



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday October 13, 2022** via WebEx.

### Panel Members Present:

**Jennifer Mallard**, *Chair*

**Dayna Edwards**

**Eldon Theodore**

**Hoda Kameli**

**Ted Watson**

### Staff Present:

**Ken Coit**, Manager, Heritage and Urban Design

**Edward Winter**, Planner I, Urban Designer

**Jennifer Allen**, Planner II, Urban Team

### Others Present:

<b>Presentation #1</b> <b>Residential Development</b> 215 & 217 King Street West	<b>API Development Consultants Inc.</b>
--	---

### Regrets:

**David Clusiau** (Panel Member)

**Jana Kelemen** (Panel Member)

**Joey Giaimo** (Panel Member)

**Jennifer Sisson** (Panel Member)

**Declaration of Interest:** None

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
4:00 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Building</b> 215 & 217 King Street West	Pre consultation	API Development Consultants Inc.	Jennifer Allen, Planner II

## Summary of Comments:

**Note: The Design Review Panel is strictly an advisory body and makes recommendations to Planning Division staff. These comments should be reviewed in conjunction with all comments received by commenting agencies and should be discussed with Planning Division staff prior to resubmission.**

### 215 & 217 King Street West, Hamilton

#### Development Proposal Overview

The proposal is to construct a 14-storey mixed use building with a 5-storey podium and ground floor commercial. A total of 23 parking spaces provided within 3 levels of underground parking.

#### Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character? (B.2.1.4 d))
- Does the proposal respect and maintain or enhance the streetscape patterns including block lengths, setbacks and building separations? (B.2.4.2.2 g))
- Does the proposal complement and animate existing surroundings through building design and placement as well as through placement of pedestrian amenities? (B.3.3.2.6 a))

#### Panel Comments and Recommendations

##### a) Overview and Response to Context (Questions 1, 2 & 3)

- The panel is supportive of intensification in the downtown with commercial uses at grade but is conflicted about the scale of the proposed development in relation to the size of the site.
- Some panel members feel additional height could be accommodated on site whereas other panel members feel the site is too small to accommodate the proposed built form. The panel members who feel the site is too small specifically have concern about achieving appropriate distance separations between the tower element and the rear and interior side lot lines and the potential to impact the redevelopment of the adjacent property in the future.

**b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1 & 2)**

- Some panel members recommend exploring opportunities for a mid rise building to better respond to the surrounding context instead of a high rise (tall) building.
- The panel is supportive of the proposed building materials but recommend reviewing opportunities to refine the articulation of building to address a disconnect in the design of the podium and the tower.

**c) Site Layout and Circulation (Question 1 & 3)**

- The panel appreciates the provision of private balconies for the residential units and recommends a rooftop terrace to provide shared outdoor amenity area on site.
- One panel member notes the importance of providing sufficient long-term bicycle parking on site.
- The panel appreciates the proposal for underground parking as opposed to providing podium parking.

**d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy (Questions 1, 2 & 3)**

- The panel encourages the provision of trees along the street.
- The panel encourages the use of canopies and pedestrian covers at grade. One panel member recommends refining the design of the canopies to better connect them with the podium element.
- One panel member notes the proposed entries successfully animate the street.

**Summary**

The Design Review Panel has mixed opinions on the height, density and built form of the proposed development. Some members feel the subject site is too small to accommodate a tall building whereas other members feel the site can accommodate additional height and density. There is concern about providing appropriate distance separations from the tower element to the rear and interior side lot line of the property and whether this would hinder the ability to redevelop the adjacent property in the future. The panel is supportive of the proposed building materials but recommend reviewing opportunities to refine the articulation of building to address a disconnect in the design of the podium and the tower. The panel highlights the need for private and shared amenity areas and bicycle parking within the building, and the provision of street trees and canopies to animate the street. The panel appreciates the proposed development for a mixed-use building within the downtown.

**Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**