Consultants are recommending demolition of the Royal Victoria Hospital’s newer buildings, though some are ingenious examples of Modern architecture, and turning the others into condominiums. A McGill professor argues that it’s a mistake to change the vocation of this site from serving to the public by providing luxury housing.

ANHRIIAD SADRES

Re: lane-named so far in the public de-
bate about the superhospital on the
Glaschonstaad campus of Memorial
Buildings of the four receiving hos-

titals. Consultants hired by the McGill University
Health Centre (Mach) evaluated the older build-
ings and determined it would not cost much to re-
date them.

Other consultants were subsequently asked to
suggest possibilities for the reuse of the sites.
The proposals in the second report, Evaluation of
the Site, and Functional Requirements (February
1969), were adopted in consultation with the
decision on the fate of the pre-

There is little attention paid to the fact that the site falls within the cultural
heritage protection area of Royal Mount.
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The consultants should look at the Cour
Mont-Royal project, which
reemphasizes their own proposals.

their own proposals. It’s a fashion show.

The land and buildings of the Royal
Victoria Hospital were donated
by 19th-century philanthropists to
the people of Montreal.

the public service of the site by providing
luxury housing.

The Wanless Pavilion, for
example, could be easily con-
verted to student housing, needed at a uni-
college where demand for on-campus housing
waits envious. McGill presently offers no
housing for student families, single parents or
orphans. Other pavilions could accommodate
ministers and classrooms, incorporating the
Modern and historic structures.

In his report to the government, McKerrow
vice-president of the University who identified what he

Mackenzie’s incursions into the Royal
Mount plan are not only inordinate.

McKerrow and the consultants have ben-
lected to the general public.

by bringing about change.

But whichever critical objections one might
have, the conversion of the site from public to private
use is not as bad as the offers made by the real

Few years after the building opened.

The failure of the 1960s was that nearly all
the architects were out of touch with the

to the general public.
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the architects were out of touch with the