



# Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday December 12th, 2024**, via WebEx.

## Panel Members Present:

- Jennifer Mallard, *Vice Chair*
- Ted Watson
- Dayna Edwards
- Jennifer Sisson
- Joey Giaimo

## Staff Present:

- Jana Kelemen, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design
- Michael Vortuba, SPM Heritage and Design
- Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design
- Tricia Collingwood, Area Planning Manager (West)
- Alaina Baldassarra, Planner I

## Others Present

Presentation #2	<b>Matt Johnston</b> , Urban Solutions <b>Le Anne Whitehouse</b> , Whitehouse Urban Design & Landscape Architecture <b>Shem Myszkowski</b> , KNYMH Architecture	
-----------------	---	--

## Regrets:

David Clusieau, Eldon Theodore

## Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

# Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
1:30 pm	<b>Mixed-Use Multiple Residence Proposed Development</b> 925 Main St W & 150 Longwood Rd South	Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendment	Owner: 925 Main Street West (Hamilton) Limited Agent and Presentation: Urban Solutions	Alaina Baldassarra

# 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.**

## 925 Main Street W & 150 Longwood Road S

### Development Proposal Overview

The proposed development includes a mixed-use building complex with two 25-storey towers with a 5 & 6-storey podium. 628 residential units will be served by 382 parking spaces spread over 4 levels of underground parking. Commercial units are planned for the ground level facing both Main Street West and Longwood Road South. Approximately 3,780 square meters of amenity space is proposed.

### Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- *How well does the proposed massing build upon the established pattern of development – noting the differences between the existing conditions on the north and south sides of Main Street West. Does the proposal include elements of transition successfully noting the lower density residential on the north side of Main Street West and the challenge of the two open corners with the adjacent school and commercial plaza?*
- *How well does the proposal develop the pedestrian realm along the street corner condition of Main Street West and Longwood Road South? Does the relationship of the building façade, landscape and sidewalk provide ample space for the proposed growth in pedestrian use?*
- *How successfully does the proposed development consider the view from the highway condition, and does the massing integrate with the site?*
- *How does the proposal respect and use the natural topography of the subject site to an advantage, and does the proposal address the condition of the highway below to the south? Does the proposed development use the existing natural features / trees and vegetation as transition and screening from adjacent properties and the highway condition?*
- *How well does the proposed building (and landscape) design incorporate sustainable design features?*

### Panel Comments and Recommendations

#### a) Overview and Response to Context

- Panel members generally were supportive of the proposed infill density in the proposal which also included commercial units at grade to support the community and strengthen the pedestrian realm with an active streetscape.
- The panel did have some concern for the strategy employed to use the lower (southern) portion of lands next to HWY 403 and the number of mature trees that would be removed to facilitate the design, however there was also interest in the ability to use the land for an amenity space / potentially a POPS parkette space.

#### b) Built Form and Character

- Panel members noted the two towers being proposed as the same height was not beneficial to the overall design and made the proposed complex seem larger and heavier than it should. Panel members suggested creating some asymmetry in the tower heights.

- Panel members noted the towers were larger than the 750m<sup>2</sup> floor plates suggested by the Tall Building Guidelines, and further suggested to refine the tower floorplates to reduce the overall area, and add articulation to the exterior design.

**c) Site Layout and Circulation**

- Panel members also noted the location of the parking ramp felt out of place next to the amenity space entrance – and noted concern for competing pedestrian circulation and vehicular space.
- Panel members noted the pedestrian connection to the large exterior amenity space south of the proposed building was not refined and felt like a void or no-man’s land.
- Panel members also noted the size of the green space lent itself to wider public use potentially a POPS (Privately-Owned-Public Space) – but also felt the space needed better access, more visibility across/through the site, potentially from Longwood Rd.

**d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy**

- The panel appreciated the commercial units at grade and the layout of the generous sidewalk space to serve these units. Panel members encouraged adding some soft landscaping and additional tree planting as the design is refined.
- The panel noted the challenge with the change in grade/topography of the southern portion of the property proposed as an exterior amenity / parkette space. A panel member noted the desire to reduce the number of (mature) tree removals to facilitate the design. Panel members also expressed concern for the quality of amenity space based on the adjacent 403 Highway presenting obvious noise concerns and potential safety issues.
- Panel members noted the need to refine the access and lighting in the amenity space for comfortable and safe usage.

## Summary

Overall, the panel was receptive towards an infill development at this location – noting the arterial roads and proximity to both employment and schools could support the increase in density. The panel felt the massing of the building left room for refinement, both in the tower design/layout, and the resolution at grade between the building and the amenity space / parkette.

In the lower southern portion of the site, the panel saw an opportunity for a public-use space with the amenity space which could benefit the larger community at the same time as providing amenity space for residents, however the panel also noted several concerns to be addressed for access, lighting and noise with the adjacent HWY 403.

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.**