



## Meeting Summary

---

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2023** via WebEx.

### Panel Members Present:

**David Clusiau**, *Chair*

**Dayna Edwards**

**Jennifer Sisson**

**Eldon Theodore**

**Jennifer Mallard**

**Joey Giaimo**

**Ted Watson**

### Staff Present:

**Jana Kelemen**, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design

**Michael Vortuba**, SPM Heritage and Design

**Edward Winter**, Planner 1-Urban Design

**James Van Rooi**, Senior Planner

### Others Present

<b>Presentation #3</b>	<b>Rick Lintack</b> , Lintack Architects <b>Megan Hobson</b> , Hobson Heritage Consultants	
------------------------	---	--

### Regrets:

None

### Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

## Schedule:

---

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
2:45 pm	<b>Multi-Residential Buliding</b> 233-235 Hunter Street East	Site Plan Application	Owner: Fennor Holdings Ltd. Agent and Presentation: Lintack Architects	Jennifer Catarino

# 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.**

## 233 – 235 Hunter Street East

### Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing a 6-storey multiple dwelling containing 24 units and outdoor amenity space.

Staff note the original FC submission was for 4-storey rental apartment with 20 units and three parking spaces with 81 square metres of outdoor amenity area and 65 square metres of roof terrace.

### 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?
- Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character?
- What is the relationship of the proposal with the height, massing and scale of nearby residential buildings?
- Does the proposal promote intensification that is compatible in form and function to the character of existing community and site?
- Does the proposal conserve and respect the existing built heritage features of the area and use materials that are consistent and compatible with the surrounding context?

### Panel Comments and Recommendations

#### a) Overview and Response to Context

The panel appreciated the input from the heritage consultant and noted the clear coordination with the architectural design which produced a development proposal that is appropriate and sensitive to the surrounding context.

#### b) Built Form and Character

The panel appreciated the datum lines seen in the massing which related to the adjacent buildings along Hunter Street. In discussion, the heritage consultant noted that the datum line could be raised to the 3 ½-storey level without compromising the sensitivity to the surroundings. The panel agreed with this notion, and further noted that the quality and care of architectural design would still remain with the higher datum line – suggesting design of the building would look like it was meant to be – rather than trying to bend to something that was hiding height.

#### c) Site Layout and Circulation

The panel heard the evolution of design which saw the retention of several mature trees and the provision of an amenity space at grade in the rear yard. The panel was very receptive of the change and suggested that there might be space for additional bike parking to be found – particularly covered storage for colder months.

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

The panel felt the design was very befitting the community context and also appreciated the two proposed street trees on Hunter Street.

The panel suggested a canopy or architectural detail at the main entrance could further add to the streetscape appeal of the proposed building.

**Summary**

In summary, the panel thanked the applicant and consultants for their work and the resulting infill project – noting this is a “missing middle” project that is vital to vibrant neighbourhoods. The panel felt the massing was appropriate and with minor updates should be a great example of a low-rise building infill project using design to achieve a sensitive response to the surrounding context.

The panel wanted to thank the applicant for the meaningful engagement of the heritage consultant, and thanked the heritage consultant for attending the Design Review Panel and contributing to a very productive conversation.

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