



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday January 12th, 2023** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

- David Clusiau
- Dayna Edwards
- Jennifer Mallard
- Joey Giaimo
- Hoda Kameli
- Eldon Theodore

Staff Present:

- Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Design
- Edward Winter, Urban Designer
- PLANNER, Daniel Barnett, Urban Team

Others Present

Presentation #1 Delta Joint Venture, New Horizon Development Group 1284 Main Street East	Sarah Knoll , GSP Group Samantha Irvine , ERA Heritage Consultants G&C Architects Le'Ann Whitehouse Seely , Whitehouse Urban Design Inc. Delta Joint Venture , New Horizon Development Group
--	---

Regrets:

- Ted Watson
- Jennifer Sisson

Declaration of Interest:

N/A

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
1:30 p.m.	Delta Joint Venture 1284 Main Street East	Pre-consultation FC-22-079 Current Files UHOPA-23-006 & ZAC-23-012	Owner: Delta Joint Venture Inc. New Horizon Development Group Agent and Presentation: GSP Group Inc. c/o Sarah Knoll G&C Architects ERA Heritage Consultants c/o Samantha Irvine Whitehouse Urban Design Inc. c/o Le'Ann Whitehouse Seely	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.

1284 Main Street East, Hamilton

Development Proposal Overview

Adaptive reuse of the original building for residential purpose (87 units). Re-development of the remainder of the site for residential buildings including two 3-storey townhouses and two 4-storey stacked townhouses along the perimeter of the site (173 units) and three 14-storey apartment buildings (715 units). A total of 975 dwelling units, 1,121 parking spaces, 49 short term bicycle parking spaces, and 490 long term bicycle parking spaces are proposed.

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- Does the proposal conserve and respect the existing built heritage features of the area? (B.3.3.2.3 d)
- Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form, and character? (B.2.4.1.4 d))
- Does the proposal organize the space in a logical manner through the design, placement, and construction of new design, placement, and construction of new buildings, streets, structures, and landscaping? (B.3.3.2.4 a)

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context (Questions 1, 2)

- The Panel was supportive of re-development for the site and support the adaptive re-use of an existing school and heritage building.
- The Panel while supportive of increased density for the site, raised concern that the proposed density is excessive, which is resulting in removal of heritage features, shadow impacts, heavy building massing, reduced landscaping, and other impacts.
- The Panel encouraged development that retains more of the history of the site and maintains as much of the existing buildings as possible.
- The Panel was supportive of the use of sustainability initiatives for the proposed development.

b) Built Form and Character (Questions 2)

- The Panel recognized that a tremendous amount of work has gone into the proposal.
- The Panel is generally supportive of the general concept of having the lower rise buildings along the perimeter transitioning to the taller buildings in the centre of the site.
- The Panel raised concerns with the massing of the proposed towers, noting that the massing of the buildings has the appearance of being heavy.
- The Panel raised concern about the limited separation of the proposed towers and that the off axis / cantilevering of the upper storeys was further exasperating the tower separation.
- The Panel suggested that towers be reduced to one or two towers that are more slender in floor plate but that additional tower height in a more slender tower would be more appropriate.
- The Panel suggested improving / refining the design of the low-rise buildings along the residential streets.

c) Site Layout and Circulation (Questions 3)

- The Panel noted that the proposed development has significant shadow impacts on the central courtyard.
- The Panel raised concerns that the proposed development is very enclosed and the Panel recommended that the site be opened up to be more inviting to the community, including use by the wider community of at grade amenity areas such as the proposed central courtyard.
- The Panel suggested looking into opportunities to facilitate a community function for the existing auditorium in the portion of the school that is to be retained.
- The Panel recommended providing more of a direct pedestrian connection between Main Street East and Maple Avenue.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy (Questions 2 & 3)

- The Panel recommended that greater landscaping be provided for the proposed development.
- The Panel raised concerns with the ring of hard surfaces around the southern tower.

- The Panel raised concerns that the proposed developments may have a potential impact on the view of the Niagara Escarpment.

Summary

The Panel is supportive of intensification for the subject property and recognize that a lot of work has gone into the proposal. The Panel was concerned that density of the proposed development was too high, resulting in greater removal of the existing heritage building, sun shadow impacts, heavy building massing, reduced landscaping, amongst others. The Panel recommended that the design and massing of the proposed towers should be revised, suggesting that one or two towers that are more slender and less heavy and with greater separation between towers maybe more appropriate, and the Panel suggested that an increase in building height in the context of more slender towers may be appropriate. The Panel is supportive of the adaptive re-use of a heritage building but encourage the retention of more of the existing building. The Panel recommended that revisions to the design of the low-rise building along the perimeter of the site be undertaken. The Panel recommends that increased landscaping be provided on-site, along with greater pedestrian connectivity through the site with a more open site layout which would facilitate greater community use and benefit of the site.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.