

**Commentaires écrits des résidents reçus**

Période: 14 janvier 2020 au 14 février 2020

15 janvier 2020

A mon avis, il y a encore du travail à faire pour l'intégration architecturale réussie du bâtiment avec le contexte de Dorchester. L'architecture proposée présente des caractéristiques 'commerciales' et sans caractère, une hybridation facile du passé avec le présent dont résulte une apparence lourde de bunker. Un geste plus contemporain, contrastant et de facture plus fine et fenestrée serait souhaitable pour alléger les façades.

-----  
5 février 2020

I was present at the public meeting on the 28th January. Firstly I would like to make a complaint to the city about this meeting. I stood up and voiced my concerns about the level of traffic and new cars this new building would bring and was told by the panel that I cannot make such statements without providing evidential data of such concerns. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life. I am a tax paying citizen of Westmount. I am entitled to voice my concerns without having to turn up with armfuls of "evidence" to validate my concern.

My comments regarding the 4126 proposed construction are as follows:

The design of the façade of the building does not fit into the general style of Dorchester. In particular the top-level roof terrace on the front. No other building has such a terrace on the front. Are we going to see patio umbrellas and gatherings of people on the roof overlooking Dorchester? Secondly, the images on the plans are deceiving and not clear, especially as the more detailed ones are covered up by all the tree leaves. The winter versions of the building and how it looks are conveniently lacking in the imagery. I also do not believe the request to expand the size and height of the new building above and beyond what is originally allowed and what was there before (the building that burnt down) is in the best interest in keeping the charm and character of Dorchester boulevard. If you look at archival images of the building that was originally there, it is much smaller than what 4216 is planning to be built.

On this document [https://westmount.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/3.-4216Dorchester\\_Plans-architecturaux-150120.pdf](https://westmount.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/3.-4216Dorchester_Plans-architecturaux-150120.pdf) on page 10 the images are different. The front facing image of the building in the summer shows the floor of the rooftop terrace of 4216 in line with the rim of the roof of the turret of the building at 4222. However in the winter image below, the floor of the terrace of 4216 is much lower, and inline with the bottom window of the turret as opposed to the roof of the turret on the left side of 4216. This is an incorrect representation of how the building will look and the height. 4216 in winter is a lot lower in height than the image of 4216 in summer, which is conveniently shaded by the trees. I request that we have a clearer drawing of the height of 4216.

Where are the air conditioning units going? This is not mentioned. Is it one unit on the roof covering all the apartments or separate units on each of the balconies?

As for the construction, I strongly object to a 6 day week 7am - 5pm construction time. With 11 trucks planned to be there, local residents are allowed to have the weekend construction noise and inconvenience free. Also with zero parking in the area during the day, where are the contractors going to park all their trucks over this 18 month period?

-----  
6 février 2020

So if I let my building crumble, I can then build a cement block. The character of the building does in no way fit in with the other brownstones.

Comité consultatif d'urbanisme / *Planning Advisory Committee*  
PPCMOI au / *SCAOPI at 4216 Dorchester, Westmount*

And why again are we letting a condo go so high? The area is already dense.  
The traffic from cars using the alley to access their condo's, would be high and this lane way is already  
a highway.

-----  
6 février 2020

I don't understand why we need such huge scale projects. Why are condo's allowed to go over the  
limit of height restrictions. And we as home owners can't even put one level higher even if not visible  
from the street!

-----  
7 février 2020

*Notes : les informations liées à l'auteur de la lettre et à l'adresse de la personne en référence ont été  
caviardés afin de protéger leur anonymat dans le cadre de la publication sur le site web de la Ville.*

Madame, Monsieur,

Je suis le procureur [REDACTED] (ci-après désignée ma « Cliente »), relativement à l'objet  
mentionné en rubrique.

Ma Cliente précitée m'a expressément mandaté pour que je vous adresse la présente lettre.

Ma cliente est propriétaire de l'immeuble [REDACTED], à  
Westmount; cet immeuble est aussi connu et désigné comme étant le lot [REDACTED] du cadastre du  
Québec, circonscription foncière de Montréal.

[REDACTED] le 4216, boulevard Dorchester Ouest, à Westmount,  
aussi connu et désigné comme étant le lot 4 142 956 du cadastre du Québec, circonscription foncière  
de Montréal, consistant en un terrain vacant, fait présentement l'objet d'une demande de P.P.C.M.O.I.

Cette demande, initiée par le promoteur 1114495 Canada Inc., vise l'obtention de dérogations, dont la  
hauteur et le taux d'implantation, le tout afin de permettre la construction d'un nouveau bâtiment  
résidentiel multifamilial.

Tant l'immeuble de ma Cliente que celui faisant l'objet de ladite demande de P.P.C.M.O.I. sont situés  
dans un secteur municipal considéré comme ayant une valeur exceptionnelle, ce secteur étant aussi  
appelé «Hallowell-Weredale».

Ma cliente et le soussigné ont pris connaissance de l'ensemble de la documentation disponible, à ce  
jour, concernant cette demande de P.P.C.M.O.I..

Ma cliente est en total désaccord avec ce projet et, plus particulièrement, avec les dérogations  
demandées par son promoteur.

Ma cliente soumet, avec raison, que le nouveau bâtiment résidentiel projeté ne s'intégrerait pas  
adéquatement dans le cadre bâti environnant.

Sans limiter la généralité de ce qui précède, le nouveau bâtiment résidentiel projeté ne représente  
aucunement une continuité de la trame urbaine du boulevard Dorchester, dans ce secteur. Je  
rappelle, ici, qu'il s'agit d'un secteur municipal considéré comme ayant une valeur exceptionnelle.

Les personnes qui occupent l'immeuble de ma cliente y jouissent d'un milieu de vie exceptionnel.

Ces personnes sont extrêmement « préoccupées » par ce projet. Et à raison.

**Comité consultatif d'urbanisme / Planning Advisory Committee**  
**PPCMOI au / SCAOPI at 4216 Dorchester, Westmount**

Parmi les dérogations demandées, dans le cadre de ce P.P.C.M.O.I., il y en a une visant plus particulièrement la hauteur du bâtiment ; en effet, on y vise une hauteur de 57 pieds, ce qui est de beaucoup supérieur à la hauteur présentement permise de 35 pieds.

Ceci est à mon avis totalement inacceptable et illégal.

Il ne s'agit plus là d'une dérogation dite « mineure ».

Je suis donc d'opinion qu'une telle dérogation ne peut ainsi faire l'objet d'une demande de P.P.C.M.O.I.

Ceci est sans compter le fait que la construction de ce bâtiment, à une telle hauteur excessive, privera les occupants de l'immeuble de ma cliente de beaucoup de lumière. Aussi, la vue des occupants de l'étage supérieur sera grandement obstruée. Ceci est inacceptable et illégal.

Ainsi, le projet envisagé sur cet immeuble ne s'harmonise donc pas avec le cadre bâti du secteur.

Tel qu'il appert des plans préparés par l'architecte Jean-Pierre Bart, l'empreinte « verticale » de l'immeuble projeté est de beaucoup supérieure à celle de l'ancien bâtiment qui se trouvait sur ce terrain.

Ma Cliente s'oppose donc vivement à ce projet, dans ses formes et teneurs actuelles. Elle souhaite donc que le contenu de la présente lettre soit soumis au comité consultatif d'urbanisme.

Ma Cliente se réserve expressément tous ses droits et recours, y compris à l'encontre du promoteur précité de ce projet, afin de contester, judiciairement, la poursuite de ce projet dans ses formes et teneurs actuelles.

Veillez agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

-----  
11 février 2020

First, I note that I am certainly in favour of the city permitting new construction on this site. It has been a blight on the neighborhood since I moved in.

However, I have two concerns about the proposal.

First, the design seems quite modern - it appears to be a building that would be more in keeping with Griffintown rather than Westmount. I don't see how the proposed modern facade is supposed to blend with the old greystones on that part of Dorchester. It is a very sharp contrast to its next-door neighbor to the West.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, I feel the project is too large. It extends quite far back on the property and in the back, it is effectively five stories tall, much larger than any residential properties surrounding it. Its depth means that it will tower over properties on the end of the lane, significantly reducing the privacy of those in the area. It also means a greater number of people and cars, and the area is already a high traffic area.

Finally, there appears to be communal terrace space which I would be concerned about turning into a party space as is seen on some modern developments in St. Henri and Griffintown.

Overall, I see no reason that Westmount should permit an exception to the current zoning - a building the size of the previous one (or built to the limits of zoning if the prior building was smaller) would still permit the builder to make a profit and no one in the area will feel put off.

-----

12 février 2020

The projected building is out of proportion to all other residential properties nearby. It will loom massively over its neighbours, who will see it only from the west and south sides (those compass points are simplified, Montreal-style). I am particularly concerned with the operational impact it will have on residents of the neighborhood. Garbage, recycling and compost removal will be a lengthy, noisy process. Cars entering and exiting will be a problem for any users of the lane at the rear- and it's a very busy lane, often travelled by children and seniors from programs at the Greene Avenue center. Snow removal will present other challenges - at the moment, the office building next door (often known as the Nurses' building, from its former occupants) uses the lot as a place to dump snow from their parking lot. The project designers stress the visual impact of the building, seen from the front - a point of view available mostly to passing motorists. But most of the neighborhood activity takes place at the rear: this is where the city's attention should be focussed during the review process.

-----  
12 février 2020

The size of the building should not be allowed to be larger than the guidelines, purely for financial gain. There is no reason to compare it to the commercial building which is dominating and out of character. Another huge building will not improve this residential area. The length and height of the new building, along with the party terrace and balconies will make those of us who live south of the alley feel overlooked and robbed of some privacy. More green space in the back alley, which has become a parking lot for most of its length would be a positive step in improving the area.

-----  
12 février 2020

This project exceeds permitted criteria for the site.

-----  
13 février 2020

There is no just cause or encumbrance or Social Circumstances to warrant this being a SCAOPI Project. It already benefits from having the acquired right as to the keeping the foundations after the fire.

In my opinion this site is part of an "ensemble" for Dorchester South.

The impact on the 'sense of sky' on the South end of the site is oppressive.

The cubist /moderne style is completely inappropriate.

The distinct play of the 2 different materials is not residential in this manner.

The window frames and glass should be recessed per Residential 8" wall construction with min. 6"exposed stone returns. The window divisions should be in either stone or brick to have residential proportioned window.

The exterior stairs are somewhat weather protected, the handicapped ramp if fully exposed to the elements.

The reflection of the noise from the roof-top units due to higher building to the East is a concern.

No LEED standard has been adopted.

-----  
Nombre total des commentaires écrits: 10