



City of Hamilton
Design Review Panel
Meeting Summary – August 8, 2024
87-109 Ashley Street, Hamilton

Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday August 8th, 2024**, via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*
Eldon Theodore
Jennifer Mallard
Joey Giaimo
Jennifer Sisson

Staff Present:

Jana Kelemen, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design
Michael Vortuba, SPM Heritage and Design

Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design
Tim Vrooman, Area Planning Manager (East)
Dhruv Mehta, Planner II

Others Present

Presentation #2	Craig Rohe, GSP Group Rick Lintack, Lintack Architects Inc. Matthew Madigan, Adesso Design Inc. Evelyn Thomas, GSP Group	
-----------------	---	--

Regrets:

Ted Watson, Dayna Edwards

Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
2:45 pm	Multiple Residence Development 87-109 Ashley Street	Site Plan	Owner: Tyros Development Ltd. Agent and Presentation: GSP Group	Dhruv Mehta

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.

87-109 Ashely Street

Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing to redevelop the subject lands with a new 6-storey multiple dwelling (19.8 meters in height) containing 136 residential dwelling units. A total of 91 parking spaces are proposed on site; 14 spaces will be provided as surface parking and 77 spaces will be provided as underground parking with access onto the adjacent laneways along the rear and side property lines. The laneways connect to Ashley Street.

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

Response to Context

- What is the relationship of the proposal to the existing neighbourhood character? Does it maintain, and where possible, enhance and build upon desirable established patterns, built form, height, density and landscapes? Is the proposal compatible with adjacent land uses including matters such as shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, traffic and other nuisance effects?

Site Layout

- Does the proposal contribute to the character and ambiance of the community through appropriate design of streetscapes and amenity areas? Does the proposal organize space in a logical manner through the design, placement and construction of new buildings, streets, structures and landscaping?

Building Form and Articulation

- Does the proposal use materials that are consistent and compatible with the surrounding context? Does the proposal include transitional areas between the public and private spaces through use of features such as landscaping, planters, porches, canopies and/or stairs?

Sustainable Design and Innovation

- Does the proposal encourage innovative community design and technologies?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

- Panel members were unanimous in their support of the overall layout of the proposed multiple residential building, and noted that the courtyard building typology is one that has historical presence in many parts of the city of Hamilton, and is a welcome feature.

b) Built Form and Character

- The panel noted that while the building is large in comparison to the predominantly single family dwellings surrounding it on three sides, the massing design U-shape building helps a great deal to fit within the community: upper storeys step-back to minimize shadow impacts and privacy concerns.

- The panel noted there appeared to be opportunity to make the east-facing ground floor units accessible directly to the street – which would provide a matching front-porch type condition.
- A panel member noted that a few of the interior corner units seems to employ interior bedrooms, and encouraged the design team to look at revisions that could provide bedrooms with an exterior window.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

- A panel member noted the garbage staging/collection area could likely be refined to improve upon the laneway condition – notwithstanding the panel appreciated the use and improvements to the public laneway.
- A panel member noted the 4-surface parking spaces on the west side of the public laneway could potentially be developed with an ADU overtop of the parking spaces and could provide additional building mass as transition to the proposed building.
- A panel member encouraged good (glare-free) lighting in the lane way to address safety concerns in the alleyway.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

- The panel appreciated the courtyard layout – noting that by facing the street, the courtyard benefits the community as well as the residents of the proposed building. Panel members had comments and recommendations to improve the courtyard space as well: relocate the centre tree so the private sidewalk path has clear view to the entrance door, Lighting should balance safety and privacy and be sensitive to units that face the courtyard.
- The panel appreciated the inclusion of street trees with private trees within the courtyard space.
- The panel appreciated the use of brick masonry – noting the red-clay brick is the predominant cladding material in the area.
- A panel member noted the public/private nature of the courtyard does come with some pros & cons – pros being a larger green space visually / practically available to the community and cons being that ownership or responsibility and maintenance of the courtyard space may become tricky.

Summary

Overall, the panel was in support of the development proposal noting the layout was solid. The panel noted this proposal was offering a courtyard feature which is rarely seen in contemporary developments.

The panel suggested it could be advantageous to consider revisions on the overall plan:

- the interior corner units to ensure all bedrooms receive a window to the exterior,
- garbage staging area could be improved to be more sensitive to the laneway,

Lastly, the panel noted this proposed development was offering a sensitively scaled infill – which fulfills the “missing-middle” housing solutions and were confident the minor concerns from the panel could be addressed by the applicant’s design team.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.