Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on Thursday June 10, 2021 via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:
David Clusiau, Chair
Dayna Edwards
Joey Giaimo
Jana Kelemen
Jennifer Mallard
Hoda Kameli
Ted Watson

Staff Present:
Anita Fabac, Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design
Shannon McKie, Senior Project Manager, Urban Team
Ohi Izirein, Senior Project Manager, Suburban Team
Victoria Cox, Urban Designer, Urban Team
James Van Rooi, Planner 1, suburban Team
Joe Buordolone, Planning Technician, Development Planning

Others Present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation #1</th>
<th>IBI Group c/o Ashley Minns (Agent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Development</td>
<td>Chamberlain Architects Services Ltd. c/o Linnea Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2502 Upper James Street, Glanbrook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regrets:
Jennifer Sisson (Panel Member)
Eldon Theodore (Panel Member)

Declaration of Interest: None
Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>Applicant/ Agent</th>
<th>Development Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2:45 p.m.  | **Hotel Development** 2502 Upper James Street, Glanbrook | Site Plan Control DA-20-122 | Owner: Oleakram Inc.  
Agent and Presentation: IBI Group c/o Ashley Minns | James Van Rooi, Planner I |

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. **101 Hunter Street East, Hamilton**

   Development Proposal Overview

   The applicant is proposing a six storey hotel with 80 suites, a total of 56 surface parking spaces are proposed.

   Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

   1) Does the proposal encourage on-site storm water management and infiltration through the use of techniques and technologies, including green roofs and vegetated swales (B.3.3.2.8b))?

   2) Does the proposal encourage the use of LEED or other environmental building rating tools for buildings and infrastructure? (B.3.3.2.8 d))

   3) Does the proposal reduce air, noise and water pollution through the following?

   - Facilitating and promoting the use of active transportation;
   - Providing adequate green space, landscaped buffering and storm water management facilities;
   - Use of appropriate pavement treatments;
   - Promote energy efficient design; and,
   - Promote innovative construction materials and techniques. (B.3.3.2.9 d))

   Panel Comments and Recommendations

   a) Overview and Response to sustainable design (Questions 1, 2 and 3)

   - The site is an opportunity to promote quality eco-industrial design and sustainable design.
   - Could proponent provide permeable pavers or is there opportunity for bioswales?
- Recommend high quality façade treatment for facing Upper James Street
- Consider redesigning parking for some additional breaks to allow for pedestrian pathways, landscaping and storm water facilities.
- Consider retaining existing trees especially along property lines.
- Regarding the floor plans, the amenity areas could be relocated to the south of the building to encourage pedestrian and public engagement.
- There may be an opportunity for a green roof on the canopy at the buildings entrance.
- Could lose a few more parking to incorporate more sustainable design and better pedestrian pathways.

Summary

The Design Review Panel was supportive of the massing of the building. The design of the parking area could be improved to help achieve more sustainable design. There may also be opportunities to incorporate the existing mature trees on site and possibly a canopy with a green roof.

The Design Review Panel noted that providing amenity areas (dining room/patio area) on the southern side of the building may be something to consider to help better activate the street presence.

The Design Review Panel questioned whether they would have an opportunity to see the design again, staff informed them that the next step would be to incorporate their comments into a conditional site plan approval.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.