

FULL TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Table of Contents

SECTION I: ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS.....	2
Context	2
Planning Objectives and Principles.....	4
Urban Design and Planning Directions.....	6
Section 4: Other Comments.....	9
SECTION II: OPEN HOUSES	10
Context:	10
Planning Objectives and Design Principles:.....	12
Urban Design & Planning Directions:.....	14
Marine Drive:	15
Other Questions and Comments:	16
SECTION III: COMMUNITY SURVEY	19
Planning and Design Objectives:	19
Guiding Principles:.....	44
Urban Design and Planning Directions.....	59
303 Marine Drive.....	59
752 Marine Drive.....	68
660 Clyde Ave / 657/675 Marine Drive	79

SECTION I: ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

The public engagement program kicked off with two Roundtable Discussions held Tuesday September 27 and Thursday September 29 at the West Vancouver Seniors' Activity Centre. In order to ensure a productive discussion and to maximize opportunities for participation from each attendee, attendance was limited to 25 participants per session. This allowed for two staff-facilitated breakout groups of no more than 13 participants. Advance registration occurred by phone or email and the sessions were advertised in the North Shore News, the District website and on Social Media.

Additionally to encourage area stakeholders to participate invitations were sent and spaces reserved for representatives from key stakeholders. Most stakeholder groups were able to send a representative and attendance was then supplemented by the general public. Each session was fully subscribed with 46 participants and no one interested in attending was refused (some were re-accommodated to the alternate date).

Both sessions followed the same format, beginning with a presentation from staff to introduce the Context Study and describe the evening's agenda and activities. Participants then split into two groups led by a staff facilitator. The discussions were split into three sections taken from the Context Study: Context, Planning Objectives and Principles and Urban Design and Planning Directions. To ensure all input was captured, each group had a scribe recording the discussions and participants were encouraged to provide feedback throughout the evening. Facilitators repeatedly "played back" participants' comments to confirm the record captured their input.

Context

The first discussion section focused on the contextual factors identified in the Context Study, asking participants what, if any, additional contextual factors they felt needed to be considered:

Tuesday Session Group 1:

- Familiar with context (District of North Vancouver and Active Applications).
- East side of Capilano Road development.
- Context running up to Highway 1 is important (and could be included in Study).
- Absence of access & egress to Taylor Way and Marine Drive.
- Sea to Sky Corridor growth.
- Lack of jurisdiction control.

Tuesday Session Group 2:

- Some site preparation happening in North Vancouver, clues to upcoming development.
- Coordination between municipalities?
- North Vancouver Lions Gate establishing town centre for the area.
- Lower parking requirements for residential units.
- Essentially two planning areas: District of West Vancouver and District of North Vancouver with Earls site in between, no strong link between the two.
- Not aware of future tower plans on Squamish Lands. Timeline?
- Pedestrian connections missing from Lions Gate development to Park Royal
- Distance between Lions Gate town centre will be too great given demographics. May result in more traffic, people will drive rather than walk. More impact on road network.
- Consideration should be given to rework road network to improve east-west connectivity between municipalities.
- Traffic should be diverted rather than pushing everyone through this intersection. TOD only deals with future units not the existing situation.
- Municipality should use its bargaining power.
- Lower level road has been on the books for years.
- Grade separated interchange is a possible solution therefore building on potentially usable land for road infrastructure is short sighted.
- Where is the cycling network in this plan? Need separated cycling infrastructure to connect District of North Vancouver to Park Royal.
- Why are we allowing municipality's context plan to dictate / affect our planning process rather than consulting with District of West Vancouver's citizens?
- Seismic safety issues of the buildings.
- Study should include a wider area: include Evelyn, Larco site, parking lot on north-east side of Marine Drive, etc.
- Pedestrian commercial activity along Marine Drive is a nice thought but not necessarily a real possibility.
- Transit stop in front of Park Royal is very badly planned. Not a transit hub.
- Street fronting CRUs have no access off of Marine Drive!
- Footbridge / cycling connection needed across the river.

Thursday Session Group 1:

- Exciting.
- Lions Gate Town Centre is a powerful name.
- Council has lack of control over other jurisdictions.
- Lack of discussion around Squamish Nation Lands (public knowledge) vision.
- Access.
- Highrises.

- Existing low rise, neighbourhood are part of context.
- Lions Gate Village will have a transit hub.
- Potential for CACs through redevelopment.
- Neighbourhood on Clyde.
- Need for good lighting on Clyde Avenue.

Thursday Session Group 2:

- Traffic issues need to be resolved prior to increasing density.

Planning Objectives and Principles

The Context Study includes nine Planning Objectives and ten Planning Principles that suggest what development in the area should consider and respond to. Participants were given six dots and asked to place them on their top three objectives and top three principles. They were then asked what objectives and principles, if any, were missing.

Tuesday Session Group 1:

Objectives	Total # of dots
Reinforce two centres	0
Connect the dots	3
Engage with the natural environment	12
Recognize views and reinforce legibility	0
Respond to context	7
Secure appropriate amenities	7
Minimize trip generation	4
Meet housing objectives	1
Connect to Park Royal Shopping Centre	0

Principles	Total # of dots
Distinct Centres	0
Distinct Context	3
Transit Supportive Development	12
Respond to the River	2
Hierarchy	0
Pedestrian Continuity	4
Express the Gateway	0
Complete Communities	10
Public Space, Public Life	4
Sustainable Design	1

Missing Objectives:

- Affordability.

Missing Principles:

- Missing bigger picture details of the community.

Tuesday Session Group 2:

Did not complete the dot activity.

Missing Objectives:

- What are we reinforcing around west-sub area? Not a centre.
- West Vancouver's vision for this area
- Transportation piece is so key to the success of this area. Everyone living in this area will use the intersection.
- Overall overwhelming concern around transportation.
- Transportation always playing second fiddle to land use.
- Well defined economic plan.
- We don't have jobs in West Vancouver which is one of the reasons we have transportation issues.

Missing Principles:

- We need a Housing Policy.
- Need to have an overall higher level strategy.

Thursday Session Group 1:

Objectives	Total # of dots
Reinforce two centres	3
Connect the dots	1
Engage with the natural environment	8
Recognize views and reinforce legibility	2
Respond to context	7
Secure appropriate amenities	0
Minimize trip generation	1
Meet housing objectives	8
Connect to Park Royal Shopping Centre	6

Principles	Total # of dots
Distinct Centres	1
Distinct Context	1
Transit Supportive Development	4
Respond to the River	5
Hierarchy	0
Pedestrian Continuity	9
Express the Gateway	1
Complete Communities	8
Public Space, Public Life	3
Sustainable Design	2

Missing Objectives and Principles:

- Getting over the road.
- Lack of support for transit.

Thursday Session Group 2:

Objectives	Total # of dots
Reinforce two centres	1
Connect the dots	2
Engage with the natural environment	1
Recognize views and reinforce legibility	0
Respond to context	1
Secure appropriate amenities	0
Minimize trip generation	0
Meet housing objectives	1
Connect to Park Royal Shopping Centre	0

Only partially completed the dot activity

Missing Objectives/Principles:

- Pedestrian / vehicle / cycling safety.
- Accountability to citizens of West Vancouver.
- Environment.
- Public needs / priorities, broader public engagement.
- Consideration of travel times.
- Housing variety to encourage age diversity and affordability.
- Need for pedestrian / transit / cycling infrastructure to be adequate before adding density.
- Connections: vehicle / pedestrian / cycling existing between municipalities.
- Continuity important.
- Rental housing locating close to shops, services, transit and amenities.
- Living and working on North Shore office spaces? Live / work?
- How to encourage employment in the area so people can work near home?
- Need right mix and right size of commercial spaces.
- By densifying this area, will reduce densification in other areas.

Urban Design and Planning Directions

The Context Study presents urban design and planning directions for two sub-areas: the east (adjacent to Lions Gate Town Centre) and the west (around the Marine Drive and Taylor Way intersection) and participants were asked to

comment on three key characteristics (Form of Development, Land Use and Public Realm) for each sub-area:

East Sub Area:

Tuesday Session Group 1:

Form of Development:

- Could be more than 1 tower (innovative design).
- Towers to defer to International Plaza

Land Use:

- Support for residential
- Transit Oriented Development – with parking reductions
- Commercial

Public Realm:

- Pedestrian connectivity to Park Royal – connect the dots
- Driveways off of Marine Drive

Tuesday Session Group 2:

Land Use:

- Office use here would allow people to work near where they live.

Built Form:

- Something unique to West Vancouver.

Thursday Session Group 1:

Form of Development:

- Support of tower.
- General support for single tower.

Land Use:

- Supportive of high residential use.
- General support of housing.

Public Realm:

- Bike paths continuity to and past Lions Gate.
- Walking paths to park and river.
- Walking to Park Royal.
- Bridge across Cap River.

Thursday Session Group 2:

Form of Development:

- Why is the International Plaza being used to inform the scale?

- Need to ensure cohesive design with District of North Vancouver and the Lions Gate Bridge.

West Sub-area

Tuesday Session - Group 1

Form of Development:

- Defer to existing buildings (Clyde Avenue neighbourhood and Water's Edge development) e.g. mid-rise buildings
- Concern with obstruction of view – Lions Gate Bridge from Taylor Way (iconic view)
- Height limitations to protect views e.g. 8 to 10 storeys

Land Use

- Residential (East of Taylor Way) family sized units.
- Commercial at 752 Marine Drive
- Entertainment options
- Transportation solutions need to accompany any new development
- Transportation improvements need to accompany and be part of the design of any developments

Public Realm

- Signature public art (opportunities for public art)
- Ensure significant building setbacks from right of ways
- Innovative design: something magical

Tuesday Session Group 2:

Land Use:

- Realism of turning into retail (not pedestrian friendly, vehicles can't stop)
- Retail not sufficient to support the employment base plus most of the retail is on Squamish Land therefore not contributing to municipal taxes.

Public Realm:

- Gateway missing welcoming to the community. Currently Park Royal denotes entry to West Vancouver Towers not necessarily an improvement.

Thursday Session Group 1:

Form of Development:

- Concern for shadowing on Clyde Avenue from potential towers.
- Object to high density use on 752.
- Concern with fit of tower on Clyde Avenue with existing character.
- Trade off between taller forms which provides a park.

Land Use:

- Residential on Clyde also consider commercial.
- Office space in 752.
- Clyde Avenue phase out commercial and keep it to residential.
- Consider 100%.
- Residential on 752.
- Questioning the need for residents use given proposals on SFN.
- Trade off between development proposals and what can be developed under zoning.
- Need for more than retail at grade?

Public Realm:

- Protecting future transit and access use on corner of Taylor and Marine.
- Concern of Clyde Avenue development transit / transportation.
- Plan intersection transportation conditions to inform future developments.
- Pedestrian protection and safety coming out of 660.
- Support for public space at NE corner of Marine.
- Ensure sufficient setback on property lines at 752.

Thursday Session – Group 2:

- Need to sort out traffic / intersection issues and sort out transit. Don't take away future option to improve.
- Inform the public / prospective residents.
- Increased traffic is causing cars to cut through other areas at risk of pedestrian safety.

Section 4: Other Comments

Each group had a "Parking Lot" board to record comments that fell outside of the specific questions asked:

Tuesday Session Group 1:

- Sequencing (order of doing this study before the OCP): What is the overall Growth Management framework for West Vancouver?
- Various references to transportation concerns and their impacts on quality of life

Thursday Session Group 1

- Transit upgrades.
- Ensure no road goes through Klahanie Park.
- Internal circulation is planned and functional.
- Changes in use lower transportation impacts.

Thursday Session Group 2

- Traffic is affecting quality of life.

- How do we define?
- New development should not be detrimental to quality of life.
- Impact on infrastructure as a result of increased density.
- No transit station now on North Shore. Will it exist in the future?

SECTION II: OPEN HOUSES

Two Open Houses were held at St. Anthony's elementary School at Christ the Redeemer Church on Thursday October 6 and Wednesday October 12. The events included a set of display boards, which included interactive and "dotmocracy" boards allowing those in attendance to provide feedback directly on the boards. Well over 100 residents attended and there were 125 sticky note comments received which are presented below by board and by event.

Context:

Interactive board question: "Are there any other contextual factors you feel should be considered?"

Open House #1

- Further development of 18,000 units without improved transit + improved infrastructure will result in gridlock
- What public values and priorities are used here? How were they measured?
- Park Royal dictating form + density
- What are the current zoning and OCP specs you are changing: please have a comparison chart
- Developers are greedy and will suck the marrow out of the bone
- Development outstripping infrastructure: health care, transport, transit, recreation etc, people already have to go to Whistler for CT scan
- Transit is huge issue: you say it is "best" service. It is inadequate not 15 min if can't get on bus! (just one example)
- Overwhelming overdevelopment ruining livability (+1)
- This is not so much a Context Study as it is a rationalization for 3 developments. It is essentially spot zoning
- Public quality of life (current) vs. what is will be if these developments proceed. (+1)
- You are missing the reality that people do not give up their cars
- Solve the current traffic problems before authorizing 600 units that will make it even worse
- Heavy impact on Ambleside + Dunderave
- Report says this study in no way predetermines the outcome of any development applications: this is disingenuous. Certainly once approved this study will significantly influence development approval process
- The Context Study assumes high rise buildings are the answer to affordable/ diverse housing option, it capitulates to other jurisdictions

assuming W.V. must confirm to their developments and that transportation issues will be resolved through proximity to transit: I disagree.

Open House 2

- Preserve the natural environment of the Capilano River – no cafes, coffee shops, etc.
- Too many safety hazards on the existing cycling routes. Need to be upgraded to AAA to help resolve congestion.
- Affordable housing
- Concrete ways to alleviate traffic concerns
- Isn't it time to consider the people who live in West Van currently rather than shoppers, developers and people who would like to live here in the future?
- Traffic at Marine Drive and Taylor Way is already a huge problem. These developments (even in DNV and CNV) will exacerbate the problem. Driving through that intersection will be impossible.
- Infrastructure to support (arrow) population: unrealistic to expect people to get out of their cars. We live on a mountain: how do families go shop with children down a mountain, or elderly?
- This study shows the development of the area is too ambitious for the current infrastructure. Is there a study to consider reducing or capping density?
- Seriously? Get on a bike to go to Canadian Tire? Costco? Safeway? & bring back good how? Or walk there & bank? How about getting to mountains! Other recreation?
- More concerns should be given to existing traffic problems before contemplating more density.
- Traffic – these developments will significantly impact traffic getting onto the L.G. Bridge. Put an overpass from the highway over to the bridge and from Capilano the overpass for cars – much like in Seattle – Takes commuters into the City & away from shopping etc.
- We are responding to developer rather than West Van residents. Developers are trying to eke out the last bit of developable space. These are just bad sites – there is nothing to commend them.
- We are close to gridlock already. We must consider this major problem before we add any more density. I don't see any plans to tackle this problem.
- Need more info & input from Coastal Health. Are there plans for a new hospital? This Study is incomplete without their input. 180000 units x 2 people per unit = 36,000 people relying on Lions Gate Hospital is unsustainable.
- Need "Go Train" from downtown Vancouver to Horseshoe Bay, Lions Bay, Squamish, Whistler.
- I agree with the proposed rapid transit which would be better than express busses which is what I think the designation is.

- In my experiences riding transit, I find that getting on the bus at Park Royal is a risky proposition – during peak hours the busses are mostly full. It's much better to catch the bus before Park Royal.
- Why isn't Squamish Nation plans to extend west across the Capilano River included in the Study Area?

Planning Objectives and Design Principles:

Using “dotmocracy” boards to determine levels of support, participants were provided with six dot stickers and asked to place them on their top three Planning Objectives and top three Design Principles. Below are totals from each Open House:

Open House 1

Planning Objectives	Total # of dots
Reinforce two centres	2
Connect the dots	2
Engage with the natural environment	5
Recognize views and reinforce legibility	5
Respond to context	7
Secure appropriate amenities	3
Minimize trip generation	6
Meet housing objectives	10
Connect to Park Royal Shopping Centre	2

Design Principles	Total # of dots
Distinct Centres	4
Distinct Context	0
Transit Supportive Development	4
Respond to the River	0
Hierarchy	0
Pedestrian Continuity	6
Express the Gateway	0
Complete Communities	6
Public Space, Public Life	8
Sustainable Design	3

Open House 2

Planning Objectives	Total # of dots
Reinforce two centres	1
Connect the dots	9
Engage with the natural environment	3
Recognize views and reinforce legibility	3
Respond to context	3

Secure appropriate amenities	5
Minimize trip generation	18
Meet housing objectives	9
Connect to Park Royal Shopping Centre	3

Design Principles	Total # of dots
Distinct Centres	1
Distinct Context	1
Transit Supportive Development	14
Respond to the River	6
Hierarchy	4
Pedestrian Continuity	3
Express the Gateway	1
Complete Communities	7
Public Space, Public Life	1
Sustainable Design	6

Interactive board question: “Are there any other Objectives or Principles you feel are missing?”

Open House 1

- Why does the Study Area exclude North side of Clyde Avenue?
- When was the public review of 303 Marine Drive and 660 Clyde et al? (+2)
- Development of Earls Site, Capilano Road congestion
- Encourage more office space on the N.S. so that employees to not have to cross Lions Gate
- Nothing like putting the cart before the horse. Solve vehicular traffic FIRST
- Why is North Van development being used to justify high rise in West Van? (+2)
- Public reduced 752 Marine towers proposal so why try to approve it in this study? (+3)
- Enhancing the ‘pedestrian experience’ is not a priority – you’re using amenities to enhance the properties your building. What the public want is a traffic solution.
- What do we need at this intersection right now? A realistic traffic solution. Increasing density in this area to this degree will significantly add to the problem. Relate possible development to capacity of transportation
- This is one vision – staffs. How do West Vancouverites envision their future? Does this Context Study fit with the public’s vision for WV? (public feedback from 752/White Spot clearly indicated lack of support for residential at this location) (+2)
- This isn’t a corridor in the sense that no one would walk along Marine Drive from N.V. to W.V. – the priority is not better pedestrian routes it’s the

vehicle traffic at Taylor Way/Marine + no amount of walking/bike paths will resolve this.

Open House 2

- What about a hospital to accommodate more people?
- Relate possible development to capacity of transportation.
- More affordable housing should be in the plan.
- You are totally ignoring the congestion on Taylor Way/Marine Drive. You will be adding to it and the Prov of BC has no plans to address it.
- (sketch of elephant) How will we get around?
- Consider direct connection (freeway) between Lions Gate Bridge & Upper Levels Highway – no stoplights – limited access.
- You are planning to increase the population but you are not planning to increase the amenities:
 - Hospital
 - Lions Gate Bridge
 - Access to the south
- Consider area for a new hospital.
- Encourage and promote the safe travel of pedestrians and cyclists.

Urban Design & Planning Directions:

East Sub-area:

Interactive board question: “Are there any other Urban Design & Planning Directions you feel are important?”

Open House #1

- We are being provided one option – high rises in busiest area. Buses move. Highrises are unpopular
- The only context seems to be towers, yet Clyde Ave already has an established neighbourhood of 4 – 5 storeys: What about opportunities to develop along this same scale?
- Why is Evelyn Drive development not included in Study Area?
- Why is north side of Clyde Ave not included in Study Area?
- Traffic, traffic, traffic! Let’s be realistic (+1)
- Slow down, seems it’s a done deal
- East sub area: this is going to be a nightmare

Open House #2

No comments received.

West Sub-Area:

Interactive board question: “Are there any other Urban Design & Planning Directions you feel are important?”

Open House 1

- Site should consider a low-rise building (+2)
- Maybe it is time to consider a sea bus from? To downtown
- Shadowing of Clyde Avenue
- By grouping the tall building creating a large mass (fence)
- Have you ever been to Pittsburgh?
- 752 Marine Drive Come on, we know that the West Royal Towers was a mistake, and you want to make another one.
- West Royal is too high! Don't repeat mistake. Offer low-rise option (+2)
- If all of this goes ahead it will be a solid fall facing the lower Cedardale area.
- What is this 'book end' business? You could conceivably 'book end' Deep Cove & Horseshoe Bay.
- There are not 2 centres as this report indicates, there is one – the Lions Gate Town Centre. Park Royal is not a 'centre' it's a mall. (+1)

Open House 2

- It is already over congested. How do you plan to deal with that
- Make the pedestrian walkways very wide to accommodate scooters & crowds.
- Water ferry's connecting Ambleside, Park Royal, Capilano, Lower Lonsdale to downtown *think Venice.
- Pedestrians and cyclists need a safe crossing separated from traffic to connect the Spirit Trail across the Capilano River.
- Concerned with scale of three developments. Midscale (or low scale!) much preferred given traffic concerns.

Marine Drive:

Interactive board question: “What is your vision for Marine Drive?”

Open House 1

No Comments.

Open House 2

- What about the western part of Marine Drive beyond West Bay. Much too narrow for current busses in many places.
- Recognize that Cap. Road is the current “401” to Hwy 99 on Taylor Way -> Integrated Planning.

- Could we start a discussion with Province of BC MOT to make a Highway 99 Bypass to the L.B. Bridge (tunnel)? This would give us back our Taylor Way Gateway and improve walkability.

Other Questions and Comments:

Interactive board question: “Do you have any other thoughts on the Context Study?”

Open House 1

- Nothing should be approved till the traffic is solved
- Mall complex design is unsafe and bizarre
- Consider having a traffic conductor in the morning and evening
- Consult public before making report or changes (+1)
- Write report for public not developers (+1)
- No consideration for public safety during construction (i.e. north mall now)
- Limit to low rise
- Traffic is not addressed
- Development applications should be help up until traffic solved
- Traffic needs to be considered
- If the transit and traffic at Taylor Way + Marine Drive are “not in our jurisdiction” we have no business proposing these density increases
- Important: solve the traffic problem first (Taylor Way junction) (+2)
- My main concern is the traffic congestion along Marine Drive and Taylor Way
- Think Paris: nothing above 5 storeys
- Too many tall towers for the existing roads means even worse congestion
- The Marine Drive Context Study is not well founded: the OCP as it relates to Clyde Ave east is fine as it is: Maximum 5 storeys.
- Increased housing options are important, however need improved and comprehensive traffic plan.
- Need to have improved traffic flow along Marine Drive/Ambleside Area
- What is wrong with you? (Planning Department): Traffic is a mess, no approval till traffic plan in place
- No consideration to Park Royal Towers for traffic, pedestrians
- Traffic plan should be in place b4 any construction starts
- District unable to enforce bylaws re: construction i.e. north mall ongoing now
- Solve the current traffic problems first, then worry about all this other stuff! (+1)
- No to high rises
- Crazy! 1/3 of WV lives in highrises today
- Better no development, already too many people
- Planning + Mayors West Van + District of N. Van Traffic study + plan needs to be in place before you man seriously + smartly consider any further development.

- Limit to low rise, traffic is also a concern
- Public needs and wants should be assessed before report is written
- Public already commented on 753/White Spot develop + rezone application and overwhelmingly rejected this proposal with traffic concerns being the #1 concern: why is this not reflected in staff's report? Why rezone when there is no traffic solution?
- This study has not been put in perspective of an overall housing policy (we have no housing policy?). 'A Housing Action Plan for W.V.' indicates the District would like to encourage INNOVATIVE housing projects that meet DEFINED housing gaps and are SENSITIVE to NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER. There is nothing innovative about highrise towers. It's not sensitive to Clyde Ave's established neighbourhood character and we haven't defined housing gaps/how to address them.
- What is the rush to rezone other than to expedite 3 development applications?
- What is the benefit for current residents? What is the 'downside'?
- Who are we doing this for? Immediate stakeholders should have more influence.

Open House 2

- Need to consider traffic!!
- It is about whether traffic analysis are solutions.
- Traffic study?
- "Context" should be in response to public transit infrastructure.
- Street fronting retail -> Make the store fronts more welcoming, not just a wall.
- I note very little attention to transportation, parking, etc. (Parking is very important to many W.V. residents that live "out-west".)
- Traffic for bridge (or North Vancouver) needs to be separated from traffic going to Park Royal.
- I understand the economic interest in these developments for both the developers and the District yet you have to wonder how all the traffic will flow. Welcome to the Concrete Jungle!
- What's missing?
 - The risk that we have disjointed context if we do nothing
 - The risk of overgrown vacant lots
- I want to see something other than mostly residential or residential with ground floor commercial -> more office space
- Perhaps an industry hub where workers who living N. Van or the West End commute to the Lions Gate Area. Tech centre?

SECTION III: COMMUNITY SURVEY

The Community Survey was available on westvancouverITE and in hard copy at public engagement events and Municipal Hall from September 26 to October 21, 2016. The survey received 329 responses: 197 registered and 132 unregistered. Registered respondents have a westvancouverITE account, while unregistered respondents have completed the survey but either not logged into their westvancouverITE account or have not set up an account. Trends between registered and unregistered respondents were consistent for the majority of questions. The results below are presented by Registered and Unregistered responses for full disclosure and transparency.

Planning and Design Objectives:

1. What do you think of the study's following planning and design objectives for the area?

Registered Respondents	Agree with	Disagree with	Not sure
Reinforce two centres at Park Royal South and North Vancouver's Lions Gate Town Centre	57.5% (112)	33.8% (66)	8.7% (17)
Improve pedestrian infrastructure and experience along Marine Drive	87.3% (172)	8.1% (16)	4.6% (9)
Engage with the natural environment, Klahanie Park and Capilano River	84.5% (163)	7.3% (14)	8.2% (16)
Preserve and enhance views and legibility from the Lions Gate Bridge	72.8% (144)	13.6% (27)	13.6% (27)
Respond to the context of Lions Gate Town Centre and Park Royal Shopping Centre	53.6% (103)	21.4% (41)	25% (48)
Connect to Park Royal mall by reinforcing existing patterns of pedestrian movement	79.1% (155)	12.2% (24)	8.7% (17)
Meet housing objectives by providing for affordable, rental and supportive housing	70.4% (138)	21.4% (42)	8.2% (16)
Secure community amenities like public realm improvements and childcare	77% (151)	12.8% (25)	10.2% (20)
Minimize car trips by prioritizing residential uses, which generate less traffic than offices or retail	66.8% (131)	22% (43)	11.2% (22)

Unregistered Respondents	Agree with	Disagree with	Not sure
Reinforce two centres at Park Royal South and North Vancouver's Lions Gate Town Centre	46.6% (62)	39.8% (53)	13.6% (18)
Improve pedestrian infrastructure and experience along Marine Drive	81.1% (107)	13.6% (18)	5.3% (7)
Engage with the natural environment, Klahanie Park and Capilano River	77.1% (101)	14.5% (19)	8.4% (11)
Preserve and enhance views and legibility from the Lions Gate Bridge	73.3% (96)	13.7% (18)	13% (17)
Respond to the context of Lions Gate Town Centre and Park Royal Shopping Centre	43% (55)	30.5% (39)	26.5% (34)
Connect to Park Royal mall by reinforcing existing patterns of pedestrian movement	71.3% (92)	17.8% (23)	10.9% (14)
Meet housing objectives by providing for affordable, rental and supportive housing	61.5% (80)	29.3% (38)	9.2% (12)
Secure community amenities like public realm improvements and childcare	67.7% (88)	20% (26)	12.3% (16)
Minimize car trips by prioritizing residential uses, which generate less traffic than offices or retail	69.3% (88)	21.3% (27)	9.4% (12)

2. Are there any other objectives that you think should be considered?

Registered Respondents:

there appears to be a lack of consideration for automobile traffic

Your study does not address the most important issue around this area, i.e. traffic congestion. Even though, as you state, a higher % of new residents might use public transit, the addition of all these units will further increase congestion. The notion that people will walk and bike, is a dream, as people have to go to work and many people do not work where transit takes them. Many people have to travel to Surrey, Richmond, UBC, etc and many people do not have a fixed location, but need to visit various customers around Metro Vancouver. The increased congestion around Lion's gate Bridge and Upper Levels Highway over the past 5 years is outrageous, and nobody bothers to do a study of this. This plan does not offer any 3rd crossing or expansion of road systems. And that will most probably not happen. The commute congestion is nowadays not only during "rusher". It is all day and it is horrible.

Traffic congestion issues need to be addressed before more cars are introduced into the Marine Drive-Taylor Way- Capilano Road area. While it may be true that residential uses of buildings may add less car trips to an area than commercial or office space,

I am REALLY concerned about the already snarled traffic situations we face everyday in going east along marine drive to LGBridge! These developments will only make things worse!!

Plan in context of development potential of Squamish Nation lands, including possible densities and limitations those densities may place on adjacent lands.

Recognize that land development potential may be limited by access and visual impact on public realm and local road network.

yes: 1) consider the risk of doing nothing will likely produce an undeveloped area similar to what has happened in the 1300 block of Marine Drive. No vision, no action, no change, bombed out vacant lot syndrome, and/or commercial tenants on month to month leases. 2) I think we could do better by leaving room in the plan for commercial use other than retail or ground level use, and actually seek out industries or businesses that would possibly be a good fit (thinking out loud: something in the knowledge worker field such a software development). This would actually support improvements to better transit for the area than residential alone. 3) I would like to see a variety of shapes and sizes for the dwellings, with a focus on more compact ground level housing in addition to fitting into the high-rise look. A staggered skyline is way more interesting than a couple of standalone rectangles. I think that a single hi-rise on the 600 block Marine would stick out like a sore thumb if there is not any stepping down of levels, such as over multiple structures. I also think that the 725 Marine development would have been better with 2 towers of similar height, instead of a big box and a tipped over big box. A difference of 10-12 stories between each would have been better: add another 10 stories to the short tipped over box - it will not be out of place compared to the buildings to the east or the height of the parkade in the background. I am OK with 27 stories on the tall building; view corridors between tall slender buildings are more appealing than looking at mismatched lego land boxes.

4) connecting to PR along existing patterns of pedestrian traffic: I think you want to expand new ones, as the current ones are not enough and will not be adequate if these things get built. Consider a foot bridge over Cap River to the north of Marine Drive, and somehow to get from the north side of Marine to PR without getting killed at the Taylor Way intersection, or taking a brave step up the stairs of the dark parkade. You might also consider how to link in foot traffic paths to the Evelyn development.

5) consider including spots for fire and police service. For this much increased population, surely DWV and DNV would want to look at a new fire hall near the Lions Gate center. With more institutional going up Taylor Way, one should consider an ambulance site on Clyde or Taylor Way.

6) encourage development of multi-fam units that can actually accommodate a family with young children - 3 brdm with more space --vs. those 500 sq ft Yaletown style units. - -and ground oriented in the 1500 sqft range so families can actually get the kids outdoors easily. Compare with the current trend that you can only get something over 1200 sq. ft in the massive and massively expensive penthouse unit. THis is the issue

that needs to be highlighted - right sized housing. Talking about affordable housing does not go very far with the recent asset inflation taking place across the globe.

Increase construction of rental properties. Balconies on senior apartment buildings

Taylor Way and Marine Drive is a bottleneck. There should be an overpass from Taylor Way to give access to the LGB and an overpass to connect West Vancouver to North Vancouver Marine Drive. More buses over the LGB. The new traffic lights connecting north and south Park Royal just disrupt traffic on Marine Drive. Why was the overpass taken away? A ferry to take people from Ambleside to downtown Vancouver. There was a ferry at one time - it could transport so many people (like the Sea Bus). As in Sydney Australia where the water is seen as means of transport rather than an obstacle.

solving existing traffic issues, especially the 'bridge bottleneck', before adding more vehicles into the mix. This includes acknowledging that no matter how congested the roads, a fair number of people will continue to drive, especially in West Vancouver

Study should be conducted to ensure adequate vehicular access is provided to and from Capilano Rd and Marine Dr during rush hour. Both are major feeder routes to and from the Lions Gate bridge for north shore commuters.

No where in the overall study has anyone addressed the "elephant in the room" what is the impact of the increased traffic going to be re:

1) access to the Lions Gate Bridge

2) handling of increasing traffic coming south down Taylor Way and across West/East along Marine Drive

3) when will West/North Vancouver insist on a fourth lane for the Lions Gate Bridge?

How can any plan not deal with traffic implications and the fact there are no employment opportunities for people to live and work in West Vancouver?

More rental options. More reasonably priced condos for sale.

Infrastructure and traffic should be considered first. If not you will not get the support of the community.

You are creating even more of a bottle neck for traffic at Taylor Way and Marine Drive. All this planning would be positive if people did not have a bridge to contend with to go to and from work, etc. Feel the plans as outlined far exceed the capacity of the streets and intersections to handle the increased volume of cars and trucks that will occur.

Affordable housing and traffic are the biggest concerns I have

I think these objectives are missing the key problem of traffic patters around Lions Gate bridge and Park Royal. This would need to be addressed in order to support any additional development. As we only have a bus system that must utilize the same roads we can not get around this growing problem absent reworking the bottlenecks and expanding the bridge or extending the sky train to Park Royal.

Currently, the traffic congestion in these areas is terrible. What is this going to add to that? No matter how close you live to public transportation, a good percentage of people will still add more car traffic- many out of necessity. There is already complete gridlock

along Marine Drive at certain times of the day- particularly around the two access areas to the Lions gate Bridge.

Minimize the building size to avoid more traffic.

The study appears to be designed to essentially justify Larco's proposed Marine Drive and Taylor Way development. That site should be used to create a serious identity for the entrance to West Vancouver. Has anyone considered the grandeur of the boulevards of Paris, the Avenue 9 de Julio or Buenos Aires, The Mall in London? We are a young city with space and land to make a world class planning statement, instead we are pandering to corporate greed with the pretence something worthy and fine.

1. Consider the impact of multi-storey buildings and position on the shadow they cast, blocking natural light and sunshine for those who occupy and use the spaces in and around the area.
2. Expand, improve and extend hours of transit and their links, with a safe transit hub site for late night transit users. These improvements will help reduce use of cars, and need for parking. Look at Swiss/Dutch/German/Scandinavian models for efficient/effective transit.
3. Maintain and increase/improve parking for commuters.
4. Improve links with downtown and other communities, to encourage use of transit. and affordability. Again look at European models.
5. Protect green spaces to make the spaces user friendly for everyone. A desirable place to be outside. Not a concrete jungle.
6. Reinforce use of all other modes of transport other than the car. Make taxis more affordable and more competitive. Seniors with vision and cognitive declines are safer taking alternative transportation than driving a car. Continue with bike lanes and walking paths.
7. Incorporate areas for dogs off lease areas. it is well known that pet ownership has significant mental health benefits, esp to residents who feel isolated. Consult with pet owners.

ease traffic and redesign the intersection of Marine and Taylor. take the traffic congestion of mall goes off Marine.

Pedestrians do not want to be walking next to heavy traffic, large buffer zones (boulevards at a minimum) need to be integrated into the design. There is enough room to create pedestrian corridors connecting the "town center's" that are distinct and away from the major traffic flow. They could be enhanced by landscaping - not just trees to block out the traffic and encourage walking between the centers.

Use principles of Smart Growth and Regional Growth commitment when planning

The lack of municipal, provincial and federal governments to deal with the major problem in this area and that is the vehicular traffic issue that results from the Lions Gate Bridge. You will not solve the current problem by increasing density within this study area. Don't put the cart before the horse.

Is the objective to connect the Lions Gate Town Centre to Park Royal? I notice the emphasis on walking and public transit and a turning away from driving. Do you then have to have paths through the Earls site and Klahanie Park, etc? Is there to be a tower

in the works for Klahanie Court? There seems to be an incredible lot going on at the North Vancouver site that will impact us.

However much you increase public transit, there will still be more traffic at this already horribly busy corner - there WILL be more cars and also more buses. This is all useless unless you get the provincial government to improve things at the crossing of Taylor Way and Marine Drive (even stopping cars racing to get across and then blocking the cross traffic would help today). Thousands more housing units are bound to make more traffic. And what about all the ferry traffic, Squamish and Whistler traffic? You HAVE to all work together! Sitting on Taylor Way for 45 minutes often these days is no fun - makes one want to move to Vancouver! Our bus system from 4700 Marine was one every 30 minutes when we moved here 50 years ago - and it's still one every 30 minutes! (except a few extra in rush hour), so I drive downtown all the time - day and evening. Also does it matter what West Van looks like driving north on Lions Gate Bridge! Drivers should be looking at traffic, not the view! Is there no way at all that another road could take some of the out-of-West Van traffic towards the Bridge? Don't suppose we would ever get another lane on the bridge - it was short sighted to think a bridge built in 1938 could cope today with only the same number of lanes. It's pie in the sky to think you can wean people out of their cars without a HUGE improvement in transit.

I am glad that planning is taking place for these big developments, much of which lie outside West Vancouver jurisdiction. It is good that the various agencies are working together. At the same time I am appalled at the scale of the proposed development in WV, NV and Squamish land. The Lion's Gate Bridge is already jammed and it is getting increasingly hard to drive from West Van to North Van and to take the Second Narrows Bridge. These projects will add thousands of people to our population, and even if they are more likely to take public transit, life will become totally congested on the North Shore.

Traffic at this intersection is out of control. Even busses can't get through. a solution needs to be sought before allowing more density.

traffic congestion and view impacts should be primary concerns

. nowhere is there any justification given for why such high density should be allowed on these sites

. I don't think the entry to West Van should be a tall condo tower - it doesn't reflect the character of our community. It is just a sellout the developers.

* Please ensure development of this area coordinates with the GREATER transportation plan for the North Shore

* I believe our buildings should include some architectural significance as West Vancouver is unique in its landscape (and architectural influences) and we should work within that - maybe towers aren't the answer but low rise buildings integrated with the landscape?

* Possibility of satellite learning centres/colleges/universities or modern business office pods - let's make West Vancouver a centre for excellence in learning and a hub for business excellence.

* Although it is stated that residential use minimizes car trips, not sure that is the case as residents quite likely will work elsewhere and they will have friends and family they will

visit and that will come to visit them. Is maximum density the goal? Can we not develop these lands with a focus on saving natural landscape, ultimately preserving our green spaces?

Although minimizing incremental car trips seems to be an objective, I would argue that there is almost no room for ANY ADDITIONAL car trips from these two sites. Thus, there appears to be a flaw from the get-go of this over-densification of this already unbelievably congested area. In addition it should be noted that with aging of west Vancouver, car trips (non-commuter) are likely to increase, not decrease, and these are at non-commuting hours for which the transit increases will be geared.

Would want to see actual commitments to build rapid transit and deadlines to meet for this BEFORE any or all of this stuff gets built. There is simply nowhere for more cars to go on Marine Dr corridor. Or put in a bunch of buses connecting to fast boats from multiple north shore destinations to multiple destinations in Vancouver serviced by buses and/or rapid transit. To encourage cycling install bicycle rental locations at various locations on north shore chosen for their ability to facilitate safe cycling over LG Bridge. Be creative if you want to build these new residential centres.

We need more residential housing in the community, otherwise prices will continue to increase and become even more un-affordable.

Minimize impact/increase of traffic on Lion's Gate bridge by providing transit-only housing options (similar to the Marine Drive Development in South Vancouver).

More readily available transportation to town from the Lions Gate. This traffic volume will greatly aggravate already congested access to the bridge. Furthermore, routing of ferry traffic into the same area makes overloading of the infrastructure inevitable. Perhaps introduce vehicle tolls during rush hours to alleviate the problem. Use the tolls to eventually fund a 3rd crossing.

With all due respect it is impossible to understand how increased residential and commercial development in the areas proposed can do anything but severely exacerbate the already near impossible traffic issues as they currently exist at one of the worst transportation bottlenecks in the lower mainland. It is simply crazy to consider any more development in this location.

bike routes

One thing I see missing: what are the improvements being made to access to this area and transit through this area? I'm talking about impact and need for increased public transit, with consideration to the increased flow of traffic from outside this area that will be created, and how it will affect flow through the area. The plans are for more integrated residential and commercial spaces to reduce transport needs - but that's only for those people that will live in this area. Currently this is right in the middle of a major vehicle transport hub, the Lion's Gate Bridge - and I see almost no consideration to the impact on that already overwhelmed infrastructure.

What will be done to improve the current traffic congestion in the area with this new increase in population density??

As new development is planned, remove restrictions to vehicle movement. Here are 2 examples, #1- lower road of Park Royal south, if you want to turn right over the Capilano River, that lane was taken away so cars are backed up. Have 2 lanes, one to Taylor Way, the other to head east. #2- use all bridges that cross the Capilano river to move traffic to our disposal. Link up Keith Rd in WV with Fullerton Ave in DNV. this would take traffic away from Lions Gate bound vehicles. When there has been an accident on the upper levels, all traffic comes down to Marine and the lower road. This idea of having another bridge will help with the volume of vehicles traveling east/west bound. The thing is that the bridge already exists and discussions to link the two roads are needed. it is cheaper than building another bridge. If you want more discussion, you may contact me at

While the designs look good etc, I cannot agree with the planning and design objectives for the area as I do not agree with increasing the density for the area until public services [transport/traffic/over-densification issues] have been addressed.

Traffic problems must be solved first. We need a third crossing. We need two more east- west thoroughfares across the north shore.

A better traffic design must be worked out for Marine and Taylor Way, especially from the south. Often it takes 15 min. To go from the west end of the lower bridge to get on to Marine Drive (east). Once it took me 40 minutes, and there was no accident....just congestion. DEAL WITH TRAFFIC FIRST.

There is only one bridge, and there is already major congestion problems...until traffic congestion/alternate/additional crossing to Vancouver is resolved on the north side of the Lions Gate Bridge, no development should occur....

There are many more options available! I suspect this particular one only serves to get the attention of the interested proponents of the developments.

Too much gauzy plannerspeak in stated planning and design objectives. Planning objectives should include adherence to OCP.

I have lived on the North Shore for 50 years and in that time there has been very little infrastructure performed by all three levels of government to handle the increased traffic load on all the three crossings(this includes the ferry). Rampant building has taken place with little regard for the business of actually living on the north shore. My children have moved to Sechelt because their commute to the city was becoming impossible. People have become cranky, intolerant, young drivers have become a liability in their driving habits, one has to allow at least an hour to get to one's destination in the city. How can we possibly consider building more apartment buildings at the apex of Taylor Way and Marine Drive when the exits from this area to the bridge are always blocked solid. The questions you ask are skirting around the real problem, addressing residential uses when one is fighting a tsunami from The Ferries, Whistler and Squamish. The North Shore has just received \$900 million from the feds for the sewage treatment plant - an ask which had been in place for 30 years. If we start planning for some sort of third crossing now it may be able to be used by my grandchildren in 30 years time. Your questions only mention the word 'traffic' once. You are totally skirting the problem by not mentioning the problem of crossing a bridge almost daily which is older than me.

Time has come to stand up to developers and say a big "NO" until it can be proved that movement of people on bridges can be done in an efficient and timely fashion.

Work to make the two centres aesthetically pleasing so that residents are happy to linger in these areas. Design the two centres with energy conservation in mind, especially for buildings and transportation.

I am unsure of the traffic planning, but with increased residential/commercial use at Lions Gate and Park Royal I predict a massive traffic jam, likely all day long and not just at rush hours as we have now.

The traffic at Marine Drive & Taylor Way is a mess. Park Royal itself is a nightmare, not enough parking in the right places, made worse by people parking on the southwest side to use Ambleside facilities which do not have enough parking for those using them. Traffic and parking in and around Park Royal should be cleaned up before any expansion.

Why the heck are we considering these huge residential buildings, there is no employment for people on the North shore, so people will have to travel to the areas where there are jobs, Vancouver, Burnaby, Surrey, Richmond and Coquitlam. So all this will do is increase the traffic problems. I am sure the only incentive to promote this type of development is to get foreign investors to put their money in property here and I think we all know who these foreign investors are.

I'm very concerned about the traffic on Marine Drive in both directions. While the idea is to discourage travel by car and encourage the use of transit, the reality is that the increased residential density is going to create more volume on this already over-clogged main thoroughfare. I would like to see a solution to this problem before the development of these buildings is approved.

Don't leave out the "middle class" in terms of med/high density housing options. Yes we have low income seniors & people who need support but we also have families in the \$100k plus income zone who cannot afford housing. Avoid polarizing options by increasing strata row/townhouse stock with caps on Form K units (rentals).

At the current time, there are increasingly severe traffic jams at the Taylor Way and Marine Drive intersection as well as the Capilano Road and Marine Drive intersection. Any expansion of residential and office space should only proceed after successful measures are implemented to reduce the current traffic chaos. This should be a key milestone to be achieved prior to the start of any new residential or office capacity.

- 1) minimize use of taxpayers money for bell and whistles projects funded by municipality
- 2) do not encourage densification in West Vancouver - population is just fine and no need to get more people here
- 3) reduce size of buildings in Park Royal area to max 5-6 storeys

Address and mitigate heavy traffic congestion already evident within study area including improved facilities for non-motorized transport

It would appear from the documentation that there is no question about going ahead with these projects. Has anyone thought to ask the people of our municipality whether ANY consideration should be given to more development around Taylor Way and Marine Drive? Ultimately development of going to happen. The most important element is timing. The transportation infrastructure is currently beyond capacity. Before any of these projects can be moved forward, something must be done to improve the movement of people on public transport, bikes and cars to and from the rest of West Vancouver to and from Park Royal/Ambleside and to and from the City of Vancouver. It would be irresponsible to consider these projects without knowing how the transportation infrastructure will evolve.

It might help if the study were written in plain, simple English instead of jargon. No traffic plan.

While not a planning or design objective, the amount of traffic all these changes will generate could be substantial so what will be done to alleviate that? This is an important question which must be addressed at the same time!

We need more and better roads and more bridges, before allowing any more housing to be built.

Creation of Inspirational public realm - principles are sound but not creating a special place.

Reinforce existing Neighbourhood Character through low-rise housing in the Clyde Avenue area. This should be the priority, not an out of place tower. Keep the existing OCP regulations on FAR, height and density. The District needs to demonstrate a better understanding of the nature of housing demand in WV before endorsing “developers” automatic high density response as the means to affordable housing. West Vancouver Community Foundation's Vital Signs Report 2016 concluded that “housing options such as townhomes, rowhouses, coach and laneway houses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and low-rise apartments are increasingly in demand by people wanting to downsize and those looking for more affordable and environmentally friendly housing alternatives. These are the “missing middle” that needs to become a priority for new development”. This is the sector for whom “affordable” housing needs to be targeted and this is the type of housing that reinforces, rather than destroys, the existing Clyde area neighbourhood character. Low rise housing also supports our clean energy objectives: high rise towers create 2.5 times the GHG's/sq.ft. of low rise housing. Lower density development also puts less pressure on the traffic and transit system than higher density development so you have a TRIPLE WORD SCORE!!

I didn't see any talk about additional traffic lights on Marine Drive through Park Royal or how this relates to Pound Road and the pedestrian light at Ambleside. I may have missed it, but these are very important and adding lights would improve the urban feel of this area and pedestrian infrastructure and the experience.

Improve public transit links between West Vancouver (especially the Park Royal shopping hub and Marine Drive) and North Vancouver.

Yes.. The question of whether West Vanc residents WANT Such Density at the Park royal BOTTLENECK is not asked...Just how would you like to see this density? Towers or Block structures? Who controlled the 'Design Objectives'?.. WV residents? or Developers Wish list....(especially putting major density on the "White Spot site?

Increasing Transportation to BP and West Vancouver. The reason transit trips are so low is that there is no frequent service. Chicken and egg situation.

A prime objective must be to reduce traffic congestion on Marine Drive and at Taylor Way. A priority must be travel by car to and from the airport and the main hospitals and cancer centre.

Respect existing Neighbourhood Character. The Clyde Avenue area has a well-established character with low rise (4-5 stories) modest buildings meeting commercial, residential ownership, rental and supportive housing needs. But this study ignores this established neighbourhood character and, instead, selectively promotes a high density residential/commercial tower development proposal for the neighbourhood as the appropriate context to complement tower developments in North Vancouver, even though there are also low-rise portions of the North Vancouver development. Most of your Objectives are "motherhood" statements that might be achieved through a wide range of development strategies. There is unintelligible jargon and lack of clarity in some of your objectives: "enhance views and legibility"??; what is affordable housing...affordable to whom...also, affordable housing can best be achieved on First Nations Land, where only leasehold development can be undertaken, rather than on private lands (White Spot and Clyde area sites) so if that is the objective, First Nations should be encouraged to build; also, secure community amenities...community amenities should be those that we can afford through fees and taxes not tying them to higher density development that exceeds our OCP and overtaxes our infrastructure. Prioritizing residential use generates less traffic? While residential may generate less traffic per square foot, if you are comparing 35,000 sq. ft. of residential/commercial space (which is currently allowed in the OCP for the White Spot site) to the proposed 350,000 sq.ft. of residential/commercial space being proposed by the developer, reduced traffic impact is questionable, especially if you add another 200,000 sq.ft. in the Clyde Avenue proposal.

If I understood what I was being shown at public viewing of the project the three jurisdictions increase the number of dwellings by 18,000 which is about double West Vancouver's existing dwellings. It is very wrong and irresponsible to develop such a large increase in density without having a transport plan particularly as there already exists a serious traffic problem in the area

Improve cycling infrastructure and experience along Marine Drive and throughout the study area

It is axiomatic that any planning and design objectives take into account the problem of traffic congestion at the Marine Drive/ Taylor Way intersection. It is disingenuous to ignore this very obvious fact, even though responsibility for this highway route rests with the provincial government.

My suggestion is to have a clear defined line between commercial use and residential use. Park Royal South should remain strictly commercial because of its controlled location and the growth that will take place in the next 50 years in West Vancouver. Park Royal South should be the retail, shopping, and entertainment hub.

North of Marine Drive starting from the river up to 13th should be a total central residential area with high density so people can live closer to the transit corridor and have easy access to downtown Vancouver. The traffic will be minimal as most people will use transit.

The corner of Marine Drive and Taylor Way, the site of the previous gas station, must be made a highlight point as a welcome entrance to West Vancouver with park-like landscaping.

The area between north of Marine Drive and big bluff should be concentration of high density towers with every building providing 20% of building area for rental properties.

TRAFFIC, TRAFFIC, TRAFFIC. There was too little in this plan about how existing roads/infrastructure would be able to handle increased traffic for North and West Vancouver, Squamish and Whistler

Traffic along Marine Drive and Taylor Way is often gridlocked. Adding more residents is going to make this worse Traffic needs to be improved!!

improve the present traffic flow issues and the increase in traffic before even considering adding density

consider the people's wish not to become like the west end, full of high rises

re: statement #1 - two centres will increase traffic

re: state

How can you think that increasing high rise development is not going to generate more traffic. Capilano road and Taylor way and Marine drive doesn't have the capacity to support the development contemplated. Taylor way and Marine is already a mess with traffic. I don't know how you can add three more towers without changing the traffic infrastructure. Everyone of those residents is going to own a car and will need to get out of the area to work or otherwise and it is already a mess. I believe it is a public safety issue currently that there is only two roadways to cross Capilano river. In a disaster we would face a major issue having such poor infrastructure particularly as one of the crossings is a major national highway.

- development is outpacing infrastructure

- West Van residents desires and quality of life

- traffic issues

re: statement #1 - there is only 1 centre - Park Royal cannot be considered a centre

re: statement #2 - low priority compared to traffic solute

agree with statements 7 & 8 only if there are supports and funding flowing to the new Community Living Room at Lions Gate

"Legibility" from Lions Gate Bridge???? This and many terms in the study are confusing. It would be nice if all the questions posed at the open houses could be answered before this survey closes. i.e. what is "affordable". The housing objectives should be spelled out with supporting data. i.e. There are desperate current and projected needs for publicly funded long-term care beds. but there is no mention of this.

Missing objective include: 1) Meet the needs and support the values of current citizens.
2) Enhance the liveability of current citizens.

Making the area on Clyde residential / retirement only so that commercial / office traffic is removed

should consider low rise building

- Public values and needs (not developer)
- Development outstripping infrastructure
- Quality of life for current residents
- Traffic and transportation

Why are you solely listening to developers? I live in the area and you have not asked for my advice. It is in direct contrast to community plan because it just provides 3 concrete towers. The white spot proposal needs more affordable rental options. It also needs a park around the building for community use. The Clyde Ave area ignores park access issues. This area has residents of Amica and other seniors unable to walk except on limited sidewalks. They couldn't possibly walk on the trails up Capilano River with canes and walkers. The design review committee refused to recommend this as it is once again spot zoning.

This study is clearly proposed by DEVELOPERS. It does not meet the Proposed West Vancouver Official Community Plan as it does not deal with the "Community" rather it is simply a method to justify three CONCRETE towers that fail to meet our Community Standards. The White Spot proposal lacks a sufficient number of low cost rental units available to those in need within our community; it also fails on any open park space around the building for community use (Sales area for Park Royal coffee wagons, etc.) The Clyde Avenue area fails to address the PARK ACCESS issues in the immediate area for residents of Amica and other seniors I see trying to walk along the limited sidewalks in the area avoiding the HIGH TRAFFIC STREETS.

The Design Review Committee refused to Recommend this as it is once again "SPOT ZONING." Why is the Evelyn Drive proposals for new buildings not included? Where is the Community link into Ambleside.

I doubt these plans will minimize car traffic around Marine Dr & Park Royal. I suspect future development will only exacerbate the traffic mess in that area, just like it did when the municipality gave Park Royal South more access to Marine Dr (making the wait to get thru that intersection from the west even longer for WV residents). Road designs seem only for the benefit of cheaters (who drive up the byway only lane & cut in at the light, making the wait even longer for those who wait in line & don't cheat) Also, 2 lanes on Marine from the west, should open out to allow north or thru drivers access after the last light going east, Park Royal S should not have priority access to Marine Dr during morning or evening rushhour - that only makes WV residents wait even longer!

The above planning and design objectives to which I importantly agree, in basic terms seem to speak to enhancement of the open and environmentally friendly and spectacular views at the entrance to the North Shore and West Vancouver and North Vancouver from all directions but particularly from the Lions Gate Bridge and/or from Taylor Way looking south towards the Lions Gate Bridge as well as provide the public with an improved opportunity to access same safely on foot. Having said that now we must consider what Development Monuments, their human content and height and design and placement would serve to complement the area provide needed tax dollars ensuring same do not simply provide local residents and new inhabitants of those buildings with an increasingly unpleasant life style in beautiful West Vancouver. I do not believe that building(s) at Park Royal South are needed to or need relate to those in North Vancouver's Lions Gate Town Centre. Looking west from Taylor Way on Marine Drive we have a lovely treed boulevard road and given structures, to Park Royal standard, were constructed even to accommodate retail at the White Spot location it would only further enhance the gateway to West Vancouver. Incidentally I note that a bank has only recently been placed in the same block facing Main Street. In addition I am not sure aside from adding to existing 380 Klahanie Court that any of the West Vancouver locations are suitable for affordable, rental and supportive housing.

Nothing springs to mind. The plan appears very well thought out.

We need this park at the corner of Marine Dr and Taylor Way, it will look beautiful and vastly improve the area

What do WV residents want for their community? This Study is strictly District Staff's objectives for this area. What has never been addressed is what do WV residents want for their community?

What plans are there for critical infrastructure to accommodate all this increased density? Taylor Way and Marine Drive is a traffic nightmare already. Traffic issues and solutions are completely omitted from this study. Also, we only have one hospital on the North Shore that serves all the North Shore as well as Lions Bay and Squamish. North Van's Lions Gate Town Centre will place an increased burden on existing infrastructure, these new NV residents will use WV's parks, community centre, library, etc. How is adding more density going to improve WV residents quality of life? This is not a context plan, it's a rationalization for 3 developments -- it's essentially "spot-zoning".

This study assumes high rise buildings are the answer to affordable and diverse housing options, it capitulates to other jurisdictions assuming WV must conform to other developments and that transportation issues will be resolved through proximity to transit. We already know that adding housing stock has done nothing to lower housing costs in WV. Also, won't the Lions Gate Town Centre and future residential development on Squamish Nation land address housing diversity? Residential built on Squamish Nation land will be more affordable than land with 'free-hold' title.

Improve current traffic flow issues before even considering adding density;
Consider what existing residents want for their community; I do not want WV to become like Yale Town (full of high rises).

Build an overhead (covered) direct pedestrian crosswalk via north and south park royal. Build lanes going east / west under Taylor way and Marine so cars can go right through without the traffic light impacting flow.

- drastically reduce use of personal vehicles within the centres; keep use of personal vehicles to, from, and between the centres as a supported but not prioritized option
- prioritize complete communities which reduce trip lengths and vehicle dependency

YES, what are the vehicular transportation improvement plan design and planning objectives?

Improvements to the major vehicular transportation corridors are necessary on Taylor Way to Marine Drive to Lions Gate Bridge roadway, Capilano to Marine Drive to Lions Gate Bridge roadway, and Lions Gate Bridge (also related is the northshore roadway from Lonsdale to 2nd Narrows Bridge).

I think north shore is busy enough and have traffic in Lions Gate and Marine Dr. I think We mustn't have any new building at that busy place.

The Park Royal area badly needs a comprehensive traffic study before any more apartments are added to that area.

The towers should be less than 16 stories so as to not dominate the sky line!

The June 2016 Marine Drive Context Study presents a well thought out framework for future development. The Study could be adopted as part of the OCP as is, particularly with regard to the three outstanding Development Permit Applications. However, there are two issues which could be addressed in more detail: Klahanie Park and traffic. Klahanie Park - The section of the DWV east of the Capilano River is not recognized as part of the District by most North Shore residents, including many in the District. As the Study suggests, Klahanie Park should be better presented as the entrance to the DWV. Page 20 of the Study says that the park...provides a strong landscaped contrast...to the flanking town centres" and "The natural systems are notable features in the landscape." However, the three quarters of the park edge parallel to Marine Drive is merely a thin row of trees in front of two playing fields and their associated parking lot. This is not really a ..strong landscaped contrast... or a ...natural system.. The proposed pedestrian bridge across the Capilano River will provide much needed improved pedestrian access to the park. However, once arriving on foot, there is little "park" there. How well used is the playing field complex and by whom? Are there more park-like uses which would better serve the interest of West Vancouver residents? One problem is that the only vehicular access to the park is through the DNV so it will be difficult for DWV residents, other than pedestrians, to feel that the park is theirs. If the park, being largely cut off from the DWV, is considered as a Metro amenity, perhaps other DWV Metro responsibilities should be considered. Expand BC Housing? A separate study would be required to review the alternatives. It could be mentioned in this Study that there will be a future Klahanie Park study. There would be no need to go into specifics at this point as that might result in public comments which could slow the process for the three current development permits. The remainder of the section of the DWV east of the Capilano River, the BC Housing site and 303 Marine Drive, will become a functional part of the new DNV Lions Gate Town Centre, so there is no compelling reason to emphasize that it is part of West Vancouver. It can remain a jurisdictional

anomaly.

Traffic There will be concerns about increased traffic from the three new developments. The Study discusses plans for improved public transit, but private vehicular traffic will be a worry. It would be helpful if the conceptual route of the proposed Low Level Road extension was shown in more detail on Figures 3.1. A brief description of how the completed project will divert North Vancouver/West Vancouver traffic from the dreaded Marine Drive/Taylor Way intersection would be helpful.

Vibrancy On page 31 of the study it is suggested that the Taylor Way “ Marine Drive area will become a ...vibrant, urban village... Unfortunately, the best designed built form will not result in vibrancy; young residents would be required and housing prices will likely prevent this. There is no apparent solution unless rental prices could somehow be kept reasonable. Vibrant is not a term synonymous with West Vancouver, except during the Harmony Arts Festival. Unfortunately, based on objections to amenities such as waterfront restaurants and bars, it seems many current residents object to vibrancy.

Enhancing transit connections between North and West Vancouver

Establishing transit hub -- as use of community shuttle buses increase, need transfer points from Vancouver and North Vancouver.

Way too much density with these highrises - in an already heavy traffic area - who is going to benefit from all this building - except for the developers, and Owners of Park Royal? It is certainly not the residents who are already facing huge traffic and parking problems. How can you keep putting more people in the area without addressing the transportation problems? There is no way you can expect everyone to use public transport or ride their bikes - cars are still necessary for many people - particularly the 25% of west van who are seniors. Has Council had a look at areas like Surrey Town Centre- is that really what are heading for - this is certainly not what we residents came here for and the council is supposed to be representing the people who elected them. Remember the outcry the last time the high density proposal for the White Spot land was presented to the public - and now this proposal is back along with one for more high rises to the east of the bridge - plus who knows how many will be built on the native land. I just hope the public speaks out before it is too late.

The study must address traffic issues, the reference in the study to East West frequency of buses IGNORES the real problem of the traffic from Pemberton to Deep Cove, with just 2 bridges and limited lanes. This is the most urgent and must involve Fed. Govt. and Provincial Govts. The Upper levels and Ferry traffic are part of the highway systems!! In addition you have the continued growth at Whistler, Squamish, 3 local mountains and the Sea to Sky attraction that attracts all lower mainland and beyond both Summer and Winter. Plus the Northshore has a higher concentration of Private and Independent Schools than any other area in greater Vancouver, that attract students from all over the lower mainland, this involves a higher number of cars to pickup and drop off than when children go to their local primary or secondary school.

There must be NO new Residential Development Applications Approved until the debilitating traffic problem is solved.

There is already severe traffic congestion in this entire area throughout most of the day, and it is naive to assume that new residents will be driving less than current residents and walking, cycling, or taking public transit more just because the means are provided.

Plan for two cars per residential unit and make sure that roads are widened to accommodate this exponential increase in traffic, while still providing the increased public/rapid transit as an alternative for the limited number of destinations it can serve. Will the Lions Gate Bridge be twinned? Imagine the traffic impediments of the Causeway and Denman St light! There is no mention of planning for the increased infrastructure required by all this development - utilities such as water, sewage, garbage disposal. How about the massively increased demands that this new population will place on our already overburdened health care system? How will the increased density affect crime rates?

Many here have already stated that any development in this area is out of the question until traffic infrastructure has been dealt with. West Vancouver is already becoming unbearable due to traffic congestion. People are already considering moving away and/or not even considering moving here because of this.

I really think that you need to revamp your ideas on housing, and what is "affordable". How about a co-op, or residences that are only for renters? We don't want to become Monaco. The streets leading to this area are beyond overtaxed, it is beyond reason to add residences here and more parking spots for more cars...at the bottleneck of North Van. You should be building further out, giving credits to those who take the bus or ride a bike, or just build with only CAR2Go areas. To think that people in these towers will ride the bus and take their bikes is just wrong, they won't. They will add to traffic and the nightmare will become worse. No one wants to address infrastructure....just bring in more people at all costs to the whole of the North Shore.

Not just pedestrian amenities but also bicycle amenities.

Plan for a Park Royal Train Station & transportation hub. The hub should include tourist information, trains, buses, bike rentals/repairs/secure parking, car passenger drop-off & pickup. Plan for commuter rail from/to Squamish & from/to Brentwood Town Centre Passenger Rail Station (note: co-located with Skytrain). Plan for an extended Amtrak Cascades Train service (from Portland, Seattle, SEA airport) to HS Bay Ferry terminal, the Sea to Sky, and other northern BC locations. European and Asian Cities have passenger rail stations located at busy shopping malls. We should too, as Vancouver wants to be a big city. Sea to Sky buses should stop at Park Royal, too. I encourage others not to be a 'deer in the headlights' with these visions. If you don't understand them, please ask for further explanation. Also don't be dismissive out of hand, with visions. Please give it your best to understand them. Metro Vancouver is in dire need of better Transportation Planning. Regretably, of late there has been too much Transportation Styling, which is short on vision.

create safe pedestrian and bike routes to and through these areas, connecting West Vancouver and North Vancouver as well as providing safe access to the bridge and Stanley Park.

One thing we really need is a safe way to ride across the Capilano river from West Van to North Van. The War Dance bridge is a tough, tricky crossing for a younger/ novice cyclist.

Improve cycling infrastructure along Marine Drive and to the north and south (Wardance Bridge/Spirit Trail and pathways north of Marine Drive. Connect with planned bike network in Lions Gate Town Centre.

This key study area is what connects all of the North Shore, Whistler, Squamish and Sunshine coast to the ONLY International Airport of the city and the city itself. We also cannot stop development, and cannot stop vehicles. We need a proper access directly from Lions Gate Bridge straight up to the Upper levels highway, bypassing around (or passing over on top of) this congested area. The area should be left to grow as a seaside community, and the traffic should be dealt with with a proper access DIRECTLY from the bridge to Hwy 1. Secondly, we need to extend the Skytrain to the North shore, either by tunneling under the bay or with a new bridge. Lets stop kidding ourselves that a hokie, touristy seabus, built for Expo 86 will serve the North Shore commuters in the long term. Prior provincial leaders ignored the North Shore commuter needs. We need to take the needs of the North Shore community seriously, including the needs of the feeder communities including the Sunshine coast, Whistler, Squamish and their need to get through this area. We are not an island to ourselves on the North Shore. The North shore is an expanding large community that works across town, travels across town, and needs proper access to an airport and the city. Its a seaside community also, so the public spaces must include access to the Capilano river and the hiking trails that form a backbone of this area.

Since the park royal village makeover, traffic and congestion in Ambleside is terrible. Traffic is backed up daily east and west on marine drive through both west and north van, and Taylor way and Capilano Rd are blocked as well. You will constantly find Taylor way southbound traffic coming into park royal parking areas to take shortcuts, and the same with Capilano Rd. As a resident of west van, it is a nightmare area to visit. It does not create any sense of community ironically as it is mainly filled with visitors passing through. The 'walkable village' is not ideal for walking as it is filled with traffic and parking. 'Walkable parking lot' is not what we should be striving for. If we truly wanted it walkable we would remove the cars and make it similar to whistler village. Reducing vehicle traffic congestion should be the number 1 priority as it makes the area inaccessible by car bike and walking. Overall it destroys the community atmosphere that makes west Vancouver attractive.

Building more density will never reduce car traffic. West Vancouver car traffic has triple in under 5 years. The very wealthy will continue to drive their oversized vehicles wherever, whenever they choose.

Anytime you disrupt natural land you disrupt Ecosystems. Allowing the further devastating development of land in Cypress Mountain was unconscionable, elevation restrictions or not. Our lands are only sustainable if left untouched. Less is more.

If you build it they will come, so the saying goes. Why not consider the end of growth. Think outside the box. Stop continually getting aligning with the developers and believing the myth. Please consider all the other species in these neighbourhoods. We all have more than enough. Think outside your box. Dare to embrace and stop this expansion. Do we really need more stores, towers, pollution. Please be more creative. You do not "have" to do this.

Promote a pedestrian-oriented complete community. Reduce visibility of parking areas, with parking below buildings.

Access by car and bus must be improved both to West Van and North Van.

With the contemplated construction both residential and commercial there will be an impossible traffic blockage. What we must have is a way of going to and from Vancouver and West to Horseshoe Bay and Squamish which does not seem to have been considered.

What this all adds up to is an urgent necessity to build access routes preferably by tunnel both for transit and automobile. It's all very fine to build for bicycles and pedestrian traffic for travel to Vancouver and for other than short distances in both West and North Vancouver. With the coming of electric and other non-petroleum using cars as well as conventional modes of autos and transit further tunnels and bridges are required and planning for them must proceed hand in hand with construction of residential and commercial buildings which will attract people and consequently ways in which people may be accommodated.

I fear that the planners have erred most seriously in considering erecting buildings without considering access to and from those buildings.

Some of the questions in the survey are not understandable. Proper descriptive use of our language is required. How can one 'reinforce' centres unless you mean rebar? How about 'respond to the context of'? Nonsensical.

So don't seriously consider the responses to the Survey as they will reflect the really unintelligible wording.

Better community facilities with upgrade to traffic patterns

These are all reasonable objectives (motherhood). However, they are impossible to achieve without an overall analysis of what the north shore can absorb in order to provide quality of life for its inhabitants. What we have all seen over the past couple of years is that the north shore has reached its "tipping" point from a transportation perspective. All of the new development has increased vehicular traffic to the point that the community does not function well. West Van is only part of the problem. It involves growth in traffic from Whistler, Squamish (growing community), ferry traffic; traffic from construction workers and people who must travel back and forth to North and West Van to their work places. We have only two bridges, a highway, Taylor Way, and feeder roads which can no longer handle the volume. Adding at least 18,000 more residential units without solving this crisis is simply not responsible planning. It demands the cooperation of the province, First Nations, Translink, and City and District of North Van and West Van to deal with this crisis.

Unregistered Respondents:

We are assuming everyone will be walking or taking transit - nice try. Will these towers obstruct views to the mountains from the bridge? Disagree with that. In terms of the "gateway announcing West Van" - one might consult with the Squamish Nation about the views to the east from the bridge where all the trees have been removed resulting in their new housing development less appealing.

pedestrian overpasses for Park Royal access Marine Drive, on ramps and off ramps on North side will drop when earthquake hits, and they really need repaving. They have been like this full of holes and never maintained. Take away parking outside of The Bay and put all up on roof and place an escalator or elevator into the Bay end of the roof deck parking.

Muych too high density. Comply with the OCP

not sure indicates I do not know enough to have a definite opinion

There should be no new high rises or condos or townhouses built around park royal and capilano

I would suggest that we would not need to house West Vancouver's growing population in tall towers like International Plaza if planners would rezone more neighbourhoods from single family to rowhousing/townhomes/duplex, thereby stopping the ever growing number of large, unaffordable new single family homes. With such future planning in mind, medium size towers should be built in the areas under discussion rather than the envisaged tall ones. Every newly elected council professes to support West Vancouver's "village atmosphere". The scale of International Plaza does not fit that concept.

The interchange at Taylor and Way and Marine Drive is already very congested. Increasing traffic in any way and certainly in this dramatic way will be a disaster. People will still use cars and not just public transit. Get real!

I would encourage a pedestrian/cycling bridge across the Capilano River adjacent to Klahanie Park as soon as possible; the passage over the bridge into West Vancouver from the Klahanie Park entrance, is so haphazard, most cyclists/pedestrians will not risk their safety in usage of the bridge crossing.

Taylor Way is already gridlocked at times each day: access to Lions Gate Bridge from both East and West heading South into downtown has long waiting times. Increased traffic from both the Park Royal development on the West and the development proposed at Capilano would add to this traffic chaos. Before increasing the traffic load, consideration must be given to improving access from the North Shore to the downtown hub.

Stop bringing more people in

Realistically how much more density (people) can be added to the present infrastructure? No where in the study adequately addresses this.. Than there is the stress of construction---how many years of diverted traffic and the delays caused to drivers. Has this been measured. The number of traffic lights along Marine Dr. has doubled in the past decade and often just to get through Park Royal it can take 15 minutes to get to Taylor Way. I don't see this being addressed. To go through all this just to facilitate better pedestrian traffic to and from Park Royal makes no sense. What else is gained--more tax dollars for the District. Don't see any improvements in the District for the supposed tax dollars that have been gained from earlier developments. Maybe the staff that work for the District have: above inflation wage increases and greater entitlements perhaps?

The extreme amount of traffic which will be generated in an already very busy area must be the main concern

The road ways leading to the Lions Gate Bridge are extremely congested. Any further development in and around Taylor Way, Capilano Road, and Marine Drive near the bridge will make it almost impossible to cross the Lions Gate.

For people who have to get to medical appointments , UBC, the airport and other commitments on South Granville, the traffic now is impossible at most times of the day. It is not possible for the elderly, the disabled mentally or physically or ill patients to bicycle, walk or bus to these destinations. This development plan is fine for the people who will benefit, but until the present Marine drive traffic problem through Dundarave, Ambleside to the bridge is remedied, those people who live west of Dundarave will be severely impacted.No matter how many incentives you plan for the town centres inhabitants to give up their cars, there will still be an increase of traffic. Your traffic prediction consultant said that Evelyn Drive would contribute on 1 car an hour additional!

Traffic on to lions gate bridge. I live at 22nd and the bridge traffic starts from there
!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

more housing options are critical in this area

I don't think high story apartments should be built at the old White Spot land. The traffic could be even worse than it is now.

Traffic flow for both rush hours & improve when ferry traffic clogs the balance of the time - approximately 20-30 min after ferry arrivals

I believe that Park Royal ought to emulate the successful town centre projects that have clustered around Coquitlam Centre and Metrotown. West Vancouver sorely lacks an area that could really be considered its' core, this could be an exceptional opportunity to change that. That said, solely focusing on residential construction will not achieve that aim. Commercial businesses help produce a core community as office workers will eat and often relax post-work in the areas where their offices are.

There also ought to be a master re-consideration of the Lions Gate on-ramp. In its current form, the on-ramp headed towards West Vancouver is improperly banked and a whole scale reconsideration of the corridor might be a good opportunity to examine alternatives. Subsequently, a new bridge or more lanes connecting North Vancouver's Lower Capilano area and the Park Royal area either above or below Marine drive could assist with giving the corridor a "connected" feeling while helping to alleviate traffic on a very clogged corridor.

The overall approach of your concept plan seems creative and desirable. From a transportation point of view however, there is a big omission. If we are going to de-load the critical provincial highway intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way -- accommodating an every growing volume of traffic from development of the Sea to Sky Corridor plus BC Ferry traffic, we must encourage east-west (non-provincial responsibility) transportation linkage parallel to but south of Marine Drive, through the Squamish Reserve. Accordingly I believe any concept plan must (a) involve concurrence from the Squamish Nation, and (b) anticipate a major thoroughfare east-west hooking up with the NVD now dead-ended west 1st Street, and effectively eliminate (if I was the Squamish Nation) use of Welch Avenue as a major east-west vehicular corridor, and converting the existing bridge connecting Welch to Park Royal South to bicycle and pedestrian and Spirit Trail use. The new east-west corridor would continue from 1st avenue westward, crossing the Capilano River on a new multi-lane bridge, then proceed through the designated green space north of but adjacent to the railroad tracks until arriving at the end of the Squamish Nation lands. Thereupon it would take a sharp right turn and ultimately exit to Marine Drive adjacent to Milestones Restaurant. This highway extension must respect the wetlands adjacent to the railroad tracks and in particular the Swe-weze (sp?) wetlands which have been carefully restored at the western border of Squamish nation lands and the grass hockey playing fields.

This version of the much considered "lower road" project would lie totally on Squamish Nation Lands, lie north of and parallel to the existing railroad tracks, and required active participation if not project ownership by the Squamish Nation. Encouraging Squamish Nation to take over its development may be a political necessity.

The density anticipated in your plan concept pays meagre attention to the traffic issues involved, in particular the need to maintain provincial traffic access onto the Lions Gate Bridge. This will continue, I believe, to be a provincial priority. Whether or not the high rise buildings contemplated can be service by public transit is a possibility, but many still love their cars.

You might also acknowledge in your traffic flow sketches the likelihood in my opinion of a "North Coast Express" type of passenger-only rail service on the existing railway tracks, connecting Whistler-Squamish with West and North Vancouver to Phibbs Exchange. Such a passenger rail service would require pickup locations in Park Royal, and also in NVD.

From a public acceptance point of view I am surprised that your sketches do not show the Spirit Trail, much loved. And parallel but not coincidental bicycle paths.

As a side note, if the lower road configuration I suggest is to be realized, some modest relocation of the conceptual local of high rise buildings contemplated by Squamish Nation will be necessary. That is, requiring them to be located with a modest shift of their footprint northward.

Ralph Sultan, MLA, West Vancouver-Capilano

Redevelopment of alternate routes of transit to reach the downtown core.

Develop new recreation center to address current needs.

There cannot continue to be further development of buildings around the area as the traffic demands are not met to sustain all those residence with fluid transit. As of now all the development of Evelyn in not completed, the Grosvenor developments has not been completed and the impact these will put on transit are not yet felt. By increasing on these kind of developments the congestion will be unbearable for current residents. I think this proposal could be reconsider in 2 years time to fully assess the impact of these massive developments in the area.

As it is the Recreation Facilities are bursting in capacity, and transit is not really address. Why don't we develop another bridge or tunnel before we continue with these projects?

Preserving views from residences on Sentinel Hill

Seismic concerns...

Well, all of this development and improvement sounds marvellous but with the increasing traffic problems caused by the aging Lion's Gate Bridge, the proposed changes are just framing a giant traffic jam.

The little bridge needs to be made safer. Cycling land needed on Marine Drive

The Lion's Gate bridge is already far too busy and a big problem for people living on the North Shore. I think the priority needs to be getting 4 lanes of traffic across the water rather than three before we add any further housing density.

The District of West Vancouver and the District of North Vancouver should be commissioning a transportation study prior to approving any further development in this corridor. The bridge and arterial roads are already congested and additional housing will further exacerbate the congestion.

traffic study for increase lionsgate traffic - specifically the lack of public discussion regarding the future and alternatives to Lionsgate

Despite references to transit, there are no real plans to deal with the movement of vastly increased numbers of people. Until this is worked out, this scale of development is irresponsible, like building a house without a foundation. Both the streets and bus system are already beyond capacity.

What about traffic at Taylor Way and Marine Drive?????????

What about Squamish FN lands ??

Traffic is already difficult. There is no mention of addressing that problem.

this is a very one sided set of questions

What is with this obsession with "development"? Leave things as they are.

By putting up towers on the corner of Marine and Taylor Way the views of the scenic Lions Gate Bridge will forever be lost. Do not approve this development beyond a low rise tower. You have already approved the 9 tower Grosvenor building which has ruined most of the views from the residents in Ambleside.

No just get something built that makes sense for the location... below market housing is not the solution for this location or West Vancouver. Living in West Vancouver is not a constitutional right it is a privilege that comes with hard work.

I believe the Capilano River should be kept as is and should not have further trail / pedestrian impact. Especially on the north east side above Marine Dr. There are enough trails and access to the river. Further development of trails will only put a further burden on wildlife and ecology. Nature is already being pinched.

If taller buildings can bring greater amenities or more housing options, they should be supported. The immense backdrop of the north shore mountains and surrounding forested areas can never be challenged for their impact, even with a handful of 50+ storey towers in the foreground. Don't be afraid to go tall and make the most of these rare/unique opportunities to build highrises in an otherwise medium density area.

Traffic, traffic, traffic, and the gridlock we already have without this new development.

The entrance to West Vancouver should be beautified.

Prioritizing green space and connecting it up to the north and to the west with pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths.

Connecting the study area to the rest of West Vancouver.

Traffic, parking, and proximity to noise needs to be resolved.

The area along the Capilano river needs to be treated like the waterfront in Ambleside.

I think it is ridiculous to consider building any residential towers in this already congested area. You are dreaming if you think trying to win over people by adding "incentives" which really don't add much at all - it just sounds good from the developer's point of view. You are still adding hundreds of families and cars to this area.

Vehicle traffic on Taylor Way. You cannot separate it from the flow of Marine Drive. The ferry traffic and Whistler traffic go through this intersection with no regard for whatever business is going on at Park Royal or North Vancouver. That is in addition to all the people living North of Marine drive who will not be moving into any high rises in Park Royal area.

The number of vehicular travel lanes on Marine Drive should not be compromised. Improvements to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic should be made behind the existing curb lines or on an entirely different corridor.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION/3rd.CROSSING? #1 ISSUE PRE-EMPTS ALL OTHER PLANS
!!! I participated in the first "round table" session on this Study and the TRAFFIC issue was unanimously agreed to be needed to be dealt with before any designs for OCP etc. We realize it will involve major involvement of Provincial, Federal , all 3 Municipal Governments, and Squamish Nation, but **WE NEED TO FIND A SOLUTION. FORM A PLAN AND MOVE FORWARD!** It was suggested at the Round table and unanimously agreed upon that development applications which will impact the **TRAFFIC PROBLEMS** be put on hold. **PLEASE TAKE SOME LEADERSHIP ON THIS ISSUE.** If you require any assistance in doing this, I and many others would be eager to help.

Do planning or development should be considered without an existing Provincial Government traffic plan, with particular reference to the Lions Gate Bridge. Until that is in place, do nothing.

None

Fewer developments until there is a new bridge or tunnel from the North Shore to Vancouver. All developments will add to traffic congestion.

planning and design objectives? yes plan for a new crossing, some type of design to get cars and people off the north shore, start realizing and reacting to the Northshore as an "island" we are hemmed in here by water, mountains and bridges. which all get clogged by vehicles. people in vehicles that cannot take public transit, or walk or cycle readily from all these recreation areas that the north shore supports i.e.: Whistler, Grouse, Seymour, Cypress, local golf courses, local clubs: i.e.: hollyburn, Capilano golf club, etc. the transportation plan is deplorable, it ranks pedestrians first and all others second. the reality is the west van area is somewhat of a rural area, housing built up a mountain which continues to increase, with lots of wealthy persons purchasing and residing here, they drive cars, what other way is there to get off of cypress village?

How about building another bridge to handle the additional traffic to and from West Vancouver?

How about adding another lane to the Second Narrows Bridge to handle the traffic coming to and from West Vancouver?

How about extending a road going north to handle the traffic come to and from Highway 1.

You are missing the most important aspect: Improve traffic flow. That is the primary concern of the vast majority of your constituents. DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT... make it faster and more efficient to drive between north and west van, to get downtown and to drive in and out of park royal. What is particularly needed is a route that allows access east-west when the bridge and highways are jammed up due to south bound bridge traffic.

My family knows that the traffic at the corner of Taylor Way and Marine Drive is not safe now. There is already too much traffic. Since we moved to West Vancouver nine years ago, the traffic is at least ten times what it was in 2007.

The traffic study done by the Park Royal traffic "Expert" study is fictional. They should be here from about 8:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. most days. Even on weekends the traffic is dangerous. Their so called traffic expert should be here to hear the "Symphony of Horns" during the heavy traffic time. There are many people not only from West Vancouver who have trouble with this intersection, but many also from North Vancouver.

The traffic isn't just from those who live on the North Shore, but also from the Ferries, those who go to Whistler etc. When Park Royal is ready to pay for another Bridge beside the Lions Gate, then come back to bring their request for more buildings.

please do more for safe cycling, and where possible avoid conflicts with off-leash dogs (that occur in on-leash areas)

Public transportation improvement planning should be a priority well before any higher density is planned.

Taylor way and marine drive don't work now all this growth will make it significantly worse. The Squamish nation must expand the low road capacity to at least 4 lanes

It is clearly a West Vancouver / Yuppie / New Money / kind of place. Huge numbers of people will shop at Whole Foods...regardless that the price of those same products are available at a lesser price from our Local shops.

If West Vancouver really wanted the "Farm to Table approach" they would have spent money to bolster the Local economy. I am guessing Park Royal is out of their Control. How did that happen? The "Ambleside Market" further detracts from Shop Owners who pay taxes; and now get people out front of their stores underselling them. How is the Municipality NOT IN CHARGE of the sucking vortex of a Mall that is on it's borders??

Improve pedestrian and wheelchair access

Find a way to curb the ever growing traffic grid-lock. By-passes? Overpasses? Eliminate controlled intersections?

Traffic volume access and egress, public transportation.

Guiding Principles:

3. What do you think of the study's guiding principles for the area?

Registered Respondents	Agree with	Disagree with	Not Sure
Distinct centres should be concentrated around clusters of taller buildings	53% (105)	36.9% (73)	10.1% (20)
Each centre should respond to its own context with continuity provided by the public realm	65.8% (125)	12.6% (24)	22.6% (41)
Development should take advantage of transit and include incentives to discourage car use	79% (154)	14.9% (29)	6.1% (12)
Access should be improved to Capilano River	74.3% (142)	8.4% (16)	17.3% (33)
Each centre should have a hierarchy of buildings with transitions to surrounding lower scale	61.2% (117)	22% (42)	16.8% (32)
Pedestrian continuity should be a primary consideration with key walking connections reinforced	89% (171)	6.8% (13)	4.2% (8)
Gateways should be expressed with architecturally significant buildings,	74.6% (144)	15% (29)	10.4% (20)

gathering spaces, landscaping, signage and public art			
Complete communities should provide places for residents to live, work and play	87% (168)	6.2% (12)	6.8% (13)
Open space and at-grade uses should ensure the public realm is part of the daily life of residents	87.2% (164)	5.3% (10)	7.5% (14)
Sustainability should be promoted through high-performance buildings with environmental design features	87.8% (166)	6.3% (12)	5.8% (11)

Unregistered Respondents	Agree with	Disagree with	Not Sure
Distinct centres should be concentrated around clusters of taller buildings	50.4% (66)	33.6% (44)	16% (21)
Each centre should respond to its own context with continuity provided by the public realm	57.8% (74)	15.6% (20)	26.6% (34)
Development should take advantage of transit and include incentives to discourage car use	65.9% (87)	25.8% (34)	8.3% (11)
Access should be improved to Capilano River	69% (89)	18.6% (24)	12.4% (16)
Each centre should have a hierarchy of buildings with transitions to surrounding lower scale	57.5% (73)	23.6% (30)	18.9% (24)
Pedestrian continuity should be a primary consideration with key walking connections reinforced	83.6% (107)	14.1% (18)	2.3% (3)
Gateways should be expressed with architecturally significant buildings, gathering spaces, landscaping, signage and public art	72.9% (94)	18.6% (24)	8.5% (11)

Complete communities should provide places for residents to live, work and play	76.7% (99)	15.5% (20)	7.8% (10)
Open space and at-grade uses should ensure the public realm is part of the daily life of residents	84.5% (109)	9.3% (12)	6.2% (8)
Sustainability should be promoted through high-performance buildings with environmental design features	74.2% (89)	15.8% (19)	10% (12)

4. Are there any other guiding principles that you think should be considered in the study?

Registered Responses:

The thought that people will work and play in their own neighborhood is not happening, when condos are built around a shopping mall. Is there a university there? Are there schools there? Are there industrial parks there? This is what people need. I.e. a "town" with everything and that can not be housed in this area. Let's face it, without proper transportation, like big cities have, with subways reaching to all corners within short time, this is not representing practical solution.

I don't think that a gateway to a city or district needs to be wholly constructed or manmade. I think that it can be something as simple as natural beauty. The approach to West Vancouver from the Lions Gate Bridge features views of the water, mountains and lush vegetation. Of course, once you actually enter into West Vancouver you are confronted with an aging mall, recently given a fresh coat of paint to cover over postmodern excesses. But, placing 14 or 15 high rise towers around a shopping mall and calling it a gateway is not the solution. We just need a lot of tall trees on the boulevard. The District needs more busses to keep the momentum of public transit going.

The " Centre" is the larger Park Royal area including the yet to be developed or fully developed Squamish lands. There are not three centres for concentrated development plus the Squamish lands. The east, Capilano lands in North and West Vancouver may be a different neighbourhood.

Also consider how these areas will fit into the surrounding area - e.g. Evelyn nearby, Woodcroft nearby, and the Taylor Way T-junction. Consider how Taylor Way might be changed in the next few years, rather than reacting to how it appears to be at this point in time.

Secure Bike storage for both the residence ; office and retail Staff and visitors
Allocate a parking holding area for shared rides such as Uber, Lyft , Peer-to-peer car services

Put the pressure on Todd Stone to improve transportation infrastructure on the North shore and Sea to Sky. Need a GO TRAIN from downtown Vancouver along the North shore, Horseshoe Bay,, Lions Bay, Squamish, Whistler and Pemberton. This will reduce the traffic problem on bridges, upper levels hwy and Taylor way. Most of the negative comments you receive concerning traffic can not be controlled by DWV, It's a Provincial problem.

A free bus to take customers around Park Royal to reduce car usage.

a 'gateway' should be something of significance, but not necessarily a large building or a series of buildings. West Vancouver prides itself on being unique so why announce itself with large towers. Consider a more 'natural approach'. Perhaps our gatewa

This project needs to be understood in the overall context of development of the North Shore. All parties, need to understand the impacts of their development projects on the North Shore infrastructure. Do we have sufficient roads, bridges, transportation methods in place to handle x thousands of new residences? Are the development projects contributing sufficient funding to build and maintain the additional infrastructure investments?

Need for seniors housing

This is not a "pedestrian" area - people drive. We need to improve traffic flow, which is now bad at all times. What are you going to do about that?

Far too many high rises. Recommend fewer buildings and of a lower scale to lend to a feeling of community. High rises are insular and not community based. All in all, you are planning to build high rise ghettos. What a shame.

At the risk of being repetitive I think these objectives are missing the key problem of traffic patters around Lions Gate bridge and Park Royal. This would need to be addressed in order to support any additional development. As we only have a bus system that must utilize the same roads we can not get around this growing problem absent reworking the bottlenecks and expanding the bridge or extending the sky train to Park Royal.

It seems to me that what has been missed is that with this kind of additional density we need more roads for car access to get in to and around these areas of development and the traffic problem that already exists.

Minimize size of building to a smaller scale.

What the hell is a 'high performance building with environmental design features? It is jargon to make this disingenuous 'study' seem worthy. The guiding principle that should be considered is honesty.

1. All new and renovated buildings should be mandated to have green roofs, recycling of grey water, solar panels, etc.
2. Positioning on the site not to reduce sunlight due to its shadow.
3. Low skyline as in Europe, not as in Asia or even downtown Vancouver. Just too much high level buildings, and far too overwhelming in scale, density and proximity. Too much packed together and too high.
4. Green spaces are better for our mental health.
5. Buildings that blend into its environment, not jarring on the eye.
6. Weather protection where ever possible.

DENSITY!!!!!!

Community gardens

Plan for housing needs of future generations and generational transitions. Its not all about today its about the next 50-100 years.

Welcome to West Vancouver, look at all our high rise apartments. Doesn't it look like the West End? Is this what we really want? We do not need any more high rise apartment buildings in the study area.

When I think of the gateway to West Vancouver, I try to blot out Hiroshima Heights on Folkstone Way, and the huge signs at Park Royal - and look at the Lions, the lovely mountains, sometimes snowcapped sometimes not, dynamic, at the greenery at the circular entrance and I don't really see how a series of towers will be architecturally significant. One shopping centre looks quite like the other. And, maybe communities should offer residents places to live and play, or work and play but not all three. That's a ghetto. By the way, how about a really good restaurant, not a chain. Maybe we'll stay off the bridge!

West Van is a dormitory, not a community where many people can live AND work, so without huge increases in job availability, West Van people are still going to be going downtown to work - and people who can't afford West Van housing prices are going to be driving into West Van every day - and they WILL be driving because the busses don't go everywhere, and we have steep hills! Not always easy for walking.

Is there some overall plan amongst all the adjoining municipalities guiding how many people must live in each? The guiding principles seem to indicate that West Van HAS to become much more urban and built up - but is this truly necessary?

Talking of making West Van noticeable, how about a sign in North Van on Marine Drive to indicate one has reached West Van? At present there is no sign, never mind fancy art work.

I agree with these efforts to make development attractive and environmentally responsible. Three bedroom units should be made available to encourage families to settle. Rentals should be encouraged. Canadians, not foreigners, should have first choice of purchase.

Park royal is not a centre. The centre of west Vancouver is Ambleside and Dundarave. Putting towers at Marine and Taylor Way will exacerbate an already terrible intersection. I support transit oriented development fully, however the transit situation in this city is awful and this kind of density should not be approved until transit is improved and the

issue of how to move people through Marine & Taylor Way and over Lions Gate bridge is solved.

minimize density to favour all residents of WV. do a proper traffic study that incorporates all existing traffic flows and those potential additions to this from all of these developments. Don't have the developers be the ones who provide this Study.

Emphasis on architecturally significant buildings. If it just another series of boxes, that would be a grave disappointment beside the significant natural assets here. For example, only if the building at the White Spot site is extremely significant (e.g. Zaha Hadid quality) would i consider that enough of a benefit to offset the looming of this building over this intersection.

We are being forced to answer questions that assume this development project is a fait accompli. We should be discussing whether or not any of this should be built or if it should be built as suggested here. After that, if any of this is approved we should be discussing a TIMELINE for this development. See my previous comments. In effect, this is just pabulum thrown to the masses to make them think they are playing a part in this project and to make them feel heard. But it's all basically been decided and will happen unless an awful lot of residents protest in different ways. This is so HUGE that it shouldn't be handled this way at all. When, if ever, will Councils/Developers ever really listen to the people?

This plan should enhance the First Nations living experience in the shadow of the bridge. Perhaps it should include a high rise for the First Nations Capilano Band. Also developers should be forced to provide green space for the WV citizens, not just their residents.

It is hard to believe that pedestrians are going to have much of any interest in walking within the proposed development area. This is particularly true when, despite planned efforts to reduce automobile use, there will be even more bumper to bumper traffic jams in the area with more and more vehicles contributing to the already oppressive vehicle exhaust in the air. Until there are solutions to the already near impossible traffic issues in the area resulting from sorely inadequate vehicle egress across Burrard inlet, there should be a moratorium on any additional residential development in the proposed areas.

bike routes

The ideas around live, work, play spaces are good - but this is a project that will exist in an already populated area, so some sort of consideration to the movement of people to and through this area that live NEAR this project needs to be addressed. I don't see that here...

The height of the high rise buildings in the proposed new communities are all too high
Try to incorporate ENVISION sustainable ideas through out the areas. Use rain water harvesting, use of photovoltaics on new structures.

You have an ageing community here, they are NOT going to walk a few blocks carrying bags of groceries. More cars will be on the roadways. How are you going to deal with that?

The reality is that our current transit system is inefficient. Simply improving bus routes, availability, walkways, etc. will not suffice. With our terrain as it is, walking is difficult for many residents. This is a community where families own multiple vehicles and are not willing to be subjected to our inefficient transit system. Further development should not occur until advanced transportation options/systems are in place.

see above

Interaction and collaboration should be encouraged, with public plazas that have excellent seating, interactive public art and activities that cause people to more easily meet their neighbours.

Encourage opportunities for people to work, live and play within each centre - reject the old Apartheid idea that these three uses should be kept separate.

The guiding principles sound good but are hollow words. It's ridiculous to say people working in the service industry will live in West Vancouver. Our North Shore roads are already clogged with people coming to work here each day. Increased density may be a good thing but not unless infrastructure is upgraded as well. For example the outdated sewage treatment at Lions Gate.

There is little significant career work here on the North shore and particularly West Vancouver.

Again, we need to see a solution to the traffic problem on Marine Drive.

Relates to a number of points above, but not specifically mentioned: Promotion of bike use and bike sharing programs.

Think carefully about Cap river access. Flagrant disregard for the Whytecliff Marine no fishing zone continues to occur along with dog owners allowing off leash behavior in seal habitat, etc. This will happen at Cap, too, minus the seal issue.

Increased residential and office space should not increase stress for residents due to traffic gridlock.

Communities should replicate members desires. Some members of the community may wish to work in the city centre and live and play in suburbia. I would support a study that looked at the downsizing needs of older members of our community. When looking to downsize, from a large family home to a more conducive apartment, many long term community members find a paucity of options available to them. Anecdotally many become frustrated and feel they are forced to leave their community and move to North Vancouver or Coal Harbour. A study that could estimate this flow may be able to highlight the actual needs of our community.

Non-motorized transport options, i.e., cycling, should be bundled with 'pedestrian continuity' principle. Trip distribution to be handled by a local network with adequate capacity and separate from Marine Drive, Capilano Rd and Taylor Way.

Traffic. Potential here for gridlock.

I feel we should not be considering building more homes until we have improved the roads and bridges.

Supporting public spaces with community facilities to be more than a glorified mall.

Access, accommodation and encouragement of cycling and mobility aids as modes transportation.

Green space? Trees. Especially deciduous. Shade in summer, light in winter

Architecturally significant buildings, landscaping, and gathering spaces can all be achieved without resorting to clusters of high density towers. That is fine for Georgia Street and Coal Harbour but is not the welcome to West Vancouver that residents feel reflects the quality of life in their community. It is highly unlikely, no matter how you try to sell it, that people working in the Park Royal retail and service industry, the lowest paying sector in our economy, will afford to live in the area.

High density residential centres need to be well supported by public transit. Safe, efficient, well-marked cycling routes should also be a priority.

See above..Do residents of W.Van really want such density at the Taylor Way & Marine..
BOTTLENECK?

Modern jobs and future jobs will not be well handled in a live work and play community because too many changes in employers etc. this concept is old fashioned and civil service driven. Too much density breeds anti-social behaviour, it has in the past and will in the future. We have to be able to travel quickly at any time of day to a distant high-tech hospital and having buildings tight up against roadways and streets limits the ability to improve travel and public transit is useless for this.

The Park Royal property is a regional shopping center that is already complemented with a few taller, higher density rental, supportive and owner-occupied residences and low rise residences in the Clyde area and Evelyn Drive. Why are you floating this "Towered Gateway" idea as a fitting entrance to West Vancouver...that proposal that was emphatically rejected in your survey for the White Spot site last year as being an inappropriate location for a high density residential tower and an inappropriate "gateway" as a welcoming entrance to West Vancouver. Residents also clearly stated that they did not want to see any more development proposals in this area until a solution had been agreed to and funded to resolve the traffic issues at Marine and Taylor Way, yet this study is promoting high density development again with no traffic solution other than residents will mostly walk, ride bikes or take buses to and from the area. Lets be realistic about how many people living in the area will work in Park Royal and how much you will reduce car use...I suggest you survey comprehensively all the apartment residences around Park Royal and determine their work and behavioral patterns, movements and vehicle use, to complement the Statistics Canada data and improve understanding of traffic implications.

Cycling continuity should be a primary consideration with key cycling connections reinforced

These items avoid the real question, which is sacrificing the OCP in bits and pieces to proposals by owners of certain properties, with all the bureaucratic weight and capture of planners that their submissions and ongoing contact with staff involve. Your leading guiding principle, before you get into anything else, should be to adhere to the OCP and to never make any changes to it except as part of a comprehensive consultative change every generation or so, with the process undertaken as a regular long-term exercise to take into account major climate, topographic, population and transportation shifts. In no circumstance should any such exercise be conducted in response to specific submissions by holders of property. Otherwise why have an OCP? Either it is the plan or it isn't. Once you allow piecemeal changes to the plan, you corrupt the process..

The total emphasis on guiding principles should be on the following:

1. Concentration of towers and high density residential should be between Capilano River and 13th and north of Marine Drive.
2. Rental properties in every building as there is a severe shortage and it will only get worse
3. Park Royal South should continue to strictly be commercial as there is no better or other location for this purpose

The most important principle is to accept the restrictions imposed by the physical environment - in this case, the existence of a major highway intersection.

Most of my "disagreements" above were entered because, although the principle was laudable, it was not feasible at this location.

A gateway would be out of place at the Marine Drive/Taylor Way intersection. A majority of the persons passing through are doing just that: they are not thinking that they are about to have an exciting new experience when they pass through that intersection. They are on their way to the ferries, to Whistler, to Park Royal, or home.

Each design should be ecologically focused to ensure it is harmonious with the surroundings.

The study must take account of how extra people will move. They cannot always cycle, walk etc. so need transport e.g. shuttle buses etc.

Traffic and height restrictions are the main issues

re: statement #2 - they both should address the traffic issues they are creating

re: statement #5 - all should be lower scale to protect the existing views

re: statement #8 - but not in the form of towers

re: statement #10 - no towers

You can't build on the basis that transit will be used as the reality is it won't be. People own cars. Transit is great only if the person works downtown. Improving access to Capilano river is a 'nice to have' and not a necessity. Many of these questions are motherhood - of course we want all these things if there is development but not sure we can accommodate the development based on the road infrastructure.

This study should have started from the "ground up" - first determining the public's vision for WV and this area.

re: statement #3 - the only way to ensure this is to not provide parking with these new developments - otherwise even if new residents take transit they will also contribute new vehicle traffic at times.

re: statement #5 - How about just focusing on lower scale buildings?

re: statement #6 - low priority compared to traffic issues. No one walks along Marine from NV to WV

re: statement #7 - why buildings? last round of consultation for 752 did not reveal a desire for a high rise as a gateway

re: statement #8 - This focuses on LIVE only almost entire focus is residential

re: statement #10 - sustainability should be promoted by asking residents how many people do we ultimately want to accommodate - consider that we have finite resources. There is nothing sustainable about this endless push to densify.

re statement #1 - agree with suitable design traffic management etc.

re statement #5 - do not exceed DNV OCP Plan for east of Cap River

That the public VISION of what they want the entire district to be and look like should be clearly defined BEFORE neighbourhood plans are made or they have no context. The principle of clearly determining the current public needs and wants before planning should be foremost consideration.

minimize traffic congestion

Foot and bicycle bridge at Taylor Way & Marine to Park Royal that would not impede traffic flow

traffic plans should be in place before so much approval for construction is given

We should be able to know and compare current zoning with what is proposed

Huge traffic congestion now, what about once more building are built and occupied. What is your plan? Or do you not have one? Even outside of rush hour traffic vehicles and buses are backed up to Ambleside sports fields, the result is west Vancouver buses are in traffic jam until they can reach bus only lane. Cluster buses and excessive wait times is the reality. Where are your questions on absolute traffic congestion in our community? Or are you assuming no one has a car? This does not address any community issues in west Vancouver.

Your statement on TRANSIT fails to recognize the TRAFFIC CONGESTION at Marine Drive and Taylor Way. During any rush hour in West Vancouver traffic is backed up to the SPORTS FIELDS at Ambleside. Thus West Vancouver buses cannot access the "BUS ONLY Lane" and are simply STUCK IN TRAFFIC. This results in "CLUSTER BUSES" and excessive wait times on Georgia Street waiting at the BAY or others stops as there simply are "NO BUSES AVAILABLE"

Where are your questions on the absolute TRAFFIC CONGESTION in our community. Approving this will never solve our COMMUNITY issues!

Not realistic to consider live & play along with work too at those sites.
Discourage use of cars for residents in those developments, but not by hampering access for WV residents further!

In my view, full marks for setting out the approved major project in North Vancouver namely, Lions Gate Town Centre and attempting to paint a picture of how all the pieces will come together including the current and suggested new development proposals waiting for Council's and Residents' consideration in the months to come. But with respect, on the basis of information available not just for the Marine Drive and Taylor Way location and with no vision of what may be desired/needed on the Taylor Way north artery now or in the future or scale of future growth of Park Royal Shopping Centre north or yet having experienced the completion of Evelyn Drive, it is difficult to view the study in full context. In my view any major changes to Taylor Way and Marine Drive cannot be discussed without including Taylor Way north which is delayed for another day. In addition I would assume that even given Council's mandate to meet the Regional Housing Quota, they must realize that congestion at this intersection will only get worse unless and until the North Shore Mayors, recognize that meeting that Quota will not be in anyone's best interest including the Province without some overall vision being put in place soon to deal with increasing problem situations on the North Shore.

Nothing particular

Need taller slender buildings, with some open space around them. Let's preserve heritage, this is important.

Communities should provide places for residents to live, work and play, however this study is almost entirely focused on residential development.

During the 752 (White Spot) development and rezoning application, residents were asked whether a high rise building was appropriate as a "Gateway" - what was public response then? I don't recall that people were clamouring for a high rise building to define the gateway to our community.

Pedestrian continuity is of little to no priority compared to the issue of vehicle traffic at the Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersection - fix the traffic problem before adding density at this critical intersection. It is beyond my comprehension as to how Planning can think this is a good place to densify when access/egress is already an issue.

There is nothing sustainable about high-rise, glass and concrete buildings. It is also foolish to think this continued push to densify is sustainable. Residents need to decide just how much density is right for them. This isn't something that developers or District staff should decide.

Traffic and height of development are the main issues.

- design for human-scale; view of area from afar (bridge, approaching gateways) matters but sense of place and scale and movement options for the pedestrian should be given greater priority; ground level evaluation of buildings and other infrastructure no

Yes, improve the existing major vehicular transportation routes to better accommodate densification proposals.

Because these developments are being proposed beside major vehicular transportation routes, discouraging car use will be difficult and is not realistic. These developments

need to follow after major transportation improvements to the Lions Gate and 2nd Narrows feeders.

I disagree to have any new building in that area.

Limit the height of the towers to 16 stories so as not to be massive structures dominating the field of vision!

See comments above, under Part 1

Gateways can focus on public art, gardens and gathering spaces -- not only towers. Gateways occur at ground level.

Until the Traffic Challenge is fixed, there should be very limited parking at any of the projects, maybe 20% this will ensure that those who buy the units are serious about cycling, walking and bussing. If they don't sell or the developer refuse to build you know then they are just going to add to the nightmare traffic that already exists.

It is pure development greed to try to justify a cluster of high rises by the current presence of as few as one - three at most - in the locations of these nodes, stating that they must "respond in scale". Height restrictions should be set and enforced to no more than half the height of the proposed tallest building. Why should current residents tolerate the reduced quality of life that accompanies population explosion?

Again, DEAL WITH THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE FIRST! For once any developments are built there will be no room to maneuver.

Yes. It shouldn't be here! At the bottleneck!

Think on a smaller scale, and this is the wrong location!

Emphasis on sustainability.

Good and service vehicles have been forgotten in our gentrified municipalities. Pedestrians and Bikes are great, but the primacy of roads should be goods & service deliveries. The PR Whole Foods loading zone is a nightmare. My neighbours car was pierced with a forklift at PR north, last week. Planners & engineers need to get out an observe; better yet; get out as a ride-along as a swamper on a goods vehicle. Loading zones, high-clearance parkades, improve long wheel-base goods & service turning radii,. Increased pedestrian and cyclist education. Eg. don't stand in the gutter pan and text while a large truck is trying to make a tight corner, etc!

A bike network for all ages and abilities should be a primary consideration with key cycling connections reinforced. Walking and cycling should be separated wherever possible (bridges may have physical constraints and require multi use paths).

I think more restrictions need to be put in place to minimize congestion. I don't think 2 centres a few blocks apart makes sense.

Less is more. Stop the growth enticement. Why do we invite more concentration of populations to urban areas? A moratorium is what should be considered. Please think of the long term repercussions of these plans.

Ensure that there is a significant percentage of workforce and affordable housing (over 20%), provided in low rise (six-storey) street wall building forms.

Again the questions are not really intelligible as they are couched in 'Design speak' intelligible to few. Use plain language.

What is a 'hierarchy of buildings with transitions to surrounding lower scale'? and what is 'with key walking connections reinforced'. Yes. Solutions to traffic problems must be considered first and a solution achieved before you consider adding to those problems. Planners should be forced to endure traffic problems before they add to them.

There should not be any residential builds built in either of these locations due to already congested intersections. First deal with roadway infrastructure before building more developments.

Public amenities and restaurants

I think that one of the problems we have is that most people cannot afford to work and live in this community. Giving some serious thought in how to provide an incentive for small businesses (other than retail, eg high tech) to be located in West Van should be considered. We are primarily a residential community, but we are suffering from the fact that most people have to work either in North Van or in Greater Vancouver; mostly via car, which only exacerbates the problem.

Unregistered Responses:

I do not favour dev. (access) to Capilano River. There are plenty of trails to walk already, we don't need to remove trees and vegetation. Leave it natural. Also, are salaries at the mall inspiring? Can retail workers afford these units? And do I want to work a life at the mall? After work, I probably want to get as far away as possible after I leave work.

West Van has lost a major commercial site on Clyde Avenue east of Taylor Way.

same re "not sure" one may want something but not what is proposed

There should be no more residential development in the park royal and capilano areas

Too much development given the bridge access to Vancouver.

Recognize that most people will have cars, and it is unrealistic to expect that a high percentage of the new residents will take transit or walk. Also recognize that Taylor Way is still a "highway" and the route to and from Whistler and Horseshoe Bay, along with daily travel to work. Therefore, adding intense density such as this, will overload the area at Marine and Taylor Way, which is already under extreme stress.

traffic will be excessive

What impact you will have on the rest of West Vancouver

Green roof coverings should be incorporated. With all of the 'right' fighting going on between drivers, bicycle riders, and pedestrians measures to control & enforce the law should be included.

You have to take car and road and traffic issues -- it cannot all be transferred to public transit. It's already a nightmare in the Cap Rd. to Taylor Way corridor

There shouldn't be an opposition to increasing access to Capilano River but given its' proximity to residential and commercial areas, it ought to feel like a real park as opposed to an untamed wooded area.

Big towers do not address a feeling of community or neighborhood. They are very impersonal. Our district would lose the sense of community we share.

I believe all these points are very altruistic, and do not reflect the best interest of current residents.

Setbacks from Capilano River should respect necessary setbacks from high water level

The giant traffic jam at Taylor Way and Marine Drive that is caused by the inefficiency of the aging Lions' Gate Bridge.

Need bike lanes on Marine Drive

same comment as above. To continue to approve high density developments without looking at a broader transportation strategy is irresponsible.

Unlike Mayor Gregor's grand vision for a car free utopia free of cars, petrol and natural gas - we simply aren't at a stage where that's a tenable reality (yet) - I would strongly oppose further pressures to decrease car use - for some of us, especially in the depths of North and West Van, we rely on our car's and trips across the bridge to make a living - and any further pressures on car use, will undoubtedly result in varying levels of an exodus of income generating and tax paying residents in favour of jurisdictions more in touch with the realities of today - rather than what we all hope are achievable goals in the future

Access for disabled and seniors who cannot walk long distances - the distances now are getting quite long.

SIGNAGE - I have no idea any more what is where either in the local area or within the commercial centres. I was in Park Royal South the other day and nearly went home. It took me half an hour to find the shop I was looking for and no other shop attendant had any idea what I was looking for and there were no directories that I saw. It is bad enough that I now avoid Park Royal South as much as I can.

The principles are all standard and accepted planning ones and properly applied make sense. Having witnessed the process for the 1300 block Marine, I have little faith in the process providing significant benefits to anyone but the developers. In Ambleside we got a solid block- long wall along the waterfront. there were much better alternatives to achieve the density but were not even considered. Basically took away the views from hundreds of residents to provide them to a few in the new development.

Horrendous traffic the way things are we need a third crossing if all those buildings are approved. I disagree totally and am against new towers being built.

This is all so much Planning mumbo jumbo. We need to end the ceaseless development of the waterfront and Park Royal.

Traffic is already bad. Transit should be a priority.

Improve and maintain separated bike and pedestrian routes and right of ways to encourage safe passage and usage.

Innovation should be encouraged and rewarded (either environmental, design related, or related to how amenities are provided via development).

Traffic issues, as noted above.

Questions are loaded and force a certain response. Many more things provide distinct centers. Centers can respond to many areas. Why is there a necessity for hierarchy of buildings? One should be asking whether buildings are necessary. What is meant by an "architecturally significant building"? A gateway assumes you are entering a different area. Integration of the area assumes it is part of the same space. All communities should provide "places for residents to live, work, and play" is definitely correct but which of these is true in this area? At this stage one should be asking whether there are buildings not how sustainable they are.

"Sustainability should be promoted through high-performance buildings with environmental design features"

What is sustainable in building massive towers?

High rises are not always healthy places to live. Low rises allow for more community and are safer in case of earthquakes or fires. Density of buildings means crowding of people which can develop lack of privacy and individuality.

None

what a beautiful setting the north shore is against the mountains, buildings should situate within that scheme. take a page from Dundarave or Carmel California, or Qualicum beach, low profile buildings. but before all that address the traffic issues and infrastructure. consider the impact on our hospital, and support staff and again as always traffic gridlock before you start building so much density.

This kind of density in a community already under stress from hopeless traffic is...utter madness.

The Park Center thinks that by offering all the amenities for Pedestrians will be an incentive to get people to approve their plan.

Also, it is ridiculous to think that many people on the North Shore will stop using their cars if public transit is provided to cross the bridge into Vancouver.

Again, the issue of increasing public transit needs to be prioritized.

Transportation elimination of congestion caused by signalled intersections build over passes

This is an exercise in Double Speak. What the F do you mean by "Each centre should have a hierarchy of buildings with transitions to surrounding lower scale".

I am an Architect. My Thesis was in Architectural Symiotics. The questions you are asking are so twisted. How do you expect any residents to answer these questions properly?

low rise buildings that are GHG neutral.. easy pedestrian access... green space, which is so so lacking in Park Royal..

Generally reduce the extent of development to control overpopulation and inadequate transportation infrastructure in the area.

Urban Design and Planning Directions

303 Marine Drive

5. What do you think of the proposed urban design and planning directions for 303 Marine Drive (current Earls restaurant)?

	Agree with	Disagree with	Not sure
Registered Responses	50.5% (92)	34.1% (62)	15.4% (28)
Unregistered Responses	39.8% (49)	43.1% (53)	17.1% (21)

6. Do you have any other specific comments for the urban design directions for this site?

Registered Responses:

beside the tower, I don't understand what else is being developed

Wrong place to put a high-rise. This area is too busy already.

- My concern, in principle, is with the number of units and the height of the buildings planned for the Lions Gate Town Centre. It appears that one of West Vancouver's contributions -- 303 Marine Drive -- would be the largest of the new towers in this area

Not sure of the context and surrounding development. Seems like density is being pushed when access is prohibited or restricted on 3 sides and the 4th is on Lion's Gate Capilano Road access.

I am OK with the tall tower. I think the tall tower should be fronting Marine Drive and the lower scale transitioning north and west to create a more natural step down toward Klahanie Park and Cap River. Besides, having the tall tower fronting Marine will provide some noise abatement for the stepped down structures, and you can get effective noise abatement in a high rise that might not work so well in a lower rise (glazing, for example, and the fact that most high rise windows are fixed pane)

. It must be in context design wise with what is going in to Lions Gate Village, or it will be a mistake that sticks out. I am OK with the IP informing the height in LG Village, but recommend a variety of heights with step down as one heads west to the river.

The concept of 'building scale hierarchy' appears, at times, to be a little arbitrary. In the east sub-area we're told that it's important to have the tallest buildings at either ends of the Lions Gate Tower centre, but in the west sub-area (Park Royal), the tallest building - the larger of the two 752 Marine Drive towers - is in the middle. I wonder whether the demands of the developer come into play here. Does the tower at 303 Marine Drive need to be the tallest? Would it look odd if it was the same height as the adjacent Lions Gate Town Centre towers? probably not.

- I'm not sure what is meant by 'increasing visibility' between Klahanie Park and Marine Drive. I hope that it doesn't mean cutting back the trees and vegetation (the green edge) that forms a buffer between the bridge off-ramp/Marine Drive and the park. Perhaps just better signage and a discrete path.

- Encourage non-car traffic between Lions Gate Tower Centre and Park Royal Mall

We do not need a corridor of buildings. We need to reserve open views, space, airiness etc versus a street wall of tall buildings. This location appears to be less critical to West Vancouver and may be more in keeping with the DNV vision.

Put balconies on the seniors' building

What a terrible place for people to live - along Marine Drive with the worst traffic from North and West Vancouver to/from Lions Gate Bridge providing potential residents with extreme noise and air pollution from all the cars and trucks. Surely there are better areas in DNV and WVD to develop housing alternatives that embrace creative planning for liveable, safe communities which provides a healthy environment for its residents.

I believe more housing options for West Van residents are needed and welcomed, particularly taller buildings. I like the preliminary designs shown here.

I think that lower storied buildings are more amenable to people coming into West Vancouver. We are not trying to replicate downtown Vancouver, or any city centre. We live on the North Shore because we don't want to be living in the city. Creating another mini Burnaby or Surrey Centre does not appeal to me AT ALL!!!! It is important to develop, but high does not mean better and vitality. And although North Vancouver's centre looks good it has a much more commercial and industrial base. There has to be a great deal emphasis on GREEN space. That is what we should be known for! Beaches, beautiful views and park space!

push them to design something unique for once. another glass box doesn't "mark the gateway"

What is the need of another high rise here? Are there not enough units already planned for this area by DNV.

I am not sure what this will look like. A small mixed use node and one 25 story tower - very tall. For a very long time I thought that this property was in North Vancouver and now it might look like it is an extension of the Lions Gate Town Hall. Is the idea to try integration? Lots of towers. Could this be broken up by some serious green space, i.e. tall evergreens. But NOT opening Klahanie Park to Marine Drive. Please leave the trees where they are, they are the essence of West Vancouver and disappearing fast. Think how lovely it is looking to Stanley Park from the bridge going into Vancouver.

lower the height and density. there hasn't been mention of the 6 high rise towers that could be built on the Squamish Nation Lands. How is this being factored into any traffic study and the affect of all this density on the residents of West Van.

* I don't believe West Vancouver should be developing a "tower to mark the gateway to North Vancouver's Lions Gate Town Centre." We should connect this property to Klahanie Park and the river, making this property a gateway and link to West Vancouver, not an arm of a North Vancouver development. Most people I have spoken to about this Plan did not even realize that West Vancouver land went as far East as it does. Let's make an effort to define West Vancouver on this property.

A cultural facilities plan and a Public Art program for this area and the other areas should become part of the planning process.

Yes, but mainly I am concerned over the whole project as I have already stated above. It's all way too much development for this small, narrow corridor that is the gateway TO VANCOUVER from north to south and also the gateway to SEA TO SKY COUNTRY/WHISTLER from south to north. These are MAJOR GATEWAYS so you are talking not just about local traffic but people going over the bridge and back and forth on Taylor Way between Marine Dr and Upper Levels. How can you begin to think about adding more people and cars without a BUILT rapid transit system (going from where to where? That is how far should it extend east, west and north?)

More residential options for West Vancouver residents needed. Looks like a good plan.

We need more taller buildings to increase residential product (supply) on the market, which will ultimately lower housing prices.

I believe a taller style building is very appropriate for this area. Having other options for West Van Residents is great and the whole look of the new subject site is very appealing.

While the concept of encouraging residents to walk, bike or to use transit is elegant, most of those living in the three proposed projects will have automobiles which will only add to an already highly congested route into Vancouver via Marine Drive and especially, Taylor Way.

These projects, including the Lions Gate Complex should not be built until an additional bridge or tunnel to cross Burrard Inlet is given serious consideration for its planning and then a commitment for its construction.

I think the development will limit what little sunshine the existing parks enjoy today. Klahanie Park is a joy today because there are no obstructions when looking up to the south. Given that development is inevitable, some form of compensation should be provided to the existing park.

From this sketch, tower 1 looks completely dis-congruous to the rest of the area, and the proposed towers look to be too tall for the area and look out of place

The tower height of Location 1 should not be at the height proposed. Should be lower less visible.

I cannot agree with the planning and design objectives for 303 Marine Dr as I do not agree with increasing the density for the area until public services [transport/traffic/over-densification issues] have been addressed.

Try to make buildings as green as possible.

Do not build - until responsive transportation system to Vancouver (for cars and buses) is up and running.

I have concerns as to access to this project, At the meetings earlier we were advised that Marine Drive traffic entering and exiting would be directed to Glenaire Drive. However I see nothing to indicate how that could happen?

adhere to OCP

Large concerns about the increased traffic and the impact of construction on Curling Road and access to Klahanie Park, the only green space in the area.

You can use words like "gateway" and "town centre" but it looks like more towers to add to the current congestion.

Again, we need to see a solution to the traffic problem on Marine Drive.

Would discourage the creation of green spaces that are completely passive.

Generally comment: please continue to plan based on the needs of people, not cars.

I am not a resident of North Vancouver and so it is not for me to say.

Building height should be restricted to max 5-6 storeys with some commercial in the ground floor

The tower unless modest will be a significant traffic generator contributing to an already heavily congested street system. Alternative trip distribution network required to serve this area separate from Marine Drive and Capilano Rd.

Too big, too big, too big.

I avoid Park Royal like the plague already as it is so crowded. This will make it even worse.

Placeless - could be anywhere.

Why so small? bigger tower = more community amenities

No problem. It is essentially a part of the Lions Gate Town Center

The height of the buildings should be reconsidered as I feel the current infrastructure and traffic pattern is not able to take the population density this creates.

Too much density too close to what should be a main throughway, not a crawlway.

Treat it only as an integral part of the Lions Gate Town Center

Traffic issues must be resolved first

Separated bike routes to connect to other developments in the study area

See comment on the next item.

How would the proposed development "increase the visibility between the park and Marine Drive"? To achieve that objective it would be necessary to have no buildings in a corridor between the park and Marine Drive.

Smaller building with fewer units

low rise, not high rise

would like to see the plan for traffic flow and study on how this building will affect the traffic flow for the area.

I do not think we should defer to what NV is doing at LG Town Centre as justification for adding high rise, high density residential to what is already a congested area.

* All design principles and density should align with those outlined in the DNV OCP Implementation Plan. Ensure the preservation of Kalanie Park and the gardens created by current residents west of Kalanie Gardens. "MATT" the Gardener. If possible contribute amenity funding in trust to the ongoing support required for programming at the new Lions Gate Community Living Room.

It is inappropriate to use the plans of another district to justify what we build. I have not heard any public support for re-zoning to allow towers. In fact towers anywhere are very unpopular. How about instead of the "here it is, do you agree" approach we establish our vision and then come up with MULTIPLE options to discuss?

support for low rise buildings

- no to any towers
- no to any development until transport is fixed
- housing should be small and rental only
- housing should be limited to only those without cars (and prove it). Build no resident parking

Maintain existing sports facilities for squash and rugby at Klahanie Park. Also consider views from existing residents.

The traffic here exits on Capilano Road along with all the Towers approved by the District of North Vancouver who also simply ignore Traffic Congestion.

Good luck finding a bus here; good news it they will be on a North Vancouver bus.

I have trouble viewing this building. It would again provide more traffic and there are no details as to how access and egress to Marine Drive will be arranged. I also wonder how pedestrians will conveniently be able to walk from that location to Park Royal Shopping Centre or for that matter from North Vancouver Lions Gate Town Centre. A decision without more information is difficult.

I like what I see here

There is no rush to rezone this site at this time. Leave existing zoning in place until full impact of Lions Gate Town Centre development is determined. Commercial zoning may be more appropriate as all these new residents will need somewhere to work.

Low rise development rather than high rise.

I disagree to have any new building in that area.

Traffic study needs to be undertaken urgently!

Limit the height to 16 stories!

At most, this should be a lower building as it leads up to existing high towers.

Again very limited parking, therefore those that purchase will have to use buses and other form of transport.

How about lower rise with a larger footprint? There is open space adjacent to this site. Access to Marine Dr. should be only via Capilano Rd.

Stop day dreaming and deal with the traffic congestion!!!!

What is the impact of the traffic you are bringing in, in terms of time for a commuter, and during rush hour?

Don't you get it? People here like to drive, the buses are unreliable, and there is no safe bike network connecting the north shore.

Adds substantially to traffic together with over 1000 units by DNV. The largest of two projects has been approved and construction is underway; the second is set and will be approved in a few months. It is blindness to assume most of these units will be occupied by retirees, people working on the North Shore, or ride ride bicycles across the bridge in the rain. Many will use buses if they work down town but many will need to drive to other parts of metro Vancouver.drive

Build a low-speed vehicle bridge with great pedestrian and bike facilities across the Capilano River, upstream from the Marine Drive Bridge. DON'T connect this bridge with Marine Drive, for cars! The connection should also be grade separated at Capilano Road and Taylor Way, to maintain circulation, and movement for emergency vehicles, as required.

Tower should be lower to reduce shading to the north.

Need to consider traffic flow, incorporate bicycle paths, and pedestrian walkways into the design. Optimize on public transit access.

I used to live next to this location and when trying to get home on Capilano Rd, I would sit in traffic for 20min stuck, even though my house was 1 block away. Adding many more towers in this area is a terrible idea, as there are major traffic issues right now. Also it is ridiculous to say that this is in any way related to affordable housing, as it is a few blocks from the water and likely has ocean views.

Ensure that there is a significant percentage of workforce and affordable housing (over 20%), provided in low rise (six-storey) street wall building forms, particularly fronting Marine Drive and replacing the surface parking lots.

Solve traffic problems first. Stop being ostriches!

It will introduce more congestion in the area.

Again, we need to develop in a sustainable way instead of focusing on the look of the skyline. I do not agree that we have to have towers as high as the International Plaza. I don't see anywhere any information about what people want. Townhouses versus condos? Who are you trying to attract to living in these towers?

Unregistered Responses:

Is the plan to remove vegetation along Marine and the river? There is a tower and other lower buildings? On this site? Why open Klahanie Park to Marine Drive? Is there a tower planned for Klahanie Court as well?

Would greatly detract from the entrance to West Vancouver and remove the green street scape.

Traffic has worsened exponentially over the past few years.

West Vancouver is being ruined by too many added building and lack of an adequate crossing to downtown

I disagree with the height of the tower.

Whilst appreciating the need for more affordable housing, concentrating large numbers of people in this particular location is bound to have an enormous impact on traffic along Marine Drive and Capilano Road, contributing to the gridlock which occurs for several hours on these roads.

Traffic continues to be the challenge for this route, and by adding density of this nature, it will be too unmanageable without a second crossing or additional lane to the Lions Gate Bridge. In addition, this will impede views of single family homes further up the hill.

Good location for a tower. Compatible with neighbourhood and street.

Don't have any more building and don't cooperate with others who want these buildings

Lower density because the roadways are already clogged!!!

"how does one get on lions gate bridge where many from the north shore work? Already it is backed up to Westview off Cap road and 22nd street West Van . It takes over 1.5 hours to get to UBC or a lot longer to get to my last place of work in Richmond on Shell road which would include a 4 block walk in the rain. I went to the pumpkin patch 4 k past Fort langley last weekend how long would that take by transit?? I live in the real world not some fantasy that you seem to

Traffic & parking issues

Again, traffic will be the problem. Limit cars per unit dwelling??

As much as I love that Earl's Restaurant, the densification of the area is far more important.

Away from West Vancouver

My only concern is traffic patterns! we are at gridlock already.

Not sure the scale of International Plaza is good enough to be the generator of urban form. It has always seemed very over-scaled in relation to its context. A finer grained scale would be more appropriate - slender towers with more articulation and less concrete.

Waaay too congested. Cart before the horse. There is no way to make transportation for people easy and convenient with only option of a 1930's bridge into the city.

see previous comments.

It is fine to reference to natural spaces but when you vastly increase the population you need to expand natural spaces in kind or they get degraded. Affordability is seldom achieved in the end -these tend to be higher-end developments.

No more towers no more building till a new bridge is built or a tunnel

Where is Kalhanie park?

Encourage a landmark building and don't restrict height to International Plaza if there is merit in going taller (ie. more housing options or amenities generated). These opportunities to build significant buildings on key sites don't come up often so don't waste it.

Too high density leads to too many more vehicles in an already gridlocked area.

Buildings should not necessarily be used as a gateway to an area. One needs to study the cities and towns of Europe.

Is it a good planning practice to put residential towers on busy streets without buffers?

Adds to an already completely unsatisfactory traffic flow.

The traffic is already horrendous in and around Capilano Road, Park Royal, Taylor Way, Marine Drive and the Lions Gate Bridge so who in their right mind would think that adding more residential towers to an already congested area is a good idea? Developers? The City Council so they can reap the taxes? Get real.

While you are filling up the landscape with tall buildings, are you leaving any space for parking? Just because there are pedestrians and cyclists doesn't mean that there won't be people in cars, tourists and homeowners, who will need parking. We do not need all those tall buildings like Metro town which crowd out the sunshine and detract from the human element already living in the area.

Vehicular access to the development should be confined to Curling Road with no direct access to Marine Drive.

See comment above re:Lions Gate Bridge

It is too large and will add tremendous vehicle congestion

far too much density and traffic for the area

West Vancouver residents will become prisoners in there own community.

Because a lot of the traffic also comes to use the Lions Gate Bridge, this would cause even worse congestion.

Even now, you can see the traffic crawling from North Vancouver to get onto the bridge.

I cannot stress enough that public transit is of utmost concern.

Affordability is a shame when cities cause the costs to rise due to excessive charges for development which is passed on to the end purchaser

NO TOWERS

low rise and green..

Generally reduce the extent of development to control overpopulation and inadequate transportation infrastructure in the area.

752 Marine Drive

7. What do you think of the proposed urban design and planning directions for 752 Marine Drive (former White Spot restaurant)?

	Agree with	Disagree with	Not sure
Registered Responses	42.6% (80)	46.3% (87)	11.1% (21)
Unregistered Responses	36.7% (47)	54.7% (70)	8.6% (11)

8. Do you have any other specific comments for the urban design and planning directions for this site?

Registered Respondents:

I agree with the single tower 303 Marine Drive not the two towers that were planned earlier
Wrong place to put a high-rise. This area is too busy already.

- I believe that the proposal made last year included two towers. Has this been changed to one or is the rendering incomplete? I'm also wondering whether this tower is now taller than last year's proposal.

- I find that the massing and scale of this d

This site is too restricted for high rise, high density proposal. Also visual impact can overwhelm the immediately adjacent West Van gateway. Such development will occur on Park Royal lease lands under Squamish development control and will still provide transit based residential development and a high density regional centre.

I think that the height differential between the 2 towers makes the whole thing very disjointed. I am OK with 27 stories in the tall slender building, but the 2nd now shorter one looks stupid. I would prefer more height on the lower one, with a step down in the sky scape, and less massing at street level fronting Marine Drive. View corridors can be preserved, even with 2 tall towers.

Here we are told that the 'gateway' building doesn't need to be the tallest - that distinction would be given to another Larco tower. 752 Marine Drive would be the tallest 'to provide contract'. Again, it appears almost arbitrary as if other non design / planning concerns are in play.

My biggest concern with this proposed development is the negative effect it will have on traffic of an already heavily congested area. In addition to the 7 proposed towers on Park Royal's leased lands, the mall continues a large scale expansion on its retail/commercial side. there will be additional traffic generated from Evelyn Drive, Maison, Grosvenor Ambleside, as well as the towers slated for Lions Gate Town Centre, 657/675 Marine Drive - 660 Clyde Avenue, 303 Marine Drive and Klahanie Court. Plus these two towers. I'm not sure how all this increased traffic will flow. Certainly, park Royal does have a few more transit options (buses) than other locations in the District, specifically, service to North Vancouver, but, at this stage, can there be any reasonable estimate as to the number of residents that would chose public transit over cars? (would our 'bus riding seniors' be the main tenants of these new buildings?)

And, if a fair number of residents use their cars to get to and from work, they will be entering the traffic at the time of peak congestion. Some traffic measures have gone into effect over the past year or two, but I can honestly say that I have never, in 27 years, seen the area as congested as it has been in the past year. The only strategy offered by the DWV and DNV is to 'frustrate' drivers out of their cars. this strategy may end up failing as it has in LA or Seattle. Geography is against us. Perhaps, as has been discussed over the years the 4 levels of government will come together and devise a traffic plan that will overcome the huge logistic and geographical challenges of the area. Density is swell but there has to be the infrastructure there to support it.

Unless this building is one of the most unique architectural designs, it should not be built. If you can stipulate a design from such renowned architects such as Zaha Haddad, then it is worthwhile to be built. If it is just another box in the sky, forget it.

Appear to have considered all the principles of urban design. A great location for seniors. Will reduce the need for use of vehicles.

Traffic at this intersection is already absolutely terrible. There is no plan to improve this - you are only adding more congestion.

Again, see above response. There would be absolutely no sense of community living in a highrise at the corner of Taylor Way and Marine Drive.

Too many tall towers are completely changing the look of our beautiful community - We are starting to look like the west end of Vancouver

The proposed building should be much lower than the plaza because the height of the building will visually detract from the beauty of the area and also a smaller building will help minimize the traffic congestion.

How about, build no building at all. Have an open plaza that presents a worthy grand entrance to the richest community in Canada.

Building is just too way too high. Signature building reminds me of Singapore, Doha, or Dubai. No thank you!

Do you mean to tell me that with all the high rise apartments that are planned by the DNV and CNV, you feel the need to add more? Is this municipal greed?

Developer greed? Larco is not making enough money with the development planned for the Lions Gate Centre?

This site does not need another high rise. Evelyn Drive has not even completed yet. We know that the Park Royal Towers were a big mistake and you want to continue along the same path. Why is the municipality of West Vancouver being driven by a developer?

What happened to the two towers proposed? Are they not still under discussion? Onni at Evelyn Drive has a mock up of them as initially proposed when they discuss views. Aren't there 7 others on this site? Do we need these 2? At the earlier meeting discussing the proposed Park Royal towers, traffic was an issue down Taylor Way, on Marine Drive and coming from North Vancouver and none of these other developments were even discussed. OMG! How will that work?. Get to work, airport, hospital, hockey game, dinner over town, theatre - you cannot always take the Blue Bus.

It appears as if this building, or buildings, will be very tall. I am very uneasy about this and other high rise buildings going into Park Royal.

Awful idea for this site - density too much, traffic problems and will kill many nice views including that of LGBridge when driving south down Taylor Way. Is a poor site for public amenities as many residents will avoid this area due to high density and traffic congestion.

see above, needs to be extremely architecturally significant (Zaha Hadid quality and uniqueness)

Same comments as above

too obtrusive, will obstruct the ocean views and scale is off with surrounding adjacent Park Royal Mall (David and Goliath).

I see no way that the residents of that tower can get to downtown for work. Every work-around just aggravates the traffic problem. Even now, the traffic backup from Taylor Way extends well past Park Royal Towers at rush hour. Putting another 200 households into the mix does no one a favour except the developers.

I am not against development but the developers will have to pay the price of the traffic congestion they will aggravate. Plus they need to provide some additional green space for everyone.

Planned towers to the left look to promote a skyline that will simply be ugly - too tall too close to the water - and the towers across from the existing towers will create cold, vertical "canyon". The existing towers are not bad as they are up against the hillside. The new towers are placed on the flat land and will look unsightly at that height.

There is far too much traffic and congestion on this area already

Site No. 1 should absolutely not be higher than existing Park Royal Towers - I would rather see a height similar to existing Park Royal Towers.

I cannot agree with the planning and design objectives for 752 marine Dr as I do not agree with increasing the density for the area until public services [transport/traffic/over-densification issues] have been addressed.

The traffic congestion has to be dealt with FIRST!!! An ageing population is not going to walk blocks with several bags of groceries. Perhaps a shuttle from apartment buildings to grocery stores and back would alleviate the problem.

What foolishness to subject our community to such a massive development program when there is currently such a major transportation problem already. Until an alternate/expanded bridge/transit system is in place, it is totally unacceptable to support/accept such a proposal.

Traffic onto Marine Drive & Taylor Way! It is irresponsible to even consider that traffic will not increase due to that Towers positioning!

do not deviate from OCP.

"Massing that responds to site geometry?" Again, existing traffic congestion at this intersection must be fixed before adding more density.

We need a third crossing of the harbour before any development takes place nor significant improvement to public transit.

Again, we need to see a solution to the traffic problem on Marine Drive.

Agree with anything that increases density in areas that are near main transportation routes and nearest access to the City of Vancouver: Evelyn Drive, Marine and Taylor Way, Marine and Capilano.

I am pro-density and pro-development as long as it creates a livable and accessible community. I think the residents of West Vancouver and North Vancouver (District and City) will support the envisioned development if a plan to address severe traffic issues is successfully implemented in advance of expanding residential and office capacity. Don't promise it will be fixed. Prove it.

This area is already congested. Additional development would only further reduce the utility of the area for all existing residents.

This tower is not necessary and will rather create the eyesore than any aesthetics in subject area.

Maximum 5-6 storeys should be permitted in this location - should not be taller than any other PR commercial buildings.

The tower unless modest will be a significant traffic generator contributing to an already heavily congested street system. Improved trip distribution network required for this area separate from Marine Drive and Taylor Way

Too much additional density

keep to a height of 5 stories.

It is too crowded in this area already and we don't want any more huge buildings anywhere.

See above

Again why so small, this is a gateway site for West Vancouver.... bigger tower = more amenities

Absolutely not. Do not change to existing OCP or rezone this site. There is a total disconnect between your development recommendations and the traffic reality. The Provincial Government has absolutely no plans to do anything to resolve the traffic issues in that area and you are recommending high density development at a scale many times greater than the current zoning.

Width of sidewalks should not be determined at this time. This is an unpleasant walking area and possible uses of the space could include a small separation between the road and the sidewalk instead of insisting on width of sidewalk.

Density should relate to Site size (small) and traffic impacts at this BUSY / "bottleneck" location

Both visually and population density wise such a tall structure will not fit in with the current buildings in the area.

This corner needs to have a subway or tunnel for traffic turning to go over the southern bridge over the Cap river into North Van

Absolutely inappropriate location for high density residential tower jammed right on the sidewalk at the highest traffic intersection on the North Shore. Your minimalist transit, walking, bicycle assumptions and live, work, play rationale will do little to exacerbate an already intolerable situation. In addition, allowing major development on both corners of that intersection may well foreclose the best infrastructural options for resolving the traffic issues at that intersection that may need space to be implemented. You should not change the current OCP and zoning conditions at the site.

Traffic issues must be resolved first

Separated bike routes to connect to other developments in the study area

This one should never be approved because it departs from the OCP, not to mention that there's absolutely no need for it. Otherwise you're just gifting the property development company. Whenever and however the property was acquired or the leasing arrangement for the property was made, the OCP was in place, so the company can't possibly claim a grievance in having their proposal dismissed routinely as not conforming to the OCP. Planning staff should show a bit of self-discipline and stop playing games with the OCP, even if it means less work for them or less interesting work. There may in fact be compelling aesthetic and transportation reasons for rejecting the proposal, but that's not the point, either. Defending the OCP, and anterior to that, respecting the integrity of the community which is implicit in an OCP, are the point.

What about traffic congestion? It is unlikely that people who could afford to live in the proposed building would, for the most part, give up their cars. Some would take the bus to work downtown; everyone else would drive.

No more housing

Too intrusive in height and bulk overall, impeding on the views towards towards the water and of surrounding buildings/developments.

What happened to the two stepped up towers?

low rise, not high rise

would like to have an approved traffic plan in place prior to any further development approved. Currently this area is visited by shoppers so I don't think further retail would increase traffic but a tower will overwhelm the current infrastructure.

As previous public feedback on 752 application showed - there is NO public appetite for residential at this corner and traffic is the number one concern.

Views will be primarily of the Park Royal Parking facility. We are already too "boxed" in along the Park Royal Marine Drive corridor - it is becoming a "tunnel" to all those who commute (car, bike and walkers). It definitely is "not" bike/pedestrian friendly. Put some green space/park on this corner.

The Public has previously indicated (through your own survey) they do NOT want residential towers at this location so why is this being proposed? Public have also clearly stated they want traffic at intersection resolved BEFORE any development in this area - so again, why is this being considered?

Park, public space. Enough towers, buildings already exist.

a single slender tower allowing ample outdoor resting and parking space
a green complimentary area to all the proposed store fronts and all the financial benefits that the shopping center owners have gained over recent years!
all west enders shop

support for low rise building

North side of Clyde should be precedent - no higher than that - no residential here at all, remain commercial low rise as is. Previous public input rejected residential here, what has changed? Where is your evidence public has changed mind?

Consider views from existing residents

against such high Highrises
. Limit to 5 stories

The site is currently Zoned for a three storey building. Developer should build to the current OCP guidelines. Adding a tower here without any regard to increased TRAFFIC is not appropriate.

The Proposed LOWER ROAD extension across the Capilano River near the railway bridge with a western EXIT at "Pound Road" to Marine Drive needs to be completed BEFORE ANY MORE INCREASED DENSITY AT PARK ROYAL.

I don't think a tower will enhance the area at all, on the contrary it will simply block the view S & W (& only add to the traffic chaos I am sure)

I have written extensively opposing this high rise development. In my view completing the corner with retail would not really add much more traffic remembering that Park Royal continues to expand retail outside our control really on both sides of Marine Drive. In any event, I am unclear just how many buildings are now contemplated - one or two? My current view is that if buildings or a building is constructed at that corner - they should be no higher than the parking garage behind - not obstruct the views of the Lions Gate Bridge looking from the north and that access and egress from the parking garage should be on

to West Vancouver controlled land and definitely not on to Taylor Way. I contend that an additional tower is neither needed or will complement the West Royal Towers, In addition, notwithstanding, there should be no left turn from Main Street on the Taylor Way north, an additional northbound lane should be cut on the east side of Taylor Way with directional arrows installed above the road surface restricting turning to the Lions Gate Bridge to the two right lanes, the turn to North Vancouver restricted to the next lane to the west and the remaining two lanes for proceeding north up Taylor Way or left (west) along Marine Drive.

Again, I like what I see presented

Leave existing zoning in place. Feedback on the last proposal for this site already told us the public does not feel this is a good spot for residential development and that traffic is a main concern.

Low rise development, rather than high rise.

Build lanes going east / west under Taylor Way and Marine so cars can go right through without the traffic light impacting flow.

Lower in height than West Royal towers.

I disagree to have any new building in that area.

Traffic study needs to be undertaken urgently!

Limit the height to 16 stories - a moderate height to not dwarf the public structures at the base.

Proposed tower dominates area -- needs a lower configuration to fit within context of area. More emphasis on ground level, welcoming, human scale gateway.

It should not have dedicated parking. They are even closer to bus stops

Lower rise, larger footprint, underground parking if possible, and traffic access to Marine Dr. only from the south side of the development through Park Royal South.

Please read comments above!

see above

Although I agree with the concept of another tower where White Spot was, I am concerned about further development in this area in terms of congestion. Not seeing much about better biking infrastructure and high density transit, which both have to happen if this area (and W Van generally) continues to densify.

Concerned about height, density and particularly contribution to traffic congestion. Adding multiple housing units to already congested Taylor Way and Marine Drive intersection makes no sense until this problem has been resolved. "It's not our problem to resolve, it's the BC Government's issue" is an irresponsible position to take. Council directed staff to come up with a proposal that deals with the density and height issues and particularly traffic. I don't see any reference to the latter. With these three DWV developments, the Lions Gate Town Centre plus the planned towers by the Squamish Nation over which DWV has no control, you can expect an increasingly angry response by voters. I have confirmed

with a senior official of the BC Ministry of transportation that they have no plans to find a problem to this increasing traffic congestion.

Grade separated pedestrian crossing over Taylor Way, with shops and/or restaurants as part of bridge. Look to the Rialto Bridge in Venice for an example. This would lessen pedestrian movements at grade and improve goods & service vehicle movements. All the while better connection shoppers and pedestrians.

Provide protected bike lanes on Marine Drive with development and safe cycling access to Lions Gate Bridge.

Ensure that there is a significant percentage of workforce and affordable housing (over 20%), provided in low rise (six-storey) street wall building forms, particularly fronting Marine Drive and Taylor Way and replacing the surface parking lots.

Solve traffic problems first. Stop being ostriches again'

It will create more traffic and congestion in an already over populated area

Again, I don't necessarily agree that it has to be tall and "visually contrasting" with West Royal Towers. Too much emphasis on the "look" and not what is functional and sustainable from the whole community's perspective is what is important.

Unregistered Respondents:

This tower is very close to Marine Drive. And I spoke with Rick Amatea and he said Larco Property to build 2 towers, not one - 13 storeys and 20 storeys. Is he correct? About traffic - we have several developments adding people and cars, Squamish has another new development, Grosvenor, Cressey, Evelyn Drive - I understand the idea that some of the residents will not use cars if they are living in these prosperous "central' high rises. These people are moving from outer areas but the area that they are leaving will be filled by others who will still be contributing to vehicle traffic - they don't go away. And persons attending events, dinner etc. in Vancouver won't be taking the bus. Lululemon doesn't take us everywhere. And people who work in Vancouver, executives usually drive. *Vietn Cutes* [spelling hard to read], judge now retired use to take his bike, he was the only exception I know and am aware of.

Impossible to consider in the light of the strong opposition at the public hearing. Would add to the already gridlocked traffic.

Concerned about traffic congestion

You cannot put in any new towers or unit in this already overextended area

. With no new building, as it is right now, a new crossing to downtown should be built.

The traffic on Taylor Way and Capilano is currently atrocious. My parents live in the 338 Taylor Way Building - it is very difficult to get out of the driveway during the rush hours. Any new buildings in the Park Royal complex or near Capilano would be a disaster. It is naive to think that people are going to simply take public transport - it's just not realistic - residents need to use cars the majority of the time to access what they need to in the city.

I disagree with the proposed height of the tower.

Tall buildings block views and sunlight. Not great in a sea-side community. Is anyone looking at traffic flow. Because the last traffic pattern changes, taking away the overpass in Park Royal and taking away the right turn lane out of the Amberside turf fields have increased traffic jams. Taking away the pedestrian overpass from the apartments on the north side is less convenient now for people walking who have to go to the lights. Landscaping along Marine Drive between the West and East traffic is such that you can't see on-coming traffic when making a left turn into the Ambleside fields. Safety over prettiness please. Keep wild spaces and beavers and trees. Not many places have oceanfront in cities. Many cities have traffic congestion and tower blocks....we don't need or want this.

The Architectural Design of the proposed structure is so unattractive, I have a grave concern for the functionality of a design that is so thoughtless; there is nothing engaging or classical in any way about the current proposed design, needless to say it is absolutely not a reflection of the District of West Vancouver.

I feel that increased density in this area will have a similar impact on traffic flow in this high motor traffic area to that of the proposed Capilano development, thus increasing problems on the North Shore. Alternative modes of transport need to be put into place before these developments are completed.

Although I disagree with a tower here, this is the best site for a taller building. Still traffic will be increasingly problematic. Imagine even more cars feeding into the Marine Drive and Taylor Way intersection that now. It would be grid-lock.

Do not want a tower on this site. Too much development at Park Royal already.

Stick to the single tower on this site.

I don't like it due to the increased density and traffic. It should be blocked by W.Van ... council not encouraged

Improve the crossing to Vancouver before you add density.

lions gate is over capacity now with lines miles long to get on it. Built in the 30's the South of the Fraser has had close to 40 lanes since the last one we had TWO port mann bridges

Personally, I'd like to see additional towers be constructed over top of what are the two new Park Royal buildings. Make no mistake though, this is a very positive first step.

It could be a super place to live - proximity to services and walkable. Again, still concerned about more cars at the pinch point but otherwise very supportive.

Consider views from Sentinel Hill residences - the tower design should be less intrusive than the two apartment buildings across Taylor Way (which stand out in a really offensive way)

I would like to see a seismic study done and made public. I was at a business in the afternoon at this location about 40 years ago and there was an earthquake. The building I was in (a 2 story wooden structure) shook so I would like to make sure any modern structure built at his location is built with earthquakes in mind. The quake that I experienced years ago was minor but in the future it could be of longer duration.

Too congested. Towers too high, only offer a view of traffic inching onto Lion's Gate Bridge.

I do not agree that this should be a very tall tower. It will look out of context with the rest of park royal south

see previous comments regarding traffic congestion.

I can't see how this would make sense with current traffic issues being as they are - the increased load on the intersection of Taylor way and marine would be difficult to want to vote for

Again until the transit is worked out this will end up to be a big gleaming designer mess. With rapid transit, I would be much more supportive. I walk Taylor Way almost every day. the times it is backed up the hill have tripled in a few years.

Maybe a cinema in one of them but am against more construction roads are in bad condition and traffic is at its limit

Cars are not going away. You must deal with the traffic disaster.

too much traffic and no green space

You are inviting traffic chaos - short of building a flyover to go up Taylor Way which in case you have forgotten is the main link between Lion's Gate Bridge and the Upper Levels highway.

Are you kidding me. Putting highrises in front of the views of the Lions Gate Bridge....This will ruin the picture perfect views of the Lions Gate skyline. Do not approve...Use the Evelyn project design...all lowrise and does not effect anyones view. The towers are AWFUL!!!!!!

Very significant location, go taller and make the design distinctive.

Traffic issues, as noted above.

Park Royal owners should not get permission to build high rises on the former restaurant sight. They can build them on native land across the Capilano River from the mobile home park. To say in the report that traffic is not their issue is to defy reality. There is already a problem with the current expansion of the mall as it is. It makes one wonder if our mayor and council truly have the interests of the residents as their priority. I agree with the minority voice in the report that the sight at Taylor Way and Marine Drive is not a suitable location for 2 high rises.

Doing this building as planned does not fulfill the objectives above as stated under 'Public Space & Amenities'

Too dense for that area. Bridge traffic and Taylor Way/marine Drive already a nightmare.

Why not put a park in there.

It was fine as a site for White Spot. It is already almost impossible to drive from Winners to the Bay, to Lions Gate Bridge or up Taylor Way. The people in the present tower across the street can hardly merge into Park Royal traffic. One more tower in addition to all those stores will be Over Kill.

There should be no vehicular access to the development from Taylor Way.

HOW WILL THE INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION BE ADDRESSED?

See comment above

The tower is overwhelming 27 stories thereby blocking much of ocean views in the area and there is not enough ingress and egress accounted for.

Far too much car traffic for this area.

Such a large building will add tremendously to traffic congestion and during construction both busses and cars will have difficulty on Marine Drive. This option has limited public space. No real consideration has been given to the interaction with Park Royal and its customers and cars. The only reason the District wants to build this tower is to reap the construction revenue it will generate rather than simply forgoing it. As the Mayor once said that the Squamish Nation would build on property they control if the District did not permit the building and the District would lose the revenue. This is not a good enough reason.

the biggest concern is increased traffic grid lock

Stop it entirely. West Vancouver and North Vancouver are full up and until another bridge/tunnel is built our community will become unlivable.[]

When the existing towers were built in 1992, the traffic at that time, was very little. Getting onto the bridge no matter the time of day, was not a problem. It is unrealistic to even compare that to the traffic that exists now.

I agree with the 'context' and design of this building but I will never vote for it until the alternate route/ public transit issue has been established to help alleviate congestion. We are already at a breaking point.

Go tall and lots -
of open space

Who is in Charge here? The design of the White Spot is irrelevant in terms of all the other transgressions going on here.

What about a totally green park...?? No assessment, but a great approach to West Vancouver.

Generally reduce the extent of development to control overpopulation and inadequate transportation infrastructure in the area.

Taylor Way and Marine Drive are choke points for traffic. If built, this would impede the already choke points of access and egress.

660 Clyde Ave / 657/675 Marine Drive

9. What do you think of the proposed urban design and planning directions for 660 Clyde Ave / 657/675 Marine Drive?

	Agree with	Disagree with	Not sure
Registered Responses	51.8% (99)	37.7% (72)	10.5% (20)
Unregistered Responses	47.7% (62)	40.8% (53)	11.5% (15)

10. Do you have any other specific comments for the urban design and planning directions for this site?

Registered Responses:

OK with the tower (3) but wondering about the existing parkade.

Wrong place to put a high-rise. This area is too busy already.

I would need to have more information about this development before I could form an opinion about it. I do support the preservation of the heritage building at 660 Clyde Ave, but I'm unclear as to how it would be done. I also wonder whether there are any plans to develop the parkade to the west or the low rise offices to the east along Clyde.

Overall concept is well thought-out. It is a beautiful development.

Scale of newer Clyde Ave developments on the River and north side is more appropriate for the gateway and still provides significant density. Limited flexibility to assist in greening Marine Drive.

Not sure what you mean by heritage here - Frank Baker's restaurant site? The single story commercial on Clyde is charming, but how is this going to be incorporated into a tower or not left orphaned between the parkade and something else? If it were incorporated as an entrance to a tower, now, maybe we can do something there. My point is, do not risk having things look really disjointed: parkade, next to heritage office building, jammed up against a glass tower, across from a really ordinary looking old folks home.

Please consider how to link this area with the other neighbours: how can you cross Taylor Way without trouble, how can you get to the Cap River trail without thinking that you are trespassing on the Capilano Care Facility, could you easily get to LG Town center without having to get blown away by the wind created by the traffic on Marine. Can you link up to Cedardale on the 6th St. foot path without thinking you are trespassing? Could there be a tunnel under Taylor Way, or ????? Clyde avenue is a cul-de-sac, with left turns prohibited onto Taylor Way - how are people going to get in and out without getting creamed by cars merging while accelerating from Marine & Taylor Way? It is not friendly. I don't have any ready answers to these issues, and do not want to suggest that it doesn't get built, but it would be naive to think that one can build it and address the transportation and connectivity constraints after the fact. The current sidewalks are not big enough or in adequate repair for 1 person, let alone multiples more. It does make sense to put more

density into flat areas for walkability, but flat is not enough, and you have to have some place to walk to . . . work, play, professional services, coffee, going to the gym, etc.

I support the preservation of the Woyatt-Bowie building but it's unclear to me just how that will be done - encased in the tower's "podium"?

Will there not also be a future tower or two slated for the old parkade immediately along this stretch of Marine Drive, effectively blocking the views from Taylor Way no matter how slender the towers are/

good scale

We do not need a corridor of buildings. We need to reserve open views, space, airiness etc versus a street wall of tall buildings.

Consider a traffic light for left turn onto Taylor Way from Clyde

General comments: there are tons of towers planned to add traffic to an area where traffic is already unbearable. The fact is that people in west van and north van are driving. They are not cycling or walking. We don't need "affordable" housing. Rather than just building more units, how are you going to improve the infrastructure to support it? You are doing nothing. Do that first. Then add more housing, not just congestion.

Surely a public space at this extremely busy intersection would never be used other than to try to cross the street! Again, who would want to live along this busy noisy, polluted corridor. Please go back to the drawing board and create some really livable spaces.

This area has very difficult access to the current road system (getting on to Taylor Way to head south) will there be a new road access? On numerous occasions, I have seen vehicles pull out to cross Taylor Way in a very dangerous manner.

These should be no higher than the buildings that currently exist facing the river.

More acceptable as it is more modest in scale.

Again no need for a tower here. Why not continue with the height of Water's Edge?

Is the parkade staying? Probably not. More towers? And that parking lot behind, next to Amica? We are starting to feel like Metrotown. I realize that the trend is to densify near transit. However, most of the densification in other areas of the Lower Mainland is not reliant on one 3 lane bridge for access to a major city. When will Taylorwood Place ask for a DP? I am sure that H.Y.Louie is biding his time, waiting to see how things play out before he makes another run at developing the old Safeway lot. It is difficult to come to a decision when you know that much is waiting in the wings and of which you are unaware.

Just don't make us feel completely blocked in by highrise towers. What you have shown sounds OK - but already Park Royal South is overwhelming, both inside and along Marine Drive - I never go there any more except to creep around the back to go to Staples and Home Depot.

The design and planning objectives seem reasonable if one accepts the premise that the Hong Kong model of dense, high rise development is desirable. If we must have such growth it probably makes sense to put it into this area, and I am glad that the various jurisdictions are working together to plan for growth. But the sheer size of these developments worries me. Life is becoming impossible on the North Shore and in Vancouver generally. This is what comes from the movies and shakers making us into a "world class city." Sad.

too high a density. the entrance to West Van shouldn't be a bunch of ugly concrete towers. The existing ones are bad enough lets not add to the ugliness.

Also nothing should proceed until there is a better understanding of the possible development of many towers on the Squamish Nations land.

think this area should be all low-rise for maximum views of river and lovely deciduous trees here

Same comments as above

More housing options for west vancouver

The overall design and concept works extremely well for this site - restoring heritage, the height is well suited to achieve a visual balance of scale complementing the mountainous backdrop and satisfy the "gateway" landmark location of this site. Rental component is much needed and welcomed and the higher density is a much needed supply and needed mix of different residential types but it also satisfies being away from the low density bedroom communities. Beautifying this site is long overdue - the park and greenscape will do this as well. Overall it is a very reasonable and well rounded proposal.

I am in full support of this development as it will beautify the entrance to West Vancouver, reduce trip generating traffic and protect an important heritage building in our city.

I agree that this area can use some spiffing up. Too bad they are trapped by the Park Royal infrastructure unless they are heading north on Taylor Way.

Before any of these developments get approved, a solution to the increase in traffic and traffic related problems should be found first! This can only be achieved if West Vancouver, the Squamish Nation and North Vancouver address this problem collectively.

This tower is in area with other towers, plus has many tall trees near the river, so not as unsightly as other towers proposed in this area. But a lower height will lessen its impact.

I cannot agree with the planning and design objectives for 660 Clyde 657/675 Marine Dr as I do not agree with increasing the density for the area until public services [transport/traffic/over-densification issues] have been addressed.

Again, DEAL WITH CONGESTION FIRST.

See comments for previous proposal.

That corner should be opened up and landscaped similar to the West Royal complex and the ghastly concrete 'bunker style' parkade should be removed and more green space promoted.

see above

It makes sense to create high density in these three nodes where it is possible to provide places for work, housing, and services all within a walking or easy biking distance. I would only support this density here if there is a matching increase in low rise, townhouses, and duplex in the adjacent areas so that there is a complete mix of housing types instead of just high rises or single family residences.

Again, more density at an already overly congested site.

Agree but should not go ahead until a third crossing or transit has been improved significantly.

Would be concerned with how much this tower could create a visual pedestrian "pinch point" from Taylor Way to Capilano Road.

Please avoid turning this redevelopment plan into an opportunity for investors vs those seeking housing. I say this as an investor who buys such units however I live and raise my family in WV and recognize that high investor ratios are bad for the community.

This area is already congested. Additional development would only further reduce the utility of the area for all existing residents. The curtailment of the private ownership of vehicles is discriminatory to those that desire the freedom of private transport. This freedom allows people to appreciate the natural environment of the lower mainland and beyond. Some members of our community depend on private transport for their everyday needs. Such as our many parents that transport our youth around our district on a daily basis, sometimes to more than one location in narrow time frames.

On a general note I am disinclined to further development in our community. I decided to become a member of this community specifically because of its lower density environment. I did not choose to live in one of the many other communities in the lower mainland, that do offer greater density options, for this very reason. Changing the physical fabric of our community, aside from the obvious concerns regarding increased congestion that greater density would inevitably bring, would do irrevocable damage. Transforming West Vancouver into yet another veritable hive of concrete cells is not a vision of the future that I hold. Conserving this precious physical and social environment is what I wish to bequeath to posterity.

5-6 storeys max, make it similar to residential buildings in this area constructed a few years ago.

The tower unless modest will be a significant traffic generator contributing to an already heavily congested street system. Improved trip distribution network required for this area separate from Marine Drive and Taylor Way

Do nothing until you have the support of the majority of West Vancouver citizens.

It is nuts to develop this tiny property separately from the parking garage to the north.

Leave it alone. Nothing but more traffic problems

Yet another source of congestion and overcrowding.

Towers are not the answer to successful community making.

Again why so small, this is a gateway site for West Vancouver.... bigger tower = more amenities

Absolutely not. You are ignoring the very human scale developments that have created that neighbourhood. Respect and reinforce the existing neighbourhood character, connect the neighbourhood better for pedestrians to Capilano River and Park Royal, and improve vehicle access to Taylor Way.

This is too close to Marine Drive. There should be a major tunnel going under this location and up to the Highway to Squamish, Whistler and the ferry.

WVD has the opportunity to demonstrate to our residents that Neighbourhood Character is recognized and respected. It is hard to imagine that the rationale being applied to justify the acceptance of a Tower proposal on this site overrides the well-established low-rise residential character and functioning of this neighbourhood. Improve the pedestrian experience, improve the relationship to Capilano River, Kluchanie Park and the Lions Gate Town Center but respect the existing neighbourhood character and functioning. Also, do not permit the foreclosing of traffic management or infrastructure options at the TW/Marine intersection. You should not change the current zoning, height and density restrictions on this site.

Traffic issues must be resolved first

Separated bike routes to connect to other developments in the study area

See comment on the above item.

The corner of Marine Drive and Taylor Way, the site of the previous gas station, must be made a highlight point as a welcome entrance to West Vancouver with park-like landscaping. Building must provide a minimum of 20% rental properties. The preservation of the historic building which was designed by Mr. Hollingwood is the most important thing. Also, anything else between Taylor Way and Capilano River, Marine Drive to the bluff should be highrises and high density.

Nice to keep the heritage building which was designed by an excellent architect. The slender form and podium combination helps with minimizing impact on views and that park on the corner will be great for everyone in the neighborhood. As a student of architecture and context planning (BCIT), the form and character of the development is a nice departure from the two towers across marine and will give the neighborhood a much needed visual update with more green space. The views aren't really affected primarily because the two larger masses across marine already define the skyline and this accents it nicely. love the green initiatives too. Reading lots of comments on how this reflects on OCP; would like to remind all that OCP is a guideline, that must be modified and be progressive enough to deal with changing circumstances and respond to the existing and future communities as well. This project and many others like it are no different than past successful projects that followed and progressed the OCP in previous years, resulting in the great community centres we have today in West Van and across the GVA. This site has an iconic sightline from the Lions Gate and should be treated as such with the proper iconic structure that satisfies the community's current needs with more affordable housing, green space, and other amenities while provide future housing stock that will allow current

and future residents some flexibility with the addition of condos and rental homes to the current housing mix which is limited.

nice to keep the heritage building as proposed and maximize views of iconic Lions Gate bridge

The Official Community Plan, which restricts building height to five storeys should not be changed.

The idea of a public space near the intersection does not make sense because of the unrelenting passage of vehicles for most of every day.

The concept of a town centre at this location is invalid. This is the same location for which the study proposes a gateway. It is illogical to propose a town centre at a gateway - and both ideas are inappropriate for this location.

The overall design principles and compliance with the principles and guidelines of the context study is very appealing and positive. Aesthetically, this project will enhance and beautify this site in scope. The height is very reasonable given that it satisfies the overall balanced objectives of a community plan by creating higher density which is a much needed supply (especially for future demand) and tying in with the natural environment with both surrounding site plans of a park & streetscape (& good setbacks) and architectural features. Will bring this area into contemporary relevance with a new development replacing the rundown buildings on this site which is currently an eye sore and embarrassing to all tourists, residents and visitors who pass by frequently.

Underground walkway would make it easier for people to access Park Royal. Seniors from Amica and Capilano Care Centre have difficulty crossing Taylor Way and Marine Drive.

low rise

My comments continue to be that until you address the road infrastructure these buildings are not supported for development. It currently can take up to 30 min to get from west van on marine drive at 12th and marine to cross the taylor way light. That is not acceptable and that is before the development contemplated.

This is completely contrary to existing neighbourhood character of low rise buildings

The above "agree with" is contingent only if White Spot tower is not approved. See previous comments.

Why have the low rise building on Clyde not been used to "inform" the scale of this? It is a bit disingenuous to repeat (3x no less) a the term "a single tower" when it would appear that at least three are being proposed and certainly more will be if this is approved.

low rise, residential or retail or park

too much - maybe in 2050!

support for low rise building

Mid rise on north side of Clyde should be precedent - no higher. No parking spots or cars allowed.

Consider lower density tower and access to LG Bridge.

How are residents supposed to get onto Taylor way. I live in this area and most residents use the park royal parking lot to cut through. With park royal removing this and your proposed new 23 story building going in. You need a light at Clyde. By the way the developer has promised residents in the area a light at Clyde and Taylor way. I trust this will happen, as promised!

Clyde Ave has very restricted access to Taylor Way; NO LEFT TURN during rush hours. This is the only ACCESS to this area. Increasing density without any regard to TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS is a failure to the residents and just future problem for occupants in this area.

Will this proposal be a 100% rental building with "WEST VANCOUVER RESIDENTS FIRST" for rentals and clear controls on annual rent increases that fall under the RENTAL OMBUDSMAN's Office & NOT signed annual contracts where owners can arbitrarily raise rents to ANY LEVEL?

I really like the design proposed for this space. The green space on the corner will be a lovely improvement to the area, I like how the tall narrow building allows more green space and I am thrilled that the heritage building is being saved.

The proposed beautification of this site is long overdue! The scope of the project and height of the building proposed is a perfect balance both in architectural design to achieve the impact and presence of a "gateway" landmark; and height which satisfies a reasonable medium vs. high density (over 25+ stories) for this area, a much needed mixed use with rental component for improved equity in planning (situated in urban focused centres rather than scattered among SDH neighbourhoods that is less desirable), and scaled in harmony with the surrounding backdrop of the mountains and neighbouring West Towers. It is well thought out and a very optimal use of this site including beautifying this intersection (a daily eye sore), restoration of a heritage building and having a longer term of benefits than a short term (i.e. 4 storey) fix.

Low rise.

Build lanes going east / west under Taylor way and Marine so cars can go right through without the traffic light impacting flow.

Lower in height than West Royal towers.

I disagree to have any new building in that area.

Traffic study needs to be undertaken urgently!

I cannot agree with placement or high rise size at this location which again I do not believe is necessary to complement the West Royal Towers or the Lions Gate Town Centre. I believe that as with West Royal Towers all buildings at the corners of Marine Drive and Taylor Way should be set well back from the road to ensure that any future expansion is not lost as I am now suggesting for the Taylor Way north south of Marine Drive to accommodate another right turn lane east onto Marine Drive. I also find that without provision of details on increased pedestrian and automobile traffic at the one east west (double) pedestrian crossing at Taylor Way and Marine Drive and the automobile access to Taylor Way South at Clyde no knowledgeable decision can be taken. It appears that the existing Park Royal multi-storey parking garage remains in place (but I have heard rumours in the reverse) and there are no details as to the building set back from Marine Drive on the North East corner. I note there is yet another building in the picture on the north-east corner of Clyde and Taylor Way next to the Nursing Home. I am going to assume due to the lack of information available that the parking garage would remain open with access and egress on to Taylor Way via Clyde and the dangerous unmarked pedestrian crossing at the corner will not be improved. We would remind that it is difficult to turn left off Clyde on to Taylor Way south at the best of times. Again this is why without inclusion of Taylor Way north in the Study especially this project should not be considered. In fact it is my belief that none to the contemplated projects should be considered before a new OCP is in place.

Positive improvement, plans seem very thorough and it will be good to see improvements and enhancements to these related areas, some of which have been derelict for some time.

Let's preserve heritage and build more park space, tall slender buildings with more open space

Why should this neighbourhood absorb a 20 story tower (setting precedent for 2 - 3 more) when five story residential and commercial buildings have already established the scale and character of this neighbourhood and residents are already dealing with severe problems with access/egress during peak traffic times?

Limit the height to create a moderate sized tower that does not dominate the sky line!

There can be increased housing built without it being high rises. Look to other countries - look to Paris where max height is about 7 stories.

No High Rises on this side of Marine Drive. This area is already restricted to 5 stories.

Another Number One in height! And it is delusional to imagine that any pleasure could be derived from public space at this busy intersection. How about a transit hub instead?

Please read comments above!

see above

The current OCP limits height and density and I commend DWV in sticking to this plan. It is a beautiful community but now in the interest of a "gateway" concept defined by towers, this proposal violates the current OCP which has been prepared with extensive community consultation. A tower on this site is inconsistent with the character of this neighbourhood. I strongly disagree with this plan for 660 Marine.

See previous '303 Marine' comments for full service bridge over Capilano River n/o Marine Drive for better w/e circulation of all modes.

please be sure to develop strong, safe bike and pedestrian infrastructure, where bikes and pedestrians have their own spaces wherever possible.

Provide protected bike lanes on Marine Drive with development.

Finally, this ugly corner will be visually appealing and will have some use.

This whole area will look like Burnaby and you will not stop vehicle, traffic and pollution. Build low elevation housing and simple, small units for low cost housing. Spend some time in Denmark.

Ensure that there is a significant percentage of workforce and affordable housing (over 20%), provided in low rise (six-storey) street wall building forms, particularly fronting Marine Drive and Taylor Way and replacing the structured parking building.

You are still being ostriches.' Solve traffic problems first!

While it sounds warm and fuzzy to discourage car use and encourage the use of transit, the Lions Gate Bridge and Ironworks are already maxed out. 7 days a week any time between 7am and 8pm there is a serious chance of sitting in an hour long traffic jam trying to get off the North Shore. It seems that West Van, North Van and the Squamish Nation are sticking their heads in the sand, hoping that all of this development will not cause more problems by fantasizing that the new people in the new developments will not have cars, will work nearby, or will use transit. This is a fantasy, not a practical reality. Without rapid transit or a sea bus from West Van to downtown, there is no quick or easy way for West Van residents to get to the rest of the Lower Mainland without hitting the over-congested bridges in a car. Also, the mountains, ferries and road to Whistler bring a huge amount of traffic THROUGH our communities. Without the Province pledging another crossing (i.e. bridge, tunnel, sea bus, rapid transit) these developments will just make living on the North Shore like living in a giant traffic jam. Developments around the Lions Gate bridge without further transportation solutions are a huge mistake.

Again, setting the height to be compatible with the two tall towers is the wrong starting point from my perspective. Determining what capacity we have as a community to absorb these numbers of new residents is the place to begin.

Unregistered Responses:

What is happening to the parkade here? Is that single tower along with the "historic" building Woyat-Bower the only thing to be built in that spot? What about the parking lot (Christmas tree lot) west of Amica? And what is coming forward for Inglewood Place? I understand someone is buying and assembling properties. Polygon?

None of the proposals would be permitted under the OCP. No increase in density should be considered. Would be a blight at the entrance to West Vancouver.

Concerned about traffic congestion

Same as above - there should be no new building on an already completely overcrowded, traffic congested area that gets clogged several times a day when the bridge only allows 1 lane heading south downtown.

This seems like a money and tax grab that is negative for out West Van and North Van communities.

The study does not specify the number of floors/height of the tower.

Concerned that the development on Squamish Nations lands ensures that new residents and developers pay tax to the municipality to help pay for roads, infrastructure, sewage, water, schools, health care etc in the district.

If you must densify Clyde, you must ensure the you don't encroach on, and impede the views of the residents on Duchess who quite simply were there first. (I don't live there, but a tower or high building(s) would be unfair. Must create a transition, such as 5 story buildings or townhouses on this site.

Do not want a tower in this location. The traffic is a mess here already. Blocks views from up the hill.

This would be a good location for an exclusive hotel, something West Vancouver desperately needs, a smaller version of the Wedgewood Hotel.

same as for 752 Marine.....don't agree with it

Yes, the developer who sent me this 'survey', told me how to answer the questions in their favor, so that's why I did it anonymously. The survey questions are extremely misleading, written to get the responses the District and the Developer want.

See my earlier comments on a probable configuration of the necessary Lower Road, as well as Spirit Trail, bicycle paths, and the North Coast Express Passenger Rail. Also, some probing of Squamish Nation intents would be advisable. It would not surprise me to see Squamish Nation high-rise development on the beaches, south of the railway tracks, on both the west side and east side of the Capilano River, which would be facilitated by the pending relocation of the Lions Gate Waste Water Treatment Plant from its present location under the north tower to the Lions Gate Bridge, to a site off 1st avenue in NVD. Federal deadline is 2020 for new plant operation but that deadline will be hard to keep.

Traffic & parking

Why aren't you doing a road/transportation study???

It's a travesty and desecration to put highrises right on the waterfront in Ambleside Park. Even though the city hasn't got direct jurisdiction, surely there is some means to block the Squamish Nation's selfish intent. And then why add to the problem with your own highrise in Park Royal. Does anyone think about anything besides short-term monetary gain? Any thought to quality of life??

I think it's regrettable that the building isn't taller given the efforts of increasing density in the area. I think that is somewhat of a missed opportunity. With that said, once again, the property is a step in the right direction for the area.

Address the traffic concerns first before continue building massive towers. Why not wait until the completion of Grosvenor and let us see how to proceed from there? Let's review this request in 2 years time.

Only traffic. I am a big fan of creating housing choice in West Van.

Concerned about more traffic at Taylor Way and Marine Drive. .. More delays at lights...heavier volume in general. Hopefully public transit and pedestrian walkways would alleviate the need for a car for majority of residents. Also, would like to see low income/seniors units in any buildings built throughout this project.

Sure, why not block the view of all the people behind this site? Before this building goes up they have a view, after the building goes up, they will look at a concrete block - that is if the tower is "deferring" to West Royal Towers. Maybe it could be called "Trump Tower Two".

For the entire plan it is much to difficult to visualize what is being planned with what you have provided here on this website.

see earlier comments

Same comment as above - I can't see how this would make sense with current traffic issues being as they are - the increased load on the intersection of taylor way and marine would be difficult to want to vote for

. With the added challenge of how these residents head south to join lionsgate without either an arduous circling back around Keith - or a further traffic light on taylor way just before marine (heading south)

How do you plan to deal with the increased traffic and vehicular access when these huge places are built? The Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersection is a mess as it is now. And that is almost any time of day or night.

Again, need proper transit first.

traffic traffic traffic

hurts the green space along the river walk. Park Royal is already overdeveloped

The tower behind the West Royal is fine...it is in the same sight line and away from the best part of the view which is the bridge...

Traffic issues, as noted above.

Green space seems to be left out of the study along with an understanding of good planning principals.

As above. Agree with public space.

Another tower? Really??

We cannot afford a podium with heritage elements. We need space for the Seniors residence and Care Center presently on Clyde Ave.

There are already many condos in that area. How many stores and how many condos do we need in West Vancouver?!

I am opposed to any high rise development in this area because gaining vehicular access onto Taylor Way from Clyde Avenue is already a challenge with no other access available.

See comment above

Beautifying this corner with landscaping, a landmark design and connecting park space and Capilano river nature.

good use of the property

Will add to congestion on Taylor Way. Too large a tower.

again traffic concerns

I agree with the built form and 'context' of this proposed building. I will repeat my urgent recommendation for public transit and alternate route plans to allow for any new density in the area, or any area of West Van.

When a pedestrian crosses the intersection of Taylor Way and Marine drive, because of the existing traffic it is very dangerous. Increasing the time for pedestrians to cross that intersection would not change this. The traffic coming from wither the Mall or the bridge across the Capilano river at different times of the day, is crawling to let those who want to get onto the Lions Gate. It can take a half hour just to get from the Capilano Bridge to the corner of Marine Drive and Taylor way. Any further construction will definitely increase that traffic a lot more !!!

If West Vancouver actually has any jurisdiction over this land... you have a duty to support the Local economy. Do a Granville Market kind of thing. If you want to put up High rises around the Sewage Plant, then by all means.

If you want to get more tax dollars, for things the Community would actually like... then tax Foreign investors. You've got that info on the water bill, and on the Municipal Tax Structure.

Generally reduce the extent of development to control overpopulation and inadequate transportation infrastructure in the area.

While this would clean up the entrance to West Vancouver, the density would continue to choke all vehicular traffic. This is not a good idea.