

City of Hamilton

Design Review Panel

Meeting Summary – 96 Main Street East

The Design Review Panel met virtually at 2:45pm on Thursday September 10th, 2026, via WebEX.

Development Proposal	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
Mixed-Use Multiple Residence Development 96 Main Street East	Site Plan Application, with Minor Variance	Owner: Tamwood Developments c/o Steve Pocrnic Agent and Presentation: A.J. Clarke & Associates Ltd.	Michael Fiorino, Planner 1

Panel Members Present:

- Jennifer Mallard, Chair
- Sharon Mittman
- Olga Pushkar
- Tyler Walker
- Eric Lucic
- Jennifer Sisson

Regrets:

- Dennis Lago
- Graham Taylor
- Shadi Adab

Declarations: None

Staff Present:

- Jana Kelemen, Manager Heritage & Urban Design
- Michael Votruba, Program Lead Urban Design
- Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design
- Michael Fiorino, Planner 1

Others Present:

- Ryan Ferrari, A.J. Clarke
- Jon McGinn, Chamberlain Architects
- Claudia Costa, Chamberlain Architects
- Michael Krasic , Tamwood Development

Summary of Comments: 96 Main Street East

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.

Key Discussion Topics suggested to the Panel by Planning Staff:

- How well does the building base or podium work to support the pedestrian realm and establish a street wall on Main Street?
- How well does the proposed design mitigate the shadow and wind impacts at street level and the common shared amenity terrace?
- How does the landscaping plan work to support an active streetscape on the three sides: Main Street East, Catharine Street South and Bowen Street and noting the different characteristics of each street.
- How is the design implementing sensitivity towards the heritage building directly south of the subject site, and is the narrow gap between the buildings effective in this regard?

Panel Comments and Recommendations:

Overview and Response to Context

- The panel was generally supportive of the massing and density for the subject site, but there were some questions regarding the lower massing.
- The panel felt there was still opportunity to improve the relationship between the heritage building to the south in reference to the relatively small gap between the proposed building and the existing stone structure, as well as the material selection and detailing on the south elevation.

Built Form and Character

- The panel appreciated the exterior detailing of the upper portions of the building – particularly the texture and mullions.
- Panel members felt there was an excess of parking being proposed given the Main Street location and access to both local and regional transit options available basically at the doorstep. Panel members asked if there was any thought given to designing the podium parking levels so they could be converted to residential in the future.

- Panel members were generally supportive of the exterior massing and detailing but panel members did not feel EIFS materials (smooth or patterned) were not appropriate on lower levels of the building.
- Panel members encouraged the upper floor plates to be revised to be closer to the suggested 750 square metre maximum suggested in the City of Hamilton's Tall Building Guidelines.
- Panel members saw the need to improve the wind performance on the shared amenity roof terrace to ensure use and enjoyment of the (urban) residents.
- Panel members felt there should be more 3-bedroom units proposed in the suite-mix to support a full range of residents.

Site Layout and Circulation

- Panel members appreciated the parking entrances being located off the side streets: Caroline and Bowen which left Main Street to be a truly pedestrian frontage
- Panel members had questions as to whether the Bowen Street right-of-way width was sufficient to support the building accesses for service vehicles. It was noted by the applicant planner and planning staff that Bowen Street was an oddity in the area currently without curbs, but that the road could be urbanized to include curbs and sidewalks as shown on the landscape drawings.
- Additionally, panel members posed the question if a reduction in parking could give an opportunity to increase the setback from the south property line – and give some additional separation between the proposed building and the adjacent stone heritage building.
- Panel members questioned the two vehicular access points and wondered if a single access point could work with the site plan. The applicant planner confirmed the requirement for forward motion entering and exiting for service vehicles made the 2nd entrance a requirement.
- Panel members appreciated the commitment to long term bike parking

Streetscape, the Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

- Panel members appreciated the pedestrian nature of the Main Street East frontage noting the large, cantilevered podium was a little awkward in some areas but nonetheless provided for an open and protected sidewalk space in front of the building.
- Panel members expressed a design for some larger, more permanent landscape planting included in place of the potted plants proposed.

- Panel members expressed a desire to see the side streets receive some upgraded pedestrian features wrapping around the building from Main Street and connecting to the building / property to the south.

Summary

The panel thanked the applicant team for a presentation and offered support for development at the site and offered some comments and suggestions that could improve the proposed development in terms of design, function and fit within the existing community.

- The panel appreciated the overall massing and colour and texturing of the exterior and the treatment of the mullions.
- The panel noted the compact site and diminutive gap or separation between the adjacent stone heritage building and encouraged some design review to improve the separation and the treatment of the elevation facing the stone building to be more sympathetic to the existing building.
- The panel appreciated the pedestrian nature of the Main Street East frontage and encouraged more of that feeling to be wrapped around the proposed building onto the side streets as space enables.
- The panel was not supportive of EIFS use at ground level, but saw it as appropriate on higher levels as a means to manage building budget.
- The panel encouraged additional 3-bedroom suites within the suite mix to support families and multi-family options in housing.
- Panel members encouraged wind screens and improvement of the wind performance on the shared amenity roof terraces for year round use, noting the urban setting and importance of exterior spaces for recreation uses.

The Meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm