



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022** via WebEx.

### Panel Members Present:

Dayna Edwards

Joey Giaimo

Hoda Kameli

Jennifer Mallard (*chair*)

Eldon Theodore

Ted Watson

### Staff Present:

Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Design

Edward Winter, Urban Designer

PLANNER, Daniel Barnett, Urban Team

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #1</b> 2626364 Ontario Inc. c/o Kyle Camerro 2900 King Street East	<b>Matt Johnston</b> , Urban Solutions, Planning & Land Development <b>Roland Rom Colthoff</b> , RAW Design <b>Le'Ann Whitehouse Seely</b> , Whitehouse Urban Design Inc. <b>Kyle Camerro</b> , 2626364 Ontario Inc.
---	---

### Regrets:

David Clusiau

Jennifer Sisson

### Declaration of Interest:

N/A

---

## Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:45 p.m.	<b>Mixed Use Development</b> 2900 King Street East	Pre-consultation FC-18-043 Current Files UHOPA-22-022 & ZAC-22-048	Owner: 2626364 Ontario Inc. c/o Kyle Camerro  Agent and Presentation: Urban Solutions, Planning and Land Development c/o Matt Johnston  RAW Design c/o Roland Rom Colthoff	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.**

### 2900 King Street East, Hamilton

#### Development Proposal Overview

A mixed use development consisting of a 6 storey podium with two towers with heights of 20 and 18 storeys. A total of 564 dwelling units, 356 sq. m. of commercial spaces, 422 parking spaces both at grade and underground, 20 short term and 288 long term bicycle parking are proposed.

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

- What is the relationship of the proposal to the existing neighbourhood character? Does it maintain and where possible, enhance and build upon desirable established patterns, built form and landscapes? (B.2.1.4 b) and B.3.3.2.3 a))
- Is the proposal massed to respect existing and planned street proportions? (B.3.3.3.3)
- Does the proposal recognize and protect the cultural history of the City and its communities? (B.3.3.2.3 c)

#### Panel Comments and Recommendations

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

- The Panel noted that the site has characteristics that would support intensification, including the site fronting onto two arterial roads and separation from existing low density residential dwellings.
- The Panel noted that the proposed development would be precedent setting.

- The Panel recommended that a greater mix and diverse unit in size mix be provided including more family friendly units.

**b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1 & 2)**

- The Panel was split on whether the scale, height and density of the proposed development was appropriate, or whether the scale, height and density was out of step for the area and would therefore recommend a reduction in the height of the podium and towers.
- The Panel was supportive of the architectural style and the simple and bold design but also suggested that additional design changes be considered.
- The Panel noted that the development is being intended to be phased and the Panel recommended that design consideration be taken for the interim condition between the phases.
- The Panel was supportive of the size of the proposed floor plate size.

**c) Site Layout and Circulation (Questions 1 & 3)**

- The Panel noted that the development is taking up the majority of the site which is resulting in significant tree removal and thereby limiting the public use of the site.
- The Panel recommended that more public boulevard amenities be provided.
- The Panel recommended revising the location of the proposed bicycle parking.

**d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy (Questions 1 & 3)**

- The Panel noted that subject property is located between two heritage sites, Battlefield Park a National Historic Site and Stoney Creek Municipal Cemetery, and noted that the proposed development creates a visual obstruction between the heritage sites and between two greenspaces.
- The Panel recommended providing more greenspace at grade and plantings at the rooftop terrace.
- The Panel noted that the westerly lot line with the cemetery functions to an extent as an additional frontage and therefore the façade should be appropriately designed.

**Summary**

The Panel is support of intensification and does believe that the site has characteristics supportive of intensification but the Panel was mixed on whether the proposed scale, height and density was appropriate or if it is out of step with the area and therefore would require a reduction in scale, height and density. The Panel noted that the proposed development is precedent setting. The Panel noted that the site is located between two heritage sites and prominent greenspaces and would serve is a visual obstruction between the two sites. The Panel suggested increased greenspace and public amenities be provided. The Panel was supportive of the architectural design but noted that there were areas for improvement, such as the westerly façade treatment facing the existing cemetery.

**Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.**