



POLICY REPORT
URBAN STRUCTURE

Report Date: November 29, 2010
Contact: Kevin McNaney
Contact No.: 604.871.6851
RTS No.: 08566
VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20
Meeting Date: December 16, 2010

TO: Standing Committee on Planning and Environment
FROM: Director of Planning
SUBJECT: Implementation of "Vancouver Views" and Opportunities for Higher Buildings in the Downtown

RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT Council approve the finalized version of the new protected public view corridors, as generally described in Appendix A, that were adopted in principle by City Council on January 26, 2010.

FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to make consequential amendments to the *View Protection Guidelines* and all other relevant policies and guidelines to reflect these new protected views.

- B. THAT Council adopt the revised *General Policy For Higher Buildings*, as generally described in Appendix B, to allow for future consideration of higher buildings outside of protected public views (with the exception of the View 3.0 from Queen Elizabeth Park) in the Central Business District, "Burrard Bridge Gateway" and "Granville Bridge Gateway", noting that each such rezoning application would be subject to full review and Public Hearing.
- C. THAT, subject to the approval of the new protected public views through the adoption of RECOMMENDATION A, the Director of Planning be instructed to make application to amend Section 4 of the Downtown Official Development Plan to delete sub-section 4 and Map 4-Height of Buildings in View Cones (Downtown South) and all reference to the subsection and map, and that the application be referred to a public hearing.

FURTHER THAT the Director of Legal Services be instructed to prepare the necessary amending by-law, generally in accordance with Appendix C, for consideration at the public hearing.

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The General Manager of Community Services recommends APPROVAL of the foregoing.

CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The City Manager recommends APPROVAL of the foregoing.

COUNCIL POLICY

Downtown Official Development Plan (1975)

View Protection Guidelines (1989)

Downtown Vancouver Skyline Study (1997)

General Policy for Higher Buildings (1997)

Historic Area Height Review (2010)

Granville Loops Policy Plan (2010)

PURPOSE

To report back on the implementation of Council's decisions in January, 2010 on the Vancouver Views Study, including Council's direction to seek opportunities for additional higher buildings in the downtown outside of protected public view corridors (except for the Queen Elizabeth Park view 3.0).

SUMMARY

In January 2010, Council provided directions regarding the Views Study and instructed staff to report back on implementation of these directions. Staff have completed the implementation of these decisions with the exception of two items which Council requested staff to report back, those being new protected public views adopted in principle and opportunities for additional higher buildings in the downtown outside of protected views.

This report recommends that Council adopt a final configuration for the three new views adopted in principle and refers some consequential amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan to Public Hearing. The report also recommends that Council adopt a revised *General Policy for Higher Buildings* that creates additional opportunities for higher buildings in the Downtown outside of protected views. These opportunities represent a significant improvement over the previous approach considered by Council, in that they provide opportunities for signature architecture in the skyline and "gateway" locations; allow increased strategic densities to meet City goals; and provide additional benefit capacity, all without penetrating protected public views. The recommendations also incorporate Council's desire to require these higher buildings to have superior green building performance and architectural excellence.

BACKGROUND

In 2009, Council directed staff to launch the Vancouver Views Study (also known as the Downtown Capacity and View Corridors Study) to review the Council adopted height limits and view corridors affecting the Downtown study area and recommend changes, if appropriate, to achieve additional development capacity. The intent of the study was to identify possible

modifications while still achieving the objectives underlying the current height and view corridor policies.

The study undertook extensive public consultation and urban design analysis and brought a series of recommendations back for Council consideration in January 2010 (RTS# 08321). After hearing from the public and considering these recommendations Council made the following resolutions, each with different implications for reporting back.

Resolution A:

Council reaffirmed the importance of the *View Protection Guidelines*. This item requires no report back.

Resolution B:

Council approved minor changes to three existing protected public views to strengthen them. This item requires no report back. The task is complete and changes are ready to be incorporated in the City's VanMap system.

Resolution C:

Council approved adding three new views in principle and directed staff to report back on implementation "following further technical analysis and Council's decisions on the Heritage Area Height Review (HAHR)". This item is a subject of this report.

Resolution D:

Staff presented a concept for a *Limited Expansion of the General Policy for Higher Buildings*. This concept proposed four additional higher building sites that although outside of the existing higher building policy boundary (e.g. the CBD), met the basic urban design principles of the policy as well as the Council approved outcomes of the Skyline Study. Three of four of these buildings (with the exception of the Downtown Toyota site) were a departure from current policy in that they impacted protected views other than the Queen Elizabeth Park view 3.0. Staff suggested that although insertions into the view corridors were considered necessary should Council wish to proceed with higher buildings inserting into view corridors then, given resolution A, no more than four buildings should be considered.

Council decided not to pursue these taller buildings into the view corridors, but rather created a revised Resolution D instructing staff to "assess and report back detailing additional higher building opportunities within existing policies and past practises that considers potential community and economic benefits". This item is a subject of this report.

Resolution E:

Council affirmed the current, rigorous application of Cambie Street and Cambie Bridge view corridors. No further action is required.

Resolution F:

Council directed staff to report back with an amended *General Policy for Higher Buildings*, including expanded requirements for architectural excellence and additional requirements for green building performance. This item is a subject of this report.

DISCUSSION

There are two key issues that are presented for Council consideration. The first is the adoption of finalized versions of the three new views adopted in principle in January 2010. The second issue relates to the expansion of opportunities for higher buildings in the Downtown outside of protected public views through the adoption of a revised *General Policy for Higher Buildings*. These issues are discussed below.

1. Implementation of New Views

The recommended implementation of the new views adopted in principle by Council are presented in Appendix A, and summarized below.

View One: From Choklit Park to Grouse and Mt Fromme

One of the locations where the public felt that there was a need for greater view protection was from the False Creek Slopes and in particular in areas south of 6th Avenue. Choklit Park is one of the primary public vantage points on the slope and is frequented by the local population. This view will preserve views of Grouse and Mt. Fromme.

This view is being implemented generally as adopted in principle by City Council.

View Two: Creekside Park to the Lions

Creekside Park is a destination park for a wide segment of the City and Region's population and this role is likely to become more prominent with the expansion of park which will be delivered through the build-out of the remaining parcels of False Creek North (Northeast False Creek). The intention of this view is to take the protection as laid out in the guidelines for the International Village CD-1 (265) and implement it more formally in the City's *View Protection Guidelines*. This view originates from the public walkway near Science World and is intended to preserve the view of the Lions from the eastern end of False Creek.

This view is being implemented generally as adopted in principle by City Council. The recommended implementation of the view corridor passes directly over the BC Electric Building at approximately 160 feet, and thus is congruent with Council's decision in January 2010 to consider a rezoning on this site to generally 150 feet as part of the Historic Area Height Review.

View Three: Olympic Village to Mt Fromme and Lynn Range

As an emerging location of public and international importance, the plaza at the Olympic Village was a node of global celebration and is a lasting legacy from the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver. The Olympic Plaza has a tremendous vantage point which reveals not only the towers of the downtown skyline and an expansive mountain view, but also the compressed heights of the historic area and a view of the gantry cranes which are a visible reminder of Vancouver's economically and historically important port function.

The recommended implementation of this view corridor is slightly modified from what was adopted in principle by Council to reflect Council's decisions as part of the Historic Area Height Review. Staff recommend that the view objectives can be achieved by implementing the view as two separate views and view points, with one from the centre of the Olympic Plaza and one from the pier west of the pedestrian bridge in South East False Creek. This approach provides a more logical location for the view points while also recognizing the dynamic view that emerges of the mountains as one moves east between the two viewpoints on the False Creek seawall. Staff see this alteration as protecting a valuable expansive view of the mountains including the gantry cranes at the Port, the prominent ridgeline near Lynn Peak, and the valley and glacier view (the glacier on Meslilloet Mountain is the closest glacier visible from Vancouver) created as the ridge descends then rises towards Mt Seymour.

At the same time this alteration facilitates Council's resolution as part of the Historic Area Height Review to seek additional sites for taller buildings of generally 150 feet in the HA-1A and locates them on Main Street, which is more desirable from an urban design perspective. Moreover, this implementation still allows for future opportunities for the reconfiguration of Creekside Park should that be an outcome of the North East False Creek planning and development process.

2. Creating Additional Opportunities for Higher Buildings in the Downtown

When considering the outcomes of the Vancouver Views study, Council decided not to pursue taller buildings in the Downtown that would impact protected view corridors (other than View 3.0 From Q.E. Park) and directed staff to identify available higher building opportunities in Downtown, which were more consistent with current view corridor policy. The outcome of staff analysis is the recommended revised *General Policy for Higher Buildings* contained in Appendix B, which is explained in more detail below.

Following this Council direction, staff undertook a thorough review of higher building potential, challenges and opportunities within the Downtown. The methodology was to identify all areas of opportunity for higher buildings (e.g. areas not impacted by view corridors other than the Q.E. view corridor), to apply key urban design concepts to determine appropriate areas for higher buildings, and then to conduct extensive local urban design analysis to determine appropriate heights on the potential redevelopment sites. This process is summarized below in Figure 1.1 & 1.2.




Figure 1.1: Study Area with View Corridors




Figure 1.2: Areas Outside of Protected Views & Potential Locations for Higher Buildings

Some of the key urban design considerations to guide the location for potential higher buildings outside of protected views in the downtown included:

- A continuation of the current urban design approach and policy where the Central Business District reads as the highest, most prominent point in the skyline;
- A continuation of the current urban design approach and policy where higher buildings mark the city's major ceremonial streets (Burrard St, Granville St and Georgia St) both to give them prominence in the skyline, and because these streets are wide enough to handle the mass and shadow/wind impacts of larger buildings; and
- A new urban design approach to mark key entry points into the Downtown ("gateways") at the north end of the Granville and Burrard Bridges.

Some potential redevelopment sites remain outside of these areas identified through the urban design concepts above, and although they meet the basic criteria for higher buildings (e.g. do not impact protected views) they were not considered appropriate for higher buildings for one or more reasons listed below:

- There were significant, adverse shadow impacts (e.g. on important pedestrian and shopping streets like Robson and Granville and/or key intersections) or scale impacts (e.g. adjacent to important plazas, parks or buildings such as the court house);
- There were no available development sites (e.g. many of the waterfront areas in Downtown South are already "built out");
- The available sites were right on the water's edge, which goes against long standing urban design principles and practise of scaling down towards the water; and/or
- The available sites were located on smaller secondary or residential streets.

Once the three subareas were identified for creating opportunities for higher buildings (the CBD, and the Burrard and Granville Bridge "gateways"), staff conducted extensive urban design, scale and shadow impact analysis to determine an optimal local urban design outcome while allowing potential for higher buildings, where appropriate.

Minimizing shadow impacts on busy pedestrian areas and key intersections of important shopping streets was of paramount importance to ensure that these higher buildings have as little negative impact as possible on the usability, vitality and quality of the public realm. The shadow analysis was often a determining factor in the location of taller buildings and the maximum building heights, which is consistent with long-standing urban design practise in the Downtown.

It is important to note that not all sidewalks and intersections are considered equal when evaluating shadow impacts on the public realm. Although shadowing of some locations is considered acceptable, in key locations (e.g. along Granville St and at the intersection of Davie and Burrard Streets) the nature and importance of the location required careful protection from shadow impacts, which is once again consistent with long-standing practise.

The localized urban design analysis is summarized for each of the subareas below.

i) Central Business District

Enhance the prominence of the CBD in the skyline by increasing the height potential of the tallest tower and bolstering the heights and size of the shoulder area by:

- Increasing the maximum potential height for higher buildings in the CBD from the existing 600' to a height of generally 700';

- Continuing to locate the highest buildings (e.g. ~700') along Burrard, Georgia and Granville Streets, particularly at the intersection of Burrard and Georgia Streets;
- Adding another CBD shoulder area that is just to the south of Alberni Street. The existing shoulder area that is centred on Melville Street remains unchanged; and
- Increasing the maximum height in the shoulder areas from the existing 400' to generally 550'.




Figure 2.1: Existing Policy Heights from Spanish Banks




Figure 2.2: Proposed CBD Expansion from Spanish Banks

ii) Burrard Bridge Gateway

Create a Burrard Bridge Gateway by marking the entrance to the Downtown with a single, prominent tower on axis extending from the north-end of the bridge by:

- Expanding the existing boundary for higher buildings to include Burrard bridgehead precinct;
- Allowing consideration for a single higher building of generally 500' at the Downtown Toyota site to mark the axial view and stand out as the significant architectural feature from the Burrard Bridge arrival. Further detailed analysis indicates that building height higher than generally 500' will create negative and harmful shadow conditions on the intersection at Burrard and Davie, which is considered to be an important and strategic location within the Downtown public realm. Heights above ~500' would also compete with building heights in CBD (see section (i) above for the urban design analysis of the CBD sub area).
- Allowing consideration of increased height beyond existing policy heights for other sites along Burrard Street without diminishing the strength of the axial view. In particular, development at the Burrard bridgehead site (just to the east of the

bridgehead) should be no more than 300' tall. Development at the northwest corner of Davie and Burrard Streets should be no more than 375' tall.



Figure 3.1: Existing Policy Heights from South End of Burrard Bridge




Figure 3.2: Proposed Burrard Gateway from South End of Burrard Bridge

iii) Granville Bridge Gateway

Create a Granville Bridge Gateway by framing the entrance to the Downtown with a pair of prominent towers on either side of the north-end of the Granville Bridge, south of the existing Granville Loops by:

- Expanding the existing boundary for higher buildings to include Granville bridgehead precinct;
- Allowing consideration for two landmark buildings of generally 425 feet on the sites south of the Granville Loops to frame the entry view to downtown from Granville Bridge while minimizing any potential shadow impacts on the important intersection at Granville and Davie Streets through massing and tower location; and
- Maintaining the existing building heights in the Council-approved Granville Loops Policy Plan to transition down to the historic scale of Granville Street.




Figure 4.1: Existing Policy Heights from South End of Granville Bridge




Figure 4.2: Proposed Granville Gateway from South End of Granville Bridge

2.3 Summary of Public Consultation on Additional Higher Buildings in the Downtown

The consultation on creating additional opportunities for higher buildings in the Downtown built on the earlier, extensive public consultation around protected public views and higher buildings that was conducted over an 18-month period during the Vancouver Views Study.

The continued public consultation on the higher building opportunities outlined in this report was conducted in October 2010 and was targeted at gauging not only the local concerns of residents, but also the city-wide perspective. Staff also made efforts to engage as many land owners of significantly impacted properties. Over 500 people participated at three open houses at the Central Library, the Pacific Centre Mall rotunda, and the Roundhouse Community Centre, while additional meetings were held to solicit feedback from specific interest groups, where possible (e.g. Downtown Vancouver BIA). Citizens were consulted on their general feelings towards additional higher buildings, as well as their opinions on the specific sub-areas proposed.

Staff note that the questionnaire provided was not a statistically-valid poll, but rather provides a glimpse into the opinions of those who attended the Open Houses. Of the seventy-two individuals who gave their feedback on the provided comment sheets:

- 61.1% supported (48.6% Strongly Support, 12.5% Support) the introduction of additional higher buildings outside of protected public view corridors in the Downtown

The individual sub-areas proposed were each supported by over half of all residents who responded to the questionnaire, including:

- 64.7% either 'Strongly Supported' (54.4%) or 'Supported' (10.3%) the increase of maximum building heights in the CBD
- 60.9% either 'Strongly Supported' (43.5%) or 'Supported' (17.4%) the expansion of the CBD shoulder area south of Alberni
- 55.9% either 'Strongly Supported' (44.1%) or 'Supported' (11.8%) the introduction of a higher building at the Burrard Bridge Gateway
- 53.9% either 'Strongly Supported' (42.0%) or 'Supported' (11.6%) two higher buildings framing the Granville Bridge Gateway.

In all cases, very few open house attendees responded as "neutral/no opinion". A complete summary of all of the comments received is contained in Appendix D.

The response at the open houses reflects a generally positive city-wide public opinion about the proposed changes to the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*, with general support for creating new landmarks in the skyline, more interesting architecture and more visually exciting entrances into the Downtown.

Those who did not support the proposals cited a number of concerns including: the loss of private views; increased residents in the Downtown and additional strain on amenities such as community centres and parks; additional traffic and parking issues; a sense that the Downtown is already "too crowded" with towers; concerns about shadow impacts on streets; and a loss of access to sunlight in already dense neighbourhoods such as Downtown South. Staff believe that many of the comments and concerns can be resolved through the detailed urban design and technical analysis at the rezoning and development permit stage. These are legitimate issues that staff take seriously when working with applicants to mitigate impacts of new towers through careful massing, shaping of floor plates, tower siting and maintaining sufficient tower separation to ensure livability and minimize private view impacts.

2.4 Green Building Performance and Architectural Excellence Requirements

As part of a Vancouver Views decision, Council also approved the recommendation for staff to *"report back with an amended General Policy for Higher Buildings that expands requirements for potential higher building sites to include the demonstration of green building design performance (in particular energy performance) that significantly improves local knowledge and results in green design beyond prevailing policy and that establishes a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the City's skyline"*.

Energy performance requirements for higher buildings should be assessed within the City's overall strategy to achieve carbon neutrality for all new buildings by 2020. The Draft *Greenest City Carbon Neutral Building Strategy* has identified a proposed policy framework, among other components, which will be considered by City Council in early 2011. Under this proposed policy framework, a multi-staged and graduated building energy performance standard will be established, with all new buildings required to achieve a 50% reduction in energy consumption from 2010 levels (which is ASHRAE 90.1 2007) by 2020.

Within this context, staff recommend that higher buildings can be used as a tool to advance the carbon neutrality objective and serve as learning opportunities to advance green building practices for other local buildings. The taller buildings can advance the energy efficiency benchmark ahead of the implementation of the requirements for all buildings and act as demonstration projects of how the new energy requirements can be met.

In terms of the specific role of higher buildings in advancing our carbon neutrality goals, all buildings going through a regular development permit process (DE) will be required to achieve a 25% reduction in energy consumption by 2011. As of July 30, 2010, all rezoning applications will be required to be minimum LEED Gold, which represents an approximate equivalent of a 30% reduction in energy consumption. As indicated in Appendix B, staff recommend that the revised *General Policy for Higher Buildings* advance our goal of carbon neutrality by including a stated policy objective that higher buildings achieve a 40% reduction of energy consumption from 2010 levels, and an approximate 50% reduction after 2013. Moreover, staff recommend that at least one of the special review panel members for higher buildings should have extensive green building expertise. Finally, where applicable, design features/elements that are demonstrative of green building technology and that educate the public about green building technology will be specifically encouraged for higher buildings.

Greater Architectural Excellence

There are existing provisions in the current *General Policy for Higher Buildings* that seek to ensure the highest level of architectural excellence, including the addition of international designers and architects to augment the City's urban design review process.

The new language adopted by Council of "creating a new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city's skyline" is seen as a significantly strengthened and enhanced expectation for higher buildings. Staff also recommend that the architectural debate be broadened to include more public discussion on how this expectation is met. As was evident in the public process of the Vancouver Views Study, the public is becoming increasingly educated and interested in the future and image of the city, which is something that this process can engage.

Therefore, staff recommend a focussed but flexible public review and education component beyond the current special review process for higher buildings. This component could include a public forum on the role of higher building architecture in city shaping, a public lecture on architectural excellence and green building practises by the invited design panel experts, or other forms of public education and debate. The form of public education and debate will be determined creatively based on the opportunities created by each of the individual projects.

2.5 Implications for Existing Proposals for Higher Buildings in the Downtown

The policy recommendations contained in this report do not seek Council approval at this time of any proposals for higher buildings in the downtown, but rather create a framework for future consideration and evaluation of higher building proposals. Some of the opportunities created by this report may not come to fruition for many years, while others may be proposed in the near term.

There has been a rezoning application submitted recently for a proposal for a higher building on the Downtown Toyota site, which would be evaluated as part of the Burrard Bridge Gateway. The rezoning application was originally submitted with a building height of 500', but a supplemental application has since been submitted for a building height of 550'. Although staff have advised the applicant for development on the site that height above 500' is not supported by staff, it is recognized that the ultimate height will be determined by Council at the public hearing for these lands. Approving the recommendations in this report does not fetter Council's ultimate discretion regarding heights for this site above the "generally 500 feet" noted in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations contained in this report do not have implications for the City's operating budget.

However, if approved by Council, the recommendations regarding higher buildings could potentially generate approximately 0.9 million square feet of additional density beyond current zoning and policy. This additional density would be subject to the City's Financing Growth Policies and could help to support the delivery of public benefits such as parks, day care, affordable housing and heritage building rehabilitation.

CONCLUSION

Protecting cherished views of the mountains is important to the public. Creating a dynamic skyline, allowing strategic and sustainable density, and allowing bonus density to help deliver public benefits are all highly desirable public objectives. This report seeks to achieve all of these objectives by recommending an approach to Council that strengthens the view protection framework with the addition of new protected views while at the same time identifying additional, strategic opportunities for higher buildings that strengthen the image of our skyline without compromising protected public views of the mountains.

* * * * *

Implementation of New Protected Views Adopted in Principle By City Council

View F1: CHOKLIT PARK to Grouse & Mount Fromme



INFORMATION

View Point: Centre of Upper Plaza of Choklit Park at Spruce & W 7th Ave

View Field: Grouse Mountain & Mount Fromme

View Point Elevation: 28.85m

History: Adopted in principle by Council on January 26, 2010

Comments: View F1 is composed of three sections: F1.1, F1.2 & F1.3.

REFERENCE DATA

F1.1

Reference Point: Grace (1280 Richards Street)

Reference Point Elevation: 101.72 m

Distance to Reference Point: 1093 m

F1.2

Reference Point: Capitol Residences (833 Seymour Street)

Reference Point Elevation: 153.52 m

Distance to Reference Point: 1794 m


F1.3

Reference Point: 289 Drake Street

Reference Point Elevation: 83.08 m

Distance to Reference Point: 1003 m

View G1: OLYMPIC VILLAGE SHIPYARD PIER to North Shore Mountains



View Point: North End of the Pier on the west side of the Pedestrian Bridge in Southeast False Creek

View Field: North Shore Mountains

View Point Elevation: 5m

History: Adopted in principle by Council on January 26, 2010

Comments: View G1 is composed of two sections: G1.1 & G1.2

REFERENCE DATA

G1.1

Reference Point: Northwest corner of property at 601 Main Street.

(Block 18, District lot 196, Plan 184)

Reference Point Elevation: 43.52m

Distance to Reference Point: 946.17m

G1.2

Reference Point: Northwest corner of property at 601 Main Street.

(Block 18, District lot 196, Plan 184)

Reference Point Elevation: 55.94m

Distance to Reference Point: 946.17m

View H1: OLYMPIC PLAZA VIEW



INFORMATION

View Point: Centre of Stage in Olympic Village Plaza

View Field: Grouse Mountain & North Shore Mountains

View Point Elevation: 6.5m

History: Adopted in principle by Council on January 26, 2010

REFERENCE DATA

Reference Point: Southwest corner of property at 501 Keefer Street.
(Plan 7362 New Westminster Lot 1 of a Bk 15 DL 196 & 2037)

Reference Point Elevation: 40.64m

Distance to Reference Point: 982.77m

VIEW J1: CREEKSIDE PARK to the Lions



View Point: On the pedestrian path next to the Southern Pillar in Creekside Park

View Field: The Lions

View Point Elevation: 7m

History: Approved by Council on October 23, 1990, Amended December 16, 2010

Comments: View I was originally approved by Council in the Comprehensive Development for International Village CD-1 (265) and was adopted in principle by Council on January 26, 2010 for inclusion into the City's View Protection Guidelines.


REFERENCE DATA

Reference Point: Southwest corner of property at 425 Carrall Street
(District Lot 541 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan BCP8534)

Reference Point Elevation: 54.95m

Distance to Reference Point: 805.62m

MAP OF NEW VIEW LOCATIONS



Implications of these views

These view corridors have been considered in conjunction with a series of Council initiatives and have allowed for flexibility in the future while preserving these important public views in emerging communities. These new corridors are consistent with the recommendations of the Historic Area Height Review allowing for a series of potential 150' sites along Main Street in the HA-1A district and buildings of generally in the range of 150' at the BC Electric (425 Carrall St) and Budget sites (99 W Pender St). The view corridor implementation also allows for the potential of a reconfiguration of Creekside Park through the Northeast False Creek High Level Review and allows opportunities for appropriate built form should the viaducts be removed.

GENERAL POLICY FOR HIGHER BUILDINGS

Adopted by City Council May 6, 1997

Amended December XX, 2010

Application and Intent

These guidelines are to be used in conjunction with all applicable Official Development Plans for buildings seeking approval for significant additional height above current zoning and policy, or for those entering into the Queen Elizabeth View Corridor. The intent of these guidelines is to mark the prominence of the Central Business District in our downtown skyline, while also providing opportunities for strategically placed height at two prominent bridge “gateways” to mark the entry into downtown from the Burrard and Granville Bridges.

General Policy for Higher Buildings

The following should be considered when reviewing proposals for Higher Buildings (i.e. those which significantly exceed current height limits and/or enter into the Queen Elizabeth View Corridor):

- Higher Buildings will only be permitted within the areas identified below in Figure 1;
- The tallest buildings (i.e. ~ 550-700’) should be located within the Central Business District with the tallest buildings (i.e. ~ 700’) located on one of Vancouver’s three primary streets: Georgia, Burrard and Granville;
- Secondary heights may be considered for buildings at the Granville and Burrard Bridgeheads with a single prominent tower (~ 500’) in axial alignment with the Burrard Bridge, and two towers framing the Granville Bridge Gateway (~ 425’);
- All other application for additional height at these two bridgehead locations should be analyzed to ensure that the experiential intent of these gateways is maintained;
- All Higher Buildings must establish a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city’s skyline;
- Higher buildings should demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption and as a result must be subjected, not only to current review requirements, but also to review by a Council appointed panel including respected community leaders, notable local and international design experts, and leaders in sustainable design;
- All Higher Buildings must significantly demonstrate and advance the city’s objective for carbon neutrality for new buildings with a stated objective to achieve a 40-50% reduction in energy consumption from 2010 levels;
- As a component of this enhanced review, a special public engagement, such as a public forum or guest lecture, should be held featuring the guest panel members and experts to expand public discussion and education around architectural excellence and green design in Vancouver.

In addition, all Higher Buildings should be considered with careful effort to provide a lasting and meaningful public legacy to Vancouver and should include careful consideration of the following:

- The buildings should achieve community benefits (i.e. as a recipient site for density transfers; retention of important heritage components; provision of significant cultural or social facilities; or provision of low cost housing);
- The development should not involve the demolition of a Class ‘A’ heritage building;
- The building should include activities and uses of community significance such as public observation decks or other public amenity;

- The development should provide on-site open space that represents a significant contribution to the downtown network of green and plaza space;
- The building should not contribute to adverse microclimate effects;
- Careful consideration should be given to minimize adverse shadowing and view impacts on public realm including key streets, parks and plazas, as well as neighbouring buildings ;
- Signage on the buildings should not be located at a height which exceeds the building’s current height limit.




Figure 1: General Policy for Higher Buildings Map

DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE
DOWNTOWN OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
BY-LAW NO. 4912

Note: A By-law will be prepared generally in accordance with the provisions listed below, subject to change and refinement prior to posting.

- In Section 4 - Height of Buildings:
 - delete subsection 2(a), subsection 4 and Map 4 - Height of Buildings in View Cones (Downtown South);
 - renumber subsection 2(b) as subsection 2(a); and
 - from renumbered subsection 2(a), delete the words "or under subsection (4)".
- Renumber the remaining maps in Section 5 and Section 7, and the references to them within those sections.
- Delete Map 4 from the List of Maps and Figures, and renumber the remaining maps.

Summary of Public Consultation on Creating New Opportunities for Higher Buildings in the Downtown

QUESTION 1: In general, do you support additional Higher Building sites in the downtown area that are outside of protected public views?

<i>Strongly Supportive</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Neutral/ Don't know</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Strongly Opposed</i>	<i>Total</i>
35	9	2	2	24	72
48.61%	12.50%	2.78%	2.78%	33.33%	100.00%
61.11%		2.78%	36.11%		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON QUESTION 1
From my perspective, we should hold off on these opportunities until we see our investment return from the Afghanistan War and until we can measure the American investment return from the Iraqi war. Interesting environmental & Technological changes. Few years!!!
Every city has to grow, I think done properly and tastefully it can add to our already beautiful city, as long as it doesn't get out of control and doesn't wreck the view of our awesome environment I am all for it.
From the presentation it sound like they've done their homework before making proposals
Skyline needs additional height to stop tabletop look. Great cities have great buildings!
City can no longer support urban sprawl therefore the city must either place a population cap or allow taller buildings
High rises sing and laugh if they are providing voices anywhere. We sing through the air everywhere
If there is a compulsory roof garden included on each one, preferably growing produce
helps our "green" city initiatives - improves our ability for rapid transit - makes the downtown look more interesting removes the plateau effect
Higher density supports green initiatives with less consumption of energy & it lessens commute for residents
I strongly support urban density. Minimizing sprawl. The parameters for height consideration should be architectural safety, climatic variables and public mobility. "Views" can be obtained at roof top level and perimeter access, surrounding the urban core
No commute support system promises can be broken as in the past
We need to look to the future. We need to go up to have more green space we would need more observation decks for our visitors
Ruins the rest of neighbourhood

So long as will don't intrude into existing view cones and that we do not end up with "sore thumbs" which are more provocative then its surrounding neighbors

Higher buildings are a good idea in selected areas such as a concentrated business district in the core.; or the areas shown in the scope of this project

We need to see mountains, sky nature and keep wild life alive

Vancouver DT area needs to look like a more modern city

Vancouver needs to establish itself as an international vibrant city that has a distinctive skyline instead of the poorly formulated flat profile of a city of 450' agreed to in the 70's

There would have to be some demonstrated need.

Don't care for the flat-top look of the skyline. Surrey will someday be bigger than Vancouver and have taller buildings than downtown Vancouver. We need 80 stories or taller. At least one iconic taller than tall building. Shangri-La building turned out to be a disappointment because it is not iconic just looks like any other building downtown only a few stories taller.

I can support a few more tall towers IF there was not more concessions for other developers to get additional SFR on other properties - as I do not think our current planners have the same vision as our previous planner, I fear Vancouver becoming unlivable. The vision was NEVER to have streets that were canyons a la New York. The principle seems to be changing.

Taller buildings as the documentation says creates more space and makes for a more dynamic and impressive city so long as public open space and green areas are intermixed

The CBD need to continue its densification to help reduce sprawl. I also consider skyscrapers to enhance the city's profile both aesthetically and as a place for business.

There is not facilities for more and more - no roads no public transit only if you walk - congestion is in

I believe more rental units are needed in the downtown core, rental not more retail condos

The city has destroyed most of the views accessible in the downtown - this will reduce further access to light, sky and the mountains.

Quality of the downtown skyline downtown population and services public amenities heritage preservation

Too many people living downtown already

Downtown has limited space and higher buildings don't necessarily bring up people's living standards. Downtown nowadays already has more than plenty of office space, so the money should be used to build the areas around downtown. These areas are connected to downtown by public transit, by which people can come to downtown easily. Also, average people cannot afford these higher buildings, so it will be a waste of resources for Canadians as a whole. Foreign investors buy these property and push up the real estate value, and may result in real estate bubble. When the bugle bursts like what happened in Japan, Canada will suffer.

Higher buildings will allow increased density for our growing population and will protect lower density areas like the West End & Eastside
While we have a dense downtown and immediate surrounding area which is great, the skyline is boring with a flat top skyline. Most buildings are not interesting
While the view corridors and general height limits have helped generate more development downtown than if fewer taller buildings had been built, I think the time has come to adjust height limits to avoid further entrenchment of the table-top appearance of our skyline from many viewpoints
It's the revenue future of downtown Vancouver
They are disruptive to the skyline from other vantage points beside the currently identified PROTECTED VIEWS I.E. TOWARDS DOWNTOWN FROM Kits and vice versa. Buildings such as Shangri La conspicuously mar the skyline
View air
Vancouver is a world class city. And well thought out policies guiding the look of our city's skyline will enhance our city's stature.
There needs to be a direction where developing "true" green city is forefront with the city's agenda. Sustainability in Vancouver should be a striving goal when accommodating future growth on contracting development in the downtown core is a better way than accommodating growth in urban sprawl. New buildings are significantly more responsible with water/energy per square foot than aging office buildings built in the 50's, and a change out is a reasonable proposition
Vancouver area and downtown are part of an estuary. This lacks the underground life nec /limestone support for high-rises above 45 storey in height. As the weight would cause a singe of the building
Protected public views actually do not adequately protect views. Unintended consequences and unidentified sites are not protected
Efficient densification. Opportunity for dramatic architectural impact
The skyline is too flat topped at maximum 300-400-450 heights. It needs some iconic buildings to make it look interesting.
No accommodation for traffic pedestrians etc increase in population. Make a double Decker bridge solution or monorail
Need more density; will make our downtown skyline more interesting (which it needs)
Density & views of the mountains should not take a back seat to sprawl and affordable housing
Need additional commercial space for future job growth and to capitalize on all the transit investments that have been made
You are a bunch of liars you were elected & changed your tune when you got there
Continuing development of very dense (both commercial/residential) downtown is positive from urban planning/transportation/infrastructure standpoint. This is particularly true if active and alternative transportation is encouraged: continue commitment to transit infrastructure, cycling facilities, and pedestrian friendly architecture.

Vancouver has a need for increased density, especially in the downtown core.
Current skyline lacks shape
Noise and disruption seem to me to be more important than view corridors
They are a place to expire in privacy and dignity. we need such in this social context
Nothing should be any higher than the Wall Center building is now. The Shangri La building is already too high. If we carry on like this we are ruining what we have left.
Contrary to the contention that these great squarely high buildings will enhance the Vancouver skyline in fact it will be a detraction. Street parking has become a problem with lower building. Higher ones will aggravate the situation. I feel the detrimental effects of higher buildings will greatly exceed any benefits.
Too much traffic - too many people
A few, select taller buildings, would add visual dynamism and excitement to our skyline. Vancouver has become a major city and deserves a representative skyline. With the highest standards of architectural excellence applied. These towers have the opportunity to act as key focal points and landmarks, complementary to our mountains.
I do not know if these taller buildings would provide additional job space. All that is of concern here is impact on protected public views of the mountains. What about other factors?
The diversity in some areas is already beginning to ruin the livability of the downtown area. CBD perhaps near existing predominant commercial we're being boxed like mice in Yaletown and it's got to stop! More <u>Green space</u> community gardens, <u>low-rise</u> - social housing!
Variety of heights opportunity to showcase unique architecture
And #5&6 * outside of immediate downtown core of Georgia/Robson/Burrard- Do not want on Beach/Howe /Hornby 1. Lack of infrastructure 2. Already too much traffic 3. Nil or no road repair since development of Concord to east 4. Economic - will we end up with empty units or worse yet, constructions will stall during erection.
Less and less sunlight. Less views
1. I am opposed because I believe the "protected public view" have been too narrowly defined - the protected public view ignore the view value and impact of English Bay, focusing only on mountain views. English Bay has enormous visual impact and value views which would be compromised with the proposed Granville Bridge Gateway. 2. I am opposed because citizens have made significant personal investment decisions based on planning in place. Changing policy after those decisions are made does not honor the faith citizens have had in the long term plans in place

QUESTION 2: Do you support increasing the maximum potential height for the tallest buildings in the CBD?

<i>Strongly Supportive</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Neutral/ Don't know</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Strongly Opposed</i>	<i>Total</i>
37	7	3	3	18	68
54.41%	10.29%	4.41%	4.41%	26.47%	100.00%
64.71%		4.41%	30.88%		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON QUESTION 2.
Why not? If it doesn't affect the public views!?
According to the proposals given at the presentation
Again the city has no other options if it is to increase downtown population and not encourage sprawl
we give beauty to our view city you weep and so do you our city
Again compulsory roof garden
With the Shangri-la these additional high buildings would not stand out as much as other districts
Ensure CACs collected from any increase are put towards benefits that can be shared with everyone not only specific groups i.e. build libraries, community centers over daycares/senior centers
We are a growing city and these type of developments are necessary
This city needs a few iconic buildings to identify the central core areas
What is the use for the building? Commercial, residential
No one makes a special trip or point just to see mountains the view corridors are arbitrary. Now that we have them to work around them. But where are the views? Just glimpse of mountains here and there when you're on the west-side crossing a side walk or driving by. Do we have special "views" of the mountains between buildings" locations so that people can go there and see these views?
It's downtown peninsula and built up area higher buildings won't negatively impact the area as it now exists.
Shadowing
For the city and region to grow we need to take on a more metropolitan feel and look
These are not "modest expansions!"

Skyline excitement SOB space for high profile corp. offices still think these projects should allow some mixed use residential within these towers.
Higher buildings means more population, which will impose greater pressure on the downtown's resources. Downtown already has too many population.
Boring skyline - no tall buildings 700 - 800 '
I feel that the relative handful of undeveloped or under developed, filter downtown, and especially in the CBD mean that we need to maximize the utility and benefit of future developments. I feel that the 700' cap is still too low and would be quite comfortable with the skyline's apogee reaching 900 - 1000' It will allow for more job space, leverage rapid transit investment enable more people to work near the downtown residential areas and improve the skyline.
To provide more potential job space and to accentuate the CBD's prominence in the skyline
Landmark status
Enhances residential density and the density of jobs in the CBC which minimizes car travel makes this city more easily traveled by bicycle.
Yes, we need to continue to insert residential downtown in higher densities close "to places of work" we also need to plan in future office expansion with an organized reasonable plan
Insufficient underground liverock/limetone as Vancouver is in the heart of an estuary
In fact go higher up to 800 feet. Attract a prominent company to headquarter in Vancouver. I am tired of being second to Calgary for west coast corporate headquarters
we need more jobs
No, developers have enough height at present time
Reinforce central role of CBDs employment & activity center for Metro Vancouver. Visually interesting focus of skyline
Nothing should be higher that the Wall Cntr. Building there is no need no matter how you want to argue it.
Distinct possibility of street congestion. Also I am opposed to buildings of excessive height. They do not improve Vancouver's aesthetic appeal.
This part of the downtown peninsula is best suited for tallest towers
Not a resident in that neighbourhood
Vancouver's office space vacancy is extremely tight and is losing business to the suburbs. Vancouver needs to stay competitive for business. Downtown should not be just a residential neighbourhood, more office spaces are needed
Again less sun and views blocked etc.

These changes are consistent with public planning - impact of buildings already 450' high (550') to existing homeowners would be minimal

QUESTION 3: Do you support the modest expansion of the *General Policy for Higher Buildings* to include the CBD shoulder area to the south of Alberni Street?

Strongly Supportive	Supportive	Neutral/ Don't know	Opposed	Strongly Opposed	Total
30	12	8	1	18	69
43.48%	17.39%	11.59%	1.45%	26.09%	100.00%
60.87%		11.59%	27.54%		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON QUESTION 3
We have a high volume of mid-rise's -quite boring
Only discussed privately
Compulsory roof garden
Won't shadow Robson as its to the north so no issue
This will facilitate growth and will fit in better as the area south of Alberni is already a "tower" community. Moving this philosophy into established older neighborhoods.
I support this only if the buildings are stand-out "WOW: buildings. All the buildings have the same look now Over and over again has anyone seen what is being built in places like China or Arabia? We have enough of these "west coast modern" towers hundreds opt them for really different building we need to celebrate architecture. We have got the planning down, we don't to keep proving this with more boring buildings
Alberni is a busy downtown street and taller buildings, whilst serving a purpose, won't negatively impact the area.
too much
So that the main corridor will not look so out of place (ugly due to shorter buildings)
Boring skyline
I think the CBD shoulder is well worth expanding and the 450 to 550' height range is appropriate. I think that mixed use residential/office and residential/hotel should be allowed in the CBD shoulder but not the CBD proper However either hotel or office must be mandatory at a no-net loss rate over the tear-down structure, and preferably in a configuration that establishes and office/hotel - primary appearance from the street.
sheer logic
These taller buildings should not creep towards Stanley Park

Yes, this area has capacity downtown to grow in height without impacting any views. Shadow impact on Robson should be considered
Mainly landfill area without underground support
Provides gradualism to few increased height
Again attract more interesting higher designs for the downtown area
Enough traffic/shitty bus service
No impact on view corridors
General visitors who we have spoken to are already saying that Vancouver is getting an "overbuilt" look. Keep going like this and you can forget about livability. If you want to expand, then consider going east or south of False Creek.
This increase in height in the shoulder area would allow for a better transition to lower towers in neighboring areas.
Not a resident in that neighbourhood
More office buildings are a plus
Modest expansion is a good balance between development needs and impact on community

QUESTION 4: Do you support the creation of a “Burrard Bridge Gateway” by increasing the height of a single, prominent tower (outside of protected public views to the mountains) at the north end of the bridge to mark the entrance to the downtown?

<i>Strongly Supportive</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Neutral/ Don't know</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Strongly Opposed</i>	<i>Total</i>
30	8	5	2	23	68
44.12%	11.76%	7.35%	2.94%	33.82%	100.00%
55.88%		7.35%	36.76%		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON QUESTION 4
I am less positive but the city must continue to control expansion
Give everyone your confidence when you have our vote
Driving down Burrard the 500' high rise will stand out so much that everyone will ask why are we allowing such a high building in the middle of Burrard
Tells us it is the entry for Downtown
Will affect neighbourhood
Ensure sizeable office space is included in this proposal
I think the bridges already mark the entrance to the downtown core
The city requires a statement to be made as part of a first impression when entering the city
AGAIN - only if it is to be a memorable building. Not, just a collage of glass and concrete with an uninteresting roof. How about imaginative lighting on the roof to accentuate the new heights.
As it now stands, even with high build out current residents have some access to peek-a-boo views. Solid masses that defy the slope of the land will nullify that, further adding to the sense of claustrophobia already being created.
The idea of a grand welcome to downtown from the nicest bridges with the best views of the water and mountains is one I can support. It will be an impressive contrast.
This definitely will impact traffic. Building unreasonable height does not designate gateway.
To have some defined landmarks to let people know they are entering the downtown core.
This "Burrard Bridge Gateway" is not a "marker" or ceremonial in any way. It will further limit light, sky for a city sitting in such a beautiful setting it seems the City is determined to destroy it.

Provides a strong, high quality architectural statement about the downtown character vibrancy and property
boring skyline
I support the place making intent of announcing one's arrival in downtown via a reveal of tall bldgs, including a 500' tower. I would actually prefer cluster of taller buildings to the east of Burrard to help remold the unique character of the West End as dense-but-not -tall, vs. downtown south and the CBD
To create an interesting visual strong point in the skyline and to break up the "table-top" effect.
for the visual impact
The main proposed site is only one block from Hornby and two from Helmcken which were identified as streets to not build on the impact to the skyline of the proposed Burrard Gateway seems understated, I think it would be very disruptive.
Grand entrance to the city centre
I think there is some benefit to this
Even higher than that 500 go to 600 and have an anchor tower for the Davie Granville area
Height should be in the core not on the fringe
we need more interesting architecture
See response #1 but also need a more pronounced entrance into the downtown
The impact of this tower much greater than shown in your cute photos
Although I do support this I would prefer a more cone shaped policy from the inside centers moving out
What do we want to compare ourselves to? Dubai? New York? Neither place has any mountains, our mountains is what attracts visitors, not some high building which overwhelms all others.
The modification will detract from the Vancouver skyline's aesthetic appeal
This site is ideal for creating a prominent visual landmark as seen from Burrard Bridge, marking the entrance to downtown.
Sounds like "gateway" is another way of justifying more taller buildings downtown
It destroys view of bridge. It is creating an ugly city of towers we are destroying our city with over development. We are humans NOT BUGS! But current residents i.e. people who live nearby would lose ALL their views & most sunshine in the evening i.e. when residents come home from work! Some sustainability for who? Developers NOT people.
More revitalization of the area is needed. Retail and daycare is a plus prefer more office spaces
Prefer shorter buildings better designs

I have not researched the site nor am I familiarly with the surrounding community.

QUESTION 5: Do you support the creation of a “Granville Bridge Gateway” by increasing the height of two gateway towers (outside of protected public views to the mountains) at the north end of the bridge to frame the entrance to the downtown?

<i>Strongly Supportive</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Neutral/ Don't know</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Strongly Opposed</i>	<i>Total</i>
29	8	4	3	25	69
42.03%	11.59%	5.80%	4.35%	36.23%	100.00%
53.62%		5.80%	40.58%		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON QUESTION 5
Like this one better
Same - also great view to be framed
One way is to have your gateway around a moat. Be sure to follow the land around the moat.
Greenway towers look good at this location
It does affect view corridor
This location would be ideal for residential and public amenity and retail. Probably a bad location for office space though. Will tie in nicely with buildings proposed nearby.
The bridges already mark the entrance to the downtown core
Only if the buildings are stunning examples of tower architecture will people say "hey I was in Vancouver and there were these two towers that were amazing, gleaming uprising, inspiring. Worth a second look, a drive around the block to see it again. What would it take to get this caliber of architecture and design?
See above. More detail here. We live on Seymour above Drake. Concord Pacific has created a total wall to any vistas toward False Creek. The one reprieve is peek-a-boo views toward & over the Granville bridge. I am 100% in favour of the Granville Loops development, but giant towers will dwarf & will be obscene in scale to the rest of the development. ALSO: traffic trying to feed into the Granville Bridge will be impossible.
The entrance to downtown from Granville St. bridge is one I strongly feel needs reconsidering. Granville St. would do well to be quieter and more pedestrian friendly. I would like to see the central bridge used only for buses and create a green road on the space by the water.
As above, there is nothing "ceremonial" about these massive towers. They just contribute to an overwhelming sense of being overpowered by massive glass, steel and concrete fortresses
Burrard St needs new development

boring skyline
I like the canyon appearance of Granville as seen from the street and the Bridge I would prefer to see development including buildings up to 400 some 500' in the blocks between Howe and Burrard. The cluster at the bridge would be part of this.
that area needs major refreshment
The height difference between the neighboring buildings looks too sharp to be creating a pleasing view year round
Good entrance to the city centre
I agree as long as impact is not precedent for several towers
I have trouble visualizing this entrance to the city
when you travel over the bridge I see the towers first and not the mountains
only if there is a commercial component not just condos
You don't give a rats ass about people's view corridors
We bought our property with the understanding that future buildings would not be higher than 180' and 250' To go from that to 425' each is complete deception. It may not impact a view corridor but it certainly impacts our view. It also increases the population in that area which is already at maximum in my opinion.
Protected public view to the mountains is impacted but it is not the only factor. Where is the school, library, public space? Isn't there any other land in the city to develop? This area is already very populated with no school
This site can absorb greater density, I feel, without compromising the livability of the neighbourhood.
It is not a "gateway" it is a one more bloody tower in a two block area that already has six or eight towers already. This is insane, inhuman and all about paying off the developers who support Vision. Disgusting. We need community gardens some low rise south housing etc.
Revitalization of downtown core
Change is profound (180'-425') not modest like in CBD. Impact to community, surrounding citizens also profound. Ignores the English Bay view, an enormous geographical gift to the city, as a protected view. Essentially eliminates the English bay view for 245' of vertical community. We called the city for planning on the site before we made one of the most significant financial decisions of our life and relied on that planning. The change would drastically impact the experience of living in that home and its value. Too close to water to be 425' and meet objective of normal scale

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS : Do you have any additional thoughts, comments or ideas on Higher Buildings downtown?

I don't really see the big deal, if it adds to our city and if it doesn't wreck the view/skyline that our city is known for around the world why not. Plus it adds jobs to our economy which speaking as a former construction worker WE NEED!

I'm pleased to hear this is being thought through by city staff prior to demand

View corridors are great but sometimes too controlling. It doesn't take long to move into a different view - i.e. they don't always have to be the perfect mountain view. We're not static

Sprawl has already destroyed a massive amount of farmland in the lower mainland. We can no longer support sprawl. As population caps are unworkable there is no other option than to go up. Keeping the population in a contained area makes public transit more feasible. Cycling is also easier to implement.

Mostly everything you do have everyone listen to you. Given everyday accountability of your concern knowing that outstanding work will be everyone's concern. It means give your one light of concern knowing our majority will give you your light. Trust in your Holy majesty. Give her light.

My thoughts run to roof gardens not just token green spaces but 100% coverage of the roof area. Vegetable crops, beehives etc. Save energy, create something positive.

Overall I think the heights are not high enough and future reviews should press higher

The 1997 dome shaped skyline should be maintained. I feel that with some of the high rises not in particular these 5 districts under review are penetrating the dome shaped skyline

I strongly support higher buildings in general. They add to look of a city. I lived in Toronto for two years on the 46th floor of a bldg. facing the CN Tower and all the office bldgs of downtown. I presume all the new buildings would have sprinkler systems. The high rise I lived in (Spadina & Gardiner Xcrossway) did not.

Put different colors of cement and windows and more curves and bay windows and symmetries

Below Pacific needs to be left. Already a high density area

The heights proposed are nice and suitable please ensure though that they are caps and that they can not be increased with density transfer and mechanical allowances above proposed heights

It seems the city is trying their best to cut our sunlight to downtown and create more wind tunnels. Vancouver has enough tall buildings and does not need any more. Will all new residents be required to own bicycles?

I know that the West End is not within the scope of this project. This process shows that proper planning is in place for a CBD etc. With regards to the West End this is clearly not the core. A relaxed height building here and there is surely not the way to go

I hate out of country investors who buy those apartments just for a goal. Making money and then regular families can't buy a house at reasonable price!!!

Sorry I don't have time to give full attention. Very important. Looks like a lot of thought full work has gone into this proposed increased heights - CBD like varied heights "gateway" higher bldgs in embrace to more at Granville & Burrard design

I have been keenly interested in the development of downtown Vancouver over that last 40 years since my arrival here in 1970. It was then that I recognized it as a mediocre city in a spectacular setting so I have attended many meeting on specific developments over the years. Many of the policies adopted by council with regards to this development of False Creek and Coal Harbour along with the extension of the Seawall have been well planned policies with positive long term consequences - What I have been disappointed with is the attitude to the skyline and specifically the allowable height of buildings. I was at meetings in the 70s that proposed a ceiling of 450' and spoke forcefully against this but the policy was enforced and as a consequence we have a city that developed with a boring flat profile for a number of year until the Shangri La was built. I therefore hope that Council will be imaginative and seize this last opportunity to allow iconic buildings to rise to 700' in some case in order to give the city characteristic physical profile and identity

What would the square foot of development be? For residences are there community rec centers built? In what way would development improve the city? Is this initiative developer driven? Who would profit the most?

I was so disappointed in the Shangri-La because it is so neutral. It is flat on top, and fades into the darkness of the night. Nothing about the building makes it look like what it's supposed to be after all the planning and hype last time around increased heights. We get just a taller version of everything around it. My point is that Vancouver looses out on architecture and design because of too much meddling by interests other than those whose job it is to design a building. The architects are faced with design limits by city hall, for what purpose? I have seen the same architects that build here in Vancouver build other buildings overseas. May as well be on another planet compared to Vancouver. They have designed buildings with large spires, see through openings at the top, surprising colours and material, wavy shapes, tapering profiles etc. We get blue/green/gray glass with coffee shops at the street level over and over again. So can Vancouver leave behind the cookie-cutter towers and move on? These new towers to be, because of their increased height are the ones to be a feature in the skyline, more than their height but also with elements of design that make them memorable. What would New York be without the Empire State building? It's tall and everyone loves it. If the Empire State Building was Shangri-La would people talk about it?

Summary of my concerns: Fear the loss of the vision that made Vancouver a world class city. There is a tipping point, and we are getting close. Those of us who answered the siren & call to experience downtown living can sense when it becomes too difficult and you reconsider & leave taking your substantial property tax dollars & businesses with us. History has shown how once proud cities can rise and decline, leaving slums in their wake. I already find it easier to not shop downtown. When I need a car to carry home my purchases I go to Park Royal or Oakridge. I have tried to use public transport when it is too far for me to walk. It took me 45 minutes to take a bus up Granville to Georgia (from Davie) then to catch a bus going west to keep an appointment at Thurlow and Georgia. As my foot was injured, I tried getting a bus back, failed. We do not have the public transport infrastructure to create a downtown where cars are not necessary. So no more high density development without better transport. I work a lot in Europe, where cars are NOT necessary, as trains and buses come every 5 minutes. Basil for example.

Be innovative, and sustainable with thought to individuals and how they will enjoy the space inside and out. NO CAR PARKS! Portland doesn't build car parks nor should we. Emphasis should be on public transport and cycling.

Please don't make attempts to camouflage anymore "higher buildings" like the Wall Center, the different tints of glass look strange luckily there are other buildings which have distracted the eye from it recently.

The downtown is now in massive gridlock most of the day. The expansion of Yaletown contemplated 15 years ago is now almost fully built out and is reaching over-population. The move to attract families has resulted in the public school becoming overcrowded and new admissions turned down. The idea of downtown residents not having cars and not driving is fictitious – attempts to use shared cars have not been a great success. To add 1000s more to the already overcrowded pocket is foolhardy and will not work.

This is just part of the continuing "tower" creep and having to sell it as a way to obtain CAC's is a travesty

From the Cambie Bridge Gateway the new stadium roof will be ugly. There should be a Cambie Gateway concept developed as well.

More and higher buildings don't necessarily result in prosperity for the following reasons: 1. it may very likely help create real estate bubble if we look at Japan; downtown Tokyo has many tall buildings, but the economy of Japan has suffered for two decades. 2. More higher buildings create pollution and waste resources because if these building are vacant, the city still has to maintain them with electricity (even paid by the owners) and other utility. It's a waste of energy from the earth's perspective. 3. Average tax payers can't afford these high buildings, only foreign investors can come and this will beat up the property value, which makes it even harder for taxpayers to rent or buy these spaces. Money should not be used on these projects that won't bring mutual benefits for the average people. 4. There should be more gardens built in downtown, like the one at Davie and Burrard. To conclude, the social benefits in the long term from these higher building projects is much lower than the economic benefits it will bring.

I have trouble visualizing this entrance to the city

We have been praised from around the world on the density in the central core, but have been criticized for our lack of interesting architecture, boring looking buildings (100 buildings look the same) and the lack of tall buildings

I think that downtown Vancouver does not have enough tall buildings especially in the CBD and preferably office buildings. The benefits of a large downtown office retail and residential capacity increase are numerous, not the least of which is leveraging the investments in transit and now separated bicycle lanes. I support the raising of general building heights in the CBD and while that is not what is proposed it also leads to my preference for standard tall building sites. The heights proposed for the CBD shoulder feel right but the CBD proper can go much higher. I also hope that substantial buildings can be developed on the new sites that will be created around waterfront station when Canada Place Way is extended to Seymour. The standout tall buildings, even those proposed at the heights envisioned in this proposal should not intrude in the worthwhile view cones but of the handful of view cones that are now of dubious value due to the limited scope and predicated or more mountain being visible than what was saved, well those can go. I also think that the emphasis on the mountains, while entirely supported by public opinion may have resulted in the skyline itself as being treated as only accessory value to citizens. I think that a tradition of standout architecture (Marine Bldg, Dominion Bldg, Sun Tower, Royal Bank Bld, Vancouver Block,, BC Electric Bldg, MacMillan Blodel Bld) are predicted on buildings being visible with only small to medium increases to building heights. The buildings we will see proposed will not be standout pieces of architect even with the tall bldgs review process emphasizing architectural excellence. It's time to define the skyline over again for the 21st century. Go tall, go bold, go green.

There seems to have been a lot of consideration of shadowing etc. as to where these higher buildings will be located. I think the negative impacts will be minimal, while the city will gain greatly.

Don't build sun blocking (afternoon, evening) towers on the west side of Granville - it will block the life of patios/cafes that need the late day sunshine for night business environment

Due to the fact that Vancouver could be a high earth quake risk area, relevant study and/or mechanism should be put in place to ensure that taller buildings are not more prone to earth quake damages.

Vancouver is an international city now. I think careful increases in the height limit for significant buildings with architectural merit are favorable

Downtown heights for current buildings are good as is now. Leave it alone Shangri-La sticks out like a sore thumb and should not have been allowed.

The over riding cost of supporting higher structures would require engineering techniques used for both the Narita Airport in Tokyo Bay and in Shanghai to alley the weak underground in supporting the Shanghais Towers

They don't work - keep and enforce maximum heights. Deny heritage transfer density and discretionary height. Maintain prominence of north shore.

I am bias in my view because I've always wanted scientifically taller buildings in the DT core

Yes the outdated 450 height limit has to go. Most times on cloudy rainy days you never see the mountains anyway. From the south shore of False Creek all you see is Concord Pacific, hardly any mountains. Why are we protecting just a speck of peaks when the economic vitality of the city is more important? If it is all about the mountains nothing over 200 feet should have been built. So let's work on a brilliant skyline like Hong Kong's where there mountains are way less than ours. People remember the skyline. Just open more of the water front in front of waterfront station for more development and true mountain views.

We need to frame this as affordable housing vs. sprawl vs. density

Thank God for elections. Mayor pretty boy and Rennie are going to go down. Looking forward to next election!!! Yeah!

Do not totally overwhelm the view with overly high buildings. They encroach on the mountain panorama no mater what excuses you want to make. We are selling our soul to the devil

I wonder if sufficient consideration has been given to the possibility of problems which may attend the development of high condominiums. In addition to increased demand for street parking there is the matter of evacuating the buildings during an earthquake. In conclusion I believe the entire operation to be motivated absolutely by financial considerations.

There are some lands on the east side of downtown that I believe are better for these buildings and doing that helps developing these areas. Please put an online questionnaire for those who cannot attend these meetings to be able to send their views to the city. Granville Loops policy will cause more traffic in downtown.

I fully support this policy review and the suggestions offered. Appropriate sites for inverted height are few; therefore any decisions regarding these sites should be made carefully. With long-term views considered. I would encourage taller than 700' limits in the CBD, they would allow more jobs space for downtown and an opportunity for an "intimate landmark tower" downtown.

It is dark at Round House so it is difficult to see. I can hardly hear the presenter. It sounds like the city just wants to have money to pay for "public amenity". Over & over again, I see concern about concern on "view" only. Downtown traffic is already like a zoo. Shadow study is only for 5 to 6 pm? What about services to support additional residents? I live west end because of it location but if all I am going to see is tall buildings then it is turning into?

Start thinking about the HEALTH of the RESIDENTS. We need green space, community gardens, low rise social housing, more shops & restaurants along Beach and under the Granville bridge. NO MORE MONSTER TOWERS! Stop ruining this city I already have 5 towers within 200 feet on every side of me and more planned for Granville Loop. PS Put two bloody 425 ft. towers in front of Larry Campbell's house in Millennium! I hope the Yaletown residents organize and vote these developer-owned councilors out of Office!

Ensure there are sufficient amenities available for public provision for public art- no bland/boring architecture understated subtly is nice, but there is too much of that in Vancouver. Have better and striking architecture - why are the tallest buildings always residential? Downtown needs more office spaces. Would like to see an international architecture firm design an office building in CBD, I think we have enough subtle clear glass buildings.

See earlier response - Granville Bridge Gateway 1. Congestion - already heavy traffic with no planning 2. Lack of services 3. Post all view built on 400 blk Howe w/o notice 4. Economy 5. Who will buy? 6. What if economy slows down-construction halted 7. Adverse impact on residents of Howe/Beach 8. Whose opportunities? Certainly not the residents 9. Noise, pollution already exist 10. Compromises view, light, shadow 11. Does city own taxi property? 12. You can't keep Granville clean now - what will happened with dev?

Maybe we can have more interesting buildings & futuristic design not so boxy.

There does need to be a balance between development & status quo. - A measured change considerate of existing uses pattern and of Vancouver's enormous geographical gifts would be optimal. - the mountains are not the only focal point English bay views also to be protected - Citizens need to be able to have faith in the city that long term planning does not profoundly change so citizens can base their personal decisions with certainty in their city planning.