



City of Hamilton
Design Review Panel
VIRTUAL WebEx
Meeting Summary – March 10, 2022

Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on Thursday March 10, 2022 via Webex Events.

Panel Members Present:

- Jennifer Mallard, OAA, MRAIC, AIA (Chair)
- Ted Watson, OAA ARCHITECT AIBC AAA SAA NSAA Int'l. Assoc. AIA FRAIC LEED AP Partner (Vice-Chair)
- Calvin Brook, FRAIC, MCIP, OAA, MAA, SAA, RPP, AICP, LEED AP
- David Clusiau, OAA, AIBC, NCARB, FRAIC, LEED AP
- Tony Cupido, Ph.D., P.Eng.
- Petra Matar, OAA, MRAIC, CPHD
- Richard Witt, B.E.S., B.Arch., OAA, AAA, AIBC, MAA, SAA, NSAA, AANB, FRAIC, NCARB, LEED AP
- Paula Hamilton, BES, OAA

Panel Member Regrets:

- Eldon Theodore, BES, MUDS, MLAI, MCIP, RPP

City of Hamilton Staff Present:

- Steve Robichaud, Director of Planning and Chief Planner
- Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Urban Design
- Christine Newbold, Manager, Sustainable Communities
- Mark Kehler, Senior Planner, Development Planning
- Jennifer Roth, Planner I, Sustainable Communities
- Chris Phillips, Manager, Municipal Land Development Office
- Andrea Smith, Senior Consultant – West Harbour Redevelopment, Municipal Land Development Office

Applicant and Design Team Present:

- Bruce Kuwabara, KPMB Architects
- Luka Matutinovic, Purpose Building Inc.

Declaration of Interests:

None

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.

Proposal Overview

Waterfront Shores Partners is the developer of Pier 8, municipally known as 65 Guise Street East. The architect and sustainability expert from the Waterfront Shores Partners development team presented three conceptual 45 storey tower designs. Bruce Kuwabara indicated that the point tower would become a landmark similar to the McQuesten High Level bridge entry markers designed by John Lyle. Vertical windows in all options allow for views both up and down.

The three tower options include:

1. Cylinder
 - This tower option is a response to the geometry of the site and has an aerodynamic form.
2. Waves
 - The scalloped edges of this option allow a wider view from each individual unit. This is a variation of the basic form.
3. Lily
 - The floorplan shape of this option is a reference to the lilies at Cootes Paradise, and brings this reference of the natural environment to the working waterfront.

Key Questions to the Panel

- 1) To what extent do each of the proposed options implement the Pier 8 Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines?

- 2) To what extent do each of the tower design options capture the standards and design criteria required to create a unique building with high quality design and exceptionalism?
- 3) To what extent do each of the tower design options portray innovation in sustainability and quality of life for occupants?
- 4) To what extent do each of the proposed options serve as a visual anchor and regional/metropolitan scale landmark?
- 5) Are there design considerations that have not been contemplated that would contribute to design excellence, innovation in sustainability and quality of life for occupants?
- 6) What are the key features related to design excellence, quality of life for its occupants and/or sustainability that are integral and should be carried forward to the final proposed development concept for the official plan and zoning by-law amendment and site plan application?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

Overall Compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines and Implementation Process

- The Panel sought clarification on the podium height. Confirmation was provided that all three tower concepts have a two-storey condition which is not reflective of the guidelines requirement for a three storey podium.
- The Panel clarified that the building envelope of the three tower design options is within the envelope stipulated by the urban design guidelines.
- The Panel stated that this building should be an exemplar for all tall buildings to live up to and that it should be an inspiration for the City of Hamilton.
- Several Panel members suggested that there could be an opportunity to soften the transition between the two floor plate sizes (850 and 650 square metres). The Panel requests additional exploration of alternatives (ie. gradual transition/stepbacks) to the design concepts that illustrate two distinct floor plates.
- The Panel noted that they expected three very distinct tower concepts including variations in application of sustainability and quality of life measures. The three tower concepts presented have been viewed by the Panel as minor variations on the same core design, with no significant distinction in sustainability or quality of life initiatives. The Panel proffered that without three distinct tower concepts, the implementation process outlined in the urban design guidelines may not be adequately implemented.

Site Context

- The Panel understands that should the 45 storey height be permitted, Blocks 7 and 8 on Pier 8, which are two blocks adjacent to two storey homes on Guise Street East, would have their building heights reduced to improve the transition into the existing residential neighbourhood. The Panel requested further detail on the changes to Blocks 7 and 8.

Design Excellence

- The Panel notes that they are confident in the architectural team’s ability to design a building that will be beautiful regardless of which design is selected.
- Several of the Panel Members appreciated the natural design shape of the Lily design concept. The Panel valued the story of this design iteration, where it represents a transition between the industrial working waterfront and the natural heritage lands in Cootes Paradise. The Panel also appreciated how the Lily design concept changes as you move around the harbour, giving it subtly different readings. The softer curves of the Lily design gives the appearance of a more slender form and is representative of the residential nature of the building.
- The Cylinder design concept is an iconic form, however the Panel expressed that there are some challenges that come with that purity of the cylinder form including a very corporate and downtown expression.
- The Panel suggested that there could be a more significant expression on the top of the building and expressed concern that the mechanical penthouse would dominate the massing.
- The Panel noted that the three design concepts have been designed to be iconic from many miles away, however they have requested that further detail be provided to understand how the buildings have been designed to address the human scale along the mews space, greenway and the public realm.

Sustainability

- The Panel was concerned that the sustainability targets presented for the three tower design options were not reflective of the aspirations that have been outlined in the urban design guidelines.
- The Panel commented that a landmark building of this stature should be an inspiration for sustainable development within Hamilton and Ontario more broadly.

- The Panel stated landmark tall building in this location should seek aspirational sustainability certification levels to address the fact that the City of Hamilton has declared a Climate Emergency.
- The Panel cautioned that LEED Silver is not sufficient for a building of this landmark stature and location. The Panel suggested that LEED Platinum and Toronto Green Standard Version 4 should be the minimum standard sought for a building of this stature.
- The Panel was encouraged to hear that geothermal heat exchange is being explored. Further detail on the application of geothermal heat exchange was requested. The Panel requested that consideration should be given to how a geothermal system could be provided across the entirety of Pier 8.
- The Panel is supportive of partial electrification and heat pumps to reduce energy consumption within the tower form.
- The Panel was supportive of the passive design elements of the conceptual building designs that will assist in reducing the energy required for cooling in warmer months. The passive design elements include massing, recessed balconies and the ratio of vertical wall surface to enclosed floor area. The Panel recommended that further consideration be given to the window to wall ratio and the material selection to improve energy efficiency through passive design.
- The Panel sought further clarification and information on the methods that the proponent will use to reduce embodied carbon.
- The Panel sought further detail on the mechanical systems and how they could be enhanced for efficiency.
- The Panel considered if there were alternative financial sources to encourage a higher standard of sustainable development.
- The Panel requests a firm commitment to a sustainability target in the next iteration of the design.

Quality of Life

- The Panel inquired about the methodology of the wind study and suggested that a wind tunnel study be completed instead of just computer modelling. In addition to the wind mitigation methods presented (recessed lobby entrance, landscape elements and podium wind screen), the Panel wanted further detail about the range of options to mitigate wind on the north side of the building.
- The Panel suggested that community participation through public art could benefit the proposal.
- The Panel appreciated the large lobby space and the explanation of the indoor amenity spaces co-located with the outdoor spaces above the podium.

- The Panel requested that further detail be provided on how the WELL standard would enhance quality of life of the residents through community building programming.
- The Panel requested further detail on Family Friendly design.

Visual Anchor/Landmark and Public Access

- The Panel suggested consideration should be given to providing innovative ways for the site to benefit the broader public.
- The Panel suggested that Block 16 may have been viewed as publicly accessible based on the current Planning policy framework. The Panel recommended the building design should incorporate publicly accessible community programming within a three storey podium (ie. commercial uses or meeting rooms for rent) or alternatively, public access to the building could include access to the rooftop to appreciate the views.

Site Layout, Landscaping and Public Realm Interface

- The Panel expressed that there could be different design solutions to avoid approximately 100 metres of loading and parking areas adjacent to the public realm along the northern edge of the property.
- The Panel is concerned with the cantilevered base over planted areas. Further information and detail should be provided on the landscape plan.

Summary

The Design Review Panel was concerned that the implementation process outlined in the Pier 8 Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines has not been adequately followed. The Panel recommends that the future submission include more detail, specifically focused on sustainability targets and certification, quality of life measures and a refined design. City of Hamilton staff will consider the comment, review the process established in the Pier 8 Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines and evaluate timelines.

The Panel would like to see further detail on the design in the following areas:

- Further detail on the façade expression and alternatives to precast built forms.
- Consideration for additional stepbacks as the building rises to avoid the uniformity of the two floor plate elements and give the perception of a thinner profile.
- Further detail on the façade expression including materiality and fenestration (window to wall ratio)
- Detail on the programming approaches for the balconies and terraces.

- Further detail regarding the townhome units and how the design would change for live/work units.
- Further detail on the lighting strategy of the building exterior.
- Enhanced roof top/penthouse expression.
- Detail on the design of Pedestrian Mews including the public realm, landscaping and transitional strategy between the private units.

The Panel would like to see a firm commitment to a sustainability target in the next iteration of the design, including:

- Commitment to LEED Platinum, Net Zero Carbon and/or equivalence to TGS tier 4
- Understanding of how geothermal could work within the broader Pier 8 development.
- Exploration of the potential for rain water capture and greywater reuse.
- Commitment to a specified percentage of electric car charging stations and ability to expand the grid in an efficient way.

The Panel wants to better understand the quality of life measures included in the proposal, including:

- How the WELL standard is going enhance the quality of life (ie. urban agriculture, air quality, etc.?)
- How the building will be child and family friendly?
- How the townhouse units can be designed to be live/work?
- How the amenity spaces go above and beyond standard offerings in condominiums?
- Exploration of opportunities to have space open to the general public in the building.
- Detail on the innovation of the unit designs in the tower and the townhome units.



City of Hamilton

Design Review Panel

VIRTUAL WebEx

Meeting Summary – April 27, 2022

Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel (DRP) met virtually on Wednesday April 27, 2022 via Webex Events in relation to proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment application for a 45-storey residential tower located at Pier 8 Block 16, known municipally as 65 Guise Street East.

At the meeting, the proponent, Waterfront Shores Partners, provided meeting materials and presented the preferred design option related to the development applications. Changes to the design from the concepts presented at the March 8, 2022 Community Meeting, and March 10, 2022 DRP Meeting No. 1 were highlighted. Members of the DRP asked questions of clarification, as well as provided comments and recommendations on the proposed design concept.

Panel Members Present:

- Jennifer Mallard, OAA, MRAIC, AIA (Chair)
- Ted Watson, OAA ARCHITECT AIBC AAA SAA NSAA Int'l. Assoc. AIA FRAIC LEED AP Partner (Vice-Chair)
- Calvin Brook, FRAIC, MCIP, OAA, MAA, SAA, RPP, AICP, LEED AP
- David Clusiau, OAA, AIBC, NCARB, FRAIC, LEED AP
- Tony Cupido, Ph.D., P.Eng.
- Petra Matar, OAA, MRAIC, CPHD
- Paula Hamilton, BES, OAA
- Eldon Theodore, BES, MUDES, MLAI, MCIP, RPP

Panel Member Regrets:

- Richard Witt, B.E.S., B.Arch., OAA, AAA, AIBC, MAA, SAA, NSAA, AANB, FRAIC, NCARB, LEED AP

City of Hamilton Staff Present:

- Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage and Urban Design
- Christine Newbold, Manager, Sustainable Communities
- Mark Kehler, Senior Planner, Development Planning
- Jennifer Roth, Planner I, Sustainable Communities
- Andrea Smith, Senior Consultant – West Harbour Redevelopment, Municipal Land Development Office

Note: Other city staff were also in attendance as meeting observers.

Applicant and Design Team Present:

- Bruce Kuwabara, KPMB Architects
- Francesco Valente Gorjup, KPMB
- Luka Matutinovic, Purpose Building Inc.
- Hanqing Wu, RWDI
- Pat Hanson, GH3
- Guiseppe Valela, Tercot
- Sam Crignano, Citizen

Declaration of Interests

None

Summary of Comments

Note: The Design Review Panel is strictly an advisory body and makes recommendations to Planning Division staff and the proponent on the design options presented. 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.

Proposal Overview

At the April 27th meeting, Waterfront Shore Partners presented the preferred design option (Bruce Kuwabara of KPMB, Luka Matutinovic, of Purpose, Pat Hanson of GH3).

The preferred design option is an evolution of one of the three designs presented at the March 10, 2022 DRP meeting and is referred to as the “Lily”.

For a detailed summary of the proposed tower design option provided by KPMB, refer to *Appendix A: KPMB letter dated April 27, 2022 Re: Block 16 Design Review Panel Meeting #2* (attached).

A general summary of the proposed design concept is as follows:

The concept is a 45-storey residential tower that steps down to a 30-storey element, including a three-storey podium and six townhouses on the east side of the building.

The building design is contemporary in character, comprised of undulating curves of the tower in a rich copper-bronze colouration and distinctive façade elements enhancing its vertical proportions. The proposed building materials, lighting and design consider the aesthetics of the building in the day and night sky. The cylindrical form creates unique spaces for building residents.

The townhouses are convertible to live/work units, and a restaurant space is proposed on the south face of the podium addressing the publicly accessible Greenway element running across Pier 8. The Greenway includes landscaping and stormwater management elements. The building design and podium mitigate wind impacts of the site.

The third floor provides indoor and outdoor amenity spaces for residents. Consideration of public realm elements include consideration of buildings materiality, building design, uses and outdoor spaces at grade.

The sustainability strategy related to the proposed tower is innovative within the real estate development industry to make the first tower in Canada to be triple-certified—LEED Gold, Energy Star, and WELL.

Key Questions to the Panel

Members of the DRP reviewed the meeting materials and presentation, and provided comments and recommendations in accordance to the evaluation context below:

- 1) To what extent does the proposed tower design implement the Pier 8 Block 16 Urban Design Guidelines?
- 2) To what extent does the proposed tower design capture the standards and design criteria required to create a unique building with high quality design and exceptionalism?
- 3) To what extent does the proposed tower design portray innovation in sustainability and quality of life for occupants?
- 4) To what extent does the proposed tower design serve as a visual anchor and regional/metropolitan scale landmark?

DRP Member Questions & Waterfront Shores Partners Responses

DRP Questions	Waterfront Shores Partners Response
Is there a significance or a connection between the selected materials and proposed design?	<p>We are looking at locally sourced brick, Ontario hardwoods (e.g. maple and oak), and Ontario stone (e.g. limestone).</p> <p>We also are considering materials on the ground, which will be on the outside of the building and into the lobby. Considering if it will be the same material.</p>
Was there consideration of other façade expression alternatives before coming to the preferred design option?	<p>Yes, there was a tapered smooth bullnose and a flatter version (reverse scalloped), but these were more appropriate for the cylindrical building design.</p> <p>The Lilly is based on convex and concave curves in a very repetitive way accentuating the line of the perimeter. It gives the desired solidity but also opens the view.</p>
Which areas are publicly accessible?	<p>Clarified that there will be restrictions in building entry. What is truly ‘public’ is the public realm around the building, the landscaping, restaurant and greenway. The amenity room could be booked, subject to security clearance.</p> <p>Design option does not consider taking public access to the roof top based on economic and security measures. Will provide opportunities for bicycling, more will be done on the site plan.</p>
Re: geexchange system, what is meant by hybrid?	<p>Hybrid means less than 100% of the peak annual heating and cooling and domestic hot water loads will be met by geexchange system. The balance will be through conventional energy generation means.</p> <p>There is a density of load associated with proposed building height and available</p>

	<p>site area which serves as a constraint. Given this and load reduction, the ground cannot meet 100%. There are various other limitations. A transition plan for the condo could enable transition to full system over time.</p>
<p>Was there consideration for stormwater harvesting (e.g. toilet flushing)?</p>	<p>Greywater toilet flushing is not under consideration now, but all landscaping irrigation will be provided by stormwater.</p>
<p>Is goal to eliminate the fossil fuels over time? What are the enabling steps?</p>	<p>The building design would not preclude/would enable evolution from use of fossil fuels. Steps are being taken to remove those barriers and assist feasibility of transitioning. It would be up to the condo to implement. Examples of ways to support transition are: 1) In suite heat pumps vs fan coils 2) Where future of electrical service would sit on site and how it makes it way through the building. 3) Where equipment would live in the mechanical penthouse.</p>
<p>Re: Reduce longer term emissions in flexibility of the layout outs?</p>	<p>The idea over time is that a system could be designed, to combine units and could be feasible in the future. There is still a lot of consideration; space layouts still need to get resolved.</p>
<p>Have photovoltaic cells in cladding been considered?</p>	<p>We don't think it is the best use of the technology. We think that there are better strategies that deliver a better return on investment and go further in reducing carbon.</p>
<p>Is the intent to use curved glass vs segmented glass? It is an important component of organic theme.</p>	<p>There may be a combination of straight and curved glass. We want to do enough so that it is present but not to overdo it. Need to consider the spatial effects of the curved glass. Still need to consider how many glass elements to include and their location.</p>

Could there be a program element at top of tower?	Not a consideration.
Is there consideration of an alternative restaurant location with water view?	The proposed location gets the south light and connects to the community on the greenway. It also helps block the wind, and connects with a spectacular view of the marina. Potentially could do both.
Re: parking garage, what is the extent of the electrification for battery powered vehicles?	There is a plan for 10% of provided parking spaces to be electrified for vehicles on day 1, and provisions to be made for full electrification in the future (via conduit runs).
How does building compare to other landmark buildings?	In terms of carbon, Canada is a leader in shifting carbon emissions. That is why the design is on carbon reduction not just energy efficiency (this is an area of focus for the design). This is a market-driven development, and not institutional and government entity investment. Would estimate that this proposal is in top 10% in Canada.
How will building adapt in the future?	The condo corporation will have a role in managing the capital renewal plan and relates to adaptability. That said, material selection and durability will be a factor. Excellent operational efficiency can be achieved today with further future transitions happening in the future. Design and construction quality are important factors, and Waterfront Shores has delivered in this regard to date. One of the elements of LEED strategy is fully commissioning across the board including envelop commissioning, which addresses innovation in sustainability.
With minimalist design approach, the detailing becomes critical to successful outcome. The materials and fins are painted? Has there been consideration of how balcony ceiling is painted?	Yes, they are painted. Re: haven't fully considered painting of underside of the balcony; do not want it to be too dark. Lighting on balcony is important and can be warm.

What is materiality of the hardscape?	Could use curve and fill in concrete, or could be sandblasted concrete, which could be also be taken into the building. If not using concrete, we could consider bound granular. This needs to be further considered.
Re: sustainability and details in achieving high performing building, are the concrete slabs thermally broken in relation to balconies to ensure warm interior floors?	We are still studying.
Has there been consideration of triple glazing in any of the area?	Yes, did consider however decision has been made to prioritize effort that delivers carbon benefit with is geoexchange.

Comments and Recommendations

Design:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enjoy the design, a lot of great elements. • Lily floor plate is more dynamic type of units leading to better quality of life. • Lily design is an improved floor plate. • Opportunity for refining night element of penthouse for enhanced lit expression. • Progression of design concept has been great, particularly at the ground level. • Perhaps there could be further explanation of how this building relates to built form context of Pier 8. • Strong evolution from first design in buildings design and elegance. • Support how this design has developed. • The concept is a successful design. The curved elements are important. • Refinements to landscape design are very successful. • Refinements to design, in particular to lower podium and Lily curve design are integral. • Program elements that support the family positive aspects elements of the project are successful. • Commend the effort. • Lily theme complements the Greenway theme. • The Lily form achieves a slender expression, and the modulating design is interesting. • The way the building is designed, and penthouse as part of landmark element is successful. • Consider further studying the soffit materials so that it “glimmers and glints” making “people smile”.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In consideration of the site context and proposed design concept, opinion is that a tower on this site is appropriate, noting decision is to be made by Council. • The proposed design concept is achieving the objectives that were set out for this building, just some further work on sustainability is needed. • Colour has improved the design. Consider further study of different colours at a future development stage (e.g. at site plan stage). • Appreciate the addition of the restaurant enabling public into the building. Consider modification so that restaurant takes up a portion of the podium without entering the building lobby and serviced by single story elevator to bring elevated views. • Consider removing upper storey balconies; questioned desirability. Glazed-in rooms can offer alternative amenity space (e.g. greenhouse room). • Design has really progressed. • Idea of copper hue is positive development to differentiate this building and is a play of light and shadow. • Incorporation of natural materials will help with depth. • Restaurant is a positive contribution to the proposal, activating the mews. • Scale of the podium to the mews is positive. • Landscape design is compelling, tying the entire site together. • Consider further study of materiality and detail of building fins in a more finessed way. • Regarding rooftop, appreciate consideration of limiting spill of light to the sky. Consider hybrid approach of penthouse to add lightness, to bring texture and lightness as was developed at the podium. • Consider termination of the low podium. • Design concept includes a straight wall in the lobby that is opaque and intersects the curtain wall. Consider dematerializing and making it more transparent and fluid. • Impressive project.
Process:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have liked more background on rationale of façade elements (e.g. window-wall ratio), and maybe have some options.
Sustainability:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability targets have improved and uniqueness in the approach. • Given City’s declaration of climate emergency, the renewed carbon reduction targets from the Federal government and DRP’s mandate, these factors could lead to proposal to zero carbon, understanding the challenges that it would bring. • The Pier 8 Greenway provides an opportunity of a geothermal field. • Opportunity for City to contribute to sustainably objectives. • Innovation in sustainability should remain the focus of this project.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Landscaping presentation was helpful. The proposed landscaping provides opportunity for powerful public realm.• Should consider expanding the geothermal field that could serve multiple developments/projects.• Achieving a net zero carbon and all electric building would support this building achieve objective of exceptional.• Excited about geothermal on this site.• Commitment to LEED Gold is laudable.• Recognition that this project is serving as a lightning rod for sustainability, the real target is City of Hamilton. The City needs to set policy “with teeth” and establish sustainability goals in place, so that all projects are guided.
Urban Design Guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regarding UDG 6.8.2 utilize bioswale raingardens, consider revisiting compliance to this guideline.• The project is generally following the guideline and is reflecting them.
Public Realm
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development of public realm is great to see and that this building and landscaping is friendly is important.• Location of the restaurant is an animator of the Greenway. The Greenway is important key public space and feature of Pier 8, integrating environmental objectives in the project.

Summary:

- All agree that this is strong proposal.
- The design concept has come along far from first meeting.
- The design concept is achieving its objective in meeting design excellence.
- This will be an elegant solution as it develops further.
- We’ve seen improvements to the character and refinement of the cladding system.
- We’ve seen improvements in scale and development of the mews as a habitable outside street.
- The move from white approach building to copper colour is a great move. It is warm, playful, light reflectance and reminiscent of steel industry town. Look forward to seeing that concept develop.
- Appreciate comment of design that makes people smile, and role of materiality.

- Consider an approach of removing balconies on upper stories.
- The 3D massing development is very successful, the low podium exaggerating the ground plane is a good move.
- Transition at 30th floor and elegantly reaching up to taller portion of tower is a good approach.
- Subtle glow of rooftop is successful. Consider not capping it; rather a gentle approach to the sky,
- On sustainability front, great to see LEED Gold commitment, Well and Energy Star. There is opportunity to raise the bar further. Exemplary in innovation, getting us to net zero carbon is an ask.
- Consideration of greenway for whole campus, thinking broadly about the site.
- Wall cladding photovoltaics could be explored and could be an opportunity to enhance energy of the building.
- Encourage elimination of fossil fuels now versus over time.
- Minimalist approach with the detailing will be exquisite.
- Curve glass is important to carry it up the Lily.
- Strong development of texture and variation of the ground plane.
- Addition of a restaurant is brilliant, increasing public face around the building.
- Overall, great to see the development, this can be landmark in the City.

Waterfront Shores Partners (Response)

- This process is one of the most complex and front-loaded projects experienced by the team.
- There has been so much comprehensive and integrated design thinking at this stage as part of OPA and ZBA application process.
- It is a real challenge from various perspectives, because this is at the design concept stage rather than full schematic design stage with full structural design.
- WSP has embraced the process.
- Also need to consider the market in Hamilton for residential on this site.
- Panel has been fair and upfront.
- Cannot do everything in a commercial project in a commercial market. Condo context is a different context to Government buildings, or to a context when there is a long-term ownership structure. Need to consider how to place the measures properly. The truth of the project is in consideration of a particular economy, context and market. Waterfront Shores understands that context and has been successful.
- The Design Review Panel's comments have been extremely influential to the design thinking of the process.

- Incorporating sustainability measures into the design has been a balance of implementing “depth” with “breadth” of measures.
- Recognize that an argument could be made to take a narrower focus and fully implement them. However, the approach taken by WSP has been to implement breadth of the guidelines to address all the of the sustainability considerations and to elevate them. This is where there is tension as to whether to fully address select measures or to raise the bar across the majority.
- All electric buildings cost more the operate, however that will flip at some point over the next 5-10 years.
- Appreciate feedback and conversation.