

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vancouver DT area needs to look like a more modern city

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

There would have to be some demonstrated need.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Too many people living downtown already

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

Higher buildings will allow increased density for our growing population and will protect lower density areas like the West End & Eastside

While we have a dense downtown and immediate surrounding area which is great, the skyline is boring with a flat top skyline. Most buildings are not interesting

While the view corridors and general height limits have helped generate more development downtown than if fewer taller buildings had been built, I think the time has come to adjust height limits to avoid further entrenchment of the table-top appearance of our skyline from many viewpoints

It's the revenue future of downtown Vancouver

They are disruptive to the skyline from other vantage points beside the currently identified PROTECTED VIEWS I.E. TOWARDS DOWNTOWN FROM Kits and vice versa. Buildings such as Shangri La conspicuously mar the skyline

View air

Vancouver is a world class city. And well thought out policies guiding the look of our city's skyline will enhance our city's stature.

There needs to be a direction where developing "true" green city is forefront with the city's agenda. Sustainability in Vancouver should be a striving goal when accommodating future growth on contracting development in the downtown core is a better way than accommodating growth in urban sprawl. New buildings are significantly more responsible with water/energy per square foot than aging office buildings built in the 50's, and a change out is a reasonable proposition

Vancouver area and downtown are part of an estuary. This lacks the underground life nec /limestone support for high-rises above 45 storey in height. As the weight would cause a singe of the building

Protected public views actually do not adequately protect views. Unintended consequences and unidentified sites are not protected

Efficient densification. Opportunity for dramatic architectural impact

The skyline is too flat topped at maximum 300-400-450 heights. It needs some iconic buildings to make it look interesting.

No accommodation for traffic pedestrians etc increase in population. Make a double Decker bridge solution or monorail

Need more density; will make our downtown skyline more interesting (which it needs)

Density & views of the mountains should not take a back seat to sprawl and affordable housing

Need additional commercial space for future job growth and to capitalize on all the transit investments that have been made

You are a bunch of liars you were elected & changed your tune when you got there

Continuing development of very dense (both commercial/residential) downtown is positive from urban planning/transportation/infrastructure standpoint. This is particularly true if active and alternative transportation is encouraged: continue commitment to transit infrastructure, cycling facilities, and pedestrian friendly architecture.

Vancouver has a need for increased density, especially in the downtown core.

Current skyline lacks shape

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

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

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

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

Skyline excitement SOB space for high profile corp. offices still think these projects should allow some mixed use residential within these towers.

Higher buildings means more population, which will impose greater pressure on the downtown's resources. Downtown already has too many population.

Boring skyline - no tall buildings 700 - 800 '

I feel that the relative handful of undeveloped or under developed, filter downtown, and especially in the CBD mean that we need to maximize the utility and benefit of future developments. I feel that the 700' cap is still too low and would be quite comfortable with the skyline's apogee reaching 900 - 1000' It will allow for more job space, leverage rapid transit investment enable more people to work near the downtown residential areas and improve the skyline.

To provide more potential job space and to accentuate the CBD's prominence in the skyline

Landmark status

Enhances residential density and the density of jobs in the CBC which minimizes car travel makes this city more easily traveled by bicycle.

Yes, we need to continue to insert residential downtown in higher densities close "to places of work" we also need to plan in future office expansion with an organized reasonable plan

Insufficient underground liverock/limetone as Vancouver is in the heart of an estuary

In fact go higher up to 800 feet. Attract a prominent company to headquarter in Vancouver. I am tired of being second to Calgary for west coast corporate headquarters

we need more jobs

No, developers have enough height at present time

Reinforce central role of CBDs employment & activity center for Metro Vancouver. Visually interesting focus of skyline

Nothing should be higher than the Wall Cntr. Building there is no need no matter how you want to argue it.

Distinct possibility of street congestion. Also I am opposed to buildings of excessive height. They do not improve Vancouver's aesthetic appeal.

This part of the downtown peninsula is best suited for tallest towers

Not a resident in that neighbourhood

Vancouver's office space vacancy is extremely tight and is losing business to the suburbs. Vancouver needs to stay competitive for business. Downtown should not be just a residential neighbourhood, more office spaces are needed

Again less sun and views blocked etc.

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

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

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

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

Yes, this area has capacity downtown to grow in height without impacting any views. Shadow impact on Robson should be considered

Mainly landfill area without underground support

Provides gradualism to few increased height

Again attract more interesting higher designs for the downtown area

Enough traffic/shitty bus service

No impact on view corridors

General visitors who we have spoken to are already saying that Vancouver is getting an "overbuilt" look. Keep going like this and you can forget about livability. If you want to expand, then consider going east or south of False Creek.

This increase in height in the shoulder area would allow for a better transition to lower towers in neighboring areas.

Not a resident in that neighbourhood

More office buildings are a plus

Modest expansion is a good balance between development needs and impact on community

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have trouble visualizing this entrance to the city

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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