



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday, March 11, 2021** via WebEx.

### Panel Members Present:

**David Clusiau**, *Chair*

**Dayna Edwards**

**Joey Giaimo**

**Jana Kelemen**

**Jennifer Mallard**

**Jennifer Sisson**

**Eldon Theodore**

**Ted Watson**

### Staff Present:

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

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

**Johanna Black**, Business Facilitator

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #1</b> Multiple Dwelling 253 King William St	<b>Graham McNally</b> , Toms+McNally Design <b>Paula Hamilton</b> , Toms+McNally Design <b>Kevin Hutchison</b> , Montgomery Sisam <b>Katelyn Gillis</b> , T Johns Consulting <b>Terri John</b> , T Johns Consulting <b>Sean Botham</b> , City Housing Hamilton <b>Samantha Blackley</b> , City Housing Hamilton
--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Regrets:

**Hoda Kameli**, Panel Member

**Declaration of Interest:** N/A

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:00 p.m.	<b>Multiple Dwelling</b> 253 King William St	Preliminary Site Plan Review  Former File FC-19-130	City Housing Hamilton  Agent and Presentation: Toms + McNally	Johanna Black, Business Facilitator

## 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.**

### 253 King William St.

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant proposes to construct a three storey affordable housing multiple dwelling with 24 dwelling units. The proposed building uses pre-fabricated modular construction and will be Passive House certified.

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

1. Does the proposal promote development and spaces that respect natural processes and features and contribute to environmental sustainability?
2. Does the proposal organize space in a logical manner through the design, placement, and construction of new buildings, streets, structures and landscaping?
3. Does the proposal include the provision of amenity space and what is the relationship to existing patterns of private and public amenity space?

## Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- Panel members acknowledged the applicant's efforts and noted that the proposal is bold, innovative and unique.
- The panel supported the proposed modular construction and applauded the simple but elegant design.

### b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1 and 2)

- Panel members supported the proposed metal cladding but recommended exploring different textures and colours, particularly for the first floor. The applicant should ensure that the metal cladding is high-quality and durable.
- Panel members felt that the lobby is a positive feature as it opens up both the front and rear of the building.
- The panel suggested relocating the mechanical room and stairway to allow for dwelling units on the east side of the building that can take advantage of natural light.
- Some panel members recommended adding glazing with larger windows in the multi-purpose / meeting rooms.

### c) Site Layout and Circulation (Question 2)

- Some panel members were concerned with the narrow side yard in terms of safety (i.e. lack of natural surveillance) and maintenance work. There was a suggestion to move the gates closer to the street to eliminate unsafe spaces.
- Panel members appreciated the large amenity space that prioritizes people over parking. The panel suggested adding a feature wall in the amenity space that would be visible to the street.
- Overall, the panel considered the proposal to have a thoughtful interface with the street (i.e. setback from the property line, plantings, seating and bike parking) and appreciated the focus on the quality of the private and public outdoor spaces. The applicant could explore flipping the building so the entrance is closer to the bike racks and the garbage containers are on the east side of the building.

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

- Panel members noted that high-quality details and finishes are important when developing the landscape plans as the outdoor shared amenity area(s) will improve the quality of life for residents who do not have access to private outdoor amenity space.
- Most panel members appreciated the proposed bench/planting bed at the front of the building as it adds interest and has a dual function. Some panel members recommended the canopy above the front entrance could be stretched to the property line to match the length of the bench.
- Many panel members strongly suggested additional trees at the front of the building to provide more shade and wind protection.
- The design of the fence surrounding the site is important as it will meet the public realm.

**e) Sustainability (Question 3)**

- Some panel members encouraged the applicant to enhance the stormwater management strategy in order to retain more water on site (i.e. permeable pavers).
- The panel noted that the applicant should take into consideration future adjacent developments and possible impacts to the Passive House design.

**Summary**

The panel was overwhelmingly supportive of the proposal. The panel considered the design to be innovative and unique, sensitive to context and an excellent use for the site. The panel agreed that the simplicity of the design allows for more emphasis on the quality of the public and private spaces and recommended additional trees along the front façade to enhance the streetscape. The proposed metal cladding was supported by the panel; however, members noted that the chosen material should be of high-quality. The Passive House certification was appreciated by the panel and they emphasized the desire for enhanced stormwater management.

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.**