

1765 signe qu'il y ait des promoteurs qui sont effectivement en train de réfléchir et qui ont une ouverture par rapport à l'inclusion à l'Île-des-Sœurs même à côté du projet privé.

**M. GAÉTAN LEBEAU, commissaire:**

1770 Merci.

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Merci beaucoup pour votre présentation. C'est bien clair et on en prend bonne note.  
1775 Merci.

**M. STEVE BAIRD:**

Merci.

1780 **LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Alors, maintenant, nous allons entendre Ahmad Ghourab.

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB :**

1785 Bonjour. Unfortunately, I do not speak French.

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

1790 That is not a problem, that is okay.

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB:**

1795

I absolutely hate speaking in public.

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

1800

Just take your time, it is...

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB:**

1805

Something about speaking on a stage.

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Yes.

1810

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB:**

1815

So actually my point is I have no sides in this in terms of how I want you guys to develop the neighbourhood. My primary concern is how all this information has been received by me. So this – so coming on – what do you call it, on the 26th of September, we received an email for a – what do you call it – a public consultation for the 30th. It went, I didn't notice it.

Meanwhile, I have around seven emails from my building – sorry. Let me step back a second...

1820

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Just take your time.

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB:**

1825

I just basically feel like there is a dangerous situation whereby all the flow of information to myself and the residents of Evolo 2 and Evolo 1 is being controlled for the benefit of Proment, and actually it makes me quite angry.

1830

We have, so let me start off by what I mean by that is I have noticed in five emails promoting Proment's presentation, a presentation what was hosted twice in our buildings, there's posters for it, there's emails for it, and meanwhile I heard nothing about the City's presentation. I don't know anything about it. During that – my correspondence with the City I have, sorry, one email that was poorly titled, and it wasn't even a full week – four days before the City's presentation on the evening of the 26th for the 30 of September. I was never able to even hear about it; no posters, no signs, nothing.

1835

1840

That is the start of a series of irregularities that lead me to feel that they are extracting unbiased and educated opinions on the subject, it is going to be very difficult for you guys because all we hear is one side of this conversation, never ending. I never got to say anything to the City.

1845

So over the last two weeks, every time I enter my building there is a sign that says « Petition, please sign ». When I first entered the building the first time they had it, it said all the concierges were just « Come on, you need to sign this, this is for your own benefit. » What benefit? To get Proment to put a building right in front of my house, a building that they never told us before we bought these homes. It is 100 meters. It is 50 meters away from my window. Window-to-window. If you open Google Earth it is 50 metres away. We never signed up for that, and so that they can benefit.

1850

Then there's a few other issues which I highlight. For a start is the points in the petition were all lies. So they start off – I am going to go into that in a little bit, actually just going point-by-point to show you the level of how much they are lying. I asked several people from the building management and the Board in Evolo if I can put a petition, and I was told literally no. I have proof

1855 to this end. So they essentially are saying nobody else can host a petition, nobody else can steer their point of view, we are going to push Proment's thing over and over again.

1860 And so when you enter the building you have the petition sitting there, and then the concierges are telling you sign it. One day, they actually removed the document that explains what you are signing. When you come into the building you always – any guests that come into the building have to sign a paper for their cars. That paper is right next to the part where your car paper is, which it is easy to see how someone goes « oh yeah, I am in this building, I am signing », and they don't even know what they are signing for.

1865 So let me get to the – if you can just give me one second I am just going to search for the petition. When I say that my building managers and the Board are pushing the narrative of Proment, I mean they are literally sending us documents from Proment several times.

1870 So, if I pull this up real quick. One second, it is called « Explanatory Text ». They are asserting the City would have less green space. I don't know if that is true or not, but they accompany an image in all these things, which is not available in any of the – of your documentation. So they have a building, but they are saying the City is saying that they are going to build. They have orange lines everywhere to cover the fact that there might be greenery.

1875 So wherever they can't put a building they just put green to say that – what I mean by that is there is still manipulation to make it look like oh, that space is not green when in the one image that they are copying from you guys, or from the City, I am not sure actually where it comes from, that picture, that orange lines were not there. So basically someone came and took Photoshop and just painted a bunch of orange lines to make it look like there was less green space.

1880 I would definitely love green space, not that I disagree with that, but we will move on to the next point, considering that there aren't any, initially any towers that block the residents' view of the current towers. It's a bit of a weird point. What they are saying here is that we are going to build buildings at an angle that are going to cover less space is what they are saying, So in the

1885 presentation they said « we have a square, our building is a square, and we are going to turn it diagonally and you are going to see more view.» A square, if you have one metre and one metre, the diagonal of it is one squared plus one squared, the square root of that, 1.4 times, in a building where it is around 20 metres. Like, our building is around 20 to 30 metres wide. That accounts to around 50 metres suddenly, if you have more view covered.

1890 They are saying that you guys are going to have more cars on the road because you are going to have less parking, so there's going to be more cars on the road. That is stupid. The number of roads don't change, the number of parking spots don't change, how is there going to be more cars? Less cars means less cars; in the building that you guys are proposing it means there's less cars in the neighbourhood. It's not that difficult to understand. What they want is a ratio of 1.3, which essentially will be double the amount. The number of...

1900 So that's the other point. Then they are suggesting that you guys are going to – one thing that was told to me in person, and I actually have proof to this effect, is the City wants to build social housing here. Do you want poor people to be sitting, essentially living next to you? It is scare tactics like these that make people want to build a building that is – there are two towers, one is 120 metres and the other is 100 metres. It essentially covers our entire view, is a lot closer, creates – that's the visual imbalance.

1905 So what else is there? No, that is it. Oh, and it would – they put a point, they said « Considering that access to the REM would be less landscaped and more complex. » Even in the picture that they showed, there is absolutely no difference between both the City's proposition and their proposition.

1910 Essentially, I would love for the City to give their view and to have the same, the same coverage. It is like if you have an election, right, and you have one candidate who can put posters everywhere and you can share his message and the other candidate is told no, your view is shit, I am not going to let anyone see it, excuse my language, but is that a fair election, and are the people educated equally?

Thank you. Sorry, I am very...

1915

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

No, no, that's okay. It's your neighbourhood and you live there every day, and so you have your passion about it, that is fine. Just for information, not argumentation, when you did acquire your property you didn't know that there was a project carrying on developing the neighbourhood?

1920

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB :**

It changed.

1925

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

You were not told?

1930

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB :**

I was told; it was proposed to me that it would be much further away. It would be the same distance as Evolo 1. Even the presentation that Proment presented, they said it's the same, because people said « It's much closer ». They said « No, no, it's just a visual illusion », but if you go to Google Maps and you literally say – you know, right in Google Maps they measure distance from one point to the other? This new building is 50 metres, the other one is 100 metres. At 100 metres it obviously covers a lot less. At 50 metres, you know, because we – endless work – it is a lot closer. It covers around twice the amount to fill the view.

1935

1940

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Okay, I understand. Thanks. So thank you very much for your presentation.

**M. AHMAD GHOURAB :**

1945

You're welcome.

**LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

1950

And we will take that into consideration. Alors, nous allons maintenant avoir avec nous monsieur Brian Fahey. Est-ce que monsieur Fahey est avec nous? Oui. Bonsoir.

**M. BRIAN FAHEY :**

1955

Alors, bonsoir. Madame la présidente, Monsieur et Madame les Commissaires. Je suis ici ce soir à titre d'urbaniste expert qui a été mandaté par Proment de faire une expertise au niveau du PPU qui est proposé par la Ville de Montréal. Simplement pour vous dire que, personnellement, j'ai plus de trente ans d'expérience, dont les... plus des vingt dernières années spécialisé dans la planification de projet immobilier. Donc, on a vraiment développé une expertise en tout ce qui concerne la planification de projets immobiliers.

1960

Présentement, nous sommes impliqués dans la planification de plus d'une quinzaine de tours que dans le centre-ville de Montréal et on planifie également cinq TOD, cinq projets immobiliers rattachés aux futures gares du REM, de Brossard jusqu'à Pointe-Claire.

1965

Donc, l'expertise que je vous présente ce soir vise vraiment la partie nord de la partie Pointe-Nord, dans le fond, du projet de PPU, donc au nord du pont Champlain. Et, pour être encore plus clair, je ne travaille pas à la planification du projet, j'amène simplement une expertise sur le projet de PPU.

1970

Il est évident que dans la venue du nouveau pont, Samuel-De Champlain, l'implantation d'une future gare de REM présente son lot d'opportunités pour revoir, repenser la planification de l'aménagement du territoire pour le secteur de l'Île-des-Sœurs. Ce que je vous montre, ce soir,