



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **March 10, 2021** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*

Jana Kelemen

Joey Giaimo

Jennifer Mallard

Jennifer Sisson

Ted Watson

Eldon Theodore

Staff Present:

Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Design

Joe Buordolone, Planning Technician I, Urban Team

Alaina Baldassarra, Planner I, Urban Team

Others Present:

Presentation #2 Residential Development 433 King Street East	Sarah Knoll , GSP Group Kshitiz Jas Jaswal , GSP Group Chelsey Tyers , WSP Diana Benitez , 2819212 Ontario Inc. Shem Myszkowski , KNYMH Inc.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Regrets:

Dayna Edwards (Panel Member)

Hoda Kameli (Panel Member)

Declaration of Interest: None

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:45 p.m.	Residential Development 433 King Street East, Hamilton	Future Site Plan Application	Owner: 2819212 Ontario Limited Agent and Presentation: GSP Group	Alaina Baldassarra, 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.

433 King Street East, Hamilton

Development Proposal Overview

To demolish the existing 2 and a ½ storey building and construct a 6-storey, 20.15m tall, 20 unit multiple dwelling.

The development is supported by 10 long term bicycle parking spaces in the basement, 5 short term bicycle parking spaces close to King Street East and 5 Vehicle parking spaces (including 1 barrier free space) beneath a cantilevered portion of the building connecting directly to a rear municipal lane.

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 (B.2.4.1.4 d))
2. Does the proposal complement and animate existing surroundings through building design and placement as well as through placement of pedestrian amenities? (B.3.3.2.6 a))
3. Is the proposal massed to respect existing and planned street proportions? (B.3.3.3.3)

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 represents an appropriate massing and good redevelopment. In addition, the proposed density is appropriate and the panel generally supports the proposed rental tenure. The panel appreciate the use of the brick internal to the building and consider providing salvaged material that is not used to other projects that can use it.

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

- The panel appreciated the scale of the proposed building but thought the materiality was awkward between the lower level of the proposed building and the higher level of the proposed building in terms of materiality. Consider increasing the setback of the upper stories;
- Consider using a passive house design;
- Consider redesigning the west elevation of the building (such as making the entire west side all red brick, adding vertical line weights);
- Concern with using precast EFIS as part of the design of the building material;
- Consider changing the colour of the proposed grey precast brick;
- Consider redesigning the window wall on the higher portion of the building;
- Consider adding a small recess in the proposed building to complement the existing building);
- One panel member commented that modelling the façade after heritage features would be awkward. More modern design was recommended for the proposed development.

c) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Building Design (Questions 1 & 2)

- A panel member recommended that the applicant consider the alleyway frontage as a second front façade and design accordingly;
- Balconies (including small french balconies instead of full balconies) and rooftop amenity should be considered as part of a future submission;
- Include commemoration plan of the history of the site;

Summary

The Design Review Panel is generally pleased with the massing, density and rental tenure for the proposed residential development. The panel appreciated reusing existing brick on-site within the interior of the building and recommends any material that is salvaged and not used on the project is given to another project who could use the material.

The Design Review Panel recommended changes to the proposal including adding an outdoor amenity area, material use of the proposed development and constructing the building using passive house design.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.