



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday April 8, 2021** via WebEx.

### Panel Members Present:

**David Clusiau**, *Chair*

**Dayna Edwards**

**Joey Giaimo**

**Hoda Kameli**

**Jana Kelemen**

**Jennifer Sisson**

**Eldon Theodore**

### Staff Present:

**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 II, Urban Team

### Others Present:

<b>Presentation #1</b> <b>Mixed Use Development</b> 101 King Street East, Hamilton	<b>Radek Kozlowski</b> , Architect <b>Paul Kemper</b> , Coletara Development <b>Nicolas Barrette</b> , GBCA Architects <b>Ashley Paton</b> , GSP Group Inc.
--	--

### Regrets:

**Jennifer Mallard** (Panel Member)

**Ted Watson** (Panel Member)

**Declaration of Interest:** None

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
3:30 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Development</b> 101 Hunter Street East, Hamilton	Pre-consultation  FC-19-084  Submitted UHOPA-21-007 & ZAC-21-014	Owner: 75 Catharine Holding Inc. (Coletara Development)  Agent and Presentation: GSP Group Inc. c/o Ashley Paton	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 Hunter Street East, Hamilton

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing a 27 storey mixed use (commercial and residential) building, with at grade retail / commercial and residential above, containing 297 residential units. A total of 122 parking spaces and 149 bike parking spaces are proposed.

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

- 1) Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character?
- 2) Does the proposal conserve and respect the existing built heritage features of the area?
- 3) Is the proposal massed to respect existing and planned street proportions?

## Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- The panel acknowledged that the subject property is in an area that is expected to experience a transition to higher density building forms. Thus, a taller and more dense building is appropriate given the proximity to transit; however, the panel has concerns with the proposal as the building is more than twice the height as envisioned in the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law.
- The panel have concerns with the proposed building massing including the podium height and scale, tower floorplate size and setbacks and step backs. The building should be in conformance with the Tall Building Guidelines and ensure an appropriate transition to the surrounding properties while respecting the existing context.
- The existing heritage context should be respected, and the proposal should be revised to better respond to the adjacent heritage buildings.

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

- The height and scale of the podium needs to be reduced to better reflect the existing scale of the street and adjacent heritage buildings. The panel recommends reducing the entire podium height to 7.5 metres, as required in the Zoning By-law along Catharine Street South.
- The panel expressed concern with the above grade parking, noting that the podium should contain active uses to ensure an active streetscape and lively public realm. The panel recommended providing underground parking only.
- The panel noted that the city could consider reducing the number of parking spaces per units given the proximity to local and regional transit.
- The panel recommended reducing the floor plate size to respect the Tall Building Guidelines and increasing the step backs to provide a better transition to the adjacent properties while mitigating negative impacts including overlook issues. The panel noted that it is important to avoid compromising the development potential for the abutting properties and that the proposal should respect the Tall Building Guidelines.
- The panel was concerned with the reflective glazing on the podium as it does not appear to be bird friendly and recommended looking at other treatments.
- There is not enough variation between the design of tower and the design of the tower top to adequately define the top of the building. Overall, the panel felt the colour pallet needs some refinement to better complement the character of the area.

- The panel supported outdoor amenity space on top of the podium, but wind and shadow impacts need to be considered as it may not be a comfortable space for residents to use.

**c) Site Layout and Circulation**

- The panel recommended increasing the building setbacks to accommodate a wider area for pedestrians.

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

- To achieve a more active streetscape, the panel recommended providing community-oriented space on the ground floor along Hunter Street East. Above grade parking should not be the prominent feature along the streetscape nor the prominent feature of the podium.
- The panel supported the use of Urban Braille.

**Summary**

The Panel was supportive of a denser form of development due to the site's proximity to existing local and regional transit but expressed great concern with proposed building massing and lack of transition to the surrounding properties. Some panel members expressed concern with the proposed building height. The Design Review Panel recommended reducing the floor plate size, while also ensuring adequate setbacks and step backs are provided. The proposal should have more regard for the existing context including the heritage buildings adjacent to the site. The podium should be revised to better reflect the scale of the area and include active uses at grade to enliven the streetscape. Parking should be provided underground.

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.**