



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Friday September 11<sup>th</sup> 2020** via Webex.

### Panel Members Present:

**Vincent Colizza**, Vincent Colizza Architects, *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

### Staff Present:

**Jason Thorne**, General Manager of Planning and Economic Development

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

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

**Jennifer Allen**, Planning Technician, Urban Team

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #1</b> <b>Mixed Use Development</b> 11 Robert Street	<b>Clayton Payer</b> , Lintack Architects <b>James Webb</b> , WEBB Planning Consulting Inc. <b>Anthony Quattrociocchi</b> , Yoke Group Inc.
--	---

### Regrets:

**Colin Berman**, Brook McIlroy

**Mario Patitucci**, Adesso Design Inc.

### Declaration of Interest:

**James Webb**, WEBB Planning Consulting Inc. (Panel member)

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
1:30 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Development</b> 11 Robert Street	Pre-consultation	Owner: Yoke Group Inc.  Agent and Presentation: Lintack Architects	Jennifer Allen, Planning Technician 1

## 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.**

### 11 Robert Street

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant proposes to redevelop the subject lands with a six storey mixed use building comprised of approximately 274.0 square metres of ground floor commercial and 28 residential units on the upper floors.

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

1. Does the proposal use materials that are consistent and compatible with the surrounding context?
2. Does the proposal complement the existing massing patterns, rhythm, character and surrounding context?
3. Does the proposal demonstrate sensitivity toward community identity through an understanding of the character of a place, context and setting?

#### Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- The panel appreciates the building composition, the decorative panels and the framing of the front façade with a cornice; however, they recommend creating a better relationship with the historic context.
- The panel is supportive of the massing given the site's constraints and context.

**b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1, 2 and 3)**

- There are major concerns with the blank westerly façade. While the panel appreciates the decorative granite wall and variation in materials, they recommend adding voids such as punch windows or other window treatments for at least a portion of the westerly façade, toward the front, to add some variation.
- Given the rights-of-way adjacent to the site to the east and the west, the building should be designed as a stand-alone structure with side windows, rather than as a mid-block building with minimal or no side setbacks and blank walls. If a party wall is anticipated along the east property line, a deeper setback will be needed in the central area to ensure that it creates a viable light-well in the future.
- One panel member noted that if there were less units within the building, the individual unit floor plans could be adjusted to allow for windows along the westerly façade.
- The panel agrees with the use of high-quality materials and brick on the first two storeys; however, they suggest using red brick. Red brick would reflect the history of masonry in Hamilton and create a better relationship with the surrounding heritage buildings, notably the Armory across the street.
- One panel member made a note to ensure the planters on the rooftop do not pose a safety concern as they may be climbable.

**c) Site Layout and Circulation**

- One panel member noted the potential for the rear parking courtyard to evolve into a pedestrian friendly place as buildings facing James Street continue to change. It is suggested that the design team consider the future vision of James Street and develop building interphase options that continue to support this vision.

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

- One panel member suggested that a ground floor height of 4 metres may not be sufficient for a commercial use.

**Summary**

The Design Review Panel is pleased to see the subject property re-developed into a mixed use development. The panel appreciates the building composition and contemporary approach, although they recommend adding side windows and/or deeper setbacks and making some changes to materials to improve the relationship with the historic context. The panel also recommends providing more fenestration on the westerly façade.

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.**