The goal of the Waterfront Hotel Planning Study is to establish the Strategic Framework to guide development on the site. The study is being conducted through a public consultation process that provides the opportunity for all of those who are interested in the development of the site, to participate and be heard.

The results of the process will form the basis of an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

The third community workshop took place on September 14, 2017 at the Burlington Performing Arts Centre located at 440 Locust Street. The workshop was preceded by meeting with the Steering Committee and Stakeholder Advisory Committee on September 13 and 14, 2017, respectively.

At the public workshop, the consultant team provided a re-cap of the process and information presented to date before presenting the Emerging Concept. This included a reminder of the Vision Statement and Principles for the study. Following the presentation, participants were asked to share their thoughts on the Emerging Concept.

This What We Heard report summarizes the information presented and transcribes the input/comments provided by the workshop participants.

Vision Statement
The Waterfront Hotel site is envisioned to be a landmark within Burlington’s downtown core area and a major gateway to the Lake Ontario waterfront. It will be developed as a welcoming, vibrant destination where residents and visitors may experience the best aspects of Burlington.
02 Development Concepts

The three concepts that were generated through the previous design charrette/workshop, and subsequently posted on the City’s website for evaluation, are included on the facing page. Each concept addresses variations in Land Use and Built Form, Public Realm and Access and Mobility. The workshop presentation included a summary of the various inputs to the evaluation of concepts including:

» results of public survey;
» comments from City staff;
» comments from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee; and,
» technical evaluation of shadow, wind, transportation and urban design.

Frameworks

01 LAND USE and BUILT FORM

02 PUBLIC REALM

03 ACCESS and MOBILITY
02 Development Concepts
Workshop participants were asked to share their views on the land use/built form, public realm and access/mobility of this Emerging Concept.
03 Emerging Concept

Height and Massing - Views

View from the Lake

View from Gazebo Area

View from north end of Pier
Emerging Concept

LAND USE and BUILT FORM

 COMMENTS

- Both buildings too high
- West (building) 14-storeys; East (building) 9-storeys
- Same height as Bridgewater

- Buildings too high!!
  » Current zoning is still applicable as far as height
  » We already getting a landmark building – Bridgewater!
  » The footprint for podium is too big if its 4-storeys (half current waterfront hotel)
- Go speak directly to the people – the Mayor’s concepts are to be followed
- Surveys to follow
- Remove west building
- (East Building only) Less than 16-storeys

- We like Concept 2!!

- Cut the height
- 14-storeys and 8-storeys, on a 2 to 3-storey podium
- Views: there were no views presented from Pine Street down Elizabeth, John and Brant Streets. These will be visual tunnels.
- Note: given the angled orientation of the buildings, John Street view will be very narrow (from Pine Street, the views will be 2 to 4 degrees of arc).
- The number of units should be dictated by fewer but larger (i.e. Higher valued condos)
03 Emerging Concept

**LAND USE and BUILT FORM**

- The sad truth is that development on this property compromises the potential of Burlington to preserve the lakefront... something that Toronto regrets. Vancouver, with Stanley Park et al., should be the ideal.
  - Stick to heights in Concept 1
  - Prefer some curves of public spaces where meets building

- This is Burlington’s opportunity to attract ‘Point of Destination’ activities; City should define these and then insist the developer provide
  - Presentation moved far too quickly – need more time to absorb; possibly preview and send in questions before the meeting

- Landmark building can be architecturally attractive vs. tall! Or glass & steel
  - Actually, prefer Concept 3 with shorter buildings – 14-storeys vs. 40-storeys

- Keep to 8-storeys and 15-storeys high, definitely no higher than the buildings to the east and no more than a total of 28 as in concept published in the Burlington Post for the first concept
  - Move west building east, or eliminate it
  - No higher than 22-storeys as the highest at Bridgewater but hopefully no higher than 15-storeys
  - Two buildings of iconic architectural design
  - Heights to (be) determined, keeping the economics of feasibility in mind

- We do not agree with Preferred Concept 1
- We prefer Original Concept 2! Lower heights (i.e. 14-storeys and 25-storeys) – eliminate west building
  » **Reasons**: Green space with public access, window from Brant Street completely ‘open to the pier’ and driveway via Elizabeth Street with three lanes
  - Underground parking:
    » How many levels?
    » How much public parking?
  - Need parkland – one building only!

- Band shell – restaurants facing water
- Height is not the issue – design well to avoid over-massing

- Too high for northwest corner building!
- Should be maximum of 8-storeys at highest
- Danger for pedestrians + emergency services + traffic
- Height must be in northeast building to maximum 20-storeys
- Commercial space will not be used? 4-storeys is too much
- No access from Brant for vehicles – major problem for emergency buildings
- Must not put building on northwest corner; all buildings must be on east side only
- Northwest corner must be green space
- Remove or move northeast building to southwest corner
- Give (east) building more staggered height (4 to 8-storeys, 6 to 10-storeys, 8 to 14-storeys and 20 to 25-storeys)
- Consider all future developments in consideration of ‘heights’ of these 2 buildings (north side of Lakeshore)

- This is Burlington’s opportunity to attract ‘Point of Destination’ activities; City should define these and then insist the developer provide
  - Presentation moved far too quickly – need more time to absorb; possibly preview and send in questions before the meeting

- Landmark building can be architecturally attractive vs. tall! Or glass & steel
- Actually, prefer Concept 3 with shorter buildings – 14-storeys vs. 40-storeys

- Keep to 8-storeys and 15-storeys high, definitely no higher than the buildings to the east and no more than a total of 28 as in concept published in the Burlington Post for the first concept
  - Move west building east, or eliminate it
  - No higher than 22-storeys as the highest at Bridgewater but hopefully no higher than 15-storeys
  - Two buildings of iconic architectural design
  - Heights to (be) determined, keeping the economics of feasibility in mind

- We do not agree with Preferred Concept 1
- We prefer Original Concept 2! Lower heights (i.e. 14-storeys and 25-storeys) – eliminate west building
  » **Reasons**: Green space with public access, window from Brant Street completely ‘open to the pier’ and driveway via Elizabeth Street with three lanes
  - Underground parking:
    » How many levels?
    » How much public parking?
  - Need parkland – one building only!

- Band shell – restaurants facing water
- Height is not the issue – design well to avoid over-massing

- Too high for northwest corner building!
- Should be maximum of 8-storeys at highest
- Danger for pedestrians + emergency services + traffic
- Height must be in northeast building to maximum 20-storeys
- Commercial space will not be used? 4-storeys is too much
- No access from Brant for vehicles – major problem for emergency buildings
- Must not put building on northwest corner; all buildings must be on east side only
- Northwest corner must be green space
- Remove or move northeast building to southwest corner
- Give (east) building more staggered height (4 to 8-storeys, 6 to 10-storeys, 8 to 14-storeys and 20 to 25-storeys)
- Consider all future developments in consideration of ‘heights’ of these 2 buildings (north side of Lakeshore)
03 Emerging Concept

**LAND USE and BUILT FORM**

- Retail – How will businesses do?
- Want the hotel in the development
- Prefer tall buildings at GO Stations
- 14 to 18-storeys………pick 14
- 20 to 25-storeys………pick 20
- Concern about winter wind
- New book store; more variety of stores

- Will a noise study be done to ensure that noise created by the buildings does not exceed by-laws
- Suggest maximum 15-storey building at the east side only; two 15-storey buildings extending to water and east, allows more green space on west! Or (one) 30-storey building and eliminate the west building
- Has a noise study been done for Lakeshore effect?
- We have already studied and voted for 15-storey buildings on the north side of Lakeshore, up Brant Street to Ghent….. why not maximize these buildings on south Lakeshore!
- Take out middle green and move west building eastward towards east building equals green at Brant entrance
- We need to know the plan proposal and study for old Lakeshore Road…How is it compatible?

- This building height looks good (precedent image #8 which shows approximately 8-storeys
- (East building) too tall

- Height of buildings outrageous
- There is no community benefit to this concentration of development
- Stepping the buildings has no benefit in this design as it makes the building footprint larger
- Should be one building
- Are you doing wind studies at the higher elevations of the current approved buildings?
- This property should be part of the park
- Drop west building completely
- When Pine and Pearl was finished, doors were getting blown off businesses on Pine
- Pine and Pearl seniors have front door issues on high wind days

- Keep height to minimum (i.e. 14-storeys building 1 (west); 20-storeys building 2 (east))
- Concerned about traffic issues but like Elizabeth Street as access point

- Like precedent images #1 to #11, but do not like the appearance of #2 – should be more attractive

- Wasted opportunity by compromising western site – against Mayor’s inspired concept of ‘getting more park for the people’
- Must do everything to save open view of water and Spencer Park
- Height is irrelevant after first few floors; important is design of podium and street level use / contact with people
- Design at lower level must maintain and be sensitive to Burlington’s existing character
- Of course, must have high design quality ‘Iconic Architectural Solution’ that is Burlington’s CN Tower

**COMMON THEMES**

- Buildings are too tall
  » Prefer 8 and 14, but up to 22 (no higher than Bridgewater)
- Maintain the downtown character
  » Design of the Podium / Building at street level should be 2-3 storeys but not all retail
- Landmark/iconic building is desirable but not tied to height (design related)
**Emerging Concept**

**Public Realm**

- Excellent
- **Appreciate** public realm emphasis
- View down John Street is over valued
- **Issue:** Do not need another landmark building
- Have permanent features like concrete checkers tables and seats
- Conference centre in one of buildings
- ‘Granville Market’ type interior space
- Sun on sidewalks for pedestrian experience, particularly key for café patios
- Love the concept of open space….
- Please make all pedestrian areas as green as possible – permeable surfaces/paving – no asphalt!!!
- Widen Elizabeth to 3 lanes
- Sewage, water and electrical?
- Transit?
- Don’t compromise the green space
03 Emerging Concept

PUBLIC REALM

- Love the water feature, precedent image #11 (at traffic bulb); water cheers everyone up
- Like the central green spine
- Precedent #2 needs to be more appealing (this looks junky)
- Proper bandshell in the park
- More than walking in the park
- Like precedent #10 – design on pavement – it is a pedestrian promenade
- Games on tables in the park

- Current condos lose their views
- It’s going to be a nightmare area for pedestrians/residents with all this traffic
- This will keep people away from the area
- How can this added building benefit the greenspace? There is barely enough room now for festivals
- Not enough usable space
- It will not be walkable; people will not head to this location to shop
- Pollution plus from car fumes on Lakeshore (effects current residents)

- All good ideas
- Many good examples to follow today

COMMON THEMES

- Need more green space and views to the water
  » Move or eliminate the west building
- Support more activities in the park
ACCESS and MOBILITY

1. Elizabeth Street can’t handle traffic of Bridgewater and waterfront
2. Two Molinero projects need to be considered (north side of Lakeshore Road)
3. Too much traffic – Bridgewater not even built up yet
4. What about all of those cars/people?
5. Little short Elizabeth Street cannot handle all the cars and trucks!! Be Reasonable!!

Traffic studies must include all the new buildings being planned to the north
Traffic: Already paralyzed
For light at Lakeshore and Brant, make it scramble cross
Need surface spaces for taxis, couriers, emergency vehicles and drivers to drop off at buildings

Need for (more) public parking
Concern regarding (more) traffic volume on Lakeshore/QEW to Guelph Line with no ability to add additional traffic lanes
Grid-lock on Lakeshore Road eastbound to Downtown core will very likely result in cut-through traffic issues (eg. Smith Road)
Concept should include bike parking/lock-up areas
**ACCESS and MOBILITY**

- Traffic flows, particularly emergency access during high traffic flow periods
- Volume of service vehicles
  - **Question:** Do the planning processes reflect the issues of the long-term City view with the added towers that are being envisaged? (at least 6 added towers)

- Design for the future – better transit – fewer cars!
- Better pedestrian crossing across Lakeshore with multiple access points
- Median extension from Brant to Elizabeth

- Where is access for west building (residents as well as commercial vehicle)

- How is traffic going to move anywhere?
  - The whole core will be at a standstill
  - This traffic cannot be handled here
  - Construction for another five years straight in the downtown is unacceptable

- This size of building belongs on a main artery not (on) two lane roads
- Lakeshore should not be bumper to bumper all day long

- Where do people from the building on the west find the taxi they have ordered?
  - Where do ambulances pick up sick people? (from the west building)
  - Bicycle racks?

- Consider making John Street, Elizabeth Street and Pine Street one-way
  - Improve traffic flow (2 lanes) and allow parking on street
  - Important to give consideration for access for service vehicles

- Most important access must be on Elizabeth Street
  - May need access for emergencies from underground car parking, which can occupy whole site
  - May require small access off Lakeshore Road to accommodate VIP arrivals for ceremonial or special occasions. This will be Burlington’s prime hotel

**COMMON THEMES**

- There should be more than one access to development (including emergency, loading, drop-off/pick-up access)
- Concern/need for pedestrian/bicycle safety and amenities
The Waterfront Hotel Planning Study

01 The Brant & Lakeshore Planning Study will establish a **Strategic Framework** to guide development on the site

02 Develop and assess **Preliminary Redevelopment Concepts** along with any formal development applications submitted on behalf of the property owner

The redevelopment of this site must meet the City’s urban design and growth management goals, as well as enhance the adjacent public space and waterfront.

03 Prepare an **Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment**
Today’s Workshop

- vision, principles and context
- outcome of the design day
- three concepts used for the public survey
- inputs to the evaluation
- emerging preferred concept
Vision Statement

The Waterfront Hotel site is envisioned to be a landmark within Burlington’s downtown core area and a major gateway to the Lake Ontario waterfront. It will be developed as a welcoming, vibrant destination where residents and visitors may experience the best aspects of Burlington.

Design Principles

1. Land Use and Built Form
   - A concentration, mix and intensity of uses will contribute to a vital and vibrant downtown
   - High density development will support public transit

2. Public Realm
   - High-quality, pedestrian-oriented streets and open spaces will support walkability and access to transit
   - Grade related uses will activate and animate public streets/spaces
   - Access and connections to the lake will enhance community life
   - Integrating heritage into the fabric of development will enrich the character and relevance of the community

3. Mobility and Access
   - Pedestrian-scaled, small blocks will enhance connectivity
   - Well-designed streets accommodate all modes of travel
   - Loading and servicing will be provided in a way that does not detract from the quality of the pedestrian realm
   - Priority will be given to walking, cycling and transit use on site
   - The Waterfront Trail will be enhanced
The Official Plan already permits redevelopment on the site - Municipal Official Plan

The subject site is situated within the Downtown Urban Growth Centre Boundary and the Downtown Mixed Use Centre.

The site is currently zoned for buildings up to 8 storeys Burlington Zoning By-law

1. Redevelopment must meet the City’s urban design and growth management goals
2. The study will result in an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

Zone: DW (Downtown Wellington Square)
Max Height: 8 storeys and 28 metres (up to 14 storeys with community benefits)
Permitted Uses: retail commercial, service commercial, community institution, offices, hospitality uses, entertainment and recreation, multi-unit residential (including retirement homes)

*the ground floor of any building within 15m of a public street shall be used only for retail or service
Framework 1: **Land Use and Built Form Context**

- Downtown Urban Growth Centre to accommodate a minimum of 200 People & Jobs/ha
- Retail / service commercial uses required continuously at grade along public streets
- Mixed Use Precinct will contain:
  - Commercial
  - High-density residential / Mixed-use buildings
  - Cultural uses
  - Recreation and hospitality uses
  - Entertainment uses
  - Community facilities

Framework 2: **Public Realm Context**

- Recognize Brant/Lakeshore intersection as an important gateway to the Downtown, the waterfront and the Waterfront Trail
- Preserve/enhance views and vistas
- Enhance permeability and connections to the Downtown and transit
- Design pedestrian-oriented streetspaces
- Provide transition to adjacent sites
- Address interface with the ‘East Lawn’ and ‘Gazebo Area’
Framework 3: Mobility and Access Context

- Provide connections among the mobility hub area, City Hall plaza and Spencer Smith Park (i.e. enhanced boulevards, cycling connections, multi-use trails, mid-block connections and pedestrian pathways).
- Promote Brant Street as the primary connection between the Burlington GO Mobility Hub and the waterfront.
- No surface parking permitted except for loading and emergency vehicles.
- On-site parking not required for non-residential uses.

Today’s Workshop

- vision, principles and context
- outcome of the design day
- three concepts used for the public survey
- inputs to the evaluation
- emerging preferred concept
Workshop 1 & 2:
vision, principles, exploration of options, visual preference survey
Two design sessions each with four design leads and four design groups

Parameters for each Exploration to ensure variables are considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use / Built Form</th>
<th>Exploration 1</th>
<th>Exploration 2</th>
<th>Exploration 3</th>
<th>Exploration 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (2) 8-14 Storey Mixed-Use Buildings:</td>
<td>(2) 12-20 Storey Mixed-Use Buildings:</td>
<td>(2) 20-30 Storey Mixed Use Buildings:</td>
<td>(1) 30-40 Storey Mixed Use Building:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Commercial</td>
<td>Residential with Commercial at grade</td>
<td>Residential, Commercial and Hotel/Convention Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Parking</td>
<td>Underground Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Realm</th>
<th>Exploration 1</th>
<th>Exploration 2</th>
<th>Exploration 3</th>
<th>Exploration 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Open Space</td>
<td>East Open Space, adjacent to Bridgewater development</td>
<td>West Open Space, adjacent to Spencer Smith Park</td>
<td>West Open Space, adjacent to Spencer Smith Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility / Access</th>
<th>Exploration 1</th>
<th>Exploration 2</th>
<th>Exploration 3</th>
<th>Exploration 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain existing Brant Street driveway access</td>
<td>Maintain existing Brant Street driveway access</td>
<td>Remove Brant Street driveway access</td>
<td>Remove Brant Street driveway access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Parking access from Lakeshore</td>
<td>Underground Parking access from Lakeshore</td>
<td>Narrow Lakeshore Road at Brant Street</td>
<td>Narrow Lakeshore Road at Brant Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Underground Parking access from Elizabeth Street extension</td>
<td>Underground Parking access from Elizabeth Street extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploration 1

Exploration 2
Exploration 3

Exploration 4
Results of Visual Preference Survey: **Built Form / Land Use**

- Preferred images for ‘High-Rise Building’
- Preferred images for ‘Mid-Rise Building’

Results of Visual Preference Survey: **Public Realm**

- Preferred images for ‘Waterfront Amenities’
- Preferred images for ‘Urban Space’
Results of Visual Preference Survey: **Circulation**

Preferred images for ‘Shared Streets’ / Streetscaping

![Preferred images](image)

---

**Today’s Workshop**

- vision, principles and context
- outcome of the design day
- **three concepts used for the public survey**
- inputs to the evaluation
- emerging preferred concept
From Explorations to Options

8 Initial Explorations

Most of the Explorations followed prescribed design parameters; however, others moved away from them due to participants’ input and the progression of ideas and conversations as the process unfolded.

Input from the design workshop assisted the project team in preparing three preliminary Concepts. The Concepts represent and combine the workshop explorations and take into consideration the broader community objectives for placemaking and creating a walkable, transit supportive, and vibrant downtown.

3 Concepts

Concept 1 merges Exploration 1 and 2, which share similar design parameters.

Concept 2 represents Exploration 3, originally intended to contain two buildings and an open space located at the west. Initial explorations for this option led to a preference for one building and a significant open space adjacent to the waterfront park.

Concept 3 represents Exploration 4, illustrating the tallest building.
Concept 1

View of skyline from the Lake

View from Gazebo Area

View from north end of Pier

Concept 2
Today’s Workshop

- vision, principles and context
- outcome of the design day
- three concepts used for the public survey
- inputs to the evaluation
- emerging preferred concept
Public Input - Online Survey

Distribution
Online survey through City of Burlington’s website

Submission Period
August 17 - September 7, 2017

Response
919 respondents

Opinion Based Survey

- Findings of this survey are qualitative
- Findings provided are from an opinion based survey
- Information collected from this survey is an additional opportunity to provide input
- Survey has no statistical significance due to sample size

Results of Public Survey

Concept 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Concept 1</th>
<th>I like it</th>
<th>It’s ok</th>
<th>I don’t like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of buildings and the open space they create at the bottom of John Street</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central location of the open, public space at the top of the East Lawn</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open, public space along Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway access from Brant Street</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to underground parking from Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to underground parking from Lakeshore Road</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results of Public Survey

### Concept 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Concept 2</th>
<th>I like it</th>
<th>It’s ok</th>
<th>I don’t like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The location of the buildings at the corner of Lakeshore Road and Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the buildings step down in height, e.g. 20 storey building closer to Lakeshore Road</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition of open, public space at the bottom of Brant Street</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No driveway access from Brant Street</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to underground parking from Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Results of Public Survey

### Concept 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Concept 3</th>
<th>I like it</th>
<th>It’s ok</th>
<th>I don’t like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The location of the buildings at the corner of Brant Street and Lakeshore Road and Elizabeth Street and Lakeshore Road</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A four storey building base connected by a bridge at the bottom of John Street</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space along the south end of the buildings, facing the lake</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway access from Brant Street</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to underground parking from Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 1

View Corridors
- John Street corridor partially blocked
- Views from existing condos are being blocked
- The view corridors are largely being maintained

Height and Density
- Height limits on the waterfront (maximum 6 to 16 storeys)
- Appropriate scale for the area without cutting off the waterfront
- Need further shadow studies to understand impacts
- Development does not make efficient use of the site
- Concern about the market's ability to absorb residential and commercial units
- Concern with precedent being set by allowing so much height and density

Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 1

Site Design
- Support for the building layout but with the buildings flipped (lots of support for this)
- Preference for Option 2 layout but with Option 1 heights (lots of support for this)
- Poorly fits into area, lack of clarity - what is public space?
- Concern that building layout blocks view of parkland and public access
- Support for open access between the buildings and to the waterfront
- Development has too large a footprint – should limit to one (taller) building

Traffic
- The development will worsen already heavy traffic in this congested area
- Concerns with underground parking entrances, support for Elizabeth Street access
- Concern that parking will be an issue (need to include publicly-accessible parking)
- Carefully manage existing and future traffic with respect to vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist traffic, especially around Brant Street and Lakeshore.
Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 1

**Green Space**

- City should buy the property so entire site can be greenspace for future generations
- The design should have more greenspace to the west (similar to Option 2)
- Concern about the green space between the buildings being concrete
- Consider interesting uses for greenspaces (amphitheatre, gardens, a fountain etc.)
- Need for green/public space along Elizabeth Street

**Interest**

- The design of the new development must be interesting and of high architectural quality – iconic building design.
- Looking forward to opportunities for entertainment/commercial uses with waterfront views – the courtyard should be a vibrant public area
- Need to ensure that the building frontages along Lakeshore are animated and have high quality streetscaping (more than underground parking ramps), support for the podiums which closely face the road.
- Need to put more focus on preserving Burlington’s character and charm

Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 2

**View Corridors**

- Effectively preserves views along Brant and Lakeshore and creates a strong welcome to the waterfront.
- Blocks the view from several existing development

**Height and Density**

- Buildings are much too high – preference for the heights of Option 1, or lower.
- The buildings require significant terracing/setbacks to better relate to the waterfront, public space and the street.
- The buildings should build up from the lake, with the shorter building closer to the water – otherwise the lower building’s views will be cut off and the taller building will tower over the water.
- Concern about the creation of a wind tunnel and the potential shadow impacts
Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 2

Site Design

- The layout is well planned to build on the existing park and create a strong waterfront presence at the base of Brant – however, heights are too great.
- Would prefer just one tower.
- Buildings look crowded in the one end of the site and gives the site a sense of being off-balanced.
- Concern that the layout, in conjunction with the Bridgeport development, will cause Elizabeth to become canyon-like.

Traffic

- There will be too much congestion on Elizabeth Street, considering both the Bridgewater development and that this proposed development’s only access is here.
- Driveway access is appropriate on Elizabeth
- Concern with increasing congestion in an already high traffic area
- Views both that the Brant driveway was an important access and that its closure creates a much safer pedestrian environment.

Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 2

Green Space

- More park space is not necessarily always better when there is insufficient design/animation and is adjacent to towering buildings – risk of it becoming a sterile area.
- The buildings should be directly adjacent to soft-scaped parkland, not pavement
- Potentially too much parking, create a waste of space
- The entire site should be parkland.

Interest

- The design of the new development must be interesting and of high architectural quality – iconic building design.
- Need to put more focus on preserving Burlington’s character and charm
- It is critical to accommodate vibrant ground floor retail uses – there are concerns about the poor frontage along Lakeshore.
Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 3

**View Corridors**
- In general this concept, with large podiums and high towers does a poor job of protecting existing view corridors.

**Height and Density**
- The proposed towers are much too high and out of touch with its context.
- Significant terracing is needed to mitigate impacts and add interest.
- This concept pushes the boundaries for high in Burlington and make a very efficient use of space.
- Concern with significant shadow impacts.
- Too much height directly adjacent to parkland.

Themes From Public Survey Comments Concept 3

**Site Design**
- Minor layout revisions may reduce shadow impacts and widen views from Brant and John
- Support for the high quality design of the podium and its curved shape which fits its context on the water.
- Would like the layout if heights or towers were reduced to between 10-20 stores
- The design walls in the park form the downtown.
- Concern about the creation of a canyon along Elizabeth
- Mixed reaction to the inclusion of a bridge between the buildings.

**Traffic**
- Significant concern with introducing more traffic to a congested area.
- Increased traffic will make it more hazardous for pedestrians, especially around the Brant driveway
- This proposed development, with the Bridgeport development, will create significant congestion on Elizabeth
Themes From Public Survey Comments

**Green Space**
- Design emphasizes the role of the building rather than the important green space.
- This is the best designed green space of the three options.

**Interest**
- Appreciation for the bold design of this concept and anticipation for high quality architecture to make this an iconic landmark.
- Strong street edge along Lakeshore with significant opportunities for active uses such as cafes and retail.
Technical Evaluation - Public Realm: Shadow Impact

Concept 1 | Concept 2 | Concept 3
---|---|---
March 21, 10:00 am | ✓ | ✓ | X
March 21, 2:00 pm | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | X

Existing Wind Condition

Estimated Wind Condition: Summer

Estimated Wind Condition: Winter

- Windy
- Moderate
- Calm


Estimated Wind Condition: Concept 1

Estimated Wind Condition: Summer

Estimated Wind Condition: Winter

- Windy
- Moderate
- Calm
**Technical Evaluation - Public Realm: Wind Impact**

Estimated Wind Condition: Concept 2

Estimated Wind Condition: Summer

Estimated Wind Condition: Winter

- Windy
- Moderate
- Calm

---

**Technical Evaluation - Public Realm: Wind Impact**

Estimated Wind Condition: Concept 3

Estimated Wind Condition: Summer

Estimated Wind Condition: Winter

- Windy
- Moderate
- Calm
### Technical Evaluation - Public Realm: Wind Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Wind Impact</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check mark" /></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technical Evaluation – Access and Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to sidewalks and pedestrian/cycling system</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide two separate access points to underground garage</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check mark" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Brant Street Access to retail/support services</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency, garbage, utility, moving truck access</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize pedestrian conflict</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="check marks" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction:** Option #1 achieves most of the objectives for Access and Mobility
Technical Evaluation – Serviceability

The servicing available or servicing updates required, are the same for all three options.

Based on preliminary sanitary sewer modelling:

- Available capacity in the downstream sanitary sewer system is sufficient for development
- The existing Junction Street Sanitary Pumping Station (SPS) has been identified by the Region for upgrades; the upgrade would be required to allow for the proposed development
- Water supply and pressure will be sufficient

---

Project Team Evaluation - Land Use and Built Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensification Objectives Minimum 200 persons &amp; jobs per hectare</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Buildings with a Mix of Uses</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views/Vistas to Lake</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic / Landmark Building</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepped towards lake</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepped back from Brant Street View Corridor</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore Road Edge reinforced</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to surrounding context</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direction: Option #1 achieves most of the objectives for Land Use
## Project Team Evaluation – Public Realm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active / Grade related uses along streets</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce Lakeshore Road</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Pedestrian streetscape</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the most Open Space</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an open space focal point/Gateway at Brant/Lakeshore</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create open space along Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide transition to Spencer Smith Park</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of Pedestrian Access and Connectivity</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction:** Option #1 achieves most of the objectives for Public Realm Development

---

## Concepts for Public Survey

**Inputs for Evaluation**
- Results from Public Survey
- Technical / Project Team Evaluation
- Steering Committee Comments
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Input

**Emerging Preferred Concept**
Summary of comments from Burlington City Staff

**LAND USE / BUILT FORM**

- Include **public amenities** (e.g. washrooms) close to Spencer Smith Park

- **Heights shown in Concepts 1 and 2**, are consistent with existing and planned context

- Additional height may be appropriate where buildings can demonstrate:
  - high-quality architecture and urban design
  - an **iconic landmark building**
  - sustainable and **green building technologies**
  - new **public amenities** and/or spaces

- **Step back** buildings away from the water’s edge

- Stagger buildings to a **create visually interesting** skyline

- **Concentrate the tallest building** element between the John Street and Elizabeth Street view corridors

---

Summary of Comments from Burlington City Staff

**LAND USE / BUILT FORM**

- **Foot print** and massing of building shown in **Concept 3 is too large**

- The location of buildings shown in Concepts 1 and 3, **frames the open space** and create a strong, consistent, and attractive edge along Lakeshore Road, while **protecting street end views**

- Locate and **orientate podiums and towers** to preserve and **enhancing public view corridors** to the Brant Street Pier and Lake Ontario

- **The bridge connecting podiums shown in Concept 3** would obstruct the John Street public view corridor
Summary of Comments from Burlington City Staff

PUBLIC REALM

- Prefer the size and locations of the open space shown on Concepts 2 and 3
- The open space shown in Concept 3 is nicely framed by the base buildings, well integrated with the East Lawn, and responds to the shoreline

MOBILITY / ACCESS

- Consider limiting vehicular access to the site from Elizabeth Street
- Consider removing vehicular access from Lakeshore Road at the foot of Brant Street to create a pedestrian-focused open space treatment
- Consider innovative design treatments to integrate the traffic bulb at the base of Elizabeth Street as part of the park/waterfront amenities
Comments from Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Concept 1
• Like the view corridor to the lake from John Street
• Push building height to the east
• Nothing taller than 20 storeys
• Height should be located closest to Elizabeth Street
• Central square is useless and cut off from the main park
• Prefer access from Elizabeth Street

Concept 2
• Like the bigger public space on west side of the site
• Like Brant Street greenwaygateway
• 20-30 storeys is too tall

Concept 3
• 30-40 storeys is too high
• Like the symmetry of this concept
• Like the openness at John Street
• Building heights don’t appear to be contextually appropriate
• Don’t like access from Brant Street

Today’s Workshop

• vision, principles and context
• outcome of the design day
• three concepts used for the public survey
• inputs to the evaluation
• emerging preferred concept
Key Directions from all Evaluation Inputs

- **Height of buildings** - 14 to 25 storeys stepped down to Spencer Smith Park and the Lake
- **Central open space** at foot of John Street connecting through the site to the waterfront
- **Open space at Elizabeth Street**
- **Gateway to the Lake** at foot of Brant Street
- **Retail and amenity space** along building facing Spencer Smith Park
- **Vehicle access from Elizabeth Street**
- **Limited vehicle access from Lakeshore Road**

Emerging Preferred Concept
Emerging Preferred Concept – Land Use and Built Form
Emerging Preferred Concept – Open Space

Emerging Preferred Concept – Elizabeth Street
Emerging Preferred Concept – Access and Mobility

Emerging Preferred Concept
Emerging Preferred Concept

View of skyline from the Lake

View from Gazebo Area

View from north end of Pier
Burlington Skyline – All Concepts

Next Steps

- **Collect** Comments / **Refine** Emerging Preferred Concept
- **Finalize** Preferred Concept
- **Draft** Final Report / Draft OPA

- Planning and Development Committee
Today’s Workshop

• Please have a look at the emerging preferred concept

• Share your thoughts with respect to:
  – Land use and built form
  – Public realm
  – Circulation