1.0 Introduction

On April 9, 2019, The MBTW Group and the City of Hamilton Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) conducted the first of a series of Public Advisory Group meetings for the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan project. The meeting was held at the Concession Street Library located at 255 Concession St, Hamilton, Ontario. This Event Report contains copies of the materials presented and summarizes feedback obtained during the meeting.

The Public Advisory Group (PAG) was formed by the City of Hamilton LAS and includes a variety of representatives from the community. This PAG has been assembled specifically to provide input into the development of the Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan. All members are volunteers from the community. A total of 19 people attended the meeting.

Meeting No.1 provided the group with background information, project purpose, tentative project schedule, and presented a set of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for consideration and discussion. The meeting outcome provided the project team with initial concerns and ideas from the public regarding the history of Sam Lawrence Park, the Master Plan process, and the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria (Criteria for Success). The following sections provide a summary of the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria that was presented, followed by a summary of the key points that were discussed during the meeting.

The meeting material was presented to the group using multiple methods including a digital display, printed 11x17 booklets, and printed 24x36 panels that were mounted on the wall. As the project team presented the preliminary evaluation criteria, comments were recorded on sticky notes by MBTW Group and placed on 24x36 panels. Meeting minutes were recorded by the City of Hamilton LAS.

PAG Meeting No.1 included:
- A brief presentation (refer to Attachment A) conducted by the City’s Project Manager, John Vandriel, of Landscape Architectural Services and Jana Joyce, The MBTW Group;
- Display Panels to facilitate discussion (refer to Attachment B); and
- Open discussion.

2.0 Preliminary Evaluation Criteria (Criteria for Success)

In addition to the background material, the Public Advisory Group was presented with a set of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for review and discussion. The Preliminary Evaluation Criteria presented was based on feedback previously collected from:
- Staff Stakeholder Meetings;
- Informal public engagement ‘pop-up’ events; and
- Public Meeting No.1.

The evaluation criteria will represent the key goals and objectives of the master plan and are being developed by the project team with input from the public and internal stakeholders. More specifically, the final evaluation criteria will form
a schedule of questions aimed at measuring developed design concepts against the key goals and objectives, ensuring that the final master plan concept represents the most responsive design for the Park.

The Preliminary Evaluation Criteria was presented to the Public Advisory Group under a series of themes, each with a set of questions aimed at qualifying the proposed design concepts. The preliminary themes presented by the project team included:

- Connectivity
- Maintenance
- Safety
- Amenities
- Character & Heritage
- Interpretation & Education
- Landscape, Design & Programming
- Barrier Free Design (Social)
- Barrier Free Design (Physical)
- Traffic & Mobility

A summary of comments and open discussion regarding the criteria themes is provided in the following sections.

**Theme > Connectivity**

1) Wayfinding would improve the pedestrian experience and navigation around the site.
2) The pedestrian walkway adjacent to the Jolley Cut (connecting to the display gardens) presents the feeling of being unsafe next to vehicular traffic.
3) A pedestrian bridge over the Jolley Cut would improve connections to different park segments, particularly to the Concession Street businesses.
4) Currently, you cannot walk circuitously around the entire park; most people just go in and out the way they came in. A pedestrian bridge connection would allow for this movement to occur.
5) The lower walkways currently provide park users with the option to connect to the display gardens without walking next to the Jolley Cut; however, they are unsafe at certain times of day and different times of the year.
6) The pedestrian walkway directly north of (below) the west parking lot is currently too narrow for strollers, buggies, and park maintenance vehicles. Consider widening.
7) While some people have difficulty navigating stairs, others have difficulty navigating ramps / slopes. The Master Plan should consider this in its design.
8) Consider transit vehicle movements in any proposed traffic calming design measures.
9) Signage and wayfinding could be improved in the park, particularly to the different park segments.
Theme > Maintenance

1) The escarpment walkways are not plowed in winter.
2) There is litter scattered everywhere in the wooded areas (plastic bags in trees).
3) Horticultural-themed display gardens (similar to those at the Royal Botanical Gardens) that are low maintenance and drought-tolerant are a way of keeping the gardens aesthetically beautiful, but with minimal maintenance and use of water.
4) Redesigning the display gardens to be minimal maintenance will allow Parks staff to focus efforts around the rest of the park (litter clean-up, etc.)
5) Sometimes kids like to toboggan in the dark through trees and on top of some of the garden areas. Can the future garden design consider this?

Theme > Safety

1) Lighting that provides a sense of safety, but also does not take away from the dark sky would be desired.
2) There may be certain areas that are appropriate to light up and other areas that are not.
3) Examining safety of the pathways is needed.

Theme > Amenities

1) A shade structure / gazebo on the upper lawn area would be desired. Currently there isn’t much shade.
2) “Shakespeare in the Park” would be a great programming opportunity in this park.
3) Many people have wedding photos taken here. Sometimes wedding parties come with tour buses, which create conflict with other park users, especially in the parking lot.
4) Some people use the parking lot as a park-and-ride lot, commuting in to the Lower City each day.
5) Currently the park serves the needs of adults. There may be opportunity to add amenities that also accommodate children (playground?)

Theme > Character & Heritage

1) Ensure the character of the park is preserved.
2) It is understood that views are a critical component of the Park’s character and history. Maintaining views and the Park’s status in the City’s park network will be an important element of proposed design concepts.
3) The heritage of the original K.Matt Broman design should be respected/integrated into the plan. Some areas of the planting design could be restored. If not, new areas should have regard for the Broman design intent.
Theme > Interpretation & Education

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

Theme > Landscape, Design and Programming

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

Theme > Barrier Free Design (Social)

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

Theme > Barrier Free Design (Physical)

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

Theme > Traffic & Mobility

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

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

Event Presentation
Sam Lawrence Park Master Plan

Staff Advisory Group Meeting #2/
Public Advisory Group Meeting #1

Tuesday April 9th, 2019
Sam Lawrence Park
Master Plan Process

Why do a Master Plan?

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

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

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

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

What are the key outcomes?

• An evidence-based preferred design concept.

• Guidelines for open space planning and park management.

• High-level project implementation cost estimates.

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

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

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

- **Public Meeting #1**
  - (March 2019)

- **Launch Online Survey**
  - (March 2019)

- **Criteria for Success Development**
  - (April 2019)
Project Timeline

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

EVENT SUMMARY:

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

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

Some of what we’ve heard so far…

“Better lighting is needed”

“Parking and circulation are an issue during special events”

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

“Allow wedding receptions”

“Lower escarpment path not safe”

“Provide better connection to Mountain Brow West Park”

“No way to use the grass median”

“Overgrown trees and shrubs”

“Park is all about the views”

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

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

**257 Responses**
Evaluation Process

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

Public & Stakeholder Consultation
Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Group Exercise
Community Driven Design

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

- Provide for **garden maintenance operations?**
  (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)
Does the Design Concept:

- Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations?
- Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming?
- Utilize low-maintenance vegetation in new plantings? (e.g. little pruning is required to maintain clear views, less irrigation required)
- Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?
Safety

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

- Provide **access for** emergency services?
  (e.g. wide pathways, turning areas)
Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

- Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?

- Integrate existing *heritage* and *unique features* into the design?

- Address the *stability concerns* at the escarpment edge?
Barrier Free Design - Social

Does the Design Concept:

- Integrate **social inclusiveness**?
  (e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)

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

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

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

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

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

- Incorporate the Urban Braille system?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Improve access to, quality and location of parking?

- Improve vehicle access to the park?
  (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)

- Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience?
  (e.g. crossing streets, intersections)

- Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?
Traffic & Mobility

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?

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

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

### Connectivity
- Does the Design Concept: Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Does the Design Concept: Improve pedestrian access into the park? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Does the Design Concept: Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes? [ ] Yes [ ] No

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

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

#### Amenities

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Character & Heritage

Does the Design Concept:

- Retain and enhance the park's heritage and historic features?
  - Yes
  - No

- Retain and enhance the views to the lower city?
  - Yes
  - No

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

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

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

- Integrate existing and proposed memorial benches?
  - Yes
  - No

#### Interpretation & Education

Does the Design Concept:

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

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

- Coordinate with community initiatives/organizations? (e.g. Project Bookmark Canada, Bruce Trail Conservancy, local colleges)
  - Yes
  - No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landscape &amp; Design</strong></th>
<th><strong>Barrier Free Design - Social</strong></th>
<th><strong>Traffic &amp; Mobility</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the Design Concept:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does the Design Concept:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does the Design Concept:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide protection from the elements? (e.g. wind, rain, snow, heat, sun, noise, microclimate/thermal comfort)</td>
<td>Integrate social inclusiveness? (e.g. park elements are designed to be utilized by a variety of people)</td>
<td>Improve the access to, quality, and location of parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a variety of areas and elements for resting/sitting? (e.g. sun, shade, variety of seating elements)</td>
<td>Address sensitivities/conflicts between user groups? (e.g. negative uses or users do not dominate the space)</td>
<td>Improve vehicle access to the park? (e.g. considering regular use and special events, drop-off and pick-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Concession Street into the park design?</td>
<td>Provide for all abilities and ages?</td>
<td>Improve the pedestrian/cycling experience? (e.g. crossing streets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain mature trees and propose a succession/replanting/protection strategy?</td>
<td>Provide activities for different times of the day/year?</td>
<td>Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate escarpment rehabilitation planting, native and pollinator planting?</td>
<td>Provide free/no cost access?</td>
<td>Retain or improve existing vehicular traffic and transit movement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate existing heritage and unique features into the design?</td>
<td>Minimize circulation barriers? (e.g. few stairs, and no slopes steeper than 5%)</td>
<td>Retain or improve the experience at the intersection at Jolley Cut/Concession St.? (e.g. For: vehicles? Pedestrians? Cyclists? Transit?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the stability concerns at the escarpment edge?</td>
<td>Provide alternate paths to key park features? (e.g. with an understanding that some elements cannot be reconstructed)</td>
<td>Rebalance the mobility focus? (e.g. between pedestrians, cyclists, transit, regular traffic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barrier Free Design - Physical**

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

Master Plan Process

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

Public & Stakeholder Consultation

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

#### Amenities

**Does the Design Concept:**

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

---

#### Character & Heritage

**Does the Design Concept:**

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

---

#### Interpretation & Education

**Does the Design Concept:**

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

### Connectivity

**Does the Design Concept:**

- Improve pedestrian access and connectivity between the various park zones?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Improve pedestrian access into the park?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Improve the sense of arrival and facilitate connections to transit and community nodes?  
  - Yes  
  - No

### Maintenance

**Does the Design Concept:**

- Utilize resilient and durable park elements?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  (e.g. vandal and wear resistance)

- Consider the long term evolution of the park?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  (e.g. 'future-proofing', escarpment stability)

- Provide for garden maintenance operations?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  (e.g. irrigation, office and storage building)

- Provide garbage/recycling receptacles and access for operations?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Provide adequate servicing infrastructure to support programming?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Utilize local vegetation planting (e.g. little thornless bushes, grasses, irrigation lines)  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Provide a program to manage slope vegetation and display gardens?  
  - Yes  
  - No

### Safety

**Does the Design Concept:**

- Minimize conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  (e.g. at driveways, parking areas, streets and intersections)

- Incorporate clear and navigable wayfinding?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  (e.g. accessible signage at trail heads and throughout the park)

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

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

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