



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **April 14, 2021** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*

Jana Kelemen

Joey Giaimo

Jennifer Mallard

Jennifer Sisson

Hoda Kameli

Eldon Theodore

Staff Present:

Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Design

Joe Buordolone, Planning Technician I, Urban Team

Alaina Baldassarra, Planner I, Urban Team

Shannon McKie, Manager, Zoning and Committee of Adjustment

Edward Winter, Urban Designer, Heritage and Design

Others Present:

| | |
|--|---|
| Presentation #2 Residential Development 186 Hunter Street East | Matt Johnston , UrbanSolutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc. Scott Beedie , UrbanSolutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc. Edward Thomas , SRM Architects Inc. Le'Ann W. Seely , Whitehouse Urban Design |
|--|---|

Regrets:

Dayna Edwards (Panel Member)

Ted Watson (Panel Member)

Declaration of Interest: None

Schedule:

| Start Time | Address | Type of Application | Applicant/ Agent | Development Planner |
|------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 1:30 p.m. | Residential Development 186 Hunter Street East, Hamilton | Current Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment | Owner: Wellington Hamilton Non-Profit Housing Inc. Agent and Presentation: UrbanSolutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc. | 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.

186 Hunter Street East, Hamilton

Development Proposal Overview

The proposed development consists of one 12-storey Multiple dwelling containing a total of 104 affordable residential units. In addition, the proposal includes 50 parking spaces contained in an underground garage, 51 long-term parking spaces and 5 short term bicycle parking spaces are 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? (B.2.1.4 d))
2. Does the proposal organize space in a logical manner through the design, placement and construction of new buildings, streets, structures and landscaping? (B.3.3.2.4 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 recommended that the site plan drawing be revised to provide more clarity about the proposed development;
- Contextual drawings should be provided at future submissions to clarify the relationship between buildings;
- The panel had some concerns with the height of the building;
- The panel recommended that retail be added to the ground floor of the proposed building;

- Recommended that there is a reduction in the amount of patterned material used on the building façade. Include a possible canopy relationship;
- The panel recommended that the above grade parking in the podium is removed;
- The panel recommended that additional consideration be given to improve the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding context;
- Recommend a full documentation and salvage report is completed and how much of the salvaged material is being used. Consider using some of the material, for example if there is red brick as part of the existing building, as part of a proposed building material for the new building.

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

- The panel noted that the height of the building is very tall and there is no stepback on the Ferguson Avenue facade. The panel recommended that additional transition is required for the residents to the south and more consideration is given to the surroundings of the existing neighbourhood;
- The panel recommended changes to the elevations improve the composition of the building to look like a combination of smaller sections versus one large slab. The panel recommended the side yard facades should be redesigned;
- Consider removing the second podium from the development and removal of the ramp could help to buffer the residences to the south;
- The panel appreciates the transition to Liberty street and removing the second podium on the proposed building;
- The panel appreciates the green roof;
- The panel noted a possible concern with compatibility with the proposed tower and the existing tower due to the distance between the two towers; and,
- The panel was concerned with the reduction in the proposed rear yard setback from 7.5 m to 1.0 m.

c) Site Layout and Circulation (Question 2)

- The panel recommended removing the parking from the second storey of the proposed residential building (it is difficult to predict the future);
- The panel recommended green buffer between alley and building;
- The panel was generally supportive of the reduction of parking rate is acceptable;
- The panel recommended that additional outdoor amenity area be provided for the residential;
- The panel recommended consider improvements to the loading arrangement on the east side for screening from the Public Realm; and,
- The panel has concern with the location of at grade parking and bike parking spaces proposed. Given there proposed location and lack of active uses on that side of the building could create a safety concern.

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

- The panel recommended enhanced elevations since the property fronts onto public streets;
- The panel recommended improving the interface of the streets with the at grade residential units on Hunter Street East. There should be some considerations for unit entrances at grade; and,
- The panel appreciated the detail of the landscape plan for the ground floor proposed but recommended increasing the amount of landscaping on Hunter Street (for example framing the amenity area, softscape on the rooftop of the amenity area).

Summary

The Design Review Panel is recommended improvement for the relationship of the proposed buildings with the surrounding existing single detached residential. The panel recommends improving the relationship at grade for the proposed residential of the apartment building, considering retail on the first floor, increasing the amount of landscaping, adding buffer between the alley and the building. The panel recommended that Contextual drawings be included in the future to provide additional clarity about the proposal's relationship to the surrounding area. The Design Review Panel appreciated the proposed green roof, urban brail and the transition from Liberty Street to the highest point of the building.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.