward the escarpment, it would still be seen from those points. It would still be a landmark building. It would be just as sustainable, and it wouldn't be blocking everyone else's view. And that's where it should be built.</li> <li>• At 45 stories this will be an absolute eye sore, blocking out the view for many. Will look like the Toronto skyline with views extremely limited.</li> </ul>

<b>Topic</b>		<b>Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting</b>
	<b>About the height of the residential tower</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will only be panoramic views for the people that can afford to live in this building. That is not a draw for the neighbourhood unless the building will have public access. If not, this tall building will in fact prevent panoramic views for the rest of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Block 1 is blocked from any westerly view. Will this devalue these smaller properties?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Not sure what this means by devaluing other properties. Devaluing other blocks? In fairness, I am not a real estate person and couldn't tell whether there is any devaluation. The main idea of the townhouses is that the overall site not just the tower is suitable for different people particularly for families when you are looking the two-bedroom units and townhouses.</i></p>
<b>B.3</b>	<b>Comments about the tower becoming a precedent for building other towers along the waterfront:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will this tall building avoid becoming like the waterfronts in Vancouver and Toronto with too many condominiums in a row? Not happy with such a mega development focus.</li> <li>• Many people I have spoken to have concerns that an exception for the extra height for this building will open up the floodgates for a Toronto-esque look, similar to what you see between the Gardner and Lakeshore Rd. How can the city ensure this doesn't happen?</li> <li>• I believe that Setting Sail said no buildings taller than 8 floors but his awful two apartment building.</li> <li>• The city also sent out an RFP for this site. There was a community voting process. None of the proposals included 40+ storey towers. When did this change? I understand there may be a desire for density carriers, but why wasn't this studied in the initial RFP? It makes that voting and RFP process seem quite disingenuous.</li> <li>• The original 8 storeys would be a better quality of life for surrounding residential areas; 45 storeys will overwhelm the area which has traditionally been single family and quiet. It might be an architectural desire, but not practical for the surrounding neighbourhoods. It will change the "feel" of the area forever - the height in particular. How will this tall building avoid becoming Vancouver-Toronto-condified-like in its nature?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response by Waterfront Shores: I think that it is a building that is really connecting to the scale of the entire city and making transitions to the fabric of Pier 8 and actually with the podium making relationship with the Discover Centre and with Williams. The circular form is unique and is in response to the shape of the site which you can see on the drawings. It is also connecting to the James Street corridor so that you really know that this is the landmark on the waterfront. It is on the water and is speaking in a way to the other civic landmarks around the Bay or other important public places. I think that it is important that it have a civic stature. It is designed like this for this site and not any other site. It is something that I have been thinking about this for a long time. There are some buildings that I really love – Marina City in Chicago for example where there are round buildings, extraordinary buildings, they are private, and people are living there. You can't imagine Chicago without them. They are fantastic buildings. They become part of the identity of the city itself. That is where I started with the scale that is close to the</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
<p><b>Comments about the tower becoming a precedent for building other towers along the waterfront:</b></p>	<p><i>ground, the transition to the mid-rise buildings and then something that would speak to the scale of the Bay, the escarpment, the John Lyle Bridge, all of those elements. In the history cities, this is what has gone on in terms of identifying and creating buildings which become part of the image of the entire city. There are many examples of this and yes, this is not Chicago or Toronto, and I don't want that either. The principles of design that would really make this a civic site and not just a commercial-residential building and there are buildings that do that and do it really well. This is what I think is really appropriate for this site, the circular form and the placement relative to John Street. All of that is really important. That is the working principle for me.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't want to be Chicago; Hamilton has always had a small/big town feel. 45 storeys way to big for the area.</li> <li>• Marina City, Chicago is away from the lake!!! Replicate Chicago... water, beach, park, and the city with amazing architecture.</li> <li>• I have concerns about the Waterfront taking on a 'Toronto' feel. I know this has been vaguely discussed already, but what steps will be taken to maintain this area for what it is rather than a modern, industrialized centre similar to the Burlington or Toronto waterfronts</li> <li>• Contracts change, rules change and landscapes change. What's to stop a future developer from wanting to build a tower in another location on the waterfront. What stops a variance going through to change the heights?</li> <li>• What's to stop a future developer from wanting to build a tower at the corner of James St N and Burlington St., for instance, once this tall building precedent is set?</li> <li>• This new tower looks nothing like the plans presented during the RFP. Why the change from what was presented?</li> <li>• One building, one block " is just the beginning!!!</li> <li>• One building one park, that is how Toronto started. very worried.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Municipal Land Development Office: On the Toronto-esque like skyline concern noted, it is important to understand the context for the tall building on Block 16. This is one building on one block of the entire area between Bayfront Par to Eastwood Park. There are already two towers behind at John and Guise and the Ken Soble Tower. We are talking about one specific area where development would happen - Block 16 with a specific site for one building.</i></p> <p><i>On the concern about what is to stopping towers on other parcels on the site, it is important to understand the context for the this. It is also important to note that the city is the owner off all of the lands from Bayfront Park and the end of Pier 8 and as well as Eastwood Park on the other side. The City of Hamilton controls by ownership the lands. The City of Hamilton also controls the zoning on those lands which does not allow for additional residential other than what you see on Pier 8. Specifically, the LPAT Hearing Settlement Agreement says that there is only OPA and rezoning happening on this one block on Pier 8.</i></p>

<b>Topic</b>		<b>Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting</b>
	<b>Comments about the tower becoming a precedent for building other towers along the waterfront:</b>	<i>Waterfront Shores has committed to building on the rest of Pier 8 exactly as the Plan lays out. Lastly, Waterfront Shores and the City of Hamilton have a contractual legal agreement that says that they are not allowed to increase the heights and densities on any of the other lands that they have the right to build on because the city actually owns it. That gives the protection all the way around so that this will not become a Toronto-esque skyline. We are talking about one tower on Block 16. We are talking about the rest of the building being developed as what was anticipated in the Setting Sail Plan in the early 2000's when the vision for this area was laid out.</i>
<b>B.4</b>	<b>About accessibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no one on the City Design Panel who actually has a disability or experience in design. I do not want tall towers on the site at all. The newer city Westmount Recreation Centre only has one elevator which breaks down frequently. I want to ensure that all new city buildings have two elevators minimum.</li> <li>• Is loading and parking large enough for DARTs shuttles?</li> <li>• How will accessibility be addressed in the building design? Will there be accessible drop-offs, multiple elevators and accessible design?</li> <li>• Concerned that pedestrian access will not be accessible for the disabled. How will DARTS get through if there is a huge pedestrian mall space?</li> <li>• There needs to be accessible parking – for residents and visitors.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: The City Design Review Panel has 10 members, and they will be looking at Accessibility. The building must be in compliance with Universal Design standards. Accessibility is required and accessibility needs would be addressed throughout the building. There are four elevators planned for the tower. Parking and loading will accommodate accessible vehicles.</i></p>
<b>B.5</b>	<b>About parking for the residential tower</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of us are worried about the traffic flow in the area. will there be parking on site for the residents?</li> <li>• How many levels of parking below grade will there be?</li> <li>• Your earlier mention of three underground stories of parking seems inadequate when considering 1.5 parking spaces per unit. Are you sure that it will be enough?</li> <li>• Being so close to the waters edge and I'm doubtful that three stories of parking will be enough, how will this not be below water level? And is this not a concern?</li> <li>• Being so close to the waters edge, how will the parking not be below water level?</li> <li>• Currently there is already a problem with public parking for skating ring. Just 3 levels does not sound like it will be enough even for residents of the tower but what about public coming to the skating ring or for a walk on Promenade.</li> <li>• Will there be visitor parking?</li> <li>• There needs to be parking for visitors going to the building.</li> <li>• There needs to be parking for visitors for if we want to be a city to 'age in place'. Occupational and physiotherapy treatment providers need to get to their patients in their homes.</li> </ul>

Topic		Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting
	<b>About parking for the residential tower</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the proximity to the GO Station, the city's climate emergency declaration and the trend in a growing number of cities to reduce/eliminate personal car use, will the parking ratio be optimized with this foresight and to also decrease unit costs and increase affordability?</li> <li>Is the City enforcing minimum parking requirements? Parking spaces are expensive, and many go unsold. Ideally this site will be marketed as being great for transit users given the proximity to West Harbour</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Yes, there would be parking for residents, and it would be below grade under below the site. There would also be parking for visitors and accessible handicapped spaces.</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted.</i></p>

### Table C – What was Heard about Sustainability

The following table includes the verbatim comments and questions about Sustainability. Each bullet point is a different person's comment or question.

Topic		Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
C.1	<b>About climate change considerations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can you clarify how this contributes to climate action? Will there be green infrastructure? Will there be solar panels?</li> <li>The panelist spoke about Hamilton's history of addressing climate change. Please outline what about this building will address climate change? Will there be heat pumps, solar, wind, green roof?</li> <li>Where is outside water going?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: This development by its very nature and the process that is being used will deliver substantially better energy, carbon, material performance relative to what is typical and relative to the what the minimum requirements are. the specific technologies are part of that design process. We do not have a final design of what will be included. Things like solar and wind tend to not be able to generate a significant amount of energy or reduce carbon in tall buildings. It is about how we heat and cool primary and that is one of the focuses of our design process.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is not contributing to climate action. This is meeting minimum standards.</li> </ul> <p><i>This is by no means only meeting the minimum requirements. The entire Pier 8 development is already setting a higher level of energy and sustainable design relative to the minimum requirements and Block 16 is going above that. This will likely be a heat pump design although that is still being validated. Yes, there will be energy efficient low carbon heating and cooling systems be used. Wind and solar may be more appropriate for a low-rise building.</i></p>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
C.2.	<p data-bbox="235 207 492 338"><b>About Environmental Sustainability and Energy Efficiency</b></p> <ul data-bbox="521 212 1377 275" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable keeps being thrown around but not sure what that means.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="521 308 1463 741"><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Sustainable is very explicitly defined in the Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines which have very specific requirements for items that we are considering. More broadly speaking, the developer is pursuing third-party certification frameworks. The building will be Energy Star certified and we are looking at LEED and WELL certification as well (as described in the presentation). Big picture the building is going to use less energy and emit less carbon than typical development, it will have better indoor air quality, we will be considering mixed mode transportation like bicycles and electric vehicles, we will be using healthy materials that don't off-gas, Energy Star appliances will be provided throughout, there will be a robust process of commissioning, air tightness testing. There will be quite a robust framework as part of the Urban Design Guidelines.</i></p> <ul data-bbox="521 783 1276 814" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am concerned about off-gassing from materials used.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="521 848 1438 978"><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: There are a number of different requirements that will specifically address that. Both in terms of VOC paints and sealants. All those types of products will be selected so that they are not off-gassing or very limited.</i></p> <ul data-bbox="521 1020 1446 1419" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You described the low-carbon, resilient and passive environmental goals, as well as the pursuit of WELL certification. Has Waterfront Shores committed to these aspirations across the entire Pier 8 site, or is these commitments exclusive to the Block 16 tower?</li> <li>• You used the word "Passive" to describe the environmental sustainability of the tower. Are you pursuing PHIUS or PHI certification, or otherwise can you clarify what you mean by "Passive"? Thank you.</li> <li>• Reference was made to low carbon, integrated passive measures. Can you explain more about what this means? Is this tower being built to Passive House standards? Where can we learn more about levels of energy efficiency that will be realized?</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="521 1461 1458 1791"><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: It would be best to refer to the Urban Design Guidelines which provide a wealth of technical detail as to what the specific energy efficiency requirements are. With respect to passive house certification that is not something that is currently being contemplated. I will say that there are many ways of delivering passive design and it is all about reducing loads and deploying energy efficiencies and low carbon technologies and all of those and things that we are looking into right now and will be part of this. Urban Design Guidelines can be found on the city website under Pier 8, Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines.</i></p> <ul data-bbox="521 1833 1382 1896" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aren't high-rise buildings less energy efficient than low/mid rise buildings?</li> </ul>

Topic		Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
	<b>About Environmental Sustainability and Energy Efficiency</b>	<i>Response from Waterfront Shores: Generally, they can be but this one won't. There are energy efficient buildings for all types of buildings. This project will be energy efficient in keeping with the Urban Design Guidelines.</i>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>Other Sustainability comments noted</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will road salt be used on lakeside roads? Will there be a lot of road salt washing into the lake from the road?</li> <li>• Will local building materials be used? Will local talent be employed to build? Will that be a part of the sustainability?</li> <li>• With Hamilton's air quality in mind and the buildings proximity to industry, what will a lightly coloured building look like in years to come. Let's keep what happened to Stelco Tower in mind.</li> </ul> <p><i>Comments noted.</i></p>

**Table D – What was Heard about the Quality of Life and Family Housing**

The following table includes the verbatim comments and questions about the Residential Tower Design Options. Each bullet point is a different person's comment or question.

Topic		Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<b>D.1</b>	<b>About quality of life</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My comment is that it just doesn't make sense to me that a building this tall could be considered an enhancement to either the aesthetic or the quality of life of the harbour area. Don't get me wrong - It's a beautiful building. It's a gorgeous building. And I'm sure it will be as climate friendly as humanly possible. It just shouldn't be built there. If I lived there, I'd love it. If I didn't, I'd hate it. And most of us wouldn't be living there.</li> <li>• I am encouraged to see that the design allows for 2- and 3-bedroom apartments which bring more families into our neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Quality of life will not happen for those concerned that some parts will be blocked off to our residents who are disabled and need transport to their homes.</li> <li>• Are there additional schools planned given all the family units?</li> </ul> <p><i>Comments noted.</i></p>
<b>D.2</b>	<b>About affordability and family friendly units</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If I understand correctly the developer is required to construct 246 family units or 15% of 1645 total units. By increasing the height of this one building will this result in an increase in family units above and beyond the minimum required 246 units or will it just add more 1bdrm units?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from the Municipal Land Development Office: Yes, that is the agreement with respect to the consideration of increased height. Should the height be permitted, the number of family units would increase, and these could be built in any of the buildings on the Pier 8 site including Block 16.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are in great need of housing supply, and all three options would be beautiful additions to our city. Thanks to all involved for working</li> </ul>

Topic	Questions and Comments Noted and Responses Provided at the Meeting (Verbatim)
<p><b>About affordability and family friendly units</b></p>	<p>so hard to balance diverse community and environmental needs with this development!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What guarantees that the family units that will be built will at least partially be included in the affordable units?</li> <li>• Are these rentals or condominiums?</li> <li>• Will a percentage of the units in the tower be affordable i.e., rent-geared to income to make them more affordable for a greater number of Hamiltonians?</li> <li>• Are any units going to be 'affordable' or what is known is 'rent-geared-to-income'.</li> <li>• Will there be any 'social housing units included and if yes, who monitors it?</li> <li>• Will this new density come with an increase in affordable housing?</li> <li>• How many affordable units will there be and are they going to be one- or two-bedroom facilities?</li> <li>• Nothing that I have seen in any of the documentation provided ensures that the additional family units that will be built will at least partially be included in the affordable units - wondering if anyone can speak to how we will avoid having existing Hamilton residents being pushed out of the neighbourhood?</li> <li>• If the city is the landlord here, I am perplexed as to why there aren't more affordable and deeply affordable units.</li> <li>• Can you clarify whether/how many of the 5% designated as affordable housing will be family units?</li> </ul> <p><i>Response from Waterfront Shores: One of the commitments that the city made and principles in the redevelopment for Pier 8 is the mandate which is contractually obligated for the developer to provide 5% of the overall housing (5% of the 1645 units to be affordable housing). That 5% could be in any of the buildings.</i></p>

## Appendix 1 - Comments Received by March 24, 2022

The following are comment received by the City of Hamilton Municipal Land Development Office pertaining to further feedback from the March 8, 2021, Community Meeting. These comments are verbatim. They are numbered for reference purposes. Identifying information i.e., names and addresses has been omitted from this report.

1. Never, Never, Never. 45 story for an architect. Really!!!
2. Thanks for this. Whoever thought that the building of a 45-storey building on Guise would not be met with opposition, is daft. Yet again, an illustration of the heedless greed of developers, I guess. I've been overly patient (4yrs. & counting) without any signs of progress on this project. If I wait any longer for hopeful signs of ever living there, I'll likely be too old to fully enjoy the pleasure. Count me out.
3. As a Northend resident, I would like to lodge my vote against the 45 and 31 storey buildings at Pier 8 Block 16. This will forever impact the neighbourhood and start a condo craze similar to what happened at Toronto's harbour front (which is no longer a waterfront rather a condo front).

It changes natural/bird environments and increases noise, traffic, density, blocks views to the water, changes sunlight patterns, reduces access to green spaces for local residents by attracting too much density in one location, and it can potentially increase crime vis a vis too much density. I am in favour of the originally approved 8 storey building.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

4. Good day, I have participated in the community meeting regarding the proposal for a tall tower. I prefer the Lily design. One of the things that was not addressed is the impact of the tall tower on the rest of Pier 8 development. In my perspective, one of the benefits of the tall tower is that the density of the remaining blocks are reduced. To me, this is very important.

The original plans were very dense and appeared to block of sight lines to the water. I would like to see the other blocks have buildings that were further apart, with wider boulevards with more green space. This could create an opportunity for more public open space. Further public meetings should present a redesign of the whole development, which, if it showed the positive impact of reduced density, might reduce opposition to the tower.

Thanks

5. Hey there West Harbour, not everyone in the north end agrees with this. A lot of folks are not on board, and I am one of them.
6. Hello, how do I share my concerns? The proposed Tower unit is ugly and too high.

There is no one on the City Design Review panel with a disability so we ended up with that horrible "new" Waterdown Library which looks like a huge iceberg and does not fit in with Waterdown's historic 'Victorian Charm'. The new Waterdown library is not remotely suitable for the disabled as it has no elevators and is dreadful to walk in.

About the Pier 8: Habitat for Humanity only builds houses families, not individuals so how about those need a one-bedroom unit? Will each unit have storage?

The 'new' Westmount Recreation Centre only has one elevator which breaks down at least once a week – thereby incurring extra expenses for classes which are cancelled on the upper level for patrons in wheelchairs (of which there are many at Westmount).

I have more concerns as well. I dislike the whole concept anyway for the Harbour is only going to be for the wealthy as it is in Oakville and Toronto now.

7. I did get to the webinar and thought it was well done. From a design perspective, I preferred the lily form as it was playful with more possibility for interpretations-playful, natural. The straight up cylinder looked industrial and reminded me of 'the big stack' in Sudbury, not a handle that we need in The Hammer
8. Hello, I recently read an article detailing the public opposition to the pier 8 development plan's revisions to show a 147m tall building amongst a mix of lower scale buildings. I wanted to write in to voice my support for this plan as a new resident of Hamilton. I believe there is a lot of support for this, but unfortunately it does not get voiced in these meetings.

It does not make any sense to limit height on every single building in Hamilton. The obsession with the escarpment height is absolutely arbitrary in this location, and in fact this is a great location to add more housing to the severe shortage we have, without anyone claiming views are being blocked. A single tall tower, or even a few tall towers will not be detrimental to any views of Hamilton harbour. As long as pedestrian scale is respected etc. this will massively improve the use and the visual impact of the waterfront. As long as there is still ample public space provided to enjoy the waterfront, we could have a gem on our hands.

My only quibble is the shape of the tower reminds me of terrible 1980's post-modern design, aside from the Lily pad design, (Lily pad is great!) I hope the city runs this through the design panel and we don't end up with something out of the 80's. Lots of options other than tacky cylinders. This should be a beautiful tower that should look to international contemporary precedents and Hamilton's red brick and industrial heritage.