



## 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

**James Webb**, Webb Planning Inc.

### Staff Present:

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

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

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

**Sean Stewart**, Planner 2, Urban Team

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #2</b> <b>Mixed Use Development</b> 16 Cannon Street East, Hamilton	<b>Drew Koivu</b> , Atria Developments <b>Shane Kennedy</b> , Atria Developments <b>Hans Jain</b> , Atria Developments <b>Aphrodite Liaghat</b> , A & A Architects <b>Ali Kafaei</b> , A & A Architects <b>Franz Kloibhofer</b> , AJ Clarke and Associates <b>Miles Weeks</b> , AJ Clarke and Associates
--	--

### Regrets:

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

**Colin Berman**, Brook McIlroy (Panel Member)

**Declaration of Interest:** N/A

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:45 p.m.	<b>Residential Development</b> 16 Cannon Street East, Hamilton	Pre-consultation  Former File FC-19-062	Owner: Birch Tree Developments (16 Cannon) GP Inc.  Agent and Presentation: A & A Architects	Sean Stewart, 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.**

### 16 Cannon Street East

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing to construct a 16 storey multiple dwelling with 134 units and 37 parking spaces, including four parking spaces at the ground level and 33 parking spaces provided below grade using a parking stacker system.

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

1. Does the proposal complement the existing massing patterns, rhythm, character, colour and surrounding context?
2. Does the proposal define the street through consistent setbacks and building elevations?
3. Does the proposal conserve and respect the existing built heritage features of the area?

#### Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- The panel agreed that the proposed building has been carefully thought out and designed; however, considering the context within the block, they concluded that the massing does not fit in with the surrounding properties. The property is too constrained and more suited to a mid-rise building with greater setbacks and better transitions to the existing adjacent heritage buildings.

- The proposal should better respect the surrounding properties, including the recently designated 127 Hughson Street North, with regard to setbacks, window openings and separation distance.
- The panel recommended changes to the front façade to better complement the context, outlined below.

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

- The panel members expressed concerns in retaining only the skin of the existing heritage building on site and the attempt to integrate only the façade into the podium of the proposed development.
- The panel recognized the existing heritage attributes on-site and surrounding the site, recommending that the proposal attempts to retain more of the existing heritage building and create a better relationship between the podium and tower elements. A greater step-back is needed above the heritage building.
- Two panel members identified that there was no need to extend the faux-heritage treatment west of the historic façade and noted that a contemporary design could be brought to grade on that side of the site.
- Overall, the contemporary design should be approached more subtly by eliminating the black and white in favor of a less distracting treatment that is more respectful of the area's heritage character.
- The panel expressed concerns that the upper building mass does not have a strong relationship with the base. The panel questioned the relationship between the base and upper storeys, specifically pertaining to the transition.

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

- The panel agreed that the site is not big enough for the proposed building. Additional setbacks and step-backs should be included to provide more space between the proposal and the existing buildings to the south of the property. Above the 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> floor, the massing of the building should respect the City's Tall Building Guidelines with respect to setbacks from property lines.

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

- The panel questioned how the design of the lower façade made a positive contribution to the streetscape.

**Summary**

The panel agreed that the proposed development, while thoughtfully designed, does not fit on this specific site and would be more appropriately designed as a mid-rise building. The proposal does not relate well to the heritage buildings both on site and on the surrounding properties. The proposed building should be further setback from the existing buildings to the south to allow for a greater separation distance and sun access. The existing heritage building on site

should be more comprehensively incorporated into the development rather than just retaining the façade.

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.**