DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 17th STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

Date: June 23, 2014 File: 1010-20-12-085
From: Andrew Browne, Senior Community Planner
Subject: Status Update for 752 Marine Drive

RECOMMENDED THAT:
1. Development Application No. 12-085, by Park Royal Shopping Centre Holdings Ltd. for 752 Marine Drive, advance in the development consideration process; and,
2. Council endorse the next steps for consideration of the development application as generally described in the report from the Senior Community Planner dated June 23, 2014.

Purpose
To provide Council with an update on the development application, the results of the consultation undertaken to date, and to confirm Council direction for the next steps in the development application review process.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions
Council resolved the following at its July 22, 2013 regular meeting:

THAT Staff commence community consultation on the Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning for 752 Marine Drive consistent with the report from the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits dated July 17, 2013 titled "Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application No. 12-085 for 752 Marine Drive."

In discussion about the motion during the meeting, Council also emphasized the importance of a broad public consultation and the need for a comprehensive study of traffic issues in the vicinity.

1.2 History
Construction for the original shopping centre at Park Royal, which was owned by British Pacific Properties, broke ground in 1949 with the original North Mall. Through the 1960s the South Mall was added and the North Mall continued to expand. Construction at Park Royal slowed down through the 1970s until Larco Investments Ltd. purchased the mall from British Pacific Properties in 1989. From
1992 to 2004, Park Royal went through a variety of retail changes including the creation of some limited street front retail. In 2004, Park Royal opened Canada’s first ‘lifestyle centre’ – The Village at Park Royal.

Park Royal Shopping Centre is in the midst of a major redevelopment phase, which started in the summer of 2012. In June 2012 construction commenced on the new, at-grade intersection on Marine Drive, which replaced the west vehicle overpass and westerly pedestrian overpass. The intersection was the culmination of two years of planning and discussions between Park Royal and the District. The intersection, in conjunction with other work planned on site, was intended to improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, public transportation, first responders and vehicles. The at-grade intersection opened in mid-November 2012, as well as a second intersection within the shopping centre at the entrance to the Village Main Street between Home Depot and Extra Foods.

Major construction along Marine Drive for the South Mall’s retail village expansion is largely complete, though work continues on bringing the easternmost building to ‘lockup’ and completing miscellaneous landscaping. The expansion includes new retail space (with an estimated increase of 20 new retailers), parking structure reconstruction, and road works to address transportation flow issues through the shopping centre. The expansion also includes adding new parking areas, escalators and elevators to improve accessibility to and from Park Royal’s stores and services, with an estimated net gain of 300 parking stalls.

Council has recently or will be soon considering proposed changes to the North Mall including anchor store relocation (and associated changes to the principal facades and mall entrances), rooftop parking changes, and a renewal of the mall’s south-facing facade.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Plans

Official Community Plan (OCP)

The lands at Park Royal Shopping Centre are within the Development Permit Area BF – C7, which recognizes the role of Park Royal Shopping Centre as the eastern ‘gateway’ to West Vancouver. The objectives of this Development Permit Area are to:

- enhance the gateway role,
- promote a high quality of building design and landscaping, and
- screen parking from Marine Drive.

The Development Permit Guidelines and Objectives BF – C7 do not speak to residential land uses.
In Framework for Action – Achieve a Compact Metropolitan Region, the OCP states that “this Community Plan supports development of Park Royal in a manner that could help lessen the growth of traffic on the Lions Gate Bridge by encouraging land uses that provide office employment on the North Shore or which generate off-peak traffic flows”.

Policy LE 1 – Local Economy (plan for hierarchy of commercial areas that serve a variety of roles in the community) “support[s] development that enhances Park Royal’s gateway location and minimizes generation of increased peak hour traffic”, and “encourage[s] the provision of commercial entertainment facilities at Park Royal”.

Policy LE 3 – Local Economy, states “Encourage mixed commercial and residential redevelopment projects in commercial centres where consistent with ongoing commercial activity.” Note that this is a general policy and not Park Royal specific.

Policy H5 – Housing in Commercial Areas, encourages “mixed commercial and residential developments in the Ambleside, Dundarave and Horseshoe Bay commercial centres, and consider mixed uses in local commercial areas”. Note that Park Royal is not a local commercial area (it is more regional-serving).

Policy BF – C2 – Built Form and Neighbourhood Character, Commercial Areas Policies and Designations (support the commercial centers by encouraging residential uses), says to “encourage mixed commercial/residential development within commercial areas while retaining commercial frontage at street level where appropriate”.

It is important to note that while the OCP talks about mixed use development in general at Park Royal, the emphasis is on office employment, development which generates off-peak traffic flows, and commercial entertainment facilities. It does not presently contemplate a significant residential presence at Park Royal (though relatively large clusters of residences exist at both the West Royal and Park Royal Towers complexes).

2.2 Bylaws

The majority of the proposed development would be located on lands under the jurisdiction of the District of West Vancouver (the aboveground structures as well as the underground parking), and partially of the Squamish Nation (plaza/common space and the access ramp to the underground parking).

Zoning Bylaw

The lands are presently zoned C1 – Commercial Zone 1, which permits commercial development with residential dwellings above. While the C1 zone does not have a specified limit on FAR or floor area, instead regulating development by the overlapping effect of site coverage, height, building setbacks, and so forth, it is estimated that the current site could accommodate approximately 6,875 square metres (74,000 square feet) of developable floor area if two levels of underground parking were provided. The viability of this
‘base case’ scenario remains under study and it is subject to change. Any proposal by the landowner for development of 752 Marine Drive, in whatever form it ultimately takes, would almost certainly propose development beyond the existing zoning, therefore necessitating consideration of a rezoning.

2.3 Policies

Public Amenity Contribution Policy

In December 2007 Council adopted the Public Amenity Contribution Policy that established a framework for the consideration of community benefits and public amenities. The Policy differentiates between normal community benefits arising from the development (e.g. more diverse housing choice in the community) and public amenities that go over and above (e.g. contribution to District capital reserve funds for significant projects such as fire halls or new, expanded, or renovated community centres), and also describes a number of possible legal instruments for securing amenities. While it is District practice to receive 75% of the estimated ‘lift’ in land value for rezoned land, this guideline is not specifically expressed in the Policy and does vary from community to community.

The provincial government has recently released some non-regulatory guidance on Community Amenity Contributions (CACs) and staff expect to review the Policy and recommend reforms and improvements within approximately the next 18 months. In the interim, the present Policy provides a satisfactory framework for consideration of CACs within the District of West Vancouver.

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

The Site

The site is bounded to the north by Marine Drive, to the east by Taylor Way, to the south by Park Royal South, and to the west by the Park Royal East Village expansion (now well advanced in construction). The site is 9,440 square metres (101,613 square feet) in area, generally level, and is triangular in shape. The site formerly hosted the White Spot restaurant which is now operating at its new location within the Park Royal East Village expansion. The site contains a vacant, one-storey concrete building, surface parking, a large Park Royal Shopping Centre sign with flags, and very minimal landscaping.

The Proposal

A mixed use development is proposed by the landowner, consisting of two residential high-rises above a retail/office podium structure and underground parking. At this time the applicant has not applied for a Development Permit, opting instead to first pursue clarity on their proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw prior to committing the resources necessary to produce detailed design drawings.
The applicant team has produced several development schemes of varying height and density at the request of the Design Review Committee (see section 3.3 of this report), but their preferred scenario is as follows:

- two residential high-rises of 17- and 24-storeys above a two-storey podium structure with retail space and residential and office lobbies on the ground floor, with office space on the second floor;
- access to the underground parking via the Park Royal South ‘Main Street’ on FN lands, with a potential alternate access to Taylor Way;
- inclusion and covenanning of the leased, triangular FN lands immediately south of the site as a mix of small-scale retail and open space for the duration of Park Royal’s lease (approximately 90 years); and,
- 270 residential units over approximately 23,720 square metres (255,000 square feet), 2,400 square metres (26,000 square feet) of retail space, and 1,650 square metres (18,000 square feet) of office space.

3.2 Process Update and Consultation Summary Report

In July 2013 Council directed that staff commence community consultation on the proposed redevelopment. The attached consultation summary report (Appendix B) describes the public consultation undertaken to date by the District, including but not limited to:

- a series of open houses;
- website content and westvancouverITE online engagement (the first project to take advantage of this new District engagement tool);
- a virtual open house posted on the District website for review at the viewers’ chosen place and time (District staff and the applicant team presented information in brief videos, with the intent to have the videos recreate the content that is typically shared at a public open house);
- the Park Royal information storefront;
- atrium displays in the West Vancouver Community Centre; and,
- early consideration at the Design Review Committee.

Public comments received about the proposed redevelopment were broadly categorized as either supportive, mixed, or unsupportive. Generally 40-50% of the comments were considered to be supportive and 15-20% were considered to be unsupportive. Remaining comments were mixed and spoke to a variety of themes, including statements possibly indicating conditional support (e.g. “If you forget about the traffic congestion at Taylor & Marine I like the project”).

The public’s comments were general and did not provide guidance on design issues, such as specific building heights and uses. Much of the comments focussed on traffic.

For details on the consultation efforts and comments received refer to the full report attached as Appendix D.
3.3 Design Review Committee

The proposed redevelopment has now appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) on three occasions in March, May, and June 2014. At this time, the application is for amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaw that would provide a policy framework for land use and density on the site, with a Development Permit to follow at a later date.

March 13, 2014

At the first appearance before the DRC the applicant team presented their proposal for two residential towers on the site along with a limited range of other uses such as small-format retail (e.g. coffee shop), a bike valet, a day care, and housing units for the Vancouver Resource Society.

Committee members provided comment on the preliminary application but did not provide a formal resolution (as the project was at an early stage). A general summary of Committee member comments are included here for convenience:

- No discomfort with residential land use or this level of density at this location, but need to more closely examine massing and built form options.
- Would like to see the built form studies that were referenced by the architect to see the rationale for the current design and the evolution of thinking on built form and massing over time.
- Not an overly desirable location for low-rise residential due to the traffic, noise, and air quality impact of the Taylor Way & Marine Drive intersection.
- Proposed tower heights don’t seem to have a direct impact on anyone in particular based on context provided, but they have also not been justified from an urban design or built form perspective other than the desire to ‘land’ two towers.
- Need office space and opportunities for people to live and work in West Vancouver to help with bridge traffic long term.
- Concern about programming and success of the proposed village square.
- Not an integrated proposal on the ground with respect to pedestrian, retail, or residential experience.
- Project should more adequately address sustainability goals.

May 22, 2014

The proposal appeared before the DRC for a second time in May 2014 in order for staff and the applicant to receive feedback on supplementary massing and land use programming options that were developed by the applicant team at the request of the Committee. The concept recommended by the applicant team had the following highlights:

- Purported to be a more urban response that better addresses the site and context.
• Extension of retail along Marine Drive and throughout the ground floor of the site (approx. 23,000 sq ft; was previously approx. 6,000 sq ft).
• Division of podium into two masses (no bridging).
• Addition of an entire podium floor of office (approx. 15,000 sq ft).
• Village Common space re-shaped, made more urban and hard surfaced.
• Underground parking ramp incorporated into a building (had been previously an outdoor down ramp grouped with the daycare drop-off area).
• Shifting of height to increase the difference in height between the two buildings – the easternmost building has become somewhat taller (26 storeys), while the westernmost building has become somewhat more slab-like in appearance (though at 17 storeys too tall to be considered mid-rise).

The Committee passed the following resolution:

THAT the Design Review Committee has reviewed the Residences at Park Royal and recommends RESUBMISSION that addresses the following:
• submit alternate massing studies to look at options including low and mid rise configurations; and,
• massing studies should consider FAR 1.0, 2.0, and the current proposal [3.0].

June 19, 2014

The appeared before the DRC for a third time in June 2014 in order for the applicant team to present additional massing and land use programming options that were developed at the request of the Committee. The Committee requested that the applicant provide FAR and massing options other than high-rise (for example, low- and mid-rise) in order to better understand the rationale for the current design.

The drawing booklet submitted to the DRC by the applicant team illustrated three massing and land use programming options, as follows:
• Scheme 1: low-rise, two storeys of retail, two levels of underground parking, 74,000 square feet, 1.22 FAR;
• Scheme 2: mid-rise, one storey retail podium with five storeys of residential setback above, two levels of underground parking, 120,000 square feet, 1.96 FAR; and,
• Scheme 3: high-rise, two storey retail/office podium with two residential towers (17 and 24 storeys), four levels of underground parking, 305,000 square feet, 2.99 FAR.

At the meeting the applicant team also presented a ‘hybrid’ scheme with a single, taller tower and attached, terraced mid-rise, as well as a variation in tower heights for the two tower scheme.
The Committee passed the following resolutions:

\textit{THAT the Design Review Committee has reviewed "The Residences at Park Royal" (752 Marine Drive) and recommends that high-rise tower form and/or mid-rise massing be supported, and further recommends resubmission that addresses the following:}

- an FAR between 2.0 and 2.5 (across the whole site including the triangular portion of FN lands to the south);
- assurance of vehicle access from the south, with optional secondary (right in/right out) access via Taylor Way;
- orientation to Marine Drive and to Taylor Way;
- architecture should reflect importance of gateway site, and be iconic in nature.

\textit{THAT the next presentation to the Design Review Committee regarding "The Residences at Park Royal" (752 Marine Drive) include the existing urban context for 300 m in all directions.}

Staff note that Committee members discussed the proposal, its merits, and the drafting of a possible resolution at length, and that the resolution did not pass unanimously (two opposed). In addition, elements of the resolution are nuanced and do not reflect the full discussion behind the Committee’s thinking.

For example, the request for an FAR of between 2.0 and 2.5 reflects a general consensus on the part of the Committee that the proposal felt somewhat too bulky for the site, and not that the solution is necessarily any particular FAR, be it 2.3, 2.5, or 2.7. The resolution as it was being drafted in the meeting requested an FAR of between 2.0 and 3.0 but, at the request of a Council liaison for more clarity, was reduced to an FAR between 2.0 and 2.5 and voted on without any real discussion by the members. Staff suggest that the intent of the DRC was not to strictly limit FAR to a maximum of 2.5, but rather to indicate that the applicant team should explore the Committee’s recommended form and massing (high-rise and/or mid-rise) but with alternative densities, with the goal of reducing overall bulk and achieving a scheme fit to the site. In discussion, it was very clear that the members were not comfortable with or have enough information to settle upon a specific FAR number.

\textbf{Staff analysis of Design Review Committee sentiment}

It is relatively uncommon for Council to direct staff to commence consultation on a proposed redevelopment absent detailed Development Permit-level design, and it has proven difficult for the DRC to feel comfortable providing comment on broader ‘planning level’ issues based upon the information provided. However, even initial feedback from the Committee has already served to improve the proposal markedly (e.g. greater diversity of land uses, improved site planning and ground plane).
Staff understand that the Committee unanimously agrees that the site:

- is important and acts as a visible gateway to West Vancouver;
- is an appropriate location for additional density given its proximity to commercial services and the most frequent and highest capacity transit service in West Vancouver;
- demands mixed use, of which office and residential are critical parts; and,
- could conceivably be appropriate for high-rise massing, but that the applicant team has not made a strong case for this beyond the presence of the West Royal towers across the street.

Furthermore, staff understand that in general the Committee agrees (though not unanimously) that:

- high-rise and/or mid-rise massing is a natural and reasonable outcome for the site given it’s context and location, notwithstanding the lack of specific supporting rationale from the applicant team;
- that a low-rise residential scheme would have considerable quality of life and saleability issues due to the localized impacts of traffic, noise, and air quality;
- that a low-rise commercial scheme is a wasteful use of the site; and,
- that the vision for this site (mixed use and with additional density) should not be overridden by nearby traffic conditions that are in essence generated in aggregate by the entire north shore (the applicant team had initially avoided proposing retail and office space because these generate more trips than residential, and would have a larger traffic impact).

3.4 Preliminary Staff Analysis

Land use, form, and massing

While work remains with respect to the exploration of appropriate form and massing on the site (as well as the eventual production of detailed Development Permit drawings by the applicant team), the public consultation to date along with the DRC’s review provides staff with a clearer framework on which to evaluate the proposal.

The location is prominent and central, close to and integrated with existing commercial services, and indisputably enjoys the most frequent and highest capacity transit service within the District. In addition, the site is near to the Spirit Trail, the sea walk, and Ambleside Park and related recreation facilities.

While not specific to Park Royal, the OCP broadly encourages mixed commercial/residential development within commercial areas. The benefits of mixed use are numerous and can include, but are not limited to, wider housing choice for residents, walkable and convenient neighbourhoods, economic development for local businesses, the efficient use of existing municipal and private infrastructure, and more activity through the day and evening.
Furthermore, the OCP specifically supports development of Park Royal in a manner that could help lessen the growth of traffic on the Lions Gate Bridge by encouraging land uses that provide office employment on the north shore. Staff have been told by the applicant that the present proposal for office space is relatively conservative and could likely be leased quickly, and staff believe that it is fairly likely that additional office space, perhaps double what is now proposed, can be achieved on site without hardship. Providing residents and businesses the choice to operate within West Vancouver is a long term goal – certainly no dramatic transformation is expected overnight – that could help to lessen traffic pressures across Burrard Inlet.

With respect to building form and land use, staff believes that using the site for status quo low-rise commercial development would be an inefficient and wasteful use of the land given its context. One can also easily imagine that low-rise residential in the vicinity of Taylor Way & Marine Drive, certainly the busiest intersection in West Vancouver, would be challenged on a liveability basis. It is not difficult, then, to arrive at the idea of high-density, mid- or high-rise development potentially being appropriate for the site (pending study of view corridors, shadowing, etc). It is also worth noting that a benefit of a higher-density project would be the inclusion and covenantee of the leased, triangular FN lands immediately south of the site as a mix of small-scale retail and open space for the duration of Park Royal’s lease (approximately 90 years).

While this situation is somewhat unique because the initial direction from Council was to consult the public on the general vision for the site without the (normally) associated Development Permit-level drawings, staff believes that with the direction received to date from the DRC and the public, the applicant should now be able to proceed with detailed Development Permit-level drawings.

Transportation

During the initial public consultation for this proposal (which staff believes was above and beyond what has been done in the past for other applications), the public had difficulty providing comment other than expressing concerns about traffic in the area. Council at its July 22, 2013 meeting expressed a desire to further address the regional traffic issues affecting this area as part of its consideration of this proposal.

Recently completed traffic-related improvements include:

- Construction of a bus priority lane on Marine Drive adjacent to Park Royal;
- Construction of a bus priority lane on Marine Drive in North Vancouver west to the Lions Gate Bridge cloverleaf;
- Installation of a bus priority signal at Marine Drive and Taylor Way;
- Construction of a queue jumper lane for buses from West Vancouver on the approach to the Lions Gate Bridge;
- Increased bus service on Marine Drive to Vancouver as a result of converting the 251 and 252 bus routes to community shuttles; and,
• More responsive operation of the counter-flow lane on the Lions Gate Bridge.

District engineering staff are working with MoTI and Park Royal's consultants to consider further improvements, including:

• Signal timing adjustments to discourage intersection blocking behaviour;
• Additional signage to warn motorists not to block the intersection;
• Improved messaging to motorists on the Upper Levels Highway; and,
• Manned traffic control of the intersection during peak hours.

Finally, District staff are monitoring the progress of potential long term solutions:

• Reducing the traffic congestion at the Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersection by pursuing a Low Level Road connection to bypass the Lions Gate bridgehead for east-west traffic movements; and,
• Increasing the people carrying capacity from the North Shore over the Lions Gate Bridge to Vancouver by providing more efficient transit service.

3.5 Draft Policy Statement for the Official Community Plan

Based on public comment and Design Review Committee feedback received to date, significant progress has been made in refining what the OCP should speak to for this site in particular as well as for the balance of the Park Royal lands that are under the jurisdiction of the District of West Vancouver. In addition, staff have identified opportunities to better apply existing District-wide OCP policy to the site (e.g. statements encouraging housing diversity, concentrating growth near transit, encouraging new residential to be located near commercial development or as mixed use projects, etc).

A general framework for an OCP amendment addressing this site and the Park Royal area as a whole could evolve from some simple principles, such as:

• higher density;
• mixed use development including residential, commercial, and office;
• building form and massing of mid- or high-rise; and,
• integration and coordination of land use, character, and form of development across jurisdictional boundaries.

Attached as Appendix E is a report describing potential direction for a policy statement for the site. Staff will use this report and feedback received from the DRC and the public as the basis for developing a draft OCP amendment for the Park Royal area.
3.6 Next Steps

The District has a standard procedure for the review of and consultation on development applications; this application initially proceeded somewhat differently due to it not being a fully detailed proposal. Once the applicant team has suitably refined the land use and massing proposal and produced Development Permit-level drawings, the application can run through the standard process as summarized below and illustrated in Appendix C.

Staff recommend next steps generally consistent with the following:

- Refinement of the general land use and massing proposal by the applicant team based on feedback from staff, the Design Review Committee, and public comment.
- Presentation of the refined land use and massing proposal to the Design Review Committee for their review.
- Production of Development Permit-level drawings by the applicant team.
- Public consultation on the proposed Official Community Plan amendment and the Development Permit-level drawings.
- A report back to Council describing progress on the above and with a staff recommendation to proceed (or not) with the preparation of applicable bylaws and permits.
- Bylaw preparation, public information meeting(s), and bylaw consideration, all consistent with the standard review process.

3.7 Sustainability

The District considers environmental, social, and economic factors when discussing sustainability. Staff will be better positioned to assess the sustainable aspects of the proposal as it advances further and becomes more detailed.

4.0 Options

(as recommended by staff)

A. Advance Development Application No. 12-085 forward in the development consideration process and endorse the next steps for consideration;

(or, alternatively)

B. Provide different or modified direction (to be specified) and/or request additional information (to be specified); or,

C. Reject the application.

Author: Andrew Browne
Appendices:

A. Context and site map
B. Application timeline
C. Process chart
D. "Consultation Summary, 752 Marine Drive (Former White Spot Site)" prepared by Cameron Chalmers Consulting Inc. and dated June 2014
E. "Policy Statement, 752 Marine Drive (Former White Spot Site)" prepared by Cameron Chalmers Consulting Inc. and dated June 2014
## APPENDIX B – Application timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Dec 14</td>
<td>Initial application received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Feb 15</td>
<td>Revised application received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Apr - Jun</td>
<td>Landowner undertook community engagement process including stakeholder and neighbour meetings and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Jul 22</td>
<td>Council received an introductory staff report and directed that staff commence public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Sep 26/28</td>
<td>First District-led open house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Oct 21</td>
<td>westvancouverITE online engagement tool activated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Dec 13</td>
<td>westvancouverITE online engagement tool closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Jan/Feb</td>
<td>Displays and staff in the West Vancouver Community Centre atrium over approximately 3½ days in late January and early February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Feb 13</td>
<td>Second District-led open house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Mar 13</td>
<td>First appearance at the DRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 May 22</td>
<td>Second appearance at the DRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Jun 19</td>
<td>Third appearance at the DRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Jul 7</td>
<td>Council received a status update on the proposal and provided direction for next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C – Process chart

Application submitted. (Dec 2012/Feb 2013)

Staff review.

Council directed commencement of public consultation. (Jul 2013)

Public Consultation, DRC, etc. (Sep 2013 – Jun 2014)

Status update and endorsement of next steps by Council. (Jul 2014)

Applicant refines proposal and submits to District for staff review.

Staff review refinements for suitability and suggest changes as necessary. Once appropriate, the applicant presents the refined proposal to the DRC.

Applicant produces Development Permit-level drawings.

Public consultation on the proposed OCP amendment and the Development Permit-level drawings.

Council receives report describing progress and with staff recommendation to proceed (or not) with the preparation of applicable bylaws and permits.

Bylaw preparation, public information meeting(s), and bylaw consideration, all consistent with the standard review process.
Consultation Summary

Prepared for the District of West Vancouver

Prepared by: Cameron Chalmers Consulting Inc.

June 2014
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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to describe the community consultation undertaken by the District of West Vancouver in response to an application for redevelopment at 752 Marine Drive. It addresses both the processes undertaken and provides a summary of the results. It is intended as a companion to the Policy Statement being prepared to identify future policy directions for the lands at Park Royal.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Introduction

On July 22, 2013, Council of the District of West Vancouver endorsed a District-led community engagement process to review the Official Community Plan policy that applies to the land at 752 Marine Drive on the south-west corner of the Marine Drive/Taylor Way intersection.

The consultation process was initiated in response to an application to redevelop the former White Spot restaurant site into a mixed-use development consisting of two residential towers of 19 and 26 storeys in height housing approximately 289 units. The application proposes the towers will sit atop a five-storey base element consisting of 18,575 square feet of institutional, retail, and other space. The application also identifies several open space and public realm elements.

The application is a departure from the current OCP policy and zoning regulations that would apply to the relatively small parcel under consideration, which is the primary reason for the District led consultation program as a precursor to consideration of the OCP amendment application and rezoning.

The application includes an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP), which considers the land a shopping centre and does not provide for the mix of residential, institutional, and commercial uses applied for. The current zoning of the site does, however, allow for a limited amount of residential space, though not at the levels suggested by this proposal. As such, the District engaged in a more fulsome community discussion about this community gateway and the proposal to transition the Park Royal shopping centre into more mixed community to inform any community dialogue about future OCP amendments.
1.2.2 Previous Consultation and Correspondence

This document summarizes the consultation efforts undertaken by the District of West Vancouver since the July 22, 2013 Council direction. However, before the District led engagement, the Owner undertook a community engagement process between April and June 2013. The Owner’s consultation included a number of stakeholder and neighbour meetings, a community presentation and also a presentation centre in Park Royal mall where people could view a model of the proposal and learn about the application.

The Owner reports that over 4,400 people visited the presentation centre and 216 comment cards were submitted. Though part of the background and context to the current process, the Owner’s consultation efforts do not form part of this report. The Owner’s consultation summary will be made available under separate cover at www.parkroyalconnected.com.

Similarly, the Owner’s consultation efforts generated correspondence directly to Council that has been received and will be considered separately from this report. For reference all letters received by Council have been appended to this report for information, but as correspondence to Council have not been analyzed. The reader is encouraged to read those submissions as companion to this report.
2 Consultation Approach

The consultation process for 752 Marine Drive is framed in a unique jurisdictional context that has largely driven the consultation program. The land at 752 Marine Drive is the only land within the jurisdiction of the District of West Vancouver at Park Royal South. The remaining lands are within the jurisdiction of Squamish Nation, and as such have not historically been subject to District of West Vancouver led planning and consultation efforts.

The mixed-jurisdiction also drove a collaborative approach with the Owner because the immediate context for considering the application is not regulated by the District. Accordingly, the Owner was invited to share their vision for Park Royal as a whole and some of the surrounding lands to provide context for consideration in the land use discussion for 752 Marine Drive. This context area is considered vital in understanding future land use options at 752 Marine Drive.

It was also apparent from the outset that traffic and transportation concerns would be a primary consideration in the consultation program, and specifically the existing peak-period traffic congestion at the intersection of Taylor Way and Marine Drive. This intersection forms part of the provincial highway system, and is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. The multi-jurisdictional nature of the roadway system is also an important consideration and driver of the consultation approach.

Given the unique jurisdiction, a primary object of the consultation was to ensure the community was well aware of the proposed development and land use on the site,
and to provide information to the public about the jurisdictional considerations and limitations that frame the land use discussion. In short, the general approach of the early part of the process was to get information out into the community about the proposal, the multi-jurisdictional context, and the District-led process.

The second objective was invite community feedback on a range of topics including transportation, land use, the perception of the site as a gateway to West Vancouver, density, building and site design and other topics. As described in subsequent sections, a comment form was made available to the public to solicit comments on the topics relevant for consideration at the OCP review level. It is important to note, that in terms of process, additional public input, getting progressively more detailed about the application is anticipated should and OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments proceed through their own process.

In initiating this process, Council also directed that the process search out innovative ways to approach and engage the public, and several attempts have been made to enrich the engagement with the community, and these and other consultation steps are outlined below.

2.1 Community Information Meeting

The first round of open houses included two open houses, one on the evening of Thursday September 26, 2013, and the other in the morning of Saturday, September 28, 2013.

The open houses were a flow-through open house style where District representatives Staffed presentation boards about the process, the nature of the application, and the jurisdictional context affecting the development of 752 Marine Drive. The Owner had consultants staffing presentation boards regarding architecture, landscape architecture, transportation and the Park Royal context area. Residents were given an opportunity ask questions of District representatives and the Owner, view a model of the proposal, and were provided comment forms to record their comments, questions, and concerns.

Over the course of the two sessions, 76 individuals registered as attendees and there were also several individuals who attended but did not sign in.

2.2 Website

As part of the ongoing effort to make information available to the community, a project website was developed containing the application information as well as the Council reports directing the community consultation. Through that website
interested residents were able to learn more about the application and the supporting information.

The website has since been migrated into the new westvancouverITE community engagement tool.

### 2.3 westvancouverITE Online Engagement

Midway through the consultation process, the District launched the westvancouverITE online community engagement tool and the 752 Marine Drive consultation was the first District initiative to utilize the tool.

All of the application information was available through westvancouverITE, the virtual open house videos described below were posted, and residents were given an opportunity to provide comment directly through the online engagement tool, responding to the same questions as the District’s comment form.

The tool was activated October 21, 2013 and remained open until December 13, 2013. In that time, 262 registered users visited the site, resulting in 23 completed comment forms.

### 2.4 Virtual Open House

One of the innovative engagement techniques introduced as part of this consultation process was the “virtual open house”. District Staff and representatives, as well as the Owner’s and their consultants presented information in brief videos about the application and the District led process. The intent was to have the presentations mimic the type and content of material that would customarily be shared at a public open house. The six videos are as follows:

1. **Introduction and Welcome** by Bob Sokol, Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits, District of West Vancouver;
2. **Public Consultation Process** by Cameron Chalmers, Principal of Cameron Chalmers Consulting Inc., Consultant to the District of West Vancouver;
3. **Architecture** by Norm Hotson, Dialog, Applicant’s Architect;
4. **Landscape Architecture** by Mark Vaughn, Vaughn Landscape Architecture, Applicant’s Landscape Architect;
5. **Community Partnerships and Development** by Rick Amantea, Park Royal, Owner’s Representative
6. **Traffic Engineering** by Jane Farquharson, Bunt and Associates, Applicant’s Transportation Engineer
The intent of these video vignettes was to provide information to interested residents, and then provide them an opportunity to comment using the established comment form. The videos were viewed an average of 49 times, with the introduction video receiving the most views at 78.

2.5 Park Royal Storefront

Another attempt to extend engagement out to the community was the opening of the storefront presentation centre by the Owner. The Owner offered the District an opportunity to display materials and offered to provide online access to the District’s westvancouverITE online tool. The storefront was open for two consecutive weekends in November.

The objective of the storefront was to drive traffic to westvancouverITE and to promote additional consultation and responses to the District’s comment form.

2.6 Recreation Centre Atrium Display

In an effort to broaden community participation, a series of presentation panels were displayed in the atrium of the West Vancouver Recreation Centre over three ½ days in late January and early February 2014. The panels were staffed by the District’s consultant who was available to answer questions and direct residents to the westvancouverITE tool and the upcoming open house.

Over the course of three days, over 150 residents engaged in reviewing the presentation boards and/or engaging in discussion with the District’s consultant.

2.7 Second Open House

A second community information meeting was held February 13, 2014. Approximately 13 individuals attended. Attendees had an opportunity to view presentation boards and ask questions, followed by a presentation by the District’s consultant and a question and answer period. Participants were given the opportunity to complete comment forms, and were directed to the westvancouverITE online engagement tool.

2.8 Design Review Committee Consideration

The consultation process to date, and the high level land use considerations of the application were presented to the Design Review Committee on March 13, 2014. Though the DRC generally deals with detailed development permit matters, it presented an opportunity to utilize another District resource to gather input into the land use and other matters raised throughout the process. More specifically, the DRC
was asked to address a series of questions, which delved into the primary items that had been considered by the community to date.

### 2.9 Comment Forms

Attendees of the community information meeting and participants of westvancouverITE were also provided a comment form to give an opportunity to provide comments on the application proposal.

The intent of the comment form was to ensure that comments were directed to the most substantive parts of the application, and matters anticipated as part of the future OCP land use discussions. Specifically, the comment forms directed comment on the following considerations:

i. Thoughts on this location and proposed development as a gateway to West Vancouver;

ii. Thoughts on proposed land use and density;

iii. Thoughts on proposed building layout and massing;

iv. Thoughts on transportation and traffic;

v. Thoughts on the transition of Park Royal from a regional shopping centre to a mixed-use neighbourhood, including the notion of introducing residential rather than commercial development at 752 Marine Drive;

vi. Thoughts on open space and public realm space proposed; and

vii. Any other matters.

The comment forms was self-selected and in total 49 forms were received at the meetings or by email, while 39 were filled out directly on westvancouverITE for a total of 88 completed comment forms. To ensure individuals were afforded an opportunity to comment without concern, individual comments have not been linked to identities of any respondents – even those who elected to include their name on their form. The verbatim comments received are included in the Appendix.
3 Comment Summary

The following is a brief summary of the comments received and the themes that emerged from the comment forms submitted. The intent is not to provide a detailed statistical analysis, but rather to identify themes and trends in the comments that may frame future land use and policy considerations and directions.

Each individual comment form was entered into a spreadsheet. The comments for each question were grouped into three broad categories for the purpose of determining themes and trends. The intent is that the themes and trends identified in the comments will not only identify the relative levels of support or opposition to the project, but will also identify areas of importance for consideration in the development of OCP policy. The categories can be broadly classed as follows:

- **Supportive Comments**: These were comments that were generally unqualified statements of support of the question being responded to.
- **Mixed Comments**: These included comments of support or opposition that were qualified. For example a comment that “I would support if . . .”, or “I am opposed until . . .” would be considered a mixed comment. These also included statements, suggestions, ideas, or other responses that did not indicate clear opposition or support. The mixed comments are generally indicative of the policy issues and themes.
- **Unsupportive Comments**: These were comments that were generally unqualified statements of opposition to the question being responded to.

As an open-ended questionnaire, the coding and interpretation is subjective and is not suited for detailed statistical analysis. However, it can draw out general themes around the relative support or opposition in each topic area in the comment form. The themes and trends are identified in the following sections are intended to provide a broad understanding of the types and nature of the comments received. The verbatim comments are included in the Appendix, and the reader is encouraged to review the comments for themselves.

3.1 General Findings

The majority of completed comment forms were from West Vancouver residents. Of the 71 respondents who provided a postal code, 68 of them were West Vancouver postal codes.

The comment form results are generally varied. In terms of relative levels of support, there is a supportive theme in the comments received as between 40%-50% of the responses were considered supportive. Support appears to be based on the notion of
increasing density in this location due to the existing amenities and services and support for the notion of transitioning the mall into a more complete neighbourhood.

That compares between 15%-20% were considered unsupportive. The unsupportive or oppositional comments are primarily related to concerns over the increase in traffic congestion issues at Taylor Way and Marine Drive, though several were general objections to the proposed transition to a mixed-use neighbourhood.

The remaining mixed comments of cautioned support whereby the proposal would be looked upon more favorably if certain concerns were addressed. These mixed comments were often characterized by conditional support of the project, but on the condition that traffic issues are addressed. An example would be the following responses: “If you forget about the traffic congestion at Taylor + Marine I like the project” or “It is an improvement over the White Spot if traffic issues are resolved”. The mixed comments also included suggestions or alternatives that did not clearly indicate support or opposition to the project. An example of these would include the following response: “density of towers needs to be cut to 2/3”.

Similarly, the DRC generally expressed support for consideration of the introduction of residential development; however there were significant concerns about the proposed commercial uses, built form and massing.

In summary, the comments received indicate a general willingness to consider an OCP amendment to transition 752 Marine Drive from a regional shopping centre to a more mixed-use area including residential development. However, it is very clear throughout that traffic and transportation issues are the primary concern expressed by respondents.

### 3.2 Specific Findings

#### 3.2.1 Dominant Theme: Traffic

Traffic is overwhelmingly the main issue that emerged through the first phase of consultation and the comment forms. The specific issue is traffic congestion at Marine Drive and Taylor Way, followed by access into and out of Park Royal and surrounding properties.

A clear theme through the comments is that the traffic concerns already exist. Many of the comments that referenced traffic did so in terms of the existing conditions, and the proposition of adding even an incremental increase of traffic from any development. In many ways, the proposal to amend land use policy at 752 Marine Drive has become a foil for discussing the larger transportation issues – to the extent
where some respondents commented only on traffic, or did not provide comment on any other question that did not refer back to traffic.

There was a theme in the supportive comments that acknowledged the traffic concerns, but further acknowledged the possibility of transportation alternatives such as buses, cycling and other non-vehicular modes of transportation as a mitigating factor for the additional proposed density.

A number of the comments also acknowledged the existing traffic concerns, but identified the issue as a regional transportation issue rather than only a District of West Vancouver issue or an issue directly attributable to land use at 752 Marine Drive.

### 3.2.2 Land Use and Density

The comment form questions concerning land-use, density, gateway, and the transition of Park Royal from a shopping centre to a mixed-use neighbourhood were largely consistent throughout the responses. There is a fair amount of outright support, and an additional base of support if the traffic and transportation issues are suitably addressed. The support was based on the proximity to transit, shops and services, and there are a number of references the mix of housing types that could be introduced.

As described, there was a general level of support at the DRC for exploring some transition to include residential development, however, they requested additional information related to the density. There was also comment that the site may be suited to some office or other employment use.

Traffic issues aside, there were only a few comments that fundamentally objected to the proposed land use and transition of 752 Marine Drive to a mixed-use area. Those that were fundamentally opposed cited over densification and community character as the primary reasons.

As for the gateway, there is a theme questioning whether 752 Marine Drive is, or ought to be, the gateway to West Vancouver, particularly in light of recent development approvals on Marine Drive at 13th Street.

### 3.2.3 Built Form and Site Layout

The questions about the built form, heights, massing and open space were also generally consistent in the responses and followed a similar pattern to the comments about land use.

Generally supportive comments were submitted from slightly less than one-half of the respondents. Most supportive comments did not however tend to elaborate on why it
was supportable in relation to building height and massing. Those that did referenced consistency with adjacent towers as a supporting rationale.

With respect to open space there was a number of very supportive comments about introducing some quality urban outdoor space to Park Royal. Of all of the questions, the open space question was the most favorably received. Even several respondents who expressed concerns or opposition to the project acknowledged the potential benefit of the open space concept.

The unsupportive comments about the built form and massing are that the buildings proposed by the Owner are “too large”, or “too tall”. There was a minor theme that the layout and site planning is more acceptable than the tower heights.

The DRC expressed some concerns about the site layout, proposed tower form, as well as the scale of the base element. There were additional comments about the need for better integration between the residences, the open space, and the retail experience.

Compared to the land use questions, there was slightly less of a correlation between the building form and transportation, but there was a tendency for those concerned with traffic to cite excessive size as a reason to not support. The unsupportive comments about the open space were generally skepticism about whether the space would succeed.
4 Policy Implications

The intent of the comment form was to begin to deduce and distill matters of policy consideration for the next phase of the process. In this particular instance traffic has emerged as the predominant policy matter; however the comment forms do indicate several other areas for continued policy discussion.

4.1 Traffic

The policy challenge with the traffic issue is that the solutions for Marine Drive and Taylor way are outside of the direct control of the District of West Vancouver; however it is, and will continue to be the largest concern facing any OCP level amendment that considers a policy change at 752 Marine Drive. It is also clear that the policy response is not solely in response to proposed development at this site, but is the result of the existing traffic and transportation condition that has been ongoing for some time.

The fundamental policy question is whether or not there should be any contemplation of land use change at 752 Marine Drive in the context of the existing transportation challenges.

It is likely a two-stage policy response is required. The first will be to address the larger, multi-jurisdictional transportation issue that currently exists. This policy response is much larger than one development application, and will necessitate a much longer-term horizon. There will also likely be many facets to future solutions that are outside the control of the District.

The second stage policy response is to determine how land use changes at 752 Marine Drive are addressed in policy in the context of the existing traffic condition. Any level of development at that site will generate traffic, so a deeper understanding of how the incremental increase generated by any type of development will be necessary to frame additional traffic consideration.

Should the District take the position that land use changes will at 752 Marine Drive will only be considered after a solution is found, it raises a fundamental and much larger policy question about the breadth of that approach to other potential development lands in the District. The traffic issues extend beyond this particular site, and beyond the jurisdiction of the District of West Vancouver.

As such, the policy response consideration of how broadly the limitation on development should extend would likely trigger some level of policy review, and would need to take into account current development entitlements at 752 Marine Drive and other lands within the District.
Should the District choose to proceed with land use amendments at 752, it will also trigger a number of policy directions that ought to be considered. Some of those policy challenges would be as follows:

- Ensure alternate means of transportation are required by policy.
- Establish a reasonable level of parking that promotes alternatives to the automobile and reflects the location of 752 at a transit hub and adjacent to shops and services.
- Establish strategies for developing short, medium, and long-term transportation solutions with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure and other local governments.
- Determine the extent to which the Owner of 752 Marine Drive will be expected to participate in short, medium, and long-term solutions.
- Ensure the proposed uses are complementary to other uses already in the area and serve to distribute traffic out over a longer period rather than accentuate the current traffic peaks.

### 4.2 Land Use and Density

In general, the comment forms submitted would tend to support further consideration of an OCP amendment to introduce a residential component to 752 Marine Drive, particularly if traffic issues can be improved upon. As mentioned, the question that drew the most favorable responses was the question about the transition of these lands from a regional shopping centre to a more mixed-use community.

Though there is a theme of support, for the transition and for increased density, there is still question about how that density should be allocated on that site, and particularly in the context of the surrounding lands inside and outside the District. While there was limited public comment on land use and density, and a resolution did not emerge through the initial process, the District’s Design Review Committee should be able to provide comment on appropriate land uses and density at the site. Also, a policy response to ensure future development proceeds in a manner that reflects the more supportable aspects of the proposal will need to be refined.

Connections and supporting infrastructure that supports a sustainable mixed-use community will also be required to ensure the policy reflects the vision of a mixed-use community. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, reasonable parking standards, appropriate retail and service will be land use considerations that need will likely emerge as policy matters.
Specifically there is a question about the extent to which this site and the intersection forms a gateway into West Vancouver, and how it may relate to other gateway progressions along Marine Drive, and consideration of this gateway in the context of other important nodes and edges in the community will be a topic of policy deliberation.

### 4.3 Building Form and Massing

Similar to density, there does appear to be support for considering significant building development, including some level of support for the tower form and mass comparable to that contained in the application based on the comment card feedback. However, the support for tower form is questioned more than the notion of density. This raises the question of whether the tower form is the most desirable means to achieve the increased density. There will be a need for policy direction to ensure the reasons for support are reflected in the policy and also to minimize the impacts and concerns reflected in the comments. The Design Review Committee should be able to provide guidance and direction on questions related to appropriate building form and massing.

As for building form, the policy discussion will likely involve a more robust examination of the design rationale for towers similar to those proposed in the application and reflect the character of West Vancouver. Specifically, how a tower form should relate to the existing development at Park Royal and in the area should be a policy topic. Conversely, the site location and surrounding development would have to be taken into consideration of alternate forms of achieving density on the site. The overall building footprint, open space, view corridors, gateway and landmark considerations will have to inform the discussion of the tower form.

There will also need to be some consideration for design guidelines to ensure the policy will result in development that is consistent with the reasons for support, which were largely to accommodate the density in a manner that has landmark potential for the District. These matters will need to be considered through more detailed examination as part of the bylaw and development permit process.

Similarly, policy to ensure a vibrant, well-designed and active outdoor public realm will likely emerge in the next phases of consultation and land use discussion. This will entail design issues, and supporting land uses to promote successful urban outdoor space.
5 Policy Questions and Directions

5.1 Policy Questions

Flowing from the community consultation, there are a series of fundamental cascading questions that have been and will continue to be considered in determining the most appropriate response to the development applications and the approach towards future development at 752 Marine Drive.

1. What role does 752 Marine Drive play for the broader community? Is it a location that ought to be considered for the introduction of residential development?
   a. Is it a gateway?
   b. Is it a landmark site?
   c. How does residential at this location further District growth objectives?
   d. Should use drive the site planning, or should the built form drive the uses?

2. If a residential transition is generally suitable, is the site suitable for consideration of higher density? Why?
   a. What should drive considerations of density at this site?
   b. How does density work on this site relative to the surrounding context or the larger West Vancouver context?

3. If higher density is considered, what is the most suitable built form to achieve that density? Why?
   a. What rationale should drive height considerations?
   b. How does the surrounding context inform building form, height, and massing?
   c. How should this project relate to Marine Drive in the context of recent street-fronting development?

4. Aside from the residential component, what other uses should be considered in the podium? Commercial? Civic/Institutional? Professional office?
   a. What considerations should drive the non-residential uses?
   b. What is the most complementary array of uses for the area?
5.2 General Policy Directions

Through the consultation, there are varying levels of community consensus about issues related to 752. It is very clear that the existing traffic conditions will dominate any discussion until there is some level of policy direction to pursue short, medium, and longer-term improvements at the intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way.

If able to move beyond the traffic and transportation concerns, there does appear to be a general willingness to revisit the existing District of West Vancouver policy to enable a transition and some relatively high level of residential density 752 Marine Drive.

There is some question remaining about the form within which that density should be accommodated. The remaining question is whether towers, are the best solution, and if so, what should drive the determination of their height and massing. Conversely, there is some question about whether other forms would miss out on the opportunity to develop an iconic gateway visible from the Lions Gate Bridge and Taylor Way. These are discussions that will continue to be resolved throughout the remainder of the process, particularly with assistance from the Design Review Committee.
6 Summary

The intent of this document is to summarize the consultation undertaken to date. The comments received in the first phase indicate there is merit in continued discussion about the proposed transition of 752 Marine Drive to a more mixed-use neighbourhood.

This consultation will help frame and form the discussion and recommendations in the policy statement to be considered by Council and the community through the remainder of the process.
7 Appendix: Individual Comment Form Responses
The following are the verbatim comments submitted.

**Postal Codes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V7W 2R1</td>
<td>V7V 2B3</td>
<td>V7T 2Y1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7H 1L9</td>
<td>V7V 3V7</td>
<td>V7S 3H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2T4</td>
<td>V7T 1Z6</td>
<td>V7T 1E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2J8</td>
<td>V7T 2J3</td>
<td>V7T 2K8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7W 3E5</td>
<td>V7T 2J2</td>
<td>V7T 1M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7V 1P9</td>
<td>V7V 1B5</td>
<td>V7T 1M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7V 1P9</td>
<td>V7L 2Z1</td>
<td>V7T 1K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2W2</td>
<td>V7S 1S2</td>
<td>V7W 1E9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7W</td>
<td>V7S 3A5</td>
<td>V7W 1E9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7V 2Y6</td>
<td>V7V 3T6</td>
<td>V7T 2A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7V 2Y6</td>
<td>V7V 4G9</td>
<td>V7T 1S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7W 3A1</td>
<td>V7T 2Y2</td>
<td>V7T 2J3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7W 3A1</td>
<td>V7T 1B7</td>
<td>V7T 2A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7V 1B5</td>
<td>V7W 3B3</td>
<td>V7V 1B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2Y2</td>
<td>V7T 2L6</td>
<td>V7V 2Z5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2Y2</td>
<td>V7S 3A5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T 2Y2</td>
<td>V7T 1Z6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #1:

What are your thoughts on the proposal as a gateway to West Vancouver?

• Am happy with attempts to mitigate congestion problems around Park Royal, however this should be something west van muni should be doing much of this anyhow

• Looks great. Good design and features. Sounds like a good mix of housing unit sizes

• The traffic is my main concern. I think the location for these two high-rises cannot get any worse. It’s beside our most congested intersection, and will make it worse for the rest of the community

• I think it is a great idea. Make it spectacular and stunning

• Fantastic location, amenities, for the buyer as well as accruing to the DWV. Providing the intersection problem is solved for the greater good of all, it will be an asset to PR and the community

• How many "gateways" do we need? Grosvenor said they were the gateway.

• We’ve been told by District and Staff that 1300 Block is the gateway. We don’t need another

• We need to solve traffic and transit problems BEFORE we consider any more density increases on North Shore - don’t tell me these will improve only after we get more transit users. People don’t use transit now because too crowded - no non-rush hour service etc

• Excellent

• First, W. Van needs a gateway! This would appear to fulfill the need. West Van needs more diversity of housing + increased density!

• I don’t think 2 apartment towers constitute a "gateway"

• If you forget about the traffic congestion at Taylor +Marine I like the project

• Would prefer (pub stores) and low buildings

• It is a dead end!

• Not sure

• N.E. Corner of Marine and Taylor way is an eyesore

• It is an improvement over the White Spot if traffic issues are resolved
• Amazing, wonderful. I'm looking forward to the opportunities it will create + bring to our fine but under visited community

• The two towers are much too large and will add too many cars to the already jammed intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way

• Good ideas around pedestrian and bikeways through Park Royal south. The two residential towers are too dense

• The buildings are overpowering! Should be reduced by say 6-10 Floors. Design is OK but glass and coloured stripe does not provide much character

• Large project on a corner without adequate traffic lanes. Rush hour now is a huge issue

• Will not enhance - fine as it currently exists

• very forward thinking. What we need in West Van

• It looks fantastic . . . Can hardly wait to experience all this development will bring to Park Royal. What a wonderful way to welcome people to WV

• I believe it’s a project that helps to transform Park Royal into a community

• It entirely changes the aspect of entering West Vancouver as we used to know it

• Reject the project - no infrastructure plans for traffic

• visually appealing; needed residential option; well planned

• Nothing to do with being a "gateway". Its just a really busy intersection and West Vancouver's character comes further along Marine Drive beyond Park Royal

• I'm in favour of it (See#3). As a property owner and tax payer, I welcome the financial impact on the community and budget

• I am very concerned about increased congestion

• West Vancouver's gateway should be accessible - look good and inviting - and be a pleasure for people to enter

• Promising, however, no account has been given to the pedestrians need to move between PR (north) and PR (south); now that the bridge has been demolished

• Love it, love it, love it !! What a fantastic entrance to the Dist of W. Vanc - Well thought out and planned. Far superior in every way to the 1300 Block of Marine Drive - actually care about the people of all of W. Vanc., not just the "monied" ones who can afford to buy at 1300. Not in anyone's "face"! No views being lost even though you don’t have the big bucks to spend

• It would be a positive addition to the community
• I think its an excellent Idea and should be done long time ago

• Excellent idea. Should have been done ten years ago

• It will be impressive! Noisy to live there the existing mall was looking very dated

• I am open to this development and I'm not too fussed over height and density. In particular, I would encourage Council to embrace the lot H development proposal versus having the developer partner with Squamish Nation on Lot D

• Better than the gas station gateway to Ambleside; an opportunity to land swap with the gas station owners?

• It is "very wrong" to develop this gateway without infrastructure improvement first. Sewer, traffic, water, movement of people schools eke

• Looks like a very positive addition to the area

• Visually pleasing but will be sure to exacerbate the problem of traffic congestion

• If this project will be the gateway to West Van, I trust that Park Royal will make every effort to make it excellent!

• Looks like an exciting new concept

• The way of the future

• It is a very good idea and can use the wasted land that is available.

• Ridiculous - Taylor Way and Marine Drive a terrible traffic area. Adding more cars will create more chaos.

• As a gateway I am not sure it is anything other than a city high rise. As a change to a commercial area to "humanize" it - I like it!

• I love that there is more resources being put into drawing people into the West Vancouver district. However, the congestion needed to get into the city (Lions Gate, for most people) is already an issue, and would only increase the traffic issue.

• Should work out well.

• As the vanguard entry point to Canada's wealthiest community, it is both appropriate and necessary that the municipality possesses an iconic statement of arrival.

It has to be ceremonial and celebratory, the heroic pursuit of everyday civic life.

• Excellent opportunity for the district of West Vancouver to ensure all members of the community have safe and affordable housing options made available through a comprehensive planning strategy. Implement Government policies that ensure all residential Developers provide an allocation of air space as a density bonus, and a
minimum of twenty percent of all proposed residential developments be allocated as affordable housing and in particular senior's modest-income housing.

• More mass density development in the village atmosphere of West Vancouver begs the question whether people want to change the character of West Vancouver

• GREAT IDEA, but...

• As a city planner who worked on the original False Creek/Granville Island project I wonder about the efficacy of placing the development at this corner. Have you considered placing it at the back of Park Royal where perhaps there would be less traffic disruption. Also the condos in "back of lot" location could be designed to give the residents a quieter more esthetically pleasing location with unobstructed views to the SW. If the towers were constructed where the current parking lot behind Home Depot it could provide surface parking with the towers on top. This type of setting - parking at surface, building raised - would also provide some protection against the assumed coming rise in sea levels and high tides.

• This well thought out proposal will be an amazing welcome to our community. At the same time being positioned to allow residents to use transit in an efficient manner. The additional density will provide a good tax base with little additional cost to the municipality as the occupants will not likely need schools or other infrastructure that could be costly.

• I think it's a terrible idea. We already have a horrific traffic issue at that intersection and we don't need any more traffic.

• A terrible idea - benefiting only the owners of Park Royal - imagine the extra traffic in the already congested area. Residents have tried to preserve the village quality most of us moved here for - we were able to defeat Park Royal's efforts to put in big box stores and instead got the Village area of Park Royal which is very popular. Just imagine the Taylor Way intersection with the building up the hill, and the native hi-rises to the south, plus these buildings - and then just down Marine will be more density at 1300 block Marine Dr - with plans for the 1400 and 1600 blocks yet to come. Speak up before it is too late!

• I am concerned about the additional traffic which would further impede the traffic flow in and out of West Van.

• It will add to the look and feel of more of a community.

• I think this is a much needed addition to the area to make Park Royal a community

• Pleased to see our outdated community is making some progress and open minded to growth and investment
• As a trained geographer I cannot comment on one location unless the spatial data from neighboring areas that might affect 752 say for the next five years are available to the public.

• Given its scale and design, it will certainly attract attention.

• The gateway to WV is already compromised by the existing towers, the mall and the dreadful buildings just west of PR North, so this won't make it any worse.

• The Park Royal expansion with the exception of the high density towers, will be an asset to West Vancouver.

• Why?? Taylor Way and Marine is now at complete grid lock. Why?? Do we need still more condos in this area? Marine Dr-North Vanc. Has built numerous condos, still for sale

• I am not sure I care for towers as a gateway. I would rather have some pretty green park-like space. Definitely not towers so close to the street with a structure below them that will resemble a wall rather than a gate.

• Terrible idea. Will lead to too much traffic congestion, too much density and represents a very poor gateway to our great community.

• Our thoughts are; that the traffic at the Marine Dr./ Taylor Way, will in fact be considerably greater than has been outlined in this report. So much more will need to be done than is proposed. We believe that This is a VERY wrong place to build these Towers. Even now coming out of or trying to come into the West Royal Towers is at times unbearable and difficult now, even before the 2 Towers are built. To stop the illegal blocking of the intersection of Marine Dr., and Taylor Way of traffic coming North to turn East, You will have to Hire either a traffic control Person.or Police Person, especially during those Peak Traffic situations to STOP those Illegal Blockings

• Not what West Vancouverites envisage! Two towers, 289 suites plus retail built to maximum capacity on the lot. 300 cars plus joining an already congested junction at Taylor Way and Marine Drive. The "Metrotown" look is not for this municipality, particularly as The Gateway!

• If West Vancouver needs an eastern "gateway" (which is debatable) then one already exists with the new and improved Capilano Bridge.

• I cannot imagine the insanity of this plan for even more density on the intersection of Taylor Way, Marine Drive and the road onto Lions Gate Bridge - how can this even be considered as anything positive for the North Shore

• 1300-1400 Marine Drive was also called West Vancouver’s gateway. Neither of these locations is a gateway. Park Royal is a shopping centre and should retain this
excellent single-use focus. It has served the community well and should continue to do so.

• Not real - Park Royal is not THE Gateway to West Vancouver - and should not be viewed as such

• While the addition of a mixed-use neighbourhood and the extension of the Park Royal Village is a welcome idea, I am confused as why the proposed commercial/housing building is located in the White Spot lot. Look at the layout of Park Royal currently, the tallest buildings are located on the edges (Park Royal Towers, West Royal Towers, and several business buildings nearby), getting shorter and more spread-out as you come closer to the centre (The Keg, Whitespot, all single-story buildings). The new building is supposed to be the tallest building in West Vancouver, yet is in the centre lot area? This breaks the flow and design of Park Royal, and creates a large obstruction for visitors, shoppers and residents. This does not seem like a welcoming feature that represents a gateway for a community.

• I do not consider a shopping center, albeit very high end, to represent a gateway to West Vancouver. Although dressed up, after all is said and done, it is still just a shopping center which the MASSIVE concrete parking complex attests to.

• The actual gateway is more at 13th and will be defined by the Grosvenor building. Park Royal is different.

• It seems to me that the tranquil life style of West Vancouver is not exactly the principle driving this initiative. Would people who enjoy the quite life style have to move further away?

• The “Gateway” to West Vancouver is not embodied solely by this proposal, it is the area where the District begins not two residential structures. Namely, it starts at the impressive new Capilano River Bridge, the West Royal Towers and Commercial Buildings, the whole intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way, the whole of the Park Royal Mall and the boulevard separated Marine Drive, and Taylor Way north to the Upper Levels. In my view, the proposal would detract from the Gateway, overpowering the intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way.

• Would be a lot better than what there is there now...nothing but commercial

• I like the proposal, it is nice to have a nice, new neighbouring village.

• I like it; however, through its dithering, West Vancouver's gateway may well be Park Royal.
Question #2:

What are your thoughts on the proposed land uses and the density proposed in the application?

• not a problem
• Agree with increased density + introducing residential at Park Royal
• its too tall, too dense
• I support. Better use than the current use of land, and well integrated into the community.
• appropriate to the property and community need
• Max at 1.75 and 37.5 ft IF residential is considered.
• Keep Park Royal as a mall. I do not support density increases. We need to first discuss maximum population expectations for the entire North Shore before we decide where it is going to go
• A good balanced approach
• Don't have a problem with the density - tasteful densification is essential in today's world.
• Lets face it, this is purely about generating the most money out of a restricted land area
• The number of units does not seem excessive for the two tower
• Too much density
• I would value the extension of the "village" concept
• not in the interest of West Van residents
• I have no problem with the plan or density. I am not sure if your target market can afford to live in this area
• Why not put all retail on the south side. Many stores on inside malls are closed. Devote north side to tower development
• I have no problem with any of it . . . Creating a village is a great move for Park Royal
• density of towers needs to be cut to 2/3
• the buildings are too high
• small site; too much density. Approve this and everyone will want the same
• density should be reduced
• Density = fine; land use - draw for West Van
• I believe they are very well thought out . . . Something to benefit the entire community
• A positive move towards the development of a community instead of a shopping centre
• They were negative until I saw what your proposals were
• high density =- more gridlock at this critical junction
• thoughtful, responsive
• Mixed commercial and residential is acceptable although I think the phrase "much needed more housing" is developer's hype not a reality
• if we're adding density, lets add it to an area where it already exists - a shopping centre (as opposed to elsewhere up the hill)
• I am worried about the urbanization of West Vancouver. Also future encroachment on existing pedestrian/bike/park access behind Park Royal
• Land use development has to be coupled with the ease of movement for those living in the area
• no comment
• Good use of their land - lots of "people places". Everything there - good places and large variety of shopping and entertainment. Go to Vancouver? - bus outside your front door! Walking and bike paths.
• Density looks reasonable. Regarding land use, West Van needs more housing alternatives so high rise residential makes sense for the site.
• With the aging population we need many new high density projects
• May be a bit of an adjustment at first. But if transit improves their schedule and they fix the lights going north on Taylor way will be OK
• Having seen the presentation and heard the comments from many involved, I feel the plans are appropriate to have increased density on a site which will provide all amenities for living and community occupants
• I have no issue with the proposal providing there is a clear, transparent, and realistic analysis of the increased traffic flow. With Lions Gate bridge improvements being highly unlikely, traffic flow must improve and not regress with this development.

• Land use maximizes land availability without fully accommodating density-related issue of traffic (vehicular).

• See above. The traffic is one of the major problem. The survey tells me that what they are doing is stop gap - with larger problems in the future.

• Fine - we need more density in appropriate areas - this is a good area to add density.

• Higher density projects located on major transit is the key to a viable community.

• I like the idea of mixed land uses and increased density.

• It is in keeping with the density already in place. So an appropriate use of the land. Keep density where it already exists.

• The problem is the density which it needs more exit street to take acre of traffic congestion in Taylor Way.

• Over densification. The Tower should not be where proposed.

• We need housing. Density is the only way to go. I don’t like density - but we have no choice. If we have areas of very high density then we can still keep areas of single family homes.

• Proposed use of the land for retailers is a great idea as it will draw more revenue into the area and the mall itself. However, it needs to attract the right retailers and located in the right locations throughout the mall.

• It is in the right spot.

• Residential is a natural extension to a retail base.

• When considering the density factor of this planned community, twenty percent of the gross density should be set aside specifically for social housing to assist in "Fixing Canada’s Housing Crunch".

• Seems people who enjoy the quite life of west Vancouver will have to move further away.

• No problem, if access to Lions Gate Bridge is NOT impeded.

• Seems like big potential problems re: traffic movement in an already congested area which has been made worse by the present expansion of Park Royal.
• The land is ideally suited and positioned for higher densification. The location and current use are a waste. A better use incorporating into a better plan from today’s visionaries and plans will be a breath of fresh air

• We already have lots we don’t need any more

• I am concerned that if the application is denied then the project would probably be moved onto the reserve property and go ahead anyway without following Municipal by-laws & payment of Municipal taxes.

• West Vancouver is in need of more affordable housing as young families cannot afford single family dwellings.

• Density is fine and land is being built to best and highest use

• I’m ok with the density. There are few condo towers in west Vancouver. This would create for some affordable housing as well as increase tax revenues

• From my research through the schools of travel patterns among North Shore parents it is obvious that traffic at Taylor Way and Marine Drive will be unacceptable if the twin-towers go ahead

• At some 350+ units, it will significantly add to the density at that location, particularly when added to the new residences at Evelyn.

• They sound reasonable.

• High density will cause traffic problems to an already congested area.

• See above - why would we ever encourage still more people to liv in this very small area?

• These are not family size spaces but singleton spaces. With what they are likely to cost, they will not be bringing the type of people who are likely to care about West Vancouver’s schools and other services of that kind. I think we should be looking at densifying by bringing families more than looking like Yaletown or the West End.

• way too dense!! This is not a suitable location for high density residential

• We Would Highly Suggest that These 2 Towers NOT be Built here AT ALL.

• The OCP calls for commercial land use! When and how does this change. Do the voters have a say?.

• Although I am often in favour of multi use zoning and increased density, neither of those are suitable for this site. Residential use is already significant with the tower at Taylor Way and Marine and the 3 Park Royal Apt towers and will be substantially increased by the new Evelyn Drive development and the Concord Pacific development at 13th. All of these already put tremendous strain on traffic in the immediate area and on more distant side streets as traffic tries to find alternate
routes into the community. The best use of that site is for more shopping/business development only. The interests of the community and the district are not served by this proposed multi use site.

- Like I said above - this is so stupid that it is almost like a joke. What is going to happen with all the extra cars from this development? Remember Larco also wants to build another large development on the old Capilano Winter Club - MORE traffic for the Lions Gate bridge how can this possibly work

- More density in the Park Royal area only benefits the owners of Park Royal, not the interests of West Van residents. I support the development of Park Royal as a shopping centre, not as a high-rise residential neighbourhood.

- Concerned about the density

- More density is perfectly fine. It will provide Park Royal more consistent customers which may stabilize the constant revolving door of stores that seem to come and go. Change isn’t bad, but having to see closed down stores over and over again leads to questions on the overall well-being of Park Royal and makes it difficult on the consumer.

- The Marine Dr. and Taylor Way intersection is a nightmare as it is. It is unbelievable for the developers to expect those living above this intersection and have watched the increase in vehicle traffic over the years, simply accept the word(s) of their "specialists." People, this is not rocket science...simply common sense! Residential towers, commercial spaces equal a HUGE increase in population and VEHICLE USAGE.

- Appropriate for the site, no problem with the density. We need more of it.

- Over 350 units will significantly add to the population density at that location, particularly when added to the new residences at Evelyn and other developments in West Vancouver. From my research it is obvious that the actual traffic problems at Taylor Way and Marine Drive will aggravate if the twin-towers go ahead. What are the implications in terms of emergency management? (i.e earthquake etc), does West Vancouver have the capacity to attend these situations with an increased population? How about other areas: the Squamish territory behind Park Royal? Or the area behind Home Depot? would additional population density increases (for example with new residential developments in the same neighborhood) be restricted? Or is West Vancouver going to end up with Towers in all these areas? Would we end up with a Metrotown type of neighborhood? Concerns: traffic, impact to the quite life style of West Vancouver, noise, crowded/busy feel and look.

- The proposed basically residential land use is not considered appropriate or in fact appropriate at that location of the Mall and certainly does not fit in with the OCP or
Zoning. The open space and public realm space could be an attractive addition to the Gateway. The density is also too high for Marine Drive at a reported FAR of 3.00 towering over the rest of the new retail buildings being constructed on Marine Drive and the whole of the South Mall.

• Makes sense considering the value of the land.

• It makes sense, at present it is just an empty parking lot as introduction to West Vancouver

• Excellent
Question #3

What are your thoughts on the proposed building layout and massing?

• my concern is that the layout becomes so massive it will become a very inconvenient place to get around
• Agree with layout and massing
• no comment
• I support. Make the 2 towers like non-identical twins but connected. Make it light-looking (i.e. no green glass like Yaletown boxes)
• its very attractive, appealing well designed and will integrate well
• too high - a contrast rather than a complement to West Royal
• way, way, too big
• too big, too high
• Seems to be proportionate to the neighbourhood
• Layout is attractive, but I think the towers are too high
• It looks to be on the same scale as the towers on the east side of Taylor Way so I don't have any objections to the layout and massing
• I am concerned about the height of the two towers - not persuaded as to the benefit of high-rise living
• too, too dense
• looks fine
• too much "massing"!
• A great design
• layout is OK but too high
• layout OK; massing too great
• Excellent use of land
• it looks much better than the tower across the street
• I like the look
• Would have preferred a wider setback from Marine Drive, but then you would lose the park
• not much "set-back" for the two towers. A "metrotown" look for the gateway to West Vancouver
• sloping (higher to lower) from West Royal Towers makes sense
• I like the layout but think it is bigger than needed or warranted
• Looks Okay
• Too much mass
• The designs are fine
• OK
• Fantastic!
• look attractive
• Looks really great
• Looks very nice. With the exception of the new village, PR looks pretty dated (ugly!)
• looks great
• I am open to the developers design as proposed and would even support a higher density proposal. I would appreciate more info on public transit improvements and traffic flow enhancements
• Building layout appears attractive but massing forces vehicle density issues as related to traffic movement
• I think the building of towers is well planned and the space around is being used to best advantage parks - pay school - café etc.
• very elegant and designed to have minimal impact on views
• The layout and internal road plans are good but it still brings traffic congestion as a problem
• It looks impressive and an exciting introduction to that corner of Park Royal
• Cool. Different, progressive. A nice change from a concrete block.
• The building layout is great.
• Makes no sense to jam in more people and more cars except to the misguided city planners
• I like it.

• The construction should have been to expand the size of the mall, rather than building a parkade with a few additional retailers below. Furthermore, the new retailers being put in should be directed connected with Park Royal South so that customers feel as though they're still shopping in PRS as opposed to a new extension located outdoors.

• Fine.

• You need height to create the iconic statement on the horizon. Height also creates theatre and drama. The curvilinear design is rich in its application. It also possesses a timeless quality. The layout and massing are appropriate. It also has the sensuality of desirable open space, giving rise to superior placemaking opportunities.

• Seniors, age 55 to 64 are urgently in need of affordable housing. Their current housing options are limited, if any, leaving this collective group of seniors without an opportunity to reside in their community and having to look elsewhere for suitable housing options. City planners need to ensure this segment of the population is factored into the equation and planned for.

• See above

• Great

• See above.

• Clean and efficient

• Way too big!

• I do not like the further density at this location.

• With land prices in West Vancouver you have to go up. The designs I saw were beautiful. I like that some of the units will be given back to those in need and the great community spaces.

• Great community space and layout allows for successful gatherings

• Looks nice

• the additional shopping facilities seem fine

• See above.

• In that location, at our busiest intersection, they aren't a problem.

• Most of this looks reasonable with the exception of building high rise towers.

• obscene - over the top!
• The proposal does not look like it can deliver on the promise of park amenities and community spaces. It's unlikely that the people who buy into the condos are going to like sharing with everyone else. I think massing might be the proper word for it. TOO MANY units in that space. Half the number might be reasonable but this one is over the top on that very small piece of land.

• pretty pictures but it is really just a mass of concrete with some lipstick on it.

• It is overwhelming! Invasion of the quality of life.

• Only additional shopping centre use should be built here and within the general size and style now being developed for Park Royal South. Within that limitation, even the proposed 5 storey platform building is too tall and has too great a mass for the site. The proposed buildings would narrow the view coming into the community and would impact sight lines above Marine Drive. In addition, it is unclear whether the number of storeys for the two towers include the 5 storey platform. Generally, too much volume, too high and too dense.

• I think Park Royal should stay a shopping centre and if anything a green space should be put in that area. I understand Maple Leaf Self Storage is going to be towers as well sometime in the future.

• The layout is attractive enough. The massing will create a substantial amount additional traffic congestion which is already at an unacceptable level.

• See above - makes for a very crowded intersection

• If you want to keep the building tall and thin, then it has to be moved to one of the edges of Park Royal. Follow the layout that is already there, there are good reasons for it. Moving the building to the back of, say Home Depot...1) Integrates it into the Village (which is a main selling point for this project). 2) Gives the residents better living conditions (Taylor Way has a lot of both noise pollution and actual pollution from the car exhaust). 3) Gives several corridors for building traffic to flow out of (reducing the impact on Taylor Way, while still being close to the bus routes for transit users). 4) Prevention of wind tunneling (the West Royal buildings already suffer from very strong wind tunneling. Adding the new housing/commercial building and all the other buildings would extend the West Royal wind tunnel to the rest of the mall). 5) Prevention of signal tunneling (there is a set of radio antenna on one of the business buildings that will have their signal become trapped and bounce constantly between the residential buildings and mall buildings, which is a health concern for both residents and shoppers). No one I have talked to has brought up the health concerns or issue with tunneling, and I feel these are significant to both the residents and the consumers. While traffic can be mitigated, health should be a primary concern.
I personally do not believe the limited amount of land on which the Whitespot now stands, is large enough to accommodate all that is proposed and still be able to provide "green space." What does the word "massing" conjure up in one's head?

Looks OK.

I don’t have much to say as I don’t see a net benefit in the project. Over densification: By adding density at this location West Vancouver will be looking and feeling more like a crowded, noisy city. I hope this project does not proceed.

I do not believe the proposed basically residential buildings should be built at the location. The buildings are far too large for the site and location for the reasons mentioned above.

Looks good, not blocking any views

It looks feasible

okay
Question #4:

What are your thoughts on the transportation and traffic related to the application?

• your presentation goes a long way to quieting my concerns about traffic increase

• Agree with: 1) Parking. 2) co-op program - may need more cars. 3) bike storage. 4) bike valet. Par Royal is unable to control Taylor Way congestion. Suggest either police monitoring or introducing cameras for traffic blocking intersection

• as mentioned above, the location can not get any worse. It will make the traffic conditions worse than the nightmare that it already is.

• It think it will be OK if that the volumes will not be as bad as feared. I am looking forward to the co-op cars.

• This intersection is a killer. We need to solve the gridlock on many levels, as it impedes the DWV significantly. We will never progress unless traffic flow is alleviated. Double deck bridge, mass transit, sky train, elevated or buried (tunneled) intersection - it all needs a fair hearing with all interests listening hard.

• Transportation is bedlam right now. This will just make it worse. To blame "bad driving habits" as a cause is bizarre. The intersections don't work. Period. We need a T. Plan that doesn't focus on people going to the mall. Think about he people the need to go PAST Park Royal

• Traffic is a major concern - we're already "over-capacity" with traffic "solutions" - such as change driver behaviour and more effectively manage lane change flow on the L.B. Bridge don't cut it. If you're going to try to change driver behaviour - start now and prove it 1) can be done, and 2) that it has a significant impact. I've noticed recent lane change flows on the LG Bridge have resulted in idiots staying in the blinking yellow lane as their own personal through-fare. Expect more head on collisions as a result

• if we are depending on improving driver behaviour (which should not always be district responsibility) do it now to prove it in fact can be done

• Do not feel this will have an effect on traffic - address the lower level crossing to make it more efficient

• Shouldn't really be a problem

• I'm very concerned about traffic congestion at Taylor Way an marine Drive intersection, already it is a mid afternoon headache as I am a frequent visitor to {Amica}. I now have to visit my elderly mother in law before 3 p.m. Later in the afternoon, heading along Marine Dr. to the bridge a max of 3-4 cars can get
through the intersection. Sure people block the intersection but do you really think that’s going to change

- I have significant concerns about this subject. Traffic is already a serious problem at certain times of the day ie southbound on Taylor Way late in the afternoon. I hope the developers and traffic planners come up with some innovative improvements rather than just dumping more traffic onto the worst intersection on the North Shore

- More traffic into already congested area. Should put “yellow box” at the intersection before bridge. Traffic does not obey signs and block intersection constantly

- less concerned about this as it is my opinion that traffic in Park Royal is largely generated by people travelling from across the north shore (and beyond) to shop, dine, etc.

- deplorable! No or little thought is put to traffic congestion. Must go overhead for pedestrians north to south malls

- I think the traffic plan is unrealistic. Until the North Shore district develop a comprehensive plan before granting building permits, we will continue to have congestion, poorer traffic movement. The constant horn honking at Taylor Way and Marine is annoying and disruptive. The two bridges over Burrard Inlet were built in 1931-1958 except for access roads, nothing has changed. Where is the Province + Federal governments in this planning process.

- When new lights are red for north-south, main street will pour out turning LT and totally blocking the west royal driveway. Why not limit LT turn to no turn from 4-6 p.m. Fines needed for card blocking the intersection

- I think that the existing traffic study and analysis, car counting, and offered solutions must be updated to reflect what actually comes to pass after a reasonable period of full operation of all new roads, retail traffic, signalization, etc. To prepare based on guesstimates of what might/could/should happen when we are close to the reality would be inexcusable

- there are obviously significant concerns here and a solution must be found for this to make sense

- we need some sort of traffic control at Taylor Way and Marine, even in the absence of further development. e.g. police during peak traffic hours, electronic surveillance with tickets.

- Council should reject the proposal without meaningful changes to traffic congestion at Marine and Taylor
• I have listened to many traffic studies presented at the West Van Design Review Committee and none deal with the real issue of traffic addition once their project is complete.

• further congestion will result

• traffic in PR will be fine

• not particularly concerned. Most of the congestion seems to come from the upper levels traffic

• They appear to be well thought out. But as with all things, transportation needs keep changing and we need to continue adjusting to the demands on the space

• Transportation is a major concern. I now take the bus wherever practical. Rush hour is a nightmare and will get worse. We need the implementation of a revised 1968-70 tunnel proposal but in talking to two of the North Shore Mayors, this is not likely. With not infrequent bridge closures North Vancouver have the ferry we have nothing. With the Sea to Sky Highway, Whistler, and more activity than just access to the North Shore

• Taylor way/Marine Drive junction can’t handle current traffic flow! 2. Transit insufficient to persuade people out of their cars! 3. Evelyn Drive, all phases, not yet complete, lower cap village development (Larco) on its way in NV District. +++!

• To me the biggest issue already on "bad" transportation days (Friday afternoons) there is gridlock. Travel west-east along Marine Drive; travel south on Taylor Way: Egress from Park Royal south can be almost impossible. What is going to be done to alleviate this present issue? your quest to "change behaviours" is almost impossible. You must change "things" in order for the bad behaviours to come around

• improvements useful; explanations helpful; inclusion of car share, bikes etc good additions; need more of this

• Blaming bad driver behaviour is a red herring and would not cure the traffic woes if it was improved. Regardless of the behaviour at the lights, it is still nose to tail to the bridge at busy times. Changing the counter-flow on the bridge more often may be more helpful. The bus dedicated lane is an improvement to getting downtown by public transit

• I can’t comment - haven’t given enough thought to the real impact. Another thought - without knowing the demographic of those who will reside in the towers (e.g. percentage: working commuters, retired seniors etc)

• more congestion is madness in this area unless there is another route to Vancouver. Taylor Way is already too congested. Evelyn will increase this. This plan will further increase it. The bike assist programs are good and should be
implemented even if this project doesn't go ahead. Extra lanes, paths, and routes for bikes and pedestrians should be a vital element, as well as safety.

- West Vancouver has only the but to help us out. We cannot move unless the traffic issues is satisfactorily dealt with, when are we inviting more people to live here? Just to get more property taxes at the expense of the residents? IMP Make Main Street one way westbound PTG.

- the need, in my opinion, for a covered link for pedestrians between these 2 commercial halves is paramount, and has not been addressed; other than a pedestrian crossing at the new junction; miserable in the best of weathers due to wait times; dreadful in weather we face today!

- I cannot see a problem here. Quite frankly, if during one present rush ours we had a few police cars parked at Marine and Taylor Way with officers, a lot of the congestions within the intersection would be eliminated - start handling out some traffic tickets to these idiots! I cannot see much of an increase in traffic except maybe on weekends. Take the car to work - fight your way across the bridge, try and find a good parking spot, pay big bucks to park! - I don't think so !!!

- Traffic at Taylor Way and Marine Drive is a big issue but additional traffic generated by the (illegible) residents shouldn't be significant, particularly since the residents will be able to walk to stores.

- Maybe the traffic will be better organized and smoother this time

- Should be a shuttle to get people around. Again having the highways/bridge people keeping an eye on the traffic and changing the lanes over when needed will be a good help

- Better having towers there than any where else where car transpiration would be needed more. Bus service will likely need to be improved at off peak times. Bridge is obvious biggest problem - better lane switching to prevent such massive back ups? connected to ferry discharge from Horseshoe Bay, esp when 2 ferries empty close together

- Traffic congestion in Ambleside and the blocking at Marine/Taylor Way can not be allowed to further degenerate. It is important to improve flow and significantly reduce congestion without penalizing drivers. It is not realistic to believe that seniors and young families, particularly if they are affluent, to give up their vehicles to resolve a traffic problem that the District has failed to address

- The transportation and traffic congestion experienced by vehicles departing the Village at Park Royal is horrendous. The traffic density issues experience in and around the "Blue Shore" Credit Union leaves much to be desired - lineups are long, tempers are short. Pedestrian traffic issues are an accident waiting to happen as I personally have witnessed numerous near-misses.
• A much larger problem coming even though we already have a disaster around the area. How can you even consider such a development with proper transit, road and access in +out and through west van.

• Aarghh! But not Park Royal’s fault

• A bigger disaster than it is already. Better bus service needed. Not everyone can get around on a bicycle

• See #3

• I agree with the Bunt studies that the traffic increase will be minimal. Is there any opportunity to use the rail line which runs through all of West and North Van and comes very close to PR?

• Congestion is going to continue to be an issue, regardless of this application. Maybe it will force the powers that be to be a little more forward thinking and take action on the very much needed third crossing for the North Shore

• the traffic is the major issue here and it needs re-thinking of how you are going to solve. We have Lions Gate Bridge which is the major obstacle to connect West Van to downtown and the same time you are increasing the population in this area. Do you think it is time to think for the next generation and do some thing with this bridge that wasting a lot of time of tax payers in this city.

• Traffic currently is horrific at the intersection - adding more cars in insane. Translink has no plans to add buses connecting to our Blue Bus system - so people will use their cars

• Ah - now there’s the rub! The infrastructure can not cope with current traffic and though I am told this will add minimal traffic it is still a problem. When the Lion’s Gate Bridge was built, it was done so with an eye to the future. There is no advance planning in the same way today. At least it does not feel like it. We really need a comprehensive transit system such as Toronto to get the cars off the road. The increase speed of getting downtown by bus means I now use transit. Ah that it was that easy to get every where!
I love that there is to be co-op cars available and community bikes. It is on the Transit Hub which should restrict car usage. We are human and need help to get out of our cars.

• Traffic will increase which will deter customers. As a Regional Trainer with my company in this mall, I already need to time my visits accordingly to avoid being stuck in traffic for an hour. Drawing so much more traffic into West Vancouver will just create a larger amount of congestion on the bridge and roadways out.

• Suspect more buses will be in use.
• Traffic surprisingly has in fact improved at the key, Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersections. There is likely greater capacity available now to accommodate this proposal.

• Seniors love to walk and for the most part they will use public transit to meet their transportation needs.

• Although I don’t own a car and am a cycle rider who frequently uses public transport I find it hard to understand how one can afford to increase the population whilst not improving the already clogged infrastructure.

• Traffic congestion, ingress and egress are a major concern and much thought needs to still be achieved.

• See above.

• Good positioning to take advantage of the current transit system. Traffic will be a challenge, but not overwhelming only due to this project when other new local developments are taken into account.

• See above.

• If it was better policed and people didn't get stuck in the middle of the intersection much of it could be resolved.

• Traffic will always be an issue so long as there are drivers who do not follow the rules of the road.

• Haven't looked but hopefully the city will figure that one out.

• Quite unacceptable as I see them, as explained above.

• I believe this development will have much more than the net increase of only one vehicle per hour as depicted in the accompanying transportation study. The Marine/ Taylor Way intersection already has problems during morning afternoon rush and other peak periods. Increased enforcement is only a partial solution. Before this development proceeds, the whole traffic pattern involving Marine Drive from 11th Street eastward, Taylor Way from the Upper Levels, and Lions Gate bridge needs to be re-engineered.

• If you need to add housing to WV, then that's the best location to do it because of all the transit, biking and walking options.

• We have been living in West Vancouver in the West Royal complex for six years. It is very interesting to listen to the so called “Traffic Specialists” give their opinion on what to expect with the proposed expansion of Park Royal, particularly adding high density towers to the area. The traffic since we moved to this area in 2007, has increased to at times being unbearable congestion. The “Symphony of Horns” during rush hours daily including weekends, has become even worse in this time.
period. The traffic specialist is unreal in thinking only one car per minute will affect the congestion in the intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way. The traffic studies have not taken into consideration the extra traffic which will come to the expanded Park Royal South shopping area. Also, we understand that Park Royal are considering expanding Park Royal North which will add further to the congestion. Also, there will be added traffic with the completion of the Evelyn Condo complex and new ones being constructed just east of the Lions Gate Bridge in North Vancouver. These specialists are also living in denial when they believe most residents of the new towers will either use public transportation, bikes, shared automobiles etc. That is not reality and never will be for many years to come. Even if some use public transit, the increase in population will require more transit vehicles which will add to the congestion. Until another crossing is built into Vancouver from the North Shore, increased density is definitely the wrong way to go. It should only be considered when there is another bridge to handle the severe congestion we all live with now. One of our daughters who lives in North Vancouver but is often attending things and picking up children in West Vancouver, said that she used to be able to get home after work in about twenty minutes and now it takes her at times over an hour to get home. With added density, will this now add even another 30 - 40 minutes to get home?

- Can you seriously be asking this question? Do you live in West Van and drive on Marine Dr. or Upper Levels? Paradise is fast being destroyed. A pox on urban planners

- That is, of course, the worst of it. After reading all the documents and watching all the videos, I find it unbelievable that they think that everyone will bicycle...come now, many of us are getting older and cannot ride bikes uphill anymore. Plus, even if you have bike lanes, it’s still dangerous. And please tell me how you expect people to carry home all their shopping on a bike. No matter how they try to rationalize it, there is no way to believe that the traffic will be so few cars. The mall will be fill hopefully and there is still not adequate transit. This must be addressed prior to starting any more development in the area with all the other projects coming on line in North and West Van. Don’t treat us as if we are just nobodies, we pay our taxes too.

- This is a major concern. Way too much traffic which not only leads to long wait times but also increases pollution with longer idling times with the cars.

- Our thoughts are; that the traffic at the Marine Dr./ Taylor Way, will in fact be considerably greater than has been outlined in this report. So much more will need to be done than is proposed. We believe that This is a VERY wrong place to build these Towers. Even now coming out of or trying to come into the West Royal Towers is at times unbearable and difficult now, even before the 2 Towers are built. To stop the illegal blocking of the intersection of Marine Dr., and
Taylor Way of traffic coming North to turn East, You will have to Hire either a traffic control Person.or Police Person, especially during those Peak Traffic situations to STOP those Illegal Blockings

- The transportation study of Bunt and Associates does not reflect the true impact of this project on the flow of traffic into and through the Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersection what is currently known as "Gridlock Junction". Plus, our North Vancouver District are into higher densification projects, particularly the one proposed by Larco at the S.W. corner of Marine Drive and Capilano Road. More cars!

- The Application does not seem to take into account all of the other sources of traffic that can be anticipated in the general area. Taylor Way and Marine Drive are already the busiest routes in the District. The expansion of Park Royal, the new Evelyn Drive Development, the new Concord Pacific development in Ambleside and the Ambleside renewal projects will all contribute to huge increases in traffic in an area that is already notorious for traffic problems. Adding a token number of community use vehicles and a couple of electric cars does not address the real issue of too many cars on these roads.

- I live in North Vancouver and work at Park Royal. At this point of time the 239 north van bus to Park Royal does not even stop at the north side of Park Royal anymore. The drivers are saying it is too dangerous to cross over to the left to be on the south side of Park Royal, so obviously North Van shoppers are not welcome to Park Royal because we are not going to get there. What us going to happen if there is an accident with all of this density. Only 4 ambulances on the North shore and only 1 for West Vancouver?

- Traffic congestion is already at an unacceptable level. The traffic analyst deducted White Spot traffic from the net increase in cars entering/exiting, however the White Spot will continue in that general area.

- Scary

- Currently, it would be a tight fit. In terms of cars, you’re adding them directly on lanes that are already congested at peak hours. In terms of transit, you now have 250-350 units that are right next to a bus stop. Consider how many people will choose to bus downtown or to the rest of West Vancouver, as it is a very viable option for them now. There would have to be a discussion with Translink on what they’re willing to do to cover more passengers at their peak hours as it is already quite difficult catching busses on time.

- Again, as mentioned previously, the intersection of Marine Dr. and Taylor Way cannot withstand more vehicles. We live seventeen floors above this intersection in the Westroyal and have an eagle’s view of the congestion and impatience of the drivers. With horns blaring and drivers rolling down their windows to "voice" their
displeasure, it surely is just a matter of time before there is an incident of road rage.

- Not really an issue. The number of people involved is tiny compared to the daily volume of traffic through the Taylor Way intersection. (A far greater problem was created by the new intersection and removal of the overpass).

- The video posted in this site is quite poor in terms of explaining the big picture of this traffic issue and how it is expected to change in the near future. Cameron Chalmers does a great work of explaining this issue in the consultation booths. A traffic problem aggravation sound to me quite unacceptable. Before this (and other) developments proceeds, the whole traffic issue involving Marine Drive from 11th Street eastward, Taylor Way from the Upper Levels, and Lions Gate bridge needs to be re-engineered. The Marine/ Taylor Way intersection already has problems during morning afternoon and other peak periods. Increased enforcement brings only a tiny contribution to a solution. Some progress has been made but increasing density would not make it better. This development will have much more than the net increase of only one vehicle per hour as depicted in the accompanying transportation study.

- It seems the afternoon bottleneck is not as bad since they actually starting thinking about traffic flow. Not sure why this took 30 years.

- The intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way is suffering Death by 1000 Cuts. The proposed application should not be a problem, but I would point out there are only three main roadways east or west of the corner of Marine Drive and Taylor Way (Upper Levels Highway, Marine Drive, and Lower Road) to handle the traffic flowing from development on the North Shore, including Park Royal Mall, Evelyn by Onni, Marine Drive in North Vancouver, the Larco proposal on Capilano Road, and the growth and proposed substantial commercial projects in Squamish.

- My concerns are for the traffic at this intersection which is already pretty messy. But with only 2½ lanes bridge and a big flood of car from Taylor way I cannot see any possible easing of traffic.

- The traffic study seems like a farce with the findings being very favorable to the developer, wink, wink (Hard to believe that the traffic from this major construction will only marginally increase from the current Whitespot traffic, ya right). I’m all for the development, but there has to be some major changes to the intersection at Taylor Way and Marine Drive as it will be chaos if left the same. The developer should be forced to pay for a complete re construction of the whole intersection that may need to include an overpass or exchanges to allow the free flow of traffic.

- no comment
Question #5:

What are your thoughts on the transition of Park Royal from a regional shopping centre to a mixed-use neighbourhood, including the introduction of new residential development rather than additional commercial development at 752 Marine Drive?

- I’m OK with this
- Fully support mixed use
- Id like to see what the vision is. Id also like to know what Park Royal’s plans for the rest of the land is
- Good idea to make the change
- this is the trend and a good one
- Keep the mall a mall
- I don't support additional residential at Park Royal. Small apartments in high rise buildings are not desirable housing options as previous community consultation has indicated. Smaller houses and townhouses with gardens are what down-xizers are looking for.
- I have no desire for another "town centre" or "neighbourhood" - I do however have no objection to a shopping centre or mall
- This is the correct approach for urban living mixed use development on transportation corridors
- good idea - it is a neighbourhood anchor - not just for shopping . . .
- not interested
- I have no problem with a mixed use neighbourhood
- Not in favour of residential mixed with shopping centre
- this does make sense
- I’d love to live there. What a great idea!
- good ideas on mixed use. Residential addition is too overwhelming
- I believe Council should fully appreciate overall plan/vision for the future changes. This is likely the thin edge of the wedge
- What is scheduled for the north side of Park Royal? The businesses I utilize are leaking from the old structure above. Will this also be "mixed use"?
• OK
• Next Step in PR evolution
• I think it is genius. What a boon to the economy of Park Royal and the District of WV
• very positive
• more residential development and less commercial is a step in the right direction
• PR Developments are expanding to the full capacity - age of Marine Drive sidewalks. New car park will have insufficient parking spots to cope
• I believe this mixed use will encourage the owners of all the commercial properties along Marine Drive to develop in the same way as some have already done
• consistent with other centres (e.g. Oakridge and many in US)
• Not problem with that as long as you can get in and out of it and retailers and businesses can afford to be there
• There’s sufficient commercial development. Adding a residential component achieves some balance (again, see #3)
• Worried about density, concentration of population increased (pollution) and traffic problems. But especially about impact on the whole community of West Vancouver
• I’m OK with it
• Excellent!
• It’s a good idea. I like the “village” concept where people can walk to most of the services and shops they need
• This only can be a win for both sides (residents and business)
• Look forward to it being completed. Many said PR Village would be a nightmare. Now it is my favourite part of part of P.R
• I agree - mixed use way better
• I think this is a great idea and is in line with development in other large cosmopolitan cities. It is appropriate to ensure that suitable service sand amenities are part of the evolution of PR. I would encourage PR ownership to also look at PR north so it doesn’t slide into “step-sister” status
• Follows the latest fad in shopping mall development. Unfortunately the vehicle is not even close to becoming a dinosaur; the car is still king and Lions Gate bridge is still only three lanes to and fro the North Shore
• It would be Okay in the right setting. But with Evelyn Drive and all the problems with traffic which has also got a lot worse in the last year

• Very positive development

• Combined with the Evelyn Drive development, too many people for the existing infrastructure

• It will soften the shopping centre model by introducing a residential element and community space

• I think its a good idea

• Again, it is the way of the future and a great use of land space that is already 1/2 way to multi use....especially when so much of it backs on to waterfront....Great for a neighbourhood and a nice way to mix public and private use.

• I support the idea of making a mix-use neighbourhood which the project is aiming for it.

• Why develop anything? Residential or commercial will add more people putting more stress on policing, hospitals, fire responders and paramedics.

• I love it!!!! It is real progress getting to the 'City Slow' concept where we live, work, shop and play in a local area that is walking distance from our homes.

• I do not feel that it will be successful. It may appeal to some, but with it being located by a mall and a busy traffic area, there will be issues with noise for most tenants. Furthermore, most people will find that living in this area will generally make travels harder to get to other areas of BC, such as downtown Vancouver or Burnaby, etc. They will be dealing with constant traffic and congestion.

• Mixed use is be coming the norm and good use of commercial land as more and more on line shopping is happening.

• Shopping centers have gone from Main Street to Main Street in 60 years. People today want to multitask %ÛÔ they want to be in multipurpose environments. Entertainment, recreation, leisure, dining and drinking have become integral pursuits of the shopping experience and vice versa - places that are always busy. People are attracted to busy, active places. Add to this parasitic uses like office, hotel, residential and you have places that go 24/7. This adds to the urbanity. Accordingly, people are attracted to this lifestyle. Park Royal has always been at the leading edge, being Canada’s first shopping center - one of the first to enclose - the first to add a tail with the successful lifestyle village. Now it has the opportunity to capitalize on the latest macro trends by adding an onsite, vertical residential opportunity. As such it will round out further the appeal of a social gathering meeting place with its greater urbanity, at the same time galvanizing so much more community pride.
• Excellent. please refer to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities website "Fixing Canada's Housing Crunch" www.fcm.ca/housingcrunch

• I do applaud the effort to make Park Royal a more livable and attractive place. This type of mixing of purposes makes Vancouver one of the most desirable cities to live in.

• A good mix is vital to give the place some life!

• See above and I think a better job could be done on the integration.

• This is today's better use as we transition away from a car centric use to a better community use

• It needs to stay a shopping Center with no residential housing.

• Not desirable

• It is much more sustainable. Young people can live and work in the area and elderly won't have to drive for their shopping needs.

• As we get older we want to live in places where community and convenience are more important than views and privacy

• Like it. Follows some US type communities which have had great success.

• the residential component is already part of Park Royal. It is the absence of alternative travel facilities for more people that is the main concern

• I guess you can call it inevitable change. Sorry to see the old shopping centre feel disappear. I can see a move to upscale retail that I'm not likely to frequent.

• It's a very good idea. We have more than enough commercial space now, but need more multi-unit residential units. We also need more taxpayers, so it's better to put the towers at 752 than on the reserve.

• We do not believe there should be high rise residential development but perhaps only building low rise - four to five stories.

• no-no-no-no-no where is common sense?

• I wouldn't mind so much if I thought this were the appropriate plan. This is NOT it.

• keep it as a shopping centre only - maybe some public amenities but not residential, especially high density

• Better Residential than Additional Comm. But a Lot Better to do Neither.

• Do not approve of the proposal. What is next for this area?
• The area already is mixed use. Evelyn Drive, the Park Royal Towers, homes along Marine Drive and in the immediate Ambleside neighbourhood, the towers and townhouses at Taylor Way and Marine and the new residential buildings at 13th provide ample residential use. The shopping centre has been successful and can continue to make money as a regional shopping centre. We must also be conscious of possible residential development on the Squamish reserve lands now currently used as the dog Park. Again, that development would increase residential use (and add to the already overloaded traffic situation). The area already is a mixed use neighbourhood - further residential development is necessary or desirable.

• Keep it a shopping centre with more green spaces between the stores. Lalji is worth 2.9 billion and he can do without all this extra cash and citizens can do without the extra headache, traffic jams and pollution

• I support Park Royal as a shopping centre exclusively. It should focus on retail innovation such as the Park Royal Village. This should provide sufficient revenue/profit. I do not support Park Royal as a mixed-use neighbourhood.

• Understand the trend by mall owners concerned about profits. The concept of a new neighborhood is incomplete. Where is the social housing? Will these buildings sit on Indian Reserve land?

• It’s great! As mentioned, Park Royal seems to suffer from a revolving door syndrome in terms of what stores exist. Creating a space that attracts and keeps the customer base interested and shopping is essential to fixing this.

• Once again...it would appear it is still just a shopping center with massive towers and yet MORE commercial ventures.

• The right thing to do.

• I do not support the idea of transitioning to a mix-use neighborhood. The residential component is already part of Park Royal. It is the increase of density of population the main concern as well as the absence of alternative travel facilities for more.

• Due to its location, varied services, at the entrance to Vancouver, North Vancouver, West Vancouver and Squamish and Whistler, it is a Regional Shopping Centre. It was massaged by addition of the strip mall like venue “The Village”. Why the desire to add new residential development? To the south it is west of the West Royal residential complex and two substantial commercial buildings, to the east the District Sports Fields, and to the north and east by Seniors Residences and other Residential condos and commercial business and to the west the rental Park Royal Towers.

• Then people wont need their cars that live near by, We have enough commercial space there. We need tax dollars from residential.
• I am all in favour. Too many shops are already continuously closing. Too much competition, to high rent. Could we have less clothing and more books, furniture, affordable markets?

• I like the inclusion of residential in the mix
Question #6

What are your thoughts on open space and public realm space proposed in the application?

- ?
- Fully Support
- no comment
- I support the concept. Make sure that it is designed to draw people into the public space (vs. just for looks, don't touch)
- it's good. I like it
- malls too, need open space
- Malls also need open space
- a shopping centre should have it anyway
- In line with the professionalism and success that Park Royal has enjoyed with their Village concept
- don't see it happening
- There is virtually no open space in Park Royal north and south at present. Any new space where people can relax or sit and have their lunch et is an improvement
- Good to have open public space
- very positive
- Its significant, meaningful and the fact that public art is in the plans makes me very happy
- some good ideas especially the bike valet and storage
- very good ideas
- usage will be the proof. Will areas be used by mall staff?
- Okay
- OK
- about time to have green space at PR
- Its not really a place I would "hang out" but so nice for those that live and work close by.
• once again speaks to community
• if it is provided as proposed, this is great
• there is very little "open space" little setback. The green is disappearing
• amenities well planned for residents and users of Park Royal
• As long as they are big enough for practical use, its great
• Looks attractive. However haven't given a lot of thought to whether it's sufficient in scale
• Good idea to have this even in existing Park Royal layout. Badly needed
• Everything will work out if some serious discussions take place on a connecting bridge from the North Shore to downtown - other municipalities have won this battle
• Fantastic - far superior to the "open space" proposed on the 1300 block and their "Welcome back to the Waterfront" unless you can afford to live there, they are blocking the waterfront to everyone else.
• Looks attractive
• Looks great so far, it seems to work together just fine
• Sounds great as long as a good portion is covered
• Makes sense to have this so shoppers/residents can enjoy ambience - e.g. outside Whole Foods is always busy
• Great! I would endorse public seating as part of the plan to assist seniors and young families to enjoy these areas. Where appropriate, I would encourage the District to rent art vs. Ownership so the spaces may constantly be refreshed
• Support for the proposed ideas, see the "gathering place" outside whole foods - it is a magnet for people of all ages. Make it a green space this time, complete with grass, flowers, shrubs, and seating
• See above #4
• looks great
• some good ideas Cafes, open spaces and public meeting spaces all good ideas
• arts; music; kids; water; culture
• I like those ideas
• As above. There will be something for everyone
• It is not good enough but will work.
• Little "open" space. Developers do this to adjust their plans making people think they are getting something from the developers.
• A welcome change!
• Open space will be nice to have, but when you live in a city that is as rainy as Vancouver for nearly 7 months of the year, it doesn’t seem practical.
• Form follows function. Ensure the two are consistent with the needs of the community.
• The careful balancing of open space with high density housing is the way to go to avoid becoming another Hong Kong.
• No problem with the proposal
• none at this point
• Efficient and clean
• Why would one go to Park Royal for 'open space'?
• Love it! People of all ages enjoying community space is what makes a community strong.
• great way to make this our place and home
• no comment
• Neutral.
• The proposal seems misleading, as it’s hard to imagine how that much structure would leave room for all the park space shown in the pictures. However, it's not a great location for public space anyway because we have lots of much better open space nearby. So trade the public space for other community contributions instead.
• Good idea but not practical with all the rain we get.
• such a small carrot being offered to us. Forget it. The same applies to the proposed movie theatre
• They cannot deliver on this promise, I don’t believe.
• just lipstick to look pretty, this site would make a nice park. Maybe consider trading off green space on this site for some higher density elsewhere that is less "in your face" to the public being right on Marine and Taylor Way.
• The recent expansion is being built maximum to the sidewalk boundaries. I see little improvement in pedestrian accessibility or easy navigation through this area.

• Open space and public realm space are also important for the single use shopping centre development that should be allowed for this site.

• I would not trust the developers at all. All they want is density and dollars and do not care at all about the people here (they know immigration Canada will be allowing thousands of wealthy immigrants every day into Canada).

• I support open space in the further development of Park Royal as single-use shopping centre/destination. This should be a condition of Park Royal's development as a single-use shopping centre.

• If one was to cut the Village in half, and place it on either side of Marine Drive, that would be perfect. You could have that entirely be composed of a mix of small service businesses such as cafes and smaller high-end retailers. Then allocate part of it as a small park or sitting area, such as how it is outside Whole Foods. You get the gateway effect as we're looking for, while still opening both residential and commercial property for use.

• No comment(s). As mentioned above...I do not believe this parcel of land can accommodate both while providing a beautiful "gateway" to West Vancouver.

• Looks OK

• I don't see any realm but rather detriments on the quality of life. I don't see a literally open space it looks like any crowded shopping center. In my opinion a park, a garden, an artist market would bring a lot more quality of life to West Vancouver than this proposed development.

• Looks great what about a movie theatre?

• My view is that if the Applicant wishes to have this included in the mall it is up to them. I would think that decision would be based on their best interest and that of the public at large.

• Not enough, what about creating a real park on the south side along the river, improving on the wild bushes full of plastic bags and containers abandoned under the wild greenery? Or the native owners of that land are still thinking of their own version of housing?

• okay
Question #7:

Please provide any other additional comments you may have about the application.

• Generally pleasantly surprised

• Support this application as it adds a mixture of housing units and sizes in the best location in W. Van near transit + amenities. Also recommend considering adding purpose build rental apartments. Provides long term tenure and for those residents considering a Park Royal Location

• Id like to see this project stopped and would recommend that this proposal be rejected.

• I would like to see the roof space of the towers used to show some large scale sculptural art - public art. use both towers. Remember you can see this gateway from the bridge and top of Taylor Way.

• I like the synergy on this project. We have the potential of many interests progressing and solving a major transportation issue via this project. Now is the time

• A conversation about plans for the rest of P.R. and Squamish lands is needed. Before we know the possibilities/plans for that we should not proceed. I appreciated P.R. has actual long term plans. We should learn about them all before moving on this.

• A traffic land south bound on Taylor Way from Keith all the way to Marine dedicated to traffic continuing south (or turning west at Taylor Way) would significantly improve ability to transit to North Van when traffic is backed up. 2) Traffic and transit issues need a solution before we consider additional density. I don’t buy we need more people to improve these areas - buses are already over capacity. 3) If its pre-supposed that residents of these new towers will mainly take transit, bike, walk - then do not build any parking

• walk the talk. Build with NO parking or provide a community amenity contribution of minimum $100,000 per parking spot or car licensed to owner without parking.

• combined with increase in traffic from Evelyn project, this will mean major congestion at peak times and drive people away from living in West Van if they work downtown

• it is unfortunate that the proposed move theatre is not guaranteed in this application
• obviously the biggest challenge is traffic management + vision figure that out and off we go.
• we desperately need traffic control at Taylor Way and Marine
• Build the new bridge across the Capliano river at the railway bridge before getting approval for this development
• I applaud all the time and effort those involved have put into this project to make it fit so well into the future of our community.
• any development of whatever nature increases congestion at Marine Drive and Taylor Way. W need more police supervision at rush hour.
• appreciate opportunity to review; well planned; just do it rather than kill yet another needed development
• I am concerned that people downsizing might not be able to afford units and they will be bought by people not living here and sit empty most of the time. That would not make a community. Traffic patterns onto Marine Drive at rush hour is a concern from the development
• When this goes to public process and people speak (for or against) have council ask in addition to providing their home address whether they are property owners or renters! Renters don’t have "skin in the game". Also if their address is in Park Royal Towers, they should be asked to "please be seated". They are renters and their landlord is the native band. They have absolutely no stake in the community (from a financial perspective.
• Bike programs are good. Unsure if this overall project twill enhance the shopping experience, or confuse it. The major problem remains the intersection of Taylor Way and Marine Drive
• IMP We live in the West Royal Tower. The traffic on Main Street on to Taylor Way, heading north, should not be allowed, just westbound is OK
• My only dislike to the project is there are no rental of suites. Vest Vanc. Needs apartment rentals - I do not want tot live in someone’s basement suite nor do I want to be crammed into the back area of a property into a "lane" (I call them alley houses) - too much traffic and noise in the alley and some areas will have 3 "residences" in a single family zone! Quite faintly the District needs this - the property will have to be leased and think of the property taxes this will generate on these 2 towers! WE NEED THE MONEY - new sewer plants, hopefully some upgrades to water and sewer lines (also lift stations) - dykes along waterfront in Ambleside and lets fact it, the towers go there or they can put them around the back and there goes the money
• I hope it proceeds as planned
• The idea to built a movie theater is great, because that's what I really miss in West Vancouver
• We really need a proper movie theatre in West Van
• I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. The info boards are excellent and convey solid info
• Overall, the main issue facing this development is the Lions Gate Bridge and accompanying traffic issues; these have yet to be resolved to my satisfaction and that of every other West Van resident to whom I have spoken to date
• I strongly believe these developments will cause a deterioration in our way of life rather than enhancement. The infrastructure cost to taxpayers will be too much compared to the revenue you will receive. I am of the very strong opinion that we should control all development very slowly and include all infrastructure in each development
• can't wait to see the end result
• My comment is that you should think about the traffic congestion in this area to help reduce the number of stressed people for the wait in traffic this is not good for a city like Vancouver with World Reputation, good luck.
• This application is insane and city planners should re-learn a planning process and where to build to accommodate more people. The museum is another total abomination.
• It would be lovely if we could always keep things familiar... but the reality is that we need to live somewhere, the population of the Lower Mainland is growing. We may not like it but that is a reality. Living close to amenities is a lifestyle choice that should be available. Better at Park Royal than in the Streets of Ambleside filled with single family homes.
• Develop a credible long term housing plan that is sustainable, functional, a "Complete Neighbourhood".
• Sorry to be less specific on this development in my comments - nevertheless the comments are very relevant.
• The traffic congestion, access to Marine Drive., Lions Gate are the stumbling blocks to this application.
• As more people downsize this gives them an opportunity to stay in a community they know and love.
• The future always has a price - I think we can afford this one
• It’s time for the local politicians to do what’s right and stand up to the hypocritical old schoolers who have little regard for the future community and growth.

• no comment

• The biggest problem I see is traffic. Since the changes that began earlier this year, I’ve never been able to travel along Marine from 11th Street through the light at Taylor Way in under 10 minutes. I don’t see it improving with this development at 752 Marine.

• We hope The District of West Vancouver seriously takes into consideration the traffic problems that exist at Marine Drive & Taylor Way and not approve high rise towers.

• please, please say no. The Larco Group take their over the top proposal where it might be appreciated.

• Please do not accept this proposed development as it will lead to further degradation of the lifestyle that draws us to West Van

• Living adjacent to this project, and through the past two years of construction, the project seems to be on a fast track schedule with site preparation, i.e. movement of The White Spot, equipment positioning and constantly changing traffic patterns. Public Hearings sound like a farce when it seems to be a done deal!!

• Most of the videos posted were from the developer. This does not give the public a balanced view of the project or its potential pitfalls. Community consultation and engagement are undermined by this approach.

• What is the point - no one is listening and no one cares about the average person on the North Shore. We are only be measured by the size of our pockets

• Providing four car-share vehicles and a few plug-in charging stations are simply window dressing to dress up an unattractive and unnecessary proposal.

• I am not against change; if we refuse change we refuse progress. I am however a great believer in common sense and have a very difficult time believing the statistics provided by the traffic engineers. There is no possible way traffic WILL NOT be increased far more than they are projecting. On a good day, southbound traffic on Taylor Way is lined up to the highway. How is Lions Gate Bridge going to withstand the extra usage? Perhaps had Larco put forward a private/public proposal for an inspirational solution to the problem of a much needed third crossing, they would not be facing the wrath of North ShoreITES.....but would in fact become heroes!

• I hope it proceeds.
• Undeveloped lands are not a wasteland. Why develop anything when the community is not asking for it? Adding high-density residential development will impact the landscape, add more people putting more stress on policing, hospitals, fire responders and paramedics. Certainly this lot would benefit with an improvement in land use, but I don’t see the net benefit in this project. I understand this is the way consultation process work, but for me it should be the other way around. How many WV residents are asking to increase population density and re-zoning of this area? I can see this project will greatly benefit the owners/operators of Park Royal but I don’t see a community benefit. With regards to the ‘illegal blocking behavior’ mentioned in the video (which does occur)? Please explain why do you think this happens? Isn’t it because the intersection is jammed already? Is Lions Gate traffic going to be resolved? I do not support the development of more multi-tasking, multi-purpose environments: entertainment, recreating, leisure, dining, drinking all together. This is very common in some developing countries (and the US) where multi-purpose centers are the only and main alternative people have outside their homes. But we live in West Vancouver, a place where nature and tranquil life has been valued, a place with already a wealth of possibilities to enjoy all those environments: any of this multi purpose environments are close by in Vancouver (downtown, Kitsilano, Yaletown, false creek) North Vancouver etc.

• As a long time resident of Cedardale, I do not believe my shopping experience at the Mall or the Entrance to the District would be enhanced by having the Mall transition from a Regional Shopping Centre to a Mixed Use Neighbourhood, including the introduction of new residential development. I would rather be assured of an open uncongested Marine Drive and Taylor Way intersection with easily accessibility to convenient Mall parking with more varied and well manged commercial enterprises as set out in the OCP and current zoning. Turn down the proposal at least until the full intentions of the applicant for both sides of the Mall are known and Residents and Council can then formally re-address the OCP and appropriate zoning.

• Lets get this going! The elected officials drag their feet on every project. The minority of the naysayers are killing off projects Developers will start taking their $ elsewhere.

• No other comments, I hope it will be completed soon. But what about the renovation of the north side of which there are rumours but nothing visible yet?

• Get on with it.
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1 Introduction

Park Royal is one of Canada’s oldest suburban shopping centres. Opened in 1950, Park Royal pioneered a change in how retailing and suburban commercial development would serve communities for a number of decades. Now Park Royal is looking to join the emerging trend of transitioning former suburban shopping centres into mixed-use commercial/residential neighbourhoods with relatively higher-density residential development to complement the existing retail and service uses.

In December 2012, the Owners of Park Royal submitted an application to redevelop the land at 752 Marine Drive, the location of the former White Spot restaurant site, into two residential towers of 24 and 19 storeys atop a five-storey base-plane structure. The application marks a departure from existing Official Community Plan (OCP) policy and Zoning Bylaw regulations, and accordingly, an application was made to amend those bylaws. In response, the Council of the District of West Vancouver resolved to undertake a community consultation process as a precursor to considering bylaw amendments to inform any future planning decisions on the lands within the jurisdiction of the District of West Vancouver.

Though a substantial amount of higher-density residential development surrounds Park Royal, this planning study examines the introduction of residential development on lands considered in the District of West Vancouver policy as predominantly retail, with some residential density indexed to the amount of commercial area provided.

This document is a Policy Statement that introduces several land-use and OCP level policy considerations based on a balance between the proposed application, a robust community consultation program, and sound planning, land-use, and development principles. It is intended to frame future discussions about development at 752 Marine Drive, and ground those discussions in a community consultation program as outlined in the companion “Consultation Summary” document.

The document will also provide a number of principles, policies, and questions to be considered to guide future decision-making about the redevelopment of 752 Marine Drive. It functions at a level slightly above the OCP in that it proposes general directions, but also acknowledges that there are considerations and details that will be addressed at future stages for any development approvals considered at 752 Marine Drive. In that regard this document affords flexibility to refine development applications through additional community consultation and review of more detailed development applications.

Though several questions remain, it is apparent that any development approvals at 752 Marine Drive will have to address short, medium, and long-term transportation...
solutions to the existing vehicular traffic congestion experienced during peak periods at Marine Drive and Taylor Way. A redevelopment of 752 Marine Drive will likely consist of more residential density than currently contemplated in the plan and will mark a transition from a predominantly retail environment to a more mixed-use neighbourhood approach south of Marine Drive. It will also contain some level of open-space or public realm improvement. It will capitalize on the existing transit offerings at Park Royal and enhance other transportation modes other than the private automobile. It will also sustainably provide land uses, densities, and uses with proximal access to the existing goods and services available at Park Royal to promote sustainable development.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Immediate Context Area

A unique context area and multiple jurisdictions responsible for land-use and transportation frame this Policy Statement and any future decisions related to development at Park Royal as well as future transportation decisions or improvements to the intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way. Most notably, and as shown on the context map below, most of the Park Royal development south of Marine Drive is on land leased from Squamish Nation. As First Nations land, it is entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the District. The lease with Squamish Nation permits the Owner to undertake a broad range of uses on the leasehold lands, and allocates a significant amount of additional development entitlement than has already been built.

The land proposed for redevelopment at 752 Marine Drive is unique in that it is the only Park Royal land located south of Marine Drive that is within the jurisdiction of the District. As shown on the following context plan, the jurisdictional boundary transects the former White Spot Site, resulting in a small piece of fee simple land south of Marine Drive.

The District’s Official Community Plan provides direction to “Cooperate with the Park Royal Shopping Centre owners and the Squamish Nation to integrate their future development and operational decisions into the larger community planning framework.” The process leading to this policy statement has encouraged the Owner to provide an indication of future development aspirations at Park Royal on lands outside the District’s jurisdiction, at least to the extent that they are currently known.

Most of the Park Royal development north of Marine Drive falls within the jurisdiction of the District, with only the westernmost portions falling within the Squamish Nation boundary that transects the north mall area.
In order to study 752 Marine Drive, the Owners were asked to provide their vision and development aspirations for all of Park Royal, including both the land north of Marine Drive and the lands at Park Royal South that are outside the jurisdiction and control of the District. The Owners identified additional retail and entertainment development on the western portion of Park Royal South, and additional food store expansion and commercial pad development at Park Royal North. According to the Owners, there is no intention of redeveloping any of their holdings north of Marine Drive for anything other than commercial/retail expansion of the shopping centre at this time.

In addition to the retail development potential for Park Royal, a significant amount of the land within the Squamish Nation leasehold area has been identified for future residential development. That land is identified as area “D” and shaded blue in the following jurisdiction map. However at this time, there is no indication that the additional residential development is imminent.

![Context Map](image)

**Figure 1: Context Map**

This information and immediate context has been instrumental in framing the discussion about 752 Marine Drive.

### 1.1.2 The Broader Context Area

It has been apparent throughout the process that the new development in the area ought to also be taken into account in consideration of future land use changes at 752 Marine Drive. Namely the “Evelyn” project, and the redevelopment of 1300 Marine Drive are projects of significant size and scale that will increase density and traffic within...
Further, 1300 Marine Drive is an important gateway and has been identified as West Vancouver’s Town Centre. How these two gateways lead through a progression between these nodes is an important consideration in defining the role of Park Royal as a gateway.

During consideration of a recently approved project in the Taylor Way corridor, Council has discussed the need for a more comprehensive look at this area to address the impacts of traffic and the potential for the evolution of the traditional land uses in this corridor. In addition, a proposal for a residential and office tower has been discussed with Staff for the north-east corner of Marine Drive and Taylor Way.

1.1.3 The Plan Area

This policy statement addresses all of the land commonly held by the Owner of Park Royal. It includes those portions of land identified as areas G, H, I, and J on the context map. Though informed by the context area, the plan area is comprised of the lands that are within the jurisdiction of the District and which will be potentially subject to OCP, rezoning, and development permit applications.

Figure 2 Plan Area

The one notable exception is Taylor Way north of Marine Drive, which is a provincial Highway under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. It has been included however given the significance of the intersection with Marine Drive and importance to any future land use decisions.
1.2  Policy Context

1.2.1 Applicable Official Community Plan Land Use Policy

The lands at Park Royal Shopping Centre are within the Development Permit Area BF – C7, which recognizes the role of Park Royal Shopping Centre as the eastern “gateway” to West Vancouver. The objectives of this Development Permit Area are:

- To enhance the gateway role,
- To promote a high quality of building design and landscaping, and
- To screen parking from Marine Drive.

The Development Permit Guidelines and Objectives BF – C7 do not speak to residential land uses.

1.2.2 Broader Official Community Plan Policy Directions

In Framework for Action – Achieve a Compact Metropolitan Region, the OCP states that “this Community Plan supports development of Park Royal in a manner that could help lessen the growth of traffic on the Lions Gate Bridge by encouraging land uses that provide office employment on the North Shore or which generate off-peak traffic flows”.

Policy LE 1 – Local Economy (plan for hierarchy of commercial areas that serve a variety of roles in the community) “support[s] development that enhances Park Royal’s gateway location and minimizes generation of increased peak hour traffic”, and “encourage[s] the provision of commercial entertainment facilities at Park Royal”.

Policy LE 3 – Local Economy, states, “Encourage mixed commercial and residential redevelopment projects in commercial centres where consistent with ongoing commercial activity.” Note that this is a general policy and not Park Royal specific.

Policy H5 – Housing in Commercial Areas, encourages “mixed commercial and residential developments in the Ambleside, Dundarave and Horseshoe Bay commercial centres, and consider mixed uses in local commercial areas”. Note that Park Royal is not a local commercial area.

Policy BF – C2 – Built Form and Neighbourhood Character, Commercial Areas Policies and Designations (support the commercial centers by encouraging residential uses), says to “encourage mixed commercial/residential development within commercial areas while retaining commercial frontage at street level where appropriate”.
It is important to note that while the OCP talks about mixed use development in general at Park Royal, the emphasis is on “office employment,” “development which generates off-peak traffic flows,” and “commercial entertainment facilities.” The OCP does not contemplate a significant residential component of the development at Park Royal.

1.2.3 Existing Zoning Regulations

Park Royal North is zoned Comprehensive Development 30 (CD-30). This site-specific zone establishes predominantly retail uses, but also includes provision for restaurant, garden centre, childcare, and gas station uses. There is no provision made for residential, office, or other uses, as it is truly envisioned as a shopping centre.

The portion of the 752 Marine Drive lands within the municipality are currently zoned C1 – Commercial Zone 1. C1 zoning permits a broad range of commercial uses including the historic restaurant use, but also including uses such as vehicle sales and repair, banks, civic uses, retail and office. The zone also includes residential if built above commercial uses, but the residential square footage of these dwellings shall not exceed the commercial square footage, making it secondary to the commercial development. This zone would not accommodate higher density residential forms, or any development that had residential as its primary use.
2 Community Consultation

A companion “Consultation Summary” has been prepared to accompany this document to outline the consultation efforts undertaken by the District to inform this Policy Statement. In brief, the consultation included two open houses, an online virtual open house, interaction with residents at the recreation centre, and the use of the District’s online engagement tool.

The program sought innovative means to communicate the relevant information about the application, the jurisdiction, and other matters, and also gathered feedback from 88 individuals through comment forms.

The results of the consultation program have informed this policy document and the recommended policy approach for Park Royal.

In summary, the consultation report indicates a significant concern with the existing traffic issues at Marine Drive. However, in terms of land use, there is general support to consider a transition to incorporate residential development at 752 Marine Drive. This support includes additional support for additional density at that location; however there is concern raised about the appropriateness of the tower form as presented by the Applicants.
3 Policy Direction

The general policy directions outlined in this section reflect the community consultation undertaken to date. The policy direction in this Policy Statement is at a high level, and is intended to provide general direction and consideration for more refined Official Community Plan level policy. There are still questions around the detailed building form and exact density that will need to be contemplated through an Official Community Plan amendment, rezoning, and ultimately a Development Permit process. Accordingly, this policy statement will defer to those processes to get progressively more detailed as material and information is provided.

3.1 General Park Royal Objectives

The following objectives are recommended to provide high-level direction to consideration of any redevelopment of Park Royal, and particularly south of Marine Drive:

• To take a leadership role in coordinating multi-jurisdictional, regional improvements to the existing traffic conditions at Marine Drive and Taylor Way.
• To minimize impacts on the existing traffic congestion at Marine Drive and Taylor way by ensuring alternate means of transportation
• To promote a mix of land uses that benefit from being located adjacent to the existing development, transit service, and proximity to the Lions gate Bridge
• To increase the range of civic and office uses that provide benefit to West Vancouver residents
• To incorporate housing options that increase the mix and variety of housing options in West Vancouver
• To create and integrate vibrant public spaces to promote interaction among people
• To promote green building, sustainable energy initiatives, and sustainable transportation options
• To determine building forms, site design, and architecture that addresses the prominence of the corner of Marine Drive and Taylor Way.
• To retain Park Royal North as a predominantly retail and service centre to meet the retail and service needs of the community and the region.
3.1.1 General Policy
• The District should continue ongoing collaboration with the owners of Park Royal and Squamish Nation to ensure that development throughout Park Royal is coordinated, integrated, and considered comprehensively across jurisdictional boundaries.
• The role of Park Royal and Ambleside as important gateways to the community should be considered in the evaluation of appropriate uses and densities along the Marine Drive corridor.

3.2 Policy Direction 1: Transportation

3.2.1 Context
Transportation, and specifically the existing peak-period traffic congestion at the intersection of Taylor Way and Marine Drive, is the overwhelming public concern with any additional development at Park Royal and the broader context area. It is acknowledged as an existing condition, and one of regional significance, but any contemplation of additional development at Park Royal will necessarily involve consideration of the issue.

As part of the provincial highway network, that services all North Shore municipalities and other destinations such as Whistler, the short, medium, and long-term transportation solutions extend beyond the District. However, recently the District has taken a leadership role to convene meetings with the other agencies and jurisdictions involved to seek improvement. To date, changes to the counterflow management approach for the Lions Gate bridge has been implemented as a result and appears to alleviate some of the issues. Additional discussion about managing intersection blocking traffic movements have also been discussed.

3.2.2 Transportation Objectives:
• To ensure the efficient movement of people and goods through West Vancouver
• To provide as many alternatives to the automobile as possible to further the District’s existing transportation objectives
• To continue inter-jurisdictional discussions about short, medium, and long-term transportation improvements in Lions Gate bridge area

3.2.3 Policy
I. The District of West Vancouver will continue a leadership role in engaging other North Shore Municipalities, the Ministry of Transportation and
Infrastructure, Squamish Nation, and other stakeholders in the pursuit of short, medium, and long-term transportation improvements in the area surrounding Park Royal and the Lions Gate Bridge.

II. In considering any rezoning applications at Park Royal the District will consider the net traffic impacts of the proposal relative to existing development entitlements under the current zoning.

III. Any development or redevelopment at Park Royal should make provision for transit, cycling, pedestrian movements and other non-vehicular traffic in accordance with the District’s Strategic Transportation Plan and the transportation hierarchy described therein.

IV. Any development or redevelopment at Park Royal should reinforce Park Royal as a transit hub by providing direct, safe, accessible, and comfortable pedestrian connections to transit locations.

V. The District will consider reviewing current parking standards for developments at Park Royal that make significant contributions to non-vehicular transportation improvements.

VI. The District will consider parking at Park Royal in a comprehensive manner, taking into account the organized parking throughout the mall on each side of Marine Drive.

3.3 **Policy Direction 2: Land Use Allocation**

3.3.1 **Land Use Context**

Currently, Park Royal is identified in the Official Community Plan as a commercial area. Park Royal North is zoned Comprehensive Development 30 (CD-30), while 752 Marine Drive is zoned Commercial 1 (C-1). In general, the comment forms submitted tend to support further consideration of an OCP amendment to introduce a residential component to 752 Marine Drive, particularly if traffic issues can be improved. The support for residential development is only for 752 Marine Drive and accordingly, the fee-simple portions of land north of Marine Drive will retain their current commercial land use.

3.3.2 **Land Use Allocation Objectives**

- To introduce residential development that complements Park Royal’s role as a regional shopping centre and capitalizes on existing and future transportation options and infrastructure.
- To preserve Park Royal’s primary function as a retail destination over the long term, particularly for Park Royal North of Marine Drive.
• To include a range of suitable permitted uses to incorporate additional civic, retail, and office uses at 752 Marine Drive

• To incorporate vibrant and successful public open space as a component of any residential development at Park Royal

• To ensure that development at 752 Marine Drive is complementary to, and supported by, adjacent development within Park Royal on Squamish Nation lands.

3.3.3 Land Use Allocation Policies
I. Those lands north of Marine Drive within the Plan Area will retain their commercial land use and will be used in accordance with existing zoning regulations.

II. Rezoning for 752 Marine Drive will be considered for mixed-use development consisting of higher-density residential, public and professional offices, retail, commercial, civic and open space uses.

III. The Official Community Plan amendment and rezoning process will establish the final density in concert with determining the built form

IV. The Official Community Plan and rezoning process will establish ratios or proportions of the residential and non-residential uses through consideration of community need and marketability of different uses, and the District will consider some flexibility to accommodate changing market conditions.

3.3.4 Open Space Integration Policies
I. Any residential development of 752 Marine Drive will integrate publically-accessible open space

II. Through design guidelines and the Development Permit Process, specific attention will be made to ensure that the open space relates to both private residential buildings and uses, as well as the retail and commercial uses

III. The design of any future own space will consider design, use and program elements that will animate the space on an ongoing basis. The Owner and the District will consider collaborating on programming ideas for the space.

3.4 Policy Direction 3: Density and Built Form

The directions for specific densities and built form are not yet resolved to the point where detailed densities and building types can be confirmed. Though there is support for the introduction of higher-density residential, the final densities and square footage of both the residential and non-residential development will occur in
concert with a more detailed design review and consideration of more detailed design guidelines or Development Permit Area guidelines.

Specifically there is a question about the extent to which this site and the intersection forms a gateway into West Vancouver, and how it may relate to other gateway progressions along Marine Drive, and consideration of this gateway in the context of other important nodes and edges in the community will be a topic of policy deliberation.

As for building form, the policy discussion will likely involved a more robust examination of a design rationale for towers similar to those proposed in the application and reflect the character of West Vancouver. Specifically how a tower form would relate to the existing development at Park Royal and in the area would be a policy topic.

The District Design Review Committee is an appropriate venue for providing recommendations to Staff and Council on the development of policies regarding use, form and character of development.

There will also need to be some consideration for design guidelines to ensure the policy will result in development that is consistent with the reasons for support.

3.4.1 Density and Built Form Objectives
- To introduce a higher density residential development that responds to the site conditions and immediate context area
- To establish the relative importance of Park Royal, and 752 Marine Drive in particular, as a gateway to West Vancouver through architecture and built form
- To incorporate non-residential development in a density and built form that complements the residential use and the balance of Park Royal
- To consider viewscapes in consideration of any taller building forms or towers
- To create an appropriate street-frontage along Marine Drive that complements the recently developed Marine Drive streetscape

3.4.2 Density and Built Form Policies
I. Prior to the approval of any future OCP amending bylaw, the Owner’s new Development Permit Area guidelines will be required to address building form and character and the Density and Built Form Objectives.

II. Prior to the approval of any future OCP amendments, the Owners will provide a Development Permit application, or detailed designs accompanied by detailed design guidelines and design rationale for the buildings proposed.
4 Implementation

4.1 Approach

The intent of this document is to summarize the consultation undertaken to date in the form of higher-level policy statements. These statements will help frame the discussion of future Official Community Plan amendments and consideration of rezoning applications. That will be the means through which these policy directions are implemented.

There are a number of policy matters that have, and will continue to emerge, in the next phases of the consultation and more detailed planning. Specifically density, built form and massing, with a focus on the tower form will be an important consideration in future planning processes and consultations. The current review of the project by the DRC will provide more clarity into the issues of appropriate land use, built form, and density. There are also other policy matters and approaches that will be required to ensure the project meets the expectations of those who provided supportive comments, while minimizing the concerns and negative impacts identified through the consultation as well.