



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday November 12, 2020** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

Colin Berman, Brook McIlroy

Vincent Colizza, Vincent Colizza Architects, *Chair*

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:

Anita Fabac, Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design

Shannon McKie, Senior Project Manager, Urban Team

Victoria Cox, Urban Designer, Urban Team

Sean Stewart, Planner II, Urban Team

Others Present

Presentation #1 Multiple Dwelling Development 104-106 Bay Street North	Peter Ng , Kearns Mancini Architects Irene Rivera , Kearns Mancini Architects Allison Chewter , Bousfields Scott Henderson , Adesso Design Inc.
--	--

Regrets:

Robert Freedman, Freedman Urban Solutions (Panel member)

Declaration of Interest:

Mario Patitucci, Adesso Design Inc. (Panel member)

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:00 p.m.	Multiple Dwelling Development 62-64 King Street East	Pre-consultation	Owner: CityHousing Hamilton Agent and Presentation: Kearns Mancini 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.

1. 104-106 Bay Street North

Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing to construct a 6 storey 55 unit multiple dwelling with 6 surface parking spaces. The proposed multiple dwelling will be located on the Bay Street North frontage of the property. A future second multiple dwelling is being considered for the Cannon Street West frontage but is not part of this application and no formal plans have been developed. Should this phase move forward, the parking for both buildings will be accommodated within an underground parking level.

The existing property is currently used as a municipal surface parking lot. The subject property is a through lot in close proximity to the corner of Bay Street North and Cannon Street West. There is frontage on both Cannon Street West and Bay Street North. Three street townhomes are located at the corner of Bay Street North and Cannon Street West, abutting the northwest corner of the subject property. There are commercial uses to the east and south of the subject property. A former high school is located across Bay Street North to the west of the proposed development.

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 ensure an equitable distribution of accessible and stimulating amenity areas, including the development of places for passive and active recreation and use?

3. Is the proposal compatible with, and does it enhance the character of the existing environment and locale?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context (Question 2)

- The panel was generally supportive of the proposed site layout, building massing and passive house design; however, the panel felt the building should be more respectful of its context through its character and materiality.

b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1 and 3)

- Several panel members raised concerns about the proposed façade materials and how the materials will hold up over time. Some panel members suggested using brick, or a pre-cast material to mimic brick, on the brown protruding portion of the façade at a minimum to better complement the materials used on adjacent buildings.
- The panel suggested that the proposed glazing at the ground floor level could be reduced and the projected sections above could be continued down to the ground level as a unifying element.
- Two panel members suggested incorporating two-storey, grade-related units at the north end of the building, where the interior amenity space is located, as a transition to the neighbouring houses.
- Some panel members suggested that the façade should have a simpler treatment. One panel member suggested replacing the random blocks of colours with a single horizontal or vertical band of colour.

c) Site Layout and Circulation (Question 2)

- There were concerns with the interface of the indoor and outdoor amenity space. Many panel members felt that the proposed indoor amenity room should be moved from the front of the building to the rear of the building, to connect both amenity spaces. Panel members felt that more attention was needed for the design of the outdoor amenity space to maximize its usage.
- Panel members raised concerns about the amount of pavement proposed in the interior of the site and suggested that the design team consider alternative locations for the future underground parking access, which may reduce the amount of required paving. If paving cannot be reduced, panel members encourage the applicant to investigate permeable pavement options.
- The panel suggested relocating the garbage room and access door to the other side of the building to reduce conflicts.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy (Question 2)

- The panel suggested further consideration for the function of the outdoor amenity space to make the space more of an active hub for the development.

e) Sustainability (Question 3)

- Panel members strongly support the proposed passive house design and the innovative approach to the proposal.

Summary

The panel thanks the applicant for the presentation and is pleased to see an innovative passive house design for the downtown core being proposed. Although there could be some improvements as outlined above, the panel agrees that the development will be a positive addition to the neighbourhood.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.