



## Meeting Summary

---

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

### Panel Members Present:

**David Clusiau**, *Chair*

**Dayna Edwards**

**Hoda Kameli**

**Jana Kelemen**

**Joey Giaimo**

**Jennifer Mallard**

**Jennifer Sisson**

**Ted Watson**

### Staff Present:

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

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

**Joe Buordolone**, Planning Technician I, Urban Team

**Jennifer Allen**, Planner II, Urban Team

### Others Present:

<b>Presentation #3</b> <b>Mixed Use Development</b> 55 Queenston Road	<b>Graham McNally</b> , Toms + McNally Design <b>Emma Cubitt</b> , Invizij Architects Inc. <b>Holland Young</b> , Invizij Architects Inc. <b>Kyle Benassi</b> , Invizij Architects Inc. <b>Rob Broughton</b> , City of Hamilton
---	---

### Regrets:

**Eldon Theodore** (Panel Member)

**Declaration of Interest:** None

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
4:00 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Development</b> 55 Queenston Road, Hamilton	Pre-consultation	Owner: CityHousing Hamilton  Agent and Presentation: Graham McNally, Toms + McNally Design	Jennifer Allen, 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.**

### 55 Queenston Road, Hamilton

#### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing is to construct a new six storey mixed use building containing 40 residential dwelling units and 176.4 square metres of ground floor commercial along Queenston Road. The proposed building is proposed to be Passive House certified. 40 surface parking spaces, 12 long term bicycle parking spaces and 6 short term bicycle parking spaces are being provided on site.

#### 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 complement and animate existing surroundings through building design and placement as well as through placement of pedestrian amenities?
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 felt the proposed building design has consideration for the surrounding area and how it will develop in the future. Although, the panel recommended more attention be given to the materials and patterns utilized on the building facades given the visibility of the six storey building in the existing neighbourhood context; and,

- One panel member noted the importance of utilizing street trees as a noise buffer in an area with a high volume of traffic.

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

- The panel was pleased with the environmental benefits of a Passive House certified development;
- One panel member was supportive of the massing of the proposed building without increased setbacks above the ground floor;
- The panel recommended more consideration for the proposed building materials and their long term viability;
- The panel recommended reallocating glazing from common areas of the building to allow for additional glazing within individual units. In addition, one panel member suggested replacing some of the punched windows with horizontal windows;
- One panel member suggested utilizing dark elements on the building base and focusing the coloured element towards the top of the building;

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

- The panel recommended further efforts be taken to improve the pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and connection to Queenston Road;
- One panel member recommended integrating the courtyard amenity area with phase 2 of the development of the site; and,
- The panel requested further clarification on the access for waste collection vehicles and minimizing any impact on the outdoor amenity area.

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

- The panel was pleased with the number of trees and landscaping on site;
- The panel was pleased with the amount of amenity area proposed on site. One panel member recommended further attention be given to the potential wind or shadow impacts on the outdoor amenity area;
- The panel recognized the importance of creating an active public realm along Queenston Road through decorative landscaping, pedestrian connections and additional glazing along the westerly façade; and,
- The panel identified further clarification about the potential impact of the future LRT on the development of the site was necessary.

### **Summary**

The Design Review Panel is pleased with the proposed development of a Passive House certified building. The panel is supportive of the proposed massing of the building but identifies further consideration should be made for the proposed building materials and colours, and the proposed allocation of glazing. The panel recommends improving the pedestrian connections throughout the subject property and to the public realm. The panel appreciates the amount of amenity area and landscaping on the subject property and encourages further attention to how it will function.

**Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**