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Abstract
This paper attempts to assess how the planning processes for two mega-projects in Montreal treated environmental issues and impacts. The role of the public in these planning processes was an important lens in this research. The two projects are the McGill University Health Centre’s (MUHC) super hospital facility and Université de Montréal’s new Outremont campus. The planning processes for the two projects are compared. Seven semi-structured interviews, four with municipal employers, two with community organizers, and one with a project spokesperson are conducted to obtain information on the planning processes. The study was not conclusive on the extents and influence of members of the public in the planning process especially with regard to environmental issues. Ongoing planning processes and negotiations at the time of study prevented the research from fully exploring the project’s processes and outcomes. Preliminary findings suggest that involvement of the general public occurred principally through consultations led by the Office de la consultation publique de Montréal. Participation by members not represented by a community organization was difficult to assess. Further research is required.
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Executive Summary

McGill University Health Centre and the Université de Montréal are both planning the construction of multi-billion dollar campus developments. Projects of this magnitude have an important impact on the environment both during the construction and operation of the facilities. How are environmental issues being addressed in the planning phase for each of these projects? This report explores the process by which both projects are being planned, identifying key stakeholders and their relationships, and analyses the documented process to see if it has either enhanced or hindered the production of environmental benefits, or alternatively has mitigated potential environmental impacts.

New developments such as those proposed by the McGill University Health Centre (MUHC) and the Université de Montréal (UdM) raise a host of environmental concerns among area residents. Concerns include: air and noise pollution, increased surface mineralization, precipitation runoff, urban heat island effects, and higher energy consumption, as well as increased traffic congestion and changes in the visual landscape. Without adequate mitigation measures, environmental burdens of a new development can have lasting effects on the surrounding community.

The size of these future university campuses is a concern for many different municipal jurisdictions and neighbourhoods. A plurality of views and interests are often brought forward during the planning phases of the project. Participation by the various stakeholders in planning processes is essential to understanding and possibly addressing the wide range of issues involved and gaining significant public support for a project (Davidoff 1973).

Stakeholders are defined as any person, group or organisation involved or impacted by the construction and operation of these projects. In this report, they refer to planning staff and elected officials at the City of Montreal (the central City) and boroughs as project proponents, community organisations and citizen coalitions. Residents in the local area who are not members or represented by local area organisations are also considered stakeholders, although their involvement is more difficult to document due to the informal nature of their involvement and the lack of documentation of their actions.

This work is preliminary in nature and based on limited stakeholder interviews, particularly with regard to the UdM project. Since these two projects are also ongoing, there is a lot of informa-
tion regarding the current planning processes that are not readily available to researchers. For example, the same P3 arrangement that currently limits the involvement of community organisations in participating in ongoing planning of the MUHC mega-hospital also limits the availability of information on this process to researchers. Finally, the dialogue and negotiations addressing environmental concerns are ongoing and evolving, which means that a full account of how environmental issues were addressed cannot be made until the completion of each project.
Synthèse

Le Centre universitaire de santé McGill et l’Université de Montréal planifient tous deux la construction et l’aménagement de campus de plusieurs milliers de dollars. Des projets de cette ampleur ont d’importantes répercussions à la fois durant la construction et l’exploitation des installations. Comment les questions environnementales sont-elles traitées durant l’étape de planification de chacun de ces projets? Ce rapport explore le processus de planification de ces deux projets, déterminant les principaux intervenants et leurs relations, et analyse le processus documenté pour vérifier s’il a favorisé ou empêché l’obtention d’avantages environnementaux, sinon atténuer les impacts environnementaux potentiels.

De nouveaux aménagements comme ceux que proposent le Centre universitaire de santé McGill (CUSM) et l’Université de Montréal (UdeM) ont soulevé chez les résidants une foule de préoccupations environnementales telles que : pollution atmosphérique et sonore, minéralisation accrue en surface, ruissellement des précipitations, effets des îlots thermiques urbains, consommation d’énergie plus élevée, et également congestion accrue de la circulation et transformations du paysage visuel. Sans mesures d’atténuation adéquates, les pressions environnementales d’un nouvel aménagement peuvent avoir des effets durables sur la collectivité environnante.

La taille de ces futurs campus universitaires préoccupe de nombreux quartiers et compétences municipales. Durant les étapes de planification du projet, on constate une diversité d’opinions et d’intérêts. Dans le cadre d’un projet, il est essentiel d’obtenir la participation de divers intervenants dans les processus de planification afin de comprendre et possiblement traiter la vaste gamme des enjeux qui y sont rattachés et de se gagner un appui solide de la part du public (Davidoff 1973).

Par intervenants, on entend toute personne, tout groupe ou organisme impliqué ou touché par la construction ou l’exploitation de ces projets. Dans ce rapport, on fait référence au personnel de la planification et des élus de la Ville de Montréal (la ville-centre) et des arrondissements comme promoteurs de projet, organismes communautaires et coalitions de citoyens. Les résidants de la localité qui ne sont pas membres d’organismes locaux ou représentés par eux sont aussi considérés comme des intervenants, malgré que leur engagement soit plus difficile à documenter en raison du caractère non officiel de celui-ci et du peu de renseignements sur leurs activités.
Ce travail n’est que préliminaire et est basé sur un nombre limité d’entrevues avec des intervenants, particulièrement en ce qui concerne le projet de l’UdeM. Compte tenu que ces deux projets sont également en cours, il y a énormément de renseignements sur les processus actuels de planification dont ne peuvent disposer les chercheurs. Par exemple, la même entente P3 qui actuellement limite l’engagement des organismes communautaires dans la planification en cours du méga-hôpital du CUSM limite également aux chercheurs l’accès à l’information sur ce processus. En dernier lieu, le dialogue et les négociations relatives aux préoccupations environnementales sont continus et en constante évolution, ce qui signifie qu’on ne peut tenir pleinement compte de la manière dont on a traité ces questions avant l’achèvement de chaque projet.
**Introduction**

McGill University Health Centre and the Université de Montréal are both planning the construction of multi-billion dollar campus developments. Projects of this magnitude have an important impact on the environment both during the construction and operation of the facilities. The aim of this report is to understand how environmental issues are being addressed in the planning phase for each of these projects. In order to achieve this overarching goal the report has two principal objectives: first, to document the process by which both projects are being planned, including identification of key stakeholders and their relationships. Second, to analyse the documented process to see if it has either enhanced or hindered the production of environmental benefits, or alternatively has mitigated potential environmental impacts.

The two projects under study are located on former train sorting yards, or brownfield sites, in the City of Montreal. The first project is the construction of a new mega-hospital by the McGill University Health Centre (MUHC) on the Glen Campus site in Côte-des-Neiges-Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (CDN-NDG) and the City of Westmount, while the second is a campus expansion for the Université de Montréal (UdM) on the Outremont site.

Space is always a constraint to a university’s teaching and research functions. Universities look to increase the available office, teaching and laboratory space by acquiring existing buildings or constructing new ones. The expansion projects being undertaken by the MUHC and UdM are two such examples.

Along with issues of economic and social development, new developments raise a host of environmental concerns among area residents. They include measurable impacts such as air and noise pollution, increased surface mineralization, precipitation runoff, urban heat island effects, and higher energy consumption. Large urban developments also have impacts that are less certain or measurable on local area resident’s quality of life such as increased traffic congestion due to new trips to and from the development, and changes in the visual landscape. It is clear that without adequate mitigation measures, environmental burdens of a new development can have lasting effects on the surrounding community. It is not the goal of this report to detail out how different environmental concerns or issues were treated, but rather to illustrate how those concerns were raised and the manner in which they were treated by the various planning bodies and two project proponents.
The size of these future university campuses is a concern for many different municipal jurisdictions and neighbourhoods. A plurality of views and interests are often brought forward during the planning phases of the project. Participation by the various stakeholders in planning processes is essential to understanding and possibly addressing the wide range of issues involved and gaining significant public support for a project (Davidoff 1973).

Stakeholders are defined as any person, group or organisation involved or impacted by the construction and operation of these projects. In this report, they refer to planning staff and elected officials at the City of Montreal (the central City) and boroughs as project proponents, community organisations and citizen coalitions. Residents in the local area who are not members or represented by local area organisations are also considered stakeholders, although their involvement is more difficult to document due to the informal nature of their involvement and the lack of documentation of their actions.

Methodology

The goal and objectives of this paper were fulfilled by employing the use of a comparative case study of the ongoing consultation processes occurring in the two university-led developments in Montreal. Both projects lend themselves well to a comparative analysis because they are being led through similar planning frameworks and are illustrative of the formal and informal processes occurring throughout major projects in the City of Montreal. The scale of development and magnitude of public investment on both sites are similar, as they are dealing with issues of circulation and access, as well as how to make the development more environmentally friendly through Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. Furthermore, both projects have undergone a formal consultation process through the Office de consultation publique de Montréal (OCPM).

The background of the project’s development history and the stakeholders involved is obtained from documents found on the OCPM’s website, as well as from newspaper articles. To gain information about the relationships between various stakeholders and how environmental issues were treated, semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants representing different stakeholders. For the MUHC Glen campus development, three municipal employees, two people working in com-
community organisations, and a MUHC spokesperson were interviewed. For the UdM project, only one interview of a municipal employee was conducted due to the short timeframe of this work.

Interviewees were asked to describe the role of their organisation in the planning of the two developments under study. They were also asked to identify other relevant stakeholders, describe the means of interaction, and characterize the working relationships between them. Finally, interviewees were asked to identify how environmental issues were treated and whether interactions with other stakeholders have had an influence on environmental outcomes.

The Planning of the MUHC campus

The following section documents a brief history of development of the MUHC expansion project, followed by a description of the relationships of public planning agencies, the MUHC, and community groups. The public consultations held in 2005 are then discussed. This section ends with a description of how environmental issues around the MUHC Glen campus were handled.

Project overview

Five hospitals, the Montréal Children’s Hospital, the Montréal General Hospital, the Royal Victoria Hospital, The Montréal Chest Institute, and the Montréal Neurological Hospital together form the McGill University Health Centre (MUHC). The MUHC, through its facilities aims to provide patient care while also conducting research and teaching (MUHC 2006). Due to aging facilities and a lack of adequate space for patients and equipment, the idea of building new larger facilities to address these issues was conceived in 1991. After a fifteen year deliberative process on the funding and planning specifics of the project, the plan to build the new mega-hospital was finally approved by the Québec government in April 2006 (Coates 2006). The current $1.579 billion plan envisions two campuses for the MUHC. The first focuses on renovating and upgrading the Montréal General Hospital, and together with the Royal Victoria, Neurological Hospitals and Montréal Chest Institute, will form MUHC’s new Mountain Campus. The second campus, which is the focus of this paper, will involve the construction of a new health facility, or mega-hospital, on the former Glen
railway yards site that straddles Westmount\(^{1}\) and the borough of CDN-NDG, and borders the borough of the Sud-Ouest.

On April 6\(^{th}\), 2006 the Quebec government formally announced that the construction and operation of the new mega-hospital would be built, financed, and operated through a public-private-partnership (P3) (Derfel 12 October 2007). The Agence de partenariats public-privé du Québec (the Agence), a provincial government agency, will oversee the partnership arrangement. The private partner will be charged with constructing the facility, operating it for thirty years while leasing its space back to the government, and returning the facility back into public ownership after that term (Derfel 8 April 2006). Currently, the selection of a private partner by the MUHC is set for September 2008. From September 2008 to February 2009, a final design for the mega-hospital will be established. The project is scheduled for completion by 2014 (Derfel 2 August 2007).

The MUHC and the City

*The Role of public agencies*

Several different public agencies were involved in the deliberations over the design and integration of the new mega-hospital into the urban fabric. The Service de la Mise en valeur du territoire et du patrimoine (SMVTP), and the Service des Infrastructures, du transport et de l’environnement (SITE) were the primary departments involved from the central City. Also involved were the planning departments of the boroughs of CDN-NDG, the Sud-Ouest and Westmount. Together with MUHC representatives, these actors formed an administrative ensemble often referred to by various municipal employees as the administrative committee. Within the administrative committee, sub-committees were formed (project, technical, transport and circulation, and communications sub-committees) and were tasked with negotiating and refining various aspects of the new mega-hospital. Figure 1 represents a synthesis of diagrams drawn by several municipal employees showing the actors and their relationships.

---

\(^{1}\) The City of Westmount was formerly a borough of the City of Montreal from 2002 until its demerger in 2006. For simplicity, it is referred to in the following text simply as Westmount.
Negotiations within the administrative committee first began in the fall of 2004 (Montreal 2005) and continued intensively on a weekly or biweekly basis until the public consultations in May 2005. Since the end of the public consultations, municipal employees said that there have been no further meetings under the administrative committee framework. However, municipal employees are aware of ongoing negotiations between the central city and the MUHC.

The working relationships between all members of the administrative committee were generally cordial. The nature of the relationships between boroughs and the central City were described as being open. Where they differed on aspects of the project, borough planners felt free to voice their opinions. When disagreements and conflicts between the boroughs and the MUHC arose, borough planners would set up separate meetings with the staff of the central City to formulate the official position of the City. Then, more discrete and narrow negotiations would take place between central City agencies and the MUHC to resolve those specific issues. Unfortunately, interviewees were not willing to provide specific cases of these disagreements or details as to how they were resolved.

From figure 1, the relationships drawn by municipal employees clearly showed that the official relationships between all public agencies were hierarchical with the central City clearly taking the lead role. The direction and official position of public agencies were provided by the City. The three boroughs played a secondary role; one municipal employee stated that the role of the boroughs was to support and cooperate with the central city in developing the appropriate regulations to ensure
that the construction of the MUHC mega-hospital was possible. In that supporting role, municipal employees also wanted to ensure that the negative impacts of the project on the surrounding areas were mitigated while the positive spin-offs were capitalized upon. There were no formal relationships formed between boroughs outside of the administrative committee with respect to the MUHC Glen campus development, although a municipal employee noted that this did not prevent informal conversations between planners or elected officials from different boroughs from taking place. The meetings occurring within the administrative committee were sufficient to address inter-borough concerns.

According to a municipal employee from the Sud-Ouest, the impetus to engage in dialogue with the central City and MUHC was initiated by Sud-Ouest borough planners as soon as they became aware of that the Glen railway yards were chosen as the site for the future mega-hospital. This happened despite the fact that no actual hospital construction would take place in the borough of the Sud-Ouest.

In the opinion of municipal employees, the P3 arrangement does not affect the project or the borough’s relationship with the MUHC. The project is still considered a site development project. Its final design will have to be verified by the boroughs and City for conformance with the proposed by-laws presented in the 2005 consultation process discussed below. If the project’s final design changes significantly due to the discussions with the private partner, then any changes and their impacts will have to be re-examined with the possibility of revising the proposed bylaws and triggering another round of public consultations.

The boroughs and its’ residents

Each borough is advised by an urban planning consultation committee (CCU - Comité consultatif d’urbanisme). The CCU is made up of seven citizens from the borough, one of which is an elected official. These seven members, appointed to the post for two years by each borough’s council, deliberate on a host of local urban issues and make recommendations to the borough council. One municipal employee noted that CCUs make recommendations independently of borough planning staff and thus do not always reflect the views of the staff. With respect to the MUHC, the concerns and recommendations of the CCUs from the three boroughs were presented to the administrative
committee as well as to the OCPM during the 2005 public consultations. CCUs were one avenue in which a limited representation of public opinion informed the MUHC’s planning deliberations².

Other than CCUs, borough planners had no formal contacts with the wider public. They were aware of the initiative by the MUHC to engage the public through the framework of the partnership agreement discussed below, but were not engaged with or aware of any details concerning those discussions. A municipal employee did note that the public could make representation in front of borough council members during their monthly meetings, but that no formal or informal working relationships between borough planning staff and the public were otherwise identified in the planning of the MUHC Glen campus. It was noted that the wider public had the opportunity to express their opinions through the formal public consultation process in 2005 managed by the OCPM. Regarding the adequacy of this forum of expression, interviewees expressed views ranging from suggesting that the official consultation process was adequate to suggesting that the City could learn to do more to engage and interact with the public before and during a project’s planning phase.

The MUHC plan

The deliberations held by the administrative committee culminated in a plan for the MUHC Glen campus that was presented during public consultations in 2005. The 17.3 hectare site would accommodate a series of pavilions housing the different facilities of the hospital and its 500 patient beds, and is interspersed with gardens and places of respite between them. A space on the Glen site is also reserved for the construction of the Shriner’s hospital, a 40-bed facility specializing in orthopedic care for children. Several automobile and pedestrian accesses are incorporated in the plan; vehicular traffic enters the site principally from the west, although there are staff entrances and secondary access from the south and east. Pedestrians can access the site in a limited manner from all sides through several walkways or tunnels. The principal pedestrian access is through a tunnel connecting the site to the Vendome metro and suburban train stations. The existing cycling path along Maisonneuve Boulevard is extended on an east-west axis across the site. The plan for the mega-hospital accommodates approximately 2500 interior parking spaces. Several major intersections and roads bordering the site require widening or reconfiguring to facilitate vehicular access (see MUHC 2005 for more details).

² The recommendations of CCUs are first approved by each borough’s council before they are reported publically.
The MUHC and neighbourhood organisations

Initiating community dialogue

Information from interviewees suggested that the efforts to initiate dialogue to build public support and facilitate the integration of the mega-hospital on the Glen campus site were led by the MUHC itself as early as 1998. A spokesperson for the MUHC, Joanne Emmanuel, stated that the MUHC wanted to have the community on board through early discussions because they realised that the project would have many positive as well as negative effects on the surrounding neighbourhoods. Discussions in NDG started in 2001, and involved local elected officials from CDN-NDG, the Sherbrooke St. West Merchants Association, the NDG Community Council3 and the former CLSC Cavendish (now CSSS Cavendish).

Ms. Emmanuel also said that the MUHC was key in first engaging the community organisations in the borough of the Sud-Ouest. Those organisations included the Regroupement economique et social du Sud-Ouest (RESO), Solidarité St- Henri, and the CLSC St. Henri (now CSSS Sud-Ouest Verdun).

Initial dialogue between the MUHC and community organisations spurred certain community groups to organise amongst themselves and form the Inter-Neighbourhood Coalition (CIQ - Concertation interquartiers). CIQ is a group composed of nine neighbourhood organisations representing local community health, economic, and social agencies from NDG, the Sud-Ouest, and Westmount (see figure 2). Meetings between CIQ members took place as early as September 2002. Interviewees noted that groups in the Sud-Ouest were instrumental in organising this neighbourhood coalition as well as in asking the MUHC to formalize the relationships between all of them through some sort of agreement.

3 The NDG Community Council is a “community-based organization which enables people to work together to improve the quality of life in Notre-Dame-de-Grâce” (NDG Community Council 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Côte-des-Neiges</td>
<td>NDG Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre-Dame-de-Grâce</td>
<td>CDEC NDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSSS Cavendish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud-Ouest Saint-Henri</td>
<td>Regroupement economique et social du Sud-Ouest (RESO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarité Saint-Henri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSSS Sud-Ouest Verdun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmount</td>
<td>Westmount Municipal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westmount Contactivity Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSSS de la Montagne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: The list of Inter-Neighbourhood Coalition participants**

Interviewees noted that efforts by the CIQ to engage the MUHC between 2002 and 2004 were unproductive. Letters and requests sent by the CIQ to the MUHC during this period received no response, which led them to conclude that the MUHC was not as interested in engaging the community. That relationship improved in 2004, an interviewee believed, when Dr. Arthur Porter became the new chief executive officer of the MUHC.

**The Partnership Agreement**

In November 2004, a partnership agreement was signed between the MUHC and the CIQ. The goal of this partnership, as laid out in the partnership agreement, is to “establish a means of communication and participation between the partners […] in order to ensure the harmonious integration of the MUHC into the surrounding community”. Furthermore, partners agree to “combine their efforts in order to optimize the positive impacts of the arrival of the MUHC and its integration into the surrounding communities” (Partnership Agreement 2004). Five areas of concern and discussion between the CIQ and MUHC are set out in the partnership agreement. They are:

- site development (such as environment and circulation);
- direct and indirect employment;
- potential employment and training;
- economic development (businesses and services);
- housing; and
- community health care delivery (Partnership Agreement 2004).
CIQ members were divided into subcommittees to deal with these five main areas of concern. Furthermore, since the signing of the partnership agreement in 2004, the CIQ and the MUHC have participated in a joint committee where contact has been facilitated between various MUHC representatives and CIQ members. However, actual deliberations and work on specific issues have taken place within subcommittees between CIQ members and MUHC representatives.

Other community organisations

Interviewees also identified other community organisations concerned with the new mega-hospital development. They include the Residents of St. Raymond, a local residents group concerned with a variety of issues; the Montreal Urban Community Sustainment, a non-profit organisation dedicated to promoting social housing, cooperative-type businesses, social services (MUCS 2008); and the Centre de gestion de deplacement CDN-NDG, an organisation promoting alternatives to the single occupant vehicle. According to an interviewee, these groups are not formally involved with the CIQ, although their members may participate in the work of the various subcommittees of the CIQ described above.

Public Consultations 2005

It was necessary to modify the zoning of the former Glen railway yards to accommodate the new mega-hospital. The procedure for the modification of the zoning by-laws, described in article 89 of the Charter of the City of Montreal, requires a public consultation on the proposed by-laws modifying the City’s Master Plan and its borough chapter⁴. The consultations were managed by the OCPM, which held public meetings between 11 May to 16 June, 2005. The OCPM registered approximately 150 members of the public in attendance during their first round of meetings, while another 25 expressed themselves in the second round. Furthermore, the OCPM website showed that

---

⁴ Following the public consultations: At the time of writing, neither of the necessary proposed by-laws for the Glen campus site have been adopted. Interviews with municipal employees indicated that the City and boroughs are waiting to finalize agreements regarding the responsibility and financing of necessary infrastructure work before they are willing to adopt the proposed by-laws. These infrastructure modifications refer to the planning, construction, or reconfiguration of the road network, aqueducts, sewers, the CP rail line, pedestrian and cycling accesses to the site, and links with public transportation. These negotiations are ongoing between the City, the boroughs, the Ministère de transport du Québec, and the MUHC.
there were 17 memoire submitted by private citizens, physicians, a university professor, and community organisations within and outside of the CIQ.

The OCPM’s final report found that the project was generally welcomed by the participants during the consultation. However, several issues pertaining to the site plan and impacts on the surrounding neighbourhoods required further planning and coordination between the MUHC, the central city, Westmount, the two boroughs, and various local and provincial transportation agencies.

Among the findings of the OCPM’s final report were concerns about:

1. the mega-hospital site plan and integration of the new facility into the existing urban fabric. Here, participants felt that, among other things, there was insufficient access to the site for pedestrians, and greater possibilities for integration with public transportation and existing cycling infrastructure. Participants were also concerned about the impacts from traffic generated by the new mega-hospital on the surrounding road networks causing problems like congestion, noise, air pollution, and reduced parking availability for local residents; and

2. the project's environmental impact and sustainable development program. While citizens welcomed the environmental initiatives such as green roofs and energy conservation measures, participants questioned the degree of the MUHC's engagement to environmental measures, or in addressing other issues such as water and biological waste management practices, and noise and air pollution emanating from the site (Paré et al. 2005).

**LEED and environmental initiatives**

Requiring that the new mega-hospital obtain LEED certification was a MUHC led initiative. The MUHC has demonstrated a willingness to adopt a minimum of LEED silver rating. The hospital has said it was pursuing designs incorporating green roofs and geothermal heating systems. A planner for the MUHC, Cathy Ann Barr, said that that initiative was key to her own work in developing the hospital. A municipal employee involved in the discussions within the administrative committee identified the idea as originating from the MUHC’s consultant, Lemay and Associates. While it is unclear as to precisely where within the MUHC’s planning direction the idea of adopting LEED certification originated, the initiative was not community driven. Rather, Ms. Emmanuel noted that the proposition by the community to strive for LEED certification only served to reinforce the MUHC’s stance on this issue.

Community groups have called for the opportunity to contribute through dialogue to the planning of the environmental elements of the hospital. Groups such as STOP, an environmental
organisation which has worked on issues such as air quality and water quality, solid waste and energy, presented a memorandum during the public consultations in 2005 acknowledging the good will of the hospital to strive for LEED certification. However, they felt that a LEED model of development was closed to input from the community. The OCPM’s final report on the consultations noted that some community groups wished for evidence of the hospital’s engagement to green building design, and possibly an openness to allow interested community groups to participate in the planning of the hospital’s green elements (Paré et al. 2005). A 22 February, 2008 memorandum by the CIQ to the MUHC also asked for the opportunity to be involved in the future design process including the hospital’s green elements.

In attempting to address these concerns, Ms. Emmanuel commented that it is necessary to understand the constraints under which the MUHC operates. First, in response to concerns about traffic, circulation, and access, Ms. Emmanuel stated that community organisations are one of many actors in which the MUHC has to consult with. Others, including the City, the boroughs, the Agence métropolitaine de transport (AMT), the Société de transport de Montréal (STM), the Ministère des transports du Québec (MTQ), and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (CP) do not all share a coherent view as to the appropriate design. Second, the MUHC is currently constrained by the fact that the project will be built by a P3 process. A new executive director, Clermont Gignac, from the Quebec Ministère de la santé et services sociaux (MSSS) was also appointed in 2004 by the government of Quebec to ensure that the construction and renovation costs of MUHC’s Glen and Mountain campuses are within budget. With the addition of these provincial government bodies to the decision making process, the MUHC has to consult these two agencies before it can respond or act on any requests by the community. Last, the P3 process limits the involvement of the community groups in the planning of the mega-hospital. A degree of secrecy is required to ensure that any potential private partner is unaware of the proposal of others, and the Agence is worried that the involvement of community members would jeopardize the bidding process. Nonetheless, Ms. Emmanuel did say that the MUHC is in discussions with the executive director and the Agence to determine exactly how and to what degree community organisations might be involved. Ms. Emmanuel stressed the hope that community members did not perceive such actions as an unwillingness of the MUHC to work with community groups, but rather as a sign of the constraints with which the MUHC has to operate.
Subsequent to the public consultations, the MUHC announced on April 20, 2007 that it had adopted an Environmental Policy. The policy seeks to implement “sustainable best practices into all aspects of its operations, as well as into the design and construction of its facilities on the Glen and Mountain campuses” (McGill 2008). In January 2007, the MUHC also became a member of Hospitals for a Healthy Environment (H2E) and pledged to reduce environmental impacts from any new construction as well as operation of its facilities (McGill 2008). While this Environmental Policy is an MUHC initiative, it is uncertain as to whether its formulation was in response to concerns expressed by community groups.

Asked whether the MUHC would pursue a higher rating of LEED, Ms. Emmanuel noted that LEED silver is the minimum being required in the request for proposals being submitted to the potential private partners. It would be up to the private partner to achieve a higher rating of gold or platinum, but only if it can be done within the budget set out by the government of Quebec for the entire project.

The Planning of the UdM Campus

The following section documents a brief history of the planning process of UdM’s proposed campus on the former CP railway sorting yard in Outremont that took place leading up to the public consultations of 2007, and developments since those consultations up to the time of writing. Then, a brief description of how environmental issues around this project are discussed. The following represents information collected from the OCPM public consultation, newspaper articles, and an interview with one municipal employee from the borough of Villeray-St. Michel-Parc Extension (VSP).

Project overview

The Université de Montréal announced in 2005 its intention to build a new university campus on a former CP railway sorting yard, a site approximately 18 hectares in size. The university outlined its needs for more space for teaching and research as well as housing for its students. In developing the site, UdM sought to create a new institutional and residential environment of high architectural quality and urban character on what is currently a brownfield site. UdM’s project would be built in

---

5 Currently, the budget set out by the government of Quebec is $1.579 billion. However, this budget covers both the construction and renovation of the Glen and Mountain campuses. Allotting a greater amount to the Glen campus for instance to achieve a higher LEED rating would subsequently decrease the funds available for work on the Mountain campus.
multiple phases with an estimated completion date of 2027, requiring an estimated $1.1 billion in investment from itself and its partners, including the City of Montreal, and the provincial and federal governments. Among the broad components outlined in the UdM concept plan, UdM intends to:

- construct 275,000 m² of new teaching and research space;
- obtain LEED-Gold certification for new buildings and LEED-ND accreditation for the new campus;
- create new cycle paths expanding the existing pan-Montreal network;
- build a new train station on the Montreal-Blainville St-Jerome commuter rail line;
- create new park space on 15% of the site; and
- extend Wiseman Boulevard across the site to facilitate access to the Acadie and Outremont metro stations;

In September 2005, the executive committee of the City of Montreal accepted the development concept in principle, and in March 2006, UdM purchased the site (Montreal 2006).

Planning the UdM campus

According to a municipal employee, the planning department of Outremont and project planners from UdM took the lead role in the planning of the new UdM campus. Once again, Outremont’s CCU was engaged in the initial planning phases to provide recommendations regarding the project. UdM also established an advisory committee made up of Outremont residents, municipal employees and UdM representatives to consider the concerns of borough residents (Montreal 2006). Work on the site plan was finalized with the aid of the central City. They were also involved with the preparation of the proposed by-law changes for the Outremont railway sorting yards that was be presented during public consultations in 2007, as required by Article 89 of the Montreal Charter.

Public Consultations 2007

Public consultations on the proposed zoning by-laws were managed by the OCPM and were held between 27 February to 12 April, 2007. The OCPM report on the UdM’s new campus published 31 July, 2007 found that while the project presented an excellent opportunity for the redevelopment of a brownfield site and the creation of a valuable and high quality urban campus, the report high-
lighted several concerns regarding the planning process, the campus’s integration into existing fabric, and management of the circulation around the new campus (Beauchamp et al. 2007).

The OCPM report found that since the development of the campus is spread over 20 years, the concept plan lacked details over the precise design of buildings, commitments to environmental concerns, and traffic and public transportation routing and impacts. The report recommended that a collaborative process be put in place between UdM, the City of Montreal and its borough partners, and the neighbourhood organisations to elaborate in greater detail the first phase of the project. The report also recommended that a plan optimizing the circulation of public and active transport modes be detailed in order to mitigate the impacts of the 10,000 new residents, students, and visitors expected to travel to or from the site each day. Finally, the report recommended that studies be done regarding the extension of certain structuring axes serving both movement into, across, and off the site, while looking at the creation of further access points in order to avoid the further ghettoizing the borough of VSP to the north (Beauchamp et al. 2007).

One of the glaring deficiencies in the planning process of this project has been the lack of collaboration between the project’s promoters, UdM and the borough of Outremont, and stakeholders from areas adjacent to the site. The wider public who expressed themselves at the OCPM hearings revealed that adjacent boroughs and their citizens had been completely absent from initial planning discussions, leading to the expression of dissatisfaction over the lack of involvement in planning the project and an insufficient account of their interests (Lacroix 2007). The municipal employee interviewed noted that in the year leading up to the public consultations, the planning department of VSP was only approached twice by the consultant group Convercités, hired by UdM to manage its public outreach initiative, to air their concerns regarding the planning of the site. No further input leading up to the public consultations was solicited by the borough of Outremont, the central City, or UdM. Similarly, according to a memorandum presented by an engineer from TMR, their city was entirely excluded from the planning discussions of the possible impacts of circulation on their city (Hirou 2007).

The central City could have taken a more central role in coordinating and engaging the various stakeholders around the site, such as the boroughs of VSP, Rosemont-Petite Patrie, CDN-NDG, and the Town of Mount Royal (TMR). Instead, the planning department and elected officials of Outre-
mont spearheaded the project. When asked why this was the case, a municipal employee from VSP speculated that officials in Outremont wished to complete the project more quickly than might have been the case had the central City taken the lead planning role. With the central City preoccupied by other major projects such as the MUHC Glen campus, the *Centre Hospitalier de l’Université de Montréal* (CHUM) and the redevelopment of the harbour, the planning of the new UdM campus would not necessarily have been a priority for them. The municipal employee believed that such a strategy for expediency on the part of Outremont officials “*was effective at the time, but I believe that it was less effective with respect to the process, because given the regional implications of [the Outremont site], regional actors were not at the table to elaborate the project. This reality surfaced at the public consultations*”.

**Following the public consultations**

In September 2007, M. Andre Lavallé, executive committee member in charge of the service of urban planning for the central City and the mayor of the borough of Rosemont-Petite Patrie established a round table on the further planning of the UdM campus in response to the deficiencies in collaboration raised during the public consultations. Represented at this round table are elected representatives and planning directors from Outremont, VSP, Rosemont-Petite Patrie, Plateau Mont-Royal, CDN-NDG and TMR, as well as UdM and the central City. M. Lavallée announced his intention to give the UdM project a more regional scope and address the many recommendations laid out in OCPM’s final report (Saint-Pierre 2007). In the first meeting in September 2007 between all the actors identified, the City laid out their workplan to further study the questions of transport, circulation, housing, economic impacts, de-ghettoizing the territory, and the future of the CP rail line.

At the time of writing, no further meetings within this round table framework have taken place since September 2007. The municipal employee from VSP voiced continued concern at the lack of engagement and the borough’s inability to contribute to the project in a satisfactory manner. Elected officials from VSP also share the municipal employee’s views, and find that the process thus far has not allowed for meaningful contributions in order to maximize the opportunities presented by the development of the new campus. While such views need to be corroborated through further interviews, the municipal employee believes that the situation is similar for adjoining boroughs and
TMR. Several community groups have also voiced their frustrations at not being invited to join this discussion. They include citizen groups such as the Coalition of Neighbours of the Outremont Railyard Sorting Site and the Committee of Residents of Parc-Extension (Corriveau 2007, Allard 2008).

**LEED and environmental initiatives**

The initiative for the project’s environmental measures such as designing for LEED Gold came from UdM. The municipal employee of VSP stated that planning of environmental initiatives was not a major preoccupation for the borough of VSP since these initiatives were already included in the project’s initial design. Their primary concern was to ensure that the project facilitated the de-ghettoization of VSP through better pedestrian, cycling, and public transport accesses. This, in turn, would discourage the use of the single occupant vehicle in travelling to and from the site. The interviewee did add that when the design of these access points was under consideration, the borough of VSP would ensure that appropriate environmental measures were incorporated. However, once again the municipal employee expressed dissatisfaction about the lack of involvement of the borough of VSP thus far, and their inability to contribute to any discussions surrounding the impacts of the site, let alone addressing environmental issues.

**Discussion**

It is clear from this comparative analysis that the planning process for the two projects under study are following a similar procedural path with respect to the involvement of public planning agencies. In the case of the MUHC, the City, boroughs, and project proponents participated together in the administrative committee to detail the Glen campus plan. In the case of UdM, while the initial planning phase prior to the public consultations involved only Outremont, the central City and UdM, the round table set up in September 2007 seeks in theory to ameliorate the concerns about a lack of inter-municipal coordination. However, as stated above, this round table has yet to demonstrate meaningful engagement with surrounding boroughs or TMR.

In both cases, municipal employees have cited very limited contact with the local area residents or community groups. Other than through borough CCUs or elected officials, neither of the formal collaboration processes (the administrative committee and the round table in the cases of the MUHC Glen Campus and UdM campus respectively) included any community involvement.
Dialogue with the community groups was initiated by each project’s proponent. In the case of the MUHC Glen campus, community groups have been involved in discussions with the project’s proponent through involvement with the CIQ or in direct talks with MUHC representatives. In the case of the UdM campus, a community advisory committee was established in the planning phase prior to the public consultations in 2006.

In both cases, the initiative to incorporate environmental measures in the projects’ designs has been led by the projects’ proponents. With respect to public planning agencies, Quebec’s planning laws do not allow municipalities to mandate green roofs, energy efficient design, or obtaining LEED accreditation. However, all of the municipal employees interviewed noted that current public and political awareness allowed them to strongly encourage the inclusion of such measures into a project’s design.

The only meaningful engagement by the public in raising environmental issues and concerns has been aired through one forum, the formal public consultations managed by the OCPM. During those public consultations, community groups and local area residents expressed concerns regarding the environmental commitments, site access, traffic congestion, and air pollution in the case of the MUHC Glen campus. In the case of the new UdM campus, groups such as Friends of the Mountain expressed support for the new campus on the former railway sorting yard because it decreases development pressure on the mountain, while the General Union of Professors of the University of Montreal ask for a moratorium on further development of the Outremont site in order to explore a densification and consolidation of the existing UdM campus on the mountain in order to, among other things, promote more sustainable development (Amis de la montagne 2007, SGPUM 2007). While formal public consultations are open and invaluable forums for the public to raise environmental concerns, the time frame for public input short and restricted to only one phase of a project’s development process; in both cases, the final designs of the new campus developments were not yet prepared, resulting in uncertainty on the side of the public with respect to the magnitude of actual impacts or effect of proposed mitigation measures.

Has engagement between the various stakeholders produced meaningful results in terms of addressing the environmental issues and concerns of each project? Certainly the close collaboration
between both project’s proponents with public agencies has likely refined each project’s environmental measures. However, with respect to the community, other than through recommendations submitted during formal public consultations, this report finds no evidence that community efforts have contributed to improving the environmental measures of each project. In the case of the MUHC, the requests of the environmental subcommittee of the CIQ to be involved in with the design of the MUHC campus has not received a response at the time of writing. As mentioned earlier, the fact that the MUHC is being constructed by a P3 arrangement restricts the involvement of community groups. Certainly public planners and project proponents have likely taken into account local area residents’ concerns regarding improving walking, bicycling, and public transport access while mitigating the impacts of automobiles. However, these are not the sole preoccupations of local area residents, and as such this research cannot attribute any specific environmental outcomes within either project to the direct influence of public input. What is clear is that community groups concerned about the environmental impacts of the two new campuses have not been included in any of the planning discussions, past and ongoing taking place between public agencies and project proponents.

It is important to highlight UdM’s efforts to engage the community through a community advisory committee. What is advantageous about UdM’s community engagement, unlike the process being undertaken by the MUHC and the CIQ, is the fact that UdM proponents, community members, as well as public planners were sitting at the same discussion table. As mentioned earlier, public planners have the ability to strongly encourage the inclusion of environmental measures into a project’s design. Thus a forum that places planners in contact with community members could provide the latter with greater insight as to how planners are managing environmental concerns among other things. Conversely, this forum could also give planners more opportunities than afforded by the formal public consultation process to access community concerns. The role of the UdM advisory body would be strengthened if it were held on an on-going basis. Doing so has the potential to allow all stakeholders to address environmental issues at all stages of a project’s development. However, project proponents for the UdM campus should take note of the fact that the MUHC has involved stakeholders in all districts surrounding the Glen campus site. Setting up advisory committees in districts surrounding the future UdM campus in Outremont would go towards addressing the lack of engagement of community stakeholders in those districts.
Conclusion and Future work

This work documents the relationships between major stakeholders involved in the planning of the MUHC Glen campus and to a lesser extent the relationships between major stakeholders involved in the new UdM campus in Outremont. Further interviews are required with stakeholders working on the UdM campus development because one interview, while providing a valuable perspective, is insufficient to describe the overall process. Since these two projects are also ongoing, there is a lot of information regarding the current planning processes that are not readily available to researchers. For example, the same P3 arrangement that currently limits the involvement of community organisations in participating in ongoing planning of the MUHC mega-hospital also limits the availability of information on this process to researchers. Finally, the dialogue and negotiations addressing environmental concerns are ongoing and evolving, which means that a full account of how environmental issues were addressed cannot be made until the completion of each project.
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