

PIER 8 PROMENADE PARK DESIGN COMPETITION



Jury Report

September 15, 2017

Background

The City of Hamilton is undertaking a design competition to select a design team and determine a design for the new Pier 8 Promenade Park to be located along the north and east edges of Pier 8. Six design teams were selected through a pre-qualification process in April. Each team was asked to develop a concept for the park based on a predetermined budget and a park vision, design objectives and program elements developed through public consultation.

The teams presented their designs at a public event Thursday, August 24 and the designs were then on display at the Lister Block, Pier 8 and online from August 25 until September 10. Members of the public were invited to review the design concepts, identify their preferred concept and provide comments based on the competition objectives. Two hundred and seventy six comments were received.

A volunteer jury of seven sector experts met on September 13 to review all of the concepts, technical evaluations by city staff and public comments to select the winning design. They based their decision on each proposal's response to context, design excellence and innovation, response to the vision and goals for the park, and community opinions. This report is an overview of their discussion.

Award

After much discussion the jury assigned the highest score to the Forrec led design team for their proposal "Hamilton: Hammer City". They therefore recommended that the City enter into an agreement with the Forrec team to develop detailed design documents to implement their design.

Jury Comments

The jury commended all six teams for the excellent design proposals and the amount of work completed. They specifically noted that each team had a unique approach to the site and design objectives resulting in a range of very different visions for the park and providing a variety of choices for the citizens of Hamilton to review - making the jury's decision a difficult one.

The jury extended their thanks to the members of the public that commented on the designs. They observed the high quality of the comments received, considering the complexity and number of proposals to be reviewed. They noted that the comments were helpful in informing their decision.

Forrec

The jury felt that the Forrec proposal best responds to all of the design objectives and site context. They noted that the design creates a rhythm of spaces along the length of the park creating connections with the future streets and breaks down the length of the site while maintaining continuity along the water's edge. The design team playfully employs materials and features that reflect the marine and industrial heritage of the site to create a unique sense of place that will become a destination along the Waterfront Trail. The group did identify technical concerns with some elements and features illustrated prominently in the drawings that were for future consideration. These included the large crane feature that was much smaller in scale in the budgeted scope of work than the one illustrated. Upon detailed review of these elements and an understanding that the proponent was amenable to working with City staff on any changes the jury noted that the design was flexible enough to accommodate these changes while maintaining and perhaps improving the integrity of the design. The public responded well to this proposal. Most importantly the jury noted that this design incorporated a variety of sizes and types of spaces that would appeal to multiple generations including intergeneration use allowing for broad community access and flexibility in opportunities for how the community could use the park in future.

gh3

The jury noted that this proposal was conceptually strong and an elegant and innovative approach to the grade changes on site. The pavilion demonstrated a very innovative approach to the reuse the trusses from the heritage building. The proposal did receive a number of very supportive comments but overall was not identified as preferred by many during public consultation. The extensive use of the stepping blocks created beautiful passive spaces but limited overall flexibility in the types of community uses in and circulation across the park.

Hargreaves

This proposal was well received by the jury and the community. The jury noted that the presentation by the design team lead was especially strong. It is a restrained and elegant concept that responds well to the geographic context of the harbour by embracing the vistas from the site. The design was commended for its extensive use of plant material and single large public space creating continuity with other parts of the west harbour. However the jury felt that the design may limit the community use of the park in future due to a lack of a variety of spaces and that its dependence on plant material could affect the quality of and use of the park in the winter.

Janet Rosenberg Studio

The jury described this proposal as bold and innovative in its use of materials, lighting and emphasis of movement along the trail. The design was generally well received by the public, preferred by many attracted to its bold vision, indicating that it that would become a destination along the waterfront. The jury noted that the trail element is a strong and compelling feature of the proposal. However it does limit, in some areas, the connections to the water's edge and also limits the flexibility to accommodate changing community uses. Technical concerns around the scale and location of the Sunset Bridge and other features were identified. While the proponent and City staff agreed that these could be resolved at the detail design stage, the jurors, based on the presentation, felt that these changes may compromise the bold vision of the design.

PFS Studio

The jury saw this proposal as a good response to the context of the new streets and master plan for the site, creating plazas at the end of the public streets and a simple promenade that will connect seamlessly with the new public space system and existing trail on Pier 8. They noted that the design focusses on a magnificent visual landmark, a proposed pavilion located at the northeast corner of the pier. However a major part of the construction of this pavilion was identified for future consideration and not included in the immediate work. This proposal received limited support in public comments.

The MBTW Group

The jury felt that this proposal was sound and adequately addressed many of the programming and functional design objectives. It made good use of the heritage material in creating features at the entrances to the park connecting the park to the new street system. The design focuses on creating a series of linear spaces to move through as one travels the length of the park. However these spaces are of similar size and quality lacking the variety of types of spaces to be flexible in accommodating a range of future community uses. The jury also noted that the location and size of the Lower Green Foreshore area takes away opportunities for programmable areas at a prime location in the center of the park. This proposal received limited support in public comments.

Jury Members

Nadia Amorososo
BLA, MUD, PhD, ASLA
Director, Nadia Amoroso Studio, Professor at the University of Guelph

Shelley Falconer
President and C.E.O. Art Gallery of Hamilton

Kelly Gilbride
OAA, P. Eng., CAHP, LEED AP
Partner Stevens Burgess Architects Ltd. (SBA)

Erik Hess
OALA

Linda Irvine
OALA, FCSLA, ASLA
Manager, Parks and Open Space Development, Markham, Ontario.

James Parakh
OAA
Urban Design Manager - Toronto & East York, City of Toronto, Planning Division

Mario Patitucci
OALA CSLA
Principal Adesso Design Inc.