

**Planning Advisory Committee
SCAOPI/500 Claremont Avenue—Public presentation meeting
Held on Tuesday, December 11, 2018**

Present at the front tables

Planning Advisory Committee member: C.Peart, Councillor, District 4
J. Gersovitz, Chairman
E. Marosi
G. Soiferman

Assisted by: Tom Flies, Urban Planning Director

Applicants: Christine Lalonde, Groupe forum
Gideon Pollack, Groupe forum
Noémie Valensi, Groupe forum
Jean-Pierre Bart, Architect

Agenda

1. Introduction, by C. Peart
2. PPCMOI/SCAOPI application procedure, by Tom Flies
3. Summary of public meeting procedure, by J. Gersovitz
4. Presentation of proposal by applicant
5. Questions by P.A.C. members
6. Comments from public

Detailed minutes of the questions and the comments of the P.A.C. and the public

5. Questions by P.A.C. members:

1. P.A.C: Do you have the original 3D's of the first PPCMOI for comparison?

C. Lalonde: The Administration has them.

T. Flies: As of today, the previous approval is available for consultation on the City website, so everyone can consult it for comparison.

2. P.A.C: Was there any reason why your renderings didn't show the penthouse?

C. Lalonde: There is no reason, it's just because of the perspective view.

3. P.A.C: On the south elevation, your parking level, which is let's say 90%, the width of the site creates a plateau going towards the south of the site. I have never really seen an indication of the wall that it will create on the south end of the site.

G. Pollack: Are you talking of the garage entrance?

P.A.C: No, actually on the south end of the site. What visual effect will the wall have?

J.P. Bart: Nothing has changed from the previous plan, it's exactly the same, and it's a talus (...) you will not see the concrete wall.

4. P.A.C: One of the drawings that are missing are sections through the site and I think that we should be asking for that. Transverse sections through the site from Windsor down Claremont because it will answer two questions that are perplexing people: what is the condition at the edge of the property on the south end of the site and what is the condition of how the drop-off intersects with the landscaping.

5. P.A.C: You mentioned that the fifth floor is demolished. Can you help me understand visually what the impact of the change is?

J.P. Bart: Up to the 4th floor, the structure is composed of a solid masonry wall. The 5th floor is a hollow block wall. We intend to keep the solid wall, rebuilt a new concrete structure and built a new 5th floor composed of cavity walls and a brick veneer aligned with the original brick wall. The new brick will be matching or closely matching the original one.

C. Lalonde: I would like to add that there will be no change in comparison to the first SCAOPI. The demolition is required given that the 5th floor wall must be rebuilt completely, but the architecture does not change.

6. P.A.C: There is confusion about the proposal presented today and the one approved a year ago. The proposed changes are difficult to understand.

Second, you have modified the ground floor safety exits on your floor plan to lead to a door on Windsor. These changes do not appear on your elevation which does not show a door.

J.P. Bart: That is a good point. In the original plan, it was indeed a window which now has been transformed into a glass door as a means of egress. This change will not have any impact on the exterior.

7. P.A.C: Do the 43 parking stalls include visitor parking?

C. Lalonde: We are asking for a total of 43 parking spaces, 4 exterior and 38 interior. We include 2 shared vehicle spaces with smart cars on the exterior which means 2 cars in one parking space. The other 3 outdoor spaces are visitor spaces. Technically, we do have 4 exterior and 38 interior but given the 2 cars in one parking space, we ask for a total of 43 spaces.

T. Flies: For clarification, the underground parking layout shows 4 parking spaces which have an elevator. The layout therefore only shows 34 spots, but there are 4 additional elevated spots without increasing the footprint.

8. P.A.C: Were you underpinning that part of the building in the first proposal?

C. Lalonde: Yes.

9. P.A.C: I think that everybody would benefit from a wall section that shows how you are taking a solid masonry bearing wall and then turning it into a rain screen on the top floor and what the detailing is going to be, because I think that we will have to understand that and it's not going to be solely through the elevation that we get that drift. So that needs to be demonstrated with a wall section.

The last question I have is; given that you are now doing the demolition of the top floor and you're adding to it and the building has been unoccupied for a number of years, at what point do you have to do seismic retrofit?

C. Lalonde: I don't have the answer, that's a very technical engineering question.

P.A.C: Except that we don't want to have a third PPCMOI on this project.

C. Lalonde: We will get that for you.

10. P.A.C: One last question about those 4 parking spots. I remember in the first iteration, I believe there is a Bell servitude that was a constraint. Is it still a constraint now and how will you be dealing with it and I guess that's what is determining the north demarcation? What if that location, as drawn on the plan, is not exact?

C. Lalonde: There's absolutely no change in that section.

P.A.C: Is the servitude as drawn not the exact servitude?

C. Lalonde: That question is applicable both a year ago and now.

P.A.C: But before it was not an issue because you weren't excavating until that limit.

C. Lalonde: We won't go up to the limit of the servitude. We're hoping the plan is exact, but if not we will adapt to it.

Public Comments

Frank Philpott (466 Claremont): On the top level, at some point, there's going to be air conditioning in these flats and I don't see anything in the plans where the air conditioning is going to be located. Are there many units on the roof or is there one central, because I am concerned about the noise and less for myself as we are below, but for our neighbours on Parkman place, they will be exactly at the level of the roof, so my question where are the air-conditioning units and will the noise be generated?

C. Lalonde: That part of the project remains the same, so it is enclosed.

J.P. Bart: We will make sure that there will be no noise problem, I am not a mechanical engineer, but it will be most likely one unit per unit, it's not me who will decide, but it will be in that enclosed place.

G.P: We will be retaining an acoustic consultant. This said, we are extremely mindful of the quality of the environment for the tenants so naturally if it's good for the tenants who live there, it will be good for the neighbours.

Louise Carpentier (543 Prince-Albert): Like Mr. Philpott I am also concerned about the stuff above the fifth floor and I think the developer, whom I have met, understands that. Your concerns about the noise for the tenants, but it could be good for the tenants but not as good for the residents including the ones on Windsor, for example. Just out of curiosity, why did you eliminate the terrace that was facing the mountain?

C. Lalonde: Technically it's a plus for the people who live on Windsor.

J.P. Bart: The new location of the inside stairs made us remove it.

L.C: Is the gym and the Salle social going to be all glass, because in terms of privacy or aesthetics when it's going to be all lit, it will have an impact on the neighborhood.

C. Lalonde: The impact has not changed. This is exactly the same as a year ago.

J.P. Bart: It's not full glass.

L.C: I am going back to the structure underneath and back to the discussion of the first proposal. We heard that it was not possible to put the garage entrance on Windsor because it was not deep enough, but if you are going to have a lift for 4 more cars, the garage must be deep enough.

G.P: The depth of the garage hasn't changed. The reason why we couldn't have the access on Windsor was because of the slope and other various reasons.

Judith Philpott (466 Claremont): The parking suggested for visitors, does it take space on Windsor or not?

C. Lalonde: No, it doesn't, it's all on our site.

J.P: There will be more cars, so my question is why did you decide to do extra units?

C. Lalonde: One of the reasons is really to improve the interior layout of the units. The units that we had in the first PPCMOI were not fully designed and were too big for the market. The other reason is that we need to keep the project viable and make it work with all the new constraints that came up during the last year. In terms of the number of cars, we weren't offering back then what future tenants of Westmount want, two parking spaces per tenant. But in reality, I am sure they will not all have two cars. But keep in mind that in the traffic study it's just one extra car generated during rush hours and less during the rest of the day. So those additional units effectively have no impact on the traffic.

Closing of session