

Meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee

March 12, 2019:

A public presentation was held on March 12, 2019 at 8:30 am following the publication of a public notice, on February 26, 2019.

At this public presentation of the P.A.C. meeting, the applicant was represented by Sebastien Hylands of 1100 Atwater Investments Inc. / Kevin and Richard Kaplin of GKC Architects. Mr. Hylands introduced the project to the members of the P.A.C. and to the public. There was a question period for the members followed by a period of questions and comments for the public.

The first analysis and deliberation of the committee will be held at its meeting of April 9, 2019.

March 12, 2019:

Deferred to the next meeting. It is noted that the comments of two residents have been submitted and an email addressed to the applicant has been noted.

April 24, 2019:

Reviewed and deferred pending a revised proposal. The documents presented during the public consultation of March 12, 2019 were reviewed, the documents submitted for the opening of the SCAOPI application file were deposited, and the minute of the public meeting held on March 12, 2019 has been added to the file.

Following the public consultation, comments written by two citizens were received via the City's website. The correspondence between the applicant and a member of the community was also received. The comments were read and a discussion was held on the basis of the written comments received.

It is noted that the main concerns expressed by citizens included the compliance of the signs with the City's By-laws, the potential noise that could be generated by restaurant use, the traffic issues resulting from "the addition of retail and / or commercial service uses", and the demand for fewer parking spaces than required by the Zoning By-law.

The project was then evaluated on the basis of the evaluation criteria defined in section 3.2 of SCAOPI By-law 1489. The evaluation table is attached.

The following comments are noted:

- The Committee would be willing to accept non-residential signs provided it complies with the other parameters of Zoning By-law 1303 and the PIIA By-law 1305;
- The Committee would be prepared to accept the uses of "Office-type commercial activities" and "Retail and / or Professional service" as proposed in the application;
- The Committee is of the opinion that the applicant has presented a satisfactory solution to mitigate the potential impact of noise that could be generated by restaurant use;
 - The Committee is of the opinion that the letter of technical opinion on the impact on the community, traffic and safety, prepared by Luc Couture, engineer and expertise Director Transportation Planning and Traffic with EXP services inc. dated February 18, 2019 addresses the concerns satisfactorily and demonstrates that the impact on traffic would be "very low";
 - The Committee is of the opinion that the demand for fewer parking spaces than required by the Zoning By-law is not justified and is not acceptable. The request is considered redundant since the proposed parking offer meets the requirements of the regulations.
 - The committee is favourable, in principle, with the preliminary intentions presented for the development in front of the Atwater building including landscaped areas and mineral areas.
 - The committee wants the embankment along Dorchester, turning North on Atwater, to be preserved, as it was before the authorized work to the facade. It provides a transition and

protection zone to the adjacent residential area. Higher density vegetation consisting of tall plants would be more relevant than the proposed development.

The landscaping at the rear of the building should include a pedestrian crossing to connect Dorchester and Tupper streets, illuminated and providing street furniture; all, arranged and maintained by the applicant.

July 16, 2019:

Deferred at the next committee meeting due to a lack of time at the July 16 meeting.

August 6, 2019:

It is noted that a site visit was held with the Committee in front of the building to assess the existing layout.

Reviewed and deferred pending a revised proposal. A revised proposal has been submitted proposing the following changes:

- a) Withdrawal of the request for the reduction of the minimum number of parking lots;
- b) A new landscaping design on Atwater: the embankment was conserved along Dorchester and turning north on Atwater and the plantation bins were lowered;
- c) Integration of new park benches and picnic tables at the back of the building adjacent to the illuminated pedestrian crossing to connect Dorchester and Tupper streets;
- d) The signs have been revised to meet the normative regulatory requirements.

The Committee notes that the design of the proposed landscaping on Atwater is almost identical to the proposal approved under a previous permit and is therefore essentially consistent with the current situation. The Committee has no objection in principle to this development, but refers the detailed analysis of landscape components (plantations, lighting, and furniture) to an external consultant for analysis and report. The Committee would like the applicant to study the possibility of including benches / places to sit in this development. This could be done by adding wood on the top of the retaining walls.

With respect to landscaping behind the building and the pedestrian crossing, the committee recognizes the reality of the site and the potential for future development. Thus, he recommends the maintenance of a development, street furniture and pedestrian crossing until a permit for the development of the western part is obtained. In addition, future development of the western portion will have to maintain a pedestrian crossing between Tupper and Dorchester. In order to create a more attractive outdoor space for the community, the applicant will have to revise his proposal to propose a design inspired by ephemeral public squares.

Regarding signs, the committee notes that the orange sign on Atwater is obsolete because it will not be visible behind the existing trees and those to be planted. It will have to be eliminated. The Committee would also like to understand the need for two signs (shown in yellow) for the café / retail store. A more detailed sign proposal that elaborates on the content of each sign must be submitted.

In conclusion, the Committee is favourable in principle of the proposed approach, following the requested changes. The detailed analysis of the landscape components (plantations, lighting, and furniture) is referred to an external consultant for analysis and report.

**EVALUATION TABLE FOR THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW OF AN APPLICATION UNDER SCAOPI
GRILLE D'ÉVALUATION DU COMITE CONSULTATIF D'URBANISME APPLICABLE POUR L'ÉTUDE D'UNE DEMANDE DE PPCMOI**

Address & File number: 1100 ATWATER, 2019-00184

Date of analyses: April 24, 2019 – Version 1

	General assessment criteria (By-law 1489 – 3.2)	Achievement level in light of assessment criteria						Remarks
		No	Low	Moderate	High	Fully	N/A	
1	The proposal considers the general volume, height, siting and density of the existing constructions on the land as well as their integration into the built environment ;				X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few physical modifications proposed under the SCAOPI ; • The modifications that are proposed fit into the urban context: public spaces and street animation.
2	For a proposal to alter or transform a construction of heritage value, care and effort is demonstrated in the conservation and enhancement of the heritage character-defining elements ;						X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major alterations of the building have been approved under a separate building permit; not subject to this SCAOPI proposal.
3	The redevelopment proposal includes the conservation of a building of heritage value ;						X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major alterations of the building have been approved under a separate building permit; not subject to this SCAOPI proposal.
4	The proposal results in an enhancement of the immovable and the neighbouring sectors with a refined and adapted landscaping, while also providing a superior construction quality ;			X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes highlight the interface between the building and the public domain ; • The level of detail of the external facilities is not sufficiently developed and requires more information to evaluate the quality of the proposal ; • The project must be coordinated with Public Works to validate the feasibility of the concept.
5	The proposal considers the impact on the urban environment, namely in terms of sunlight, wind, noise, emanations, lighting, water run-off, the reduction of heat islands and traffic ;			X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The odor emitting report is based on the potential development of a coffee shop on the ground floor and is not sophisticated enough to assess impact in the event that a restaurant is located there ; • The lighting proposal is not detailed enough; • The addition of a retention pond in landscaping must be studied and incorporated, if possible.

	Achievement level in light of assessment criteria
--	---

**EVALUATION TABLE FOR THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW OF AN APPLICATION UNDER SCAOPI
GRILLE D'ÉVALUATION DU COMITE CONSULTATIF D'URBANISME APPLICABLE POUR L'ÉTUDE D'UNE DEMANDE DE PPCMOI**

Address & File number: 1100 ATWATER, 2019-00184

Date of analyses: April 24, 2019 – Version 1

	General assessment criteria (By-law 1489 – 3.2)	No	Low	Moderate	High	Fully	N/A	Remarks
6	The criteria of ecological design and the integration of sustainable, environmental features are integrated in the design process in accordance with LEED principles ;			X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof of the building will consist of a white roof; • The addition of a retention pond in landscaping should be studied and incorporated, if possible.
7	The proposal's functional organisation (access, security, automobile traffic, accessory buildings, parking) is of quality;				X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study submitted shows that the impact on traffic would be « very low »; • The demand for minimum parking spaces is not justified ; • The redevelopment of the site was the subject of another application for a conforming permit.
8	The proposal seeks a balance between individual and collective interests in such a manner so as to avoid one being advanced to the disadvantage of the other ;				X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design aims to minimize the impact of activities on Dorchester ; • The proposed activities will focus on Atwater Avenue.
9	The cultural and social components offer advantages to the community ;			X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project proposes a public space on Atwater and the applicant proposes to take responsibility for the maintenance of this space ; • A public pedestrian crossing should be incorporated into the backyard green space to connect Dorchester Street with Tupper Street.

* Applicable to all above criteria: All concerned parties (owners, neighbour, City) are able to benefit from an improvement upon the current situation or at the very least not experience any additional inconvenience