



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday August 13<sup>th</sup> 2020** via Webex.

### Panel Members Present:

**Colin Berman**, Brook McIlroy, *Chair*

**Robert Freedman**, Freedman Urban Solutions

**Ute Maya-Giambattista**, Fotenn Planning + Design

**Tim Smith**, Urban Strategies Inc.

**Jackie VanderVelde**, Land Art Design Landscape Architects Inc.

**Yasin Visram**, Perkins + Will Canada

**James Webb**, Webb Planning Inc.

### Staff Present:

**Steve Robichaud**, Director of Planning and Chief Planner

**Anita Fabac**, Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design

**Shannon McKie**, Senior Project Manager, Urban Team

**Victoria Cox**, Urban Designer, Urban Team

**Daniel Barnett**, Planner 2, Urban Team

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #1</b> <b>Mixed Use Development</b> 101 King Street East, Hamilton	<b>Duy Nguyen</b> , (N-Cubed Designs) (Agent) <b>David MacLean</b> , Dmac Build Group Inc. Owner
--	---

### Regrets:

**Vincent Colizza**, Vincent Colizza Architects (Panel Member)

**Mario Patitucci**, Adesso Design Inc. (Panel Member)

**Declaration of Interest:** N/A

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
1:30 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Development</b> 101 King Street East, Hamilton	Pre-consultation  Former File SPA-20-013	Owner: Dmac Build Group Inc. c/o David MacLean, 1615 Old Hwy 99, Dundas, ON, L9H 5E4  Agent and Presentation: Duy Nguyen (N-Cubed Designs)	Daniel Barnett, 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.**

### 101 King Street East, Hamilton

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing to construct a mixed use (commercial and residential) building. The first floor is retail and there are nine residential units on the upper floors (2-7). A three storey addition is proposed over the existing three storey building at the front and a seven storey addition is proposed at the rear.

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

1. Does the proposal provide connections and access to all buildings and places for all users, regardless of age and physical ability?
2. Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character?
3. Does the proposal promote quality design consistent with the locale and surrounding environment?

## Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- The panel applauded the proponent for restoring a historic façade and the creative approach to intensifying a challenging site.
- The panel recommended changes to the front façade to better complement the context, outlined below.
- The panel was not concerned with the scale of the proposal and agreed with the proposed step-backs.

### b) Built Form and Character (Questions 2 & 3)

- The panel expressed some concerns with respect to the design of the front façade, recommending that the design of the addition be simplified and achieve a stronger contrast between old and new. They recommended looking to the existing street wall for cues regarding colour and materiality.
- Panel members provided several more detailed suggestions for improving the front of the building like pulling the façade for the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors forward and/or using a strong cornice rather than a fake partial mansard to provide a clean break between the old and the new portions of the building. The panel felt the cantilevered balcony distracts from the historic façade and should be reconsidered. One panel member suggested opening up the commercial portion of the proposed development with more glass.
- Some panel members noted that the patchwork pattern on the side of the building only drew attention to a blank wall that will not be that visible from the pedestrian realm; a simpler approach or an artistic mural was recommended.
- The panel supported the use of brick at the rear of the building.

### c) Site Layout and Circulation (Questions 1)

- While the panel acknowledges the constrained nature of the site, they noted that a barrier-free residential access has not been provided from the front of the building. One panel member found this to be unacceptable and commented that access for all residents should be provided from the front of the building. An alternative suggestion was that access for all residents could be provided exclusively from the alleyway at the rear; although the City would not support this.
- The alleyway access for residents, which may be well used if it is retained, needs to be more welcoming and feel safer for residents. Lighting needs to be carefully considered.

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

- The panel noted the site limitations for providing landscaping, recommending that planters with adequate soil volumes and proper irrigation be provided for the roof top landscaping.

**Summary**

The panel applauds the applicant and design team for taking on this project and redeveloping a small and constrained site. The panel recommends simplifying the design and better integrating it with the existing heritage character of the area. They also recommend reconsideration of the residential access to try to accommodate barrier-free access from the street.

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.**