Oct 31, 2026

Mémoire on the TIDAN project, 1457 rue Ottawa

Who I am and why I am writing

I own a condo in a building in Griffintown, and I have lived in the neighbourhood since December 2024.

I am writing because this project asks for a large exception to the zoning rules, and I want the borough to understand, before it decides, what it would mean for neighbours, the future Parc des Eaux-Cachées and the streets around the site.

The borough is using a special process that lets it approve a project that does not follow today's zoning. This process is not open to a referendum (OCPM project page), so this consultation is the main way residents can be heard.

What I am asking for

I ask the borough to do four things by the time the council decides.

1. Have independent experts check, and publish, studies of sunlight, wind, views, privacy, traffic and construction, with the methods and results, in time for residents to read them.
2. Compare the project with a 25-metre option, using the same measures for each.
3. Explain, before approving anything, how deliveries, garbage collection and emergency vehicles will work on rue Ottawa.
4. Explain, when it decides, how the evidence it gathered shaped its final decision.

My reasons

Below are my reasons for these requests:

1. Height

The proposed height of the towers would affect the neighbourhood in four ways: scale and open views, sunlight, wind, and privacy.

1.1. Neighbourhood scale and open views

Most of the buildings facing the site, including Coopérative d'habitation des Bassins du Havre, BASS2, BASS3, BASS4, and the buildings at 1500, 1548 and 1550 rue des Bassins, are approximately 25 metres high. The proposed towers would be 100, 84 and 78 metres, three to four times as tall as these buildings.

The objectives of the City's 2050 Urban Planning and Mobility Plan for areas designated for high intensification call for gradual transitions between new developments and surrounding lower-scale areas, variations in building heights and volumes, human-scale relationships with the street, and measures to limit the massing effect of new construction (borough presentation, pp. 5–6). Even with a lower base under each tower, a jump of this size does not look like a gradual transition.

The borough says the project is consistent with the height framework of the 2050 plan (borough presentation, p. 4). But fitting that framework does not show that the project meets the plan's goals for transitions and massing, and the current zoning limit for this site is 25 metres (p. 15). I ask the borough to explain why this height is right for this site, and how it meets those goals and respects the neighbourhood's existing scale and open character.

Some of us chose to live here partly because of that limit and the open views toward downtown that most of the buildings facing the site share. I am not claiming a right to a private view. But planning rules help people decide where to live, and I ask the borough to weigh what a sudden change means for those who relied on them.

1.2. Sunlight

In the developer's presentation (document 4.1, pp. 109–114), the sunlight study shows some neighbouring buildings' shared rooftops and the future park in complete shadow at certain hours in summer and winter, respectively. It does not show how many hours of sun each building, the park and public places would lose because of the towers. The borough's own site-plan criteria for Griffintown (annex A.4, objective C) call for projects to be designed to maximize sunlight on streets, parks, public places, neighbouring buildings and homes. Without those numbers, no one can tell whether the project meets that criterion. I ask the borough to publish them before the council decides.

1.3. Wind

The developer's pedestrian wind study (document 4.4) predicts that the proposed development will meet wind comfort and safety criteria at ground level, but that winter conditions will be windier than today, which it considers acceptable (pp. 7–8). It does not test the rooftops and terraces of neighbouring buildings (pp. 1–2), and it never names the future Parc des Eaux-Cachées in its text or conclusions. I ask the borough to clarify the study's assumptions, to assess wind at neighbouring buildings, their terraces and rooftops, and at the park, and to identify the mitigation measures that will be required.

The borough's draft conditions call for an additional wind study at a later stage, after the council has decided on the requested exceptions (draft conditions, document 1.2, section 4a; borough presentation, pp. 3, 44 and 45). Given the potential effects on neighbouring properties and public spaces, I ask that the relevant wind assessment and mitigation commitments be available for public review before the council makes that decision.

1.4. Privacy

Towers this tall and this close could look directly into neighbouring apartments, balconies and shared terraces. I ask the borough to assess privacy at the most exposed neighbouring outdoor spaces, and to explain how tower placement, distances and design would reduce it.

2. Streets: traffic, waste, deliveries, parking, emergency access and construction

The project would add more than 900 homes (OCPM project page), plus shops, to rue Ottawa and the nearby streets, while, as far as I can see, the plans for waste, deliveries, emergency access and construction are missing or left for later.

The question is not only how many people would live here. It is whether rue Ottawa and the nearby streets can handle the traffic, deliveries, garbage trucks and construction safely, next to buildings where people already live. These streets are narrow and have only one lane, so these concerns matter more here.

2.1. Waste collection

The developer's waste note (document 4.3) says municipal garbage trucks would collect inside the private site and leave toward rue Saint-Thomas (p. 2 and sheets 4–5). It also says the current collection option does not meet the City's maximum of 15 containers for municipal collection, and that discussions with the borough are still needed to decide whether a separate private collection is necessary (p. 2).

This matters because collection trucks and bins already take up the bike lane and other public space on rue Ottawa and nearby streets, and traffic is regularly blocked (my own observation). The waste note does not say how the project's collection would work alongside this.

The borough's draft conditions leave the final waste plan to a later step (draft conditions, document 1.2, section 4a). I ask the borough to explain, before it approves anything, how collection will work in practice alongside the existing buildings' collection, how the 15-container limit will be handled, and how conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, neighbours and traffic will be avoided.

2.2. Deliveries and curbside stopping

Delivery vehicles serving the BASS2 and BASS3 condos already have limited places to stop, and they frequently stop on the sidewalk (my own observation). The borough's presentation mentions a private lane for the project's logistics, covering waste, utilities and vehicle access (p. 38), but it does not say where the lane is or whether it is meant for deliveries.

I ask that any traffic and loading review include deliveries to both the new project and the existing buildings. It should show where vehicles will stop or wait, and how sidewalks and accessible routes will be kept clear.

2.3. Parking and travel demand

The project proposes car and bicycle spaces. The number of spaces matters, but it does not show on its own whether the project meets travel needs or what it does to the curb space nearby. I ask the borough to publish the assumptions and results behind its estimates of car ownership, visitor parking, deliveries and spillover onto nearby streets, and to explain how the proposed parking relates to them.

2.4. Construction and emergency access

Construction would bring heavy trucks and noise to an area with residents, pedestrians and cyclists. As far as I can see, the borough's draft conditions (document 1.2) do not say how construction would be managed in narrow streets like rue Ottawa and rue William.

I ask the borough to require a construction traffic plan before the council decides and before permits are issued. It should cover truck routes and hours, loading and staging, pedestrian and cyclist safety, emergency access, noise, vibration, dust, communication with residents, and how the plan will be monitored and enforced.

Oct 31, 2026

I ask the borough to explain how fire trucks, ambulances and other emergency vehicles will reach buildings on rue Ottawa and nearby streets. This should cover both construction and normal use, given curbside stopping, deliveries and construction vehicles.

The 2022 precedent and comparing options

A similar case in 2022 shows why this consultation matters. A 20-storey tower was proposed at 1712–1810 rue des Bassins, in an area zoned for eight storeys (CTV News; City notice). After a written consultation that ended on 31 March 2022 (City notice), the borough did not go ahead: its council agenda for 11 April 2022 included withdrawing the draft resolution (item 40.25). The borough mayor at the time said that, after reading the consultation report, the population did not share the council's view of the project, and that the borough respected the will expressed (CTV News).

TIDAN is a different project, and it is much taller, so I am not saying the two are the same. The 2022 proposal came with a change to the City's urban plan (council agenda, item 10.11), while the borough says TIDAN fits the 2050 plan's height framework (see 1.1). But the case shows that written opinions can lead the borough to rethink a project. The 2022 proposal could have gone to a referendum (City notice). TIDAN cannot (OCPM project page), which makes it more important that the borough takes residents' written opinions seriously and tests a 25-metre option in the open.

I ask the borough to compare the project in public with a 25-metre option, using the same measures for each. The two options would be:

- A 25-metre option, which keeps to the current limit.
- The proposed towers of 100, 84 and 78 metres.

For each option, I ask the borough to show the number of homes, the number and type of off-market homes, the size of the building footprint, public outdoor space, sunlight and wind, privacy, traffic and deliveries.

This would make the trade-offs visible, instead of assuming that one design is best on every measure.

Conclusion

I support more housing in Griffintown, including off-market housing. I ask the borough not to approve this large exception to its zoning without a clear look at the effects on residents, the future park and the streets around the site, and without a real comparison with a 25-metre option.

Evidence checked by independent experts would let residents and elected officials see the trade-offs and decide whether the height is justified. I ask the borough to publish it before the council decides, and to explain how it shaped the decision.

Oct 31, 2026

Sources

- OCPM project page
- Decision summary and draft conditions (1.2)
- Borough presentation on the article 145.45 process (3.1)
- Developer's presentation (4.1)
- Waste management note (4.3)
- Pedestrian wind study (4.4)
- Griffintown site-plan criteria, annex A.4
- CTV News on the 2022 rue des Bassins tower
- City notice for the 2022 written consultation
- Borough council agenda, 11 April 2022