Explanatory Note

These are the City policies, as approved by Council on February 6, 1990 for the Coal Harbour neighbourhood area. This area is comprised of the Marathon-owned existing sub-areas 1 and 2 of the Central Waterfront District (CWD), the downtown escarpment sites along the north side of the 1300 - 1500 blocks West Pender Street and the Westin Bayshore property between Denman and Cardero Streets. These sites are located along the south shore of Burrard Inlet between Denman and Burrard Streets, generally north of Georgia/Pender/Hastings Streets, out to the existing harbour headline.

These policies have been amended to reflect public input, further staff review and Council advice, and contain a series of broadsheets that cover all major topics. These policies form the basis for the preparation of an Official Development Plan and detailed area development plans for the various development sites within Coal Harbour. These policies will guide the future development and form the basis for the provision of various public amenities, such as parks, waterfront walkways and community facilities. The policies will be used by the City and developers, and by others during public meetings and workshop discussions to be held as part of the planning process on the major development proposals for the south shore of Coal Harbour.
A Thumbnail Sketch of Coal Harbour

If the planning policies as contained in this document are implemented over the next 15-20 years, the kind of neighbourhood and public amenities that can be expected on this waterfront site (see map opposite) will include:

A broadly-mixed residential community for all ages and incomes:
- a total of about 3000 housing units, of which 25% would be suitable for families with young children;
- about 20% of the housing would be for "core-needy" households, and one-half of these would be families;
- about 25% of the housing would be affordable, small rental units; and
- an overall net residential density of about 3.3 FSR (130 units per acre), with higher densities toward the downtown edge and lower toward the water, the West End and Stanley Park.

An array of community facilities to serve the residents, workers and visitors:
- a K-7 school and associated play areas, at least 5 day cares and a small community centre and activity space;
- a potential marine-oriented public facility, possibly including a major theatre and meeting place; and
- additional visitor-oriented services and recreational facilities.

A comprehensive waterfront-oriented parks and open space system:
- a 1.5 km long continuous waterfront walkway, linking Stanley Park to Canada Place;
- at least 22 acres of parks and public open space (equivalent to about 16 football-size playing fields), including a minimum 8 acre major waterfront park on the Marathon site large enough to accommodate both active and passive activities, and other neighbourhood-oriented parks totalling about 12 acres; and
- a bicycle path system along, or close to, the waterfront.

A major public and visitor-oriented precinct at the eastern end containing offices, hotels and retail uses:
- up to 1.5 million sq. ft. of office space (e.g. 3 large office towers up to 300 feet in height);
- at least one major new hotel about the size of the Pan Pacific (min. 350,000 sq. ft.); and
- up to 150,000 sq. ft. of visitor-oriented retail shopping space.

Local shops and offices serving the residential neighbourhood:
- up to 200,000 sq. ft. of retail and office development generally located adjacent to Denman and Cardero Streets; and
- restaurants and marine-related services along the waterfront beside the marina at the western edge of the Marathon site.

A diversity of port and water uses creating a sense of a working waterfront:
- marinas for small boats with a capacity of about 550 moorage slips;
- most visitor-oriented charter boats relocated to a centralized location at the foot of Burrard Street;
- retention of essential marine servicing/industrial uses (e.g. Menchions Shipyard); and
- a conveniently located new seaplane terminal at the foot of Burrard Street.

A high-quality, urban shoreline treatment including limited areas of fill:
- up to about 5 acres of land fill on the Marathon site, mostly towards the eastern end, and little additional fill on the Marathon or Bayshore sites except where it benefits the public; and
- some shoreline changes to enhance appearance, protect marina areas and create public open space.

A street system oriented to the local neighbourhood needs:
- local traffic access without burdening adjacent congested streets in the downtown and West End;
- through traffic discouraged in the residential area;
- adequate lower level service access to the major port and commercial uses at the east end;
- opportunities for vehicular waterfront access for water users and visitors;
- adequate parking for residents, visitors and workers; and
- a street system accommodating a variety of transit options.

A built environment that is neighbourly and integrates well into the adjacent pattern of the downtown and West End:
- protection of all public street-end views to the water and mountains, and a reasonable accommodation of private views;
- a high quality public realm treatment emphasizing different neighbourhood characters and a domestic, small-scale character;
- for the residential neighbourhood west of Thurlow Street, about 15 - 20 tall, slim apartment towers widely spaced and varying in height from about 120 feet to 300 feet, with higher buildings toward the east;
- for the commercial precinct east of Thurlow Street, about 3 - 4 office/hotel towers up to a maximum 300 feet height; and
- lower buildings averaging 3 - 4 storeys in height on the north-south streets, but only where views are not a concern.
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1. OVERALL ROLE IN THE DOWNTOWN

ISSUES

Coal Harbour is of great strategic importance to the future of the downtown peninsula. It is a waterfront location, is adjacent to the downtown core and is the second largest potential development site in the downtown after Pacific Place. How does the Coal Harbour area fit within the broader context of the existing downtown?

Different approaches to this major issue are addressed in detail in the broadsheets that follow, but an overall vision for what role the area should play is an important starting point.

Key questions in this regard follow:

- To what extent is the existing mix of water uses in Coal Harbour vital to downtown? Is this a unique situation or are there alternatives for such water uses?
- Is Coal Harbour a one-of-a-kind small boat harbour within the inner-city or can this use be traded off to other locations for an alternative use more vital to balanced downtown growth?
- What should be the predominant use, if any, that determines the overall character of development -- the existing water uses, new housing, or new offices and commerce?
- Should the uses in Coal Harbour reflect those surrounding the area -- office/commercial to the south-east, port and marina functions at the waterfront and a mix of offices and high density residential to the south-west?

The relative mix of residential and commercial uses needs to be considered in light of overall planning objectives. The Vancouver Plan suggests limiting commercial office growth and encouraging housing in the downtown peninsula. This area could accommodate a significant residential component. Instead of reflecting adjacent land uses, would a more important role be to provide downtown housing? On the other hand, the growth potential for triple A offices in the adjacent "Golden Triangle" office district is limited and Coal Harbour would be ideal for office commercial development. Extending the office core to the waterfront would enhance the existing commercial precinct. To what extent should new office development be encouraged or limited?

Is there a special role for Coal Harbour in the provision for visitors and tourists to the downtown? The waterfront aspect is unique and will inevitably draw outsiders to it as much as local users. There are ample opportunities to provide public facilities. Should we have a major civic open space or park, one or several major public institutions, or cultural facilities?

Figure 1. Downtown Context Map
FACTS

Coal Harbour is the closest small boat moorage area to the downtown and, together with False Creek, is one of only two boat harbours in the inner city.

Storage and shipment of dangerous goods from the Coal Harbour area was discontinued in 1986. Until 1983, with the commitment to build the Canada Place project, little development activity had occurred on the Central Waterfront and in the Coal Harbour area. All existing land uses within the Marathon site can be considered temporary.

The only significant public waterfront park located within the Central Waterfront District is Portside Park (completed in 1987), although Devonian and Stanley Parks are close to the west end of the Coal Harbour area.

Residential development in Coal Harbour can accommodate people close to downtown jobs, reducing commuting costs.

Considerable residential potential exists on sites close to the westerly part of the Coal Harbour area (e.g. Georgina Alberni Corridor). Several high-density residential projects have been recently approved in the downtown area west of Bute, north of Robson (e.g. Triangle West).

PAST POLICY

1966 BAYSHORE CD-1 BY-LAW:
- CD-1 zoning for a four-phased mixed-use development was approved by Council that included the now existing hotel, additional hotel space, convention space, retail space, and office space, but excluded residential space. A subsequent (1979) revision allowed the development of the existing 200 berth marina.

1976 CWD PLANNING POLICIES:
- New development should be encouraged to provide a variety of new urban uses such as housing, retail and office commercial, recreational, cultural and public open spaces. These should be integrated compatibly with port and rail uses.
- There should be allowance for diversity of activity on the waterfront with limits to overall growth and a balance between residential population and working population, but oriented toward residential.

1979 CWD ODP:
- The basic objectives of the City in planning the Central Waterfront are to make the area more accessible and enjoyable to the people of Vancouver while maintaining a viable port operation and to ensure future development of the area is compatible with the adjacent Downtown and Gastown.
- Residential use was deleted from the allowable uses due to concern about hazardous goods movement and resultant residential safety concerns.

POLICY

Ensure that the diversity and broad mix of water uses that have evolved in Coal Harbour are conserved and play a major role in shaping the character and identity of the new mixed-use waterfront neighbourhood in a way that reinforces the image of the Coal Harbour inlet.

Encourage the provision of a variety of new urban uses including housing, retail, office, hotel, recreational, cultural and public open spaces as an extension of existing patterns nearby.

Allow for diversity of activity on the waterfront with the objective of making the area more accessible and enjoyable to the people of Vancouver. Reflect the use of the area by outsiders and visitors as a major feature.

Ensure that the gateway experience to Stanley Park is respected and a sense of the park-like setting at the western end of Coal Harbour is continued into the Coal Harbour development areas.

(Note: Specific policies concerning the mix of water, residential and commercial uses are affected by a range of sub-issues which can be reviewed in Broadsheet #3: Port and Water Uses, Broadsheet #8: Residential - Location and Density, Broadsheet #15: Retail/Service Development, and Broadsheet #16: Community Facilities and Services.)
2. TOPOGRAPHY / NEW GROUND PLANE

ISSUES

The Marathon site's historic role of linking rail and marine operations has for generations existed on reclaimed flatland at the base of the downtown escarpment. Downtown offices have exploited the prominent overlook to the harbour activity below and accordingly lined the escarpment 'edge', further reinforcing the geographic sense of two completely different places. Since the existing rail and ferry functions are to be removed, the site can be considered a clean slate and an open opportunity to create a special new place. The Bayshore site's historic role as part of the 'gateway' experience to Stanley Park has been possible in part due to its surface parking lot open spaces. Georgia Street commuters have enjoyed panoramic views of the mountains, Stanley Park and Coal Harbour. A slight change in elevation exists between Georgia Street and the Bayshore site that enhances views. What part should the historic topographic differences play in these opportunities?

Key questions are:

- To what extent should the escarpment, a unique part of the present identity of the downtown, be preserved? Should the overall approach to development be to establish a new grade that smooths out the topographic difference between the downtown district and the waterfront?

- How should Coal Harbour be integrated with the downtown and the West End? Are visual connections enough? Pedestrian connections? Vehicular connections?

- Should the site be integrated with the downtown and West End street grids?

FACTS

The Marathon site is relatively flat, at sea level and distinctively separated from its land surroundings by an escarpment 40 feet high at its easterly end, but declining westward to disappear at Cardero and Georgia Streets. The escarpment has been a traditional 'edge' to the downtown central business district.

The Bayshore site is also flat, with a surface parking lot approximately 15 ft. below the adjacent Georgia Street grade.

The present extent of the natural escarpment is mainly the 2 blocks between Broughton and Bute Streets. East of Bute the original escarpment has been replaced by the rear, below-grade parking walls of commercial office developments.

Bridging of the flatland has occurred with Granville Square and Canada Place, and the approved Waterfront Centre will close the gap existing behind Canada Place.
PAST POLICY

No past policy has dealt with preserving the identity of the area in terms of its topography or in terms of maintaining the historic ‘edge’ to the downtown.

POLICY

Encourage the linkage of the Marathon site with the Downtown but either preserve some of the former ‘escarpment edge’ by special landscaping treatment along its existing alignment where appropriate, or express a new ‘edge’ in association with public open space or street design.

Vary the treatment of the new ground plane to respond to the variable adjacent downtown topographic context, and bring the sense of escarpment closer to the new water’s edge where appropriate (see figure 3 below).

In the Marathon Site, develop a new surface grade connecting the top of the escarpment to the waterfront, using the area below for parking, utility areas and a potential service road. This will encourage a more convenient connection of the site with the downtown and a gentler transition to the waterfront.

For the Marathon Site, extend the adjacent north-south streets of the downtown into the site to provide vehicular, pedestrian and visual connections.

Figure 3. Coal Harbour Ground Plane Treatments
3. PORT AND WATER USES

ISSUES

The existing diverse mix of water uses in Coal Harbour has evolved into a complex marine-oriented community with economic interrelationships with the city and a substantial number of jobs directly or indirectly created. What impacts on this community will potential development of the Coal Harbour area have? Are there broader economic, social or heritage reasons to preserve aspects of this existing mix of water uses?

Water uses including marinas and boatsheds can add interest to the waterfront. They can also block water views and visually reduce the size of the waterbody. Marinas and boatsheds can hamper direct access to the shoreline, and require on-shore facilities such as parking lots and loading/unloading areas. There is a shortage of boat berths and covered boatsheds in Vancouver. Coal Harbour is a good location for visitors’ marinas and temporary moorage facilities.

Are floating homes and offices good or bad in this area?

To what extent should the Coal Harbour water area be occupied by marinas and/or covered boatsheds, and are these uses compatible with the adjacent housing proposed on the Marathon and Bayshore sites?

Are existing port uses such as a seaplane terminal, light marine industry, boat repairs, etc compatible with new water uses and residential development nearby?

Are more cruise ship facilities needed?

Is this an area for water-oriented tourist activities? The charter boat industry operates several boats in this area and would like to consolidate that activity with convenient moorage, appropriate parking and transit access.

Is special enforcement of rules for water use necessary?

Is it viable or desirable to have direct access to water for swimming and water recreation activities such as rowing?

FACTS

WATER USES

Terms for floating uses tend to be confusing. In this document the following definitions apply:

- **Boatshed** - a covered floating structure that may be totally enclosed or open on the sides, used for the storage and protection of boats.
- **Floating Home** - a floating building or marine vessel used principally for residential purposes that relies heavily on shore-based facilities and is not primarily intended for navigation.
- **Liveaboard** - a marine vessel used primarily for navigation and only incidentally for residential purposes that is not heavily dependent on shore-based facilities.
- **Marina** - the use of water area for the mooring of pleasure craft, but not including the repairing or building of boats.
- **Marine Terminal or Berth** - the use of water area for the mooring of boats, ships, float planes, ferries and other water vessels, but not including pleasure craft.

There are presently approximately 1,500 berths in 11 locations in Coal Harbour. Of this total, approximately 550 are located within the Marathon site between Cardero and the foot of Bute Street, at 6 locations. Approximately 230 are located within the Bayshore site between Cardero and Denman, at 2 locations.

Because of the existing boat wash and wave conditions being most severe at the easterly end of Coal Harbour, small boat moorage is most suited towards the westerly end of the site.

Of the 550 existing berths located within the Marathon site, approximately 400 are presently occupied. However, many of the recent vacancies have been due to boat owners anticipating expiration of leases for the redevelopment of the area. Of the 230 existing berths located within the Bayshore site, approximately 190 are presently occupied.

There are some 175 boat sheds within the Marathon site.

There are about 20 - 25 floating homes, liveaboards and floating offices in the Marathon and Bayshore sites.

Currently there are 4 major floating office barges in the westerly part of the Marathon site ranging in floor space from approximately 1,000 - 6,000 sq. ft., and 5 minor office barges ranging in size from approximately 200 - 500 sq. ft.

In the Bayshore site there are currently 6 minor office barges ranging in size from approx. 100 - 400 sq. ft.

![Figure 4. Existing Port and Water Uses](image-url)
There is a waiting list for covered berths and for large vessel berths (100+ feet) in some locations, but the average vacancy rate for marinas in the City of Vancouver is 3% and in the rest of the G.V.R.D. is 20%.

Marinas usually include supporting commercial facilities.

Parking requirements for marinas are one space for every two berths. For example, a 300 berth marina requires 150 spaces which covers about 1.0 acre.

A 300 boat marina requires about 10 acres of water.

**WATER QUALITY**

Storm and combined sewer outfalls exist in the Coal Harbour area, near Deadman's Island, and at the foot of Denman, Cardero and Burrard Streets. Nearby beach areas, including Brockton Point and Portside Park, have experienced ongoing high coliform counts from sewage discharge and are 'posted' to discourage swimming and primary contact with the water.

**PAST POLICY**

**1976 CWD PLANNING POLICIES**

(approved as basis for 1978 Draft CWD ODP):

- Marinas for smaller vessels should be encouraged particularly in the western parts of the area subject to the advice of the Port Authority on the safety capacity of the affected water.
- Floating homes and offices should be severely limited.

**1979 CWD ODP:**

- Small marinas, boat repair and harbour tour facilities encouraged as compatible water uses in CWD Sub-area 1 (Cardero to Bute).
- Marine commercial and significant light marine industry, such as small-scale boat repair, storage and boat charter, encouraged in CWD Sub-area 2 (Bute to Burrard).
- Seaplanes encouraged to continue operations in the western part of the CWD as long as negative effects on the new urban uses and the vessel traffic in Burrard Inlet are minimized.
- Boathed use in Coal Harbour has been an historical use that has progressed for the most part on an ad hoc basis.

**POLICY**

Maintain and encourage a diversity of water uses in Coal Harbour and foster the interrelationships between these uses and their linkages to downtown and port activities that contribute to their overall economic viability.

Encourage the retention of some of the small-scale marine uses that exist in the Coal Harbour area that give special character to the waterfront. Give consideration to the relocation and integration of these uses with a potential public institutional marine focus at the eastern end of the site.

Provide for increased public views and access to the water, and ensure that the arrangement of berths in marinas maximizes the available open water views from street ends.

Encourage some space within marinas to be reserved for visitors.

Maintain an approximately equal balance throughout the entire Coal Harbour basin between open water areas and water areas occupied by marine uses. Provide open water areas adjacent to waterfront park space.

Encourage the grouping of charter boat operations in preferably one location to improve public access to and awareness of these services, and to allow sharing of support facilities.

Encourage desirable port uses, including the possible provision of a new marine terminal for cruise ships and a relocated seaplane operation at the eastern part of the Coal Harbour area, as long as negative impacts on the new urban uses can be minimized.

Provide for seaplanes on the condition that noise from the planes be mitigated or seaplanes be limited to the east end of the site.

Maximize opportunities at the westerly part of the Coal Harbour waterbody for the principal water use as small boat moorage. Maintain approximately 50% of the water as open water in the area west of the tip of Deadman’s Island and the extension of Cardero Street.

Discourage and eliminate floating homes and offices, and most boatheds along the Coal Harbour waterfront, except those few boatheds required for temporary use by marina repair operations.

Allow a limited number of liveaboards in marinas to improve security, subject to their meeting City servicing requirements, including the provision of vessel holding tanks for effluent and/or sewer connections.

Allow for the gradual phasing-out of incompatible floating structures over a 3-year period.

Discourage opportunities for swimming and primary contact with the Coal Harbour waterbody, but allow for secondary contact to occur for recreational activities by appropriate shoreline treatment and design, and the provision of facilities to accommodate small boat launching by hand.
4. THE BAY AND SHORELINE

ISSUES

Significant landfill in the Bayside site or western Marathon site could affect the appearance of the relatively enclosed bay of Coal Harbour west of Deadman’s Island. Are there locations where filling should be minimized in order to maximize the amount of water area suitable for small boat moorage? Are there waterfront areas that are less sensitive to filling?

If there is significant landfill, should it be designated for private development or for public use?

Alterations to the shoreline will probably improve the appearance and public usability of the water and land. Is the existing pattern of uses preferred?

What role and character should the waterfront edge have? As a formal sweeping, monumental shoreline? Or as a more incremental, line-grain, diverse and less formal shoreline? Or as a mixture of both?

The shoreline treatment could facilitate boating and traditional port activities, or it could be a relatively pristine urban seawall, or it could be a natural place of ‘soft edges’. What shoreline treatments are appropriate adjacent to the central business and tourist district?

The existing ‘soft’ shoreline and inter-tidal areas provide significant fish habitat important for migrating and resident fish stocks in Burrard Inlet. Proposed filling and shoreline improvements in Coal Harbour would affect these fish habitat areas.

How best can the objectives to achieve no significant loss in the productive capacity of fish habitat be balanced against the needs of water users, visitors and residents to improve aspects of the Coal Harbour shoreline? Can the needs of all be accommodated by particular shoreline designs?

Should shoreline elevations be set higher than normal to take into account the possibility of a rise in ocean levels resulting from climatic trends?

FACTS

In this document, fill shall mean any material deposited in the water area or permanent decking attached to the shore that covers or reduces the extent of the usable water area.

The area’s existing shoreline, the result of haphazard filling, is mostly unimproved, unattractive and is largely inaccessible for public use.

The existing land area on the Marathon site (Existing CWD Sub-areas 1 and 2) amounts to 36.4 acres, with the existing water area out to the harbour headline being 45.6 acres.

The existing land area on the Bayside site comprises 16.1 acres, with the existing water area out to the harbour headline being 6.5 acres.

At the westerly part of the area, the waterbody between Deadman’s Island and the existing shoreline at the foot of Jervis Street is 350 m. wide. The minimum distance between Deadman’s Island and the Harbour Headline is approximately 200 m. At the easterly end of the Coal Harbour area, Burrard Inlet is several kilometers in width.

Because of the prevailing storm wind direction from the east and southeast, the open exposure of Coal Harbour to Burrard Inlet and the proximity of wave-generating marine activities (e.g. Seabus), Coal Harbour is frequently exposed to serious wave and boat wash conditions. This requires some form of breakwater or physical buffer to adequately protect marina areas and to allow for safe boat moorage conditions.

The Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans is concerned with all areas of potential filling in of tidal ocean water and shoreline changes where fish habitat could be affected. In principle, the Fisheries Department policy is to ensure no net loss in the productive capacity of existing fish habitat. Federal Government (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Canadian Coast Guard) approval is required for any filling or shoreline changes.
PAST POLICY

1979 CWD ODP:
- Limited fill and/or excavation permitted, but must provide a public benefit such as open space, improvements to tidal movements and/or water quality, improvements to the safety and visual appearance of the shoreline, or the provision of port facilities. 40 acres noted as the maximum land area for Sub-areas 1 and 2 for density calculation purposes (which would allow an approximate increase by filling to existing site of 10 percent, or approximately 3.6 acres).

POLICY

FILL
Except for refinements in the shape of the shoreline, discourage additional fill at the portion of the Coal Harbour waterbody west of Jervis Street opposite Deadman's Island, where it begins to be constricted and where small boat moorage is best suited. If there is additional fill, consider it primarily at the eastern portion of the Coal Harbour waterbody where it widens into Burrard Inlet and where port uses, public activities and open space, and large ship moorage are best suited.

Ensure that the fill provides a needed public benefit such as open space, improvements to tidal movement and/or water quality, improvements to the safety and visual appearance of the shoreline, or the provision of port facilities.

For the Bayshore site, generally discourage additional fill or significant changes to the shoreline that could reduce boat moorage areas, unless it is for the purpose of widening the existing waterfront walkway adjacent to the hotel to meet required standards.

For the Marathon site as an overall limit, the total amount of land area (including fill and pier structures covering the water area) should not exceed 50 percent of the total site area of 82.0 acres, unless it is considered to be in the public interest to increase the amount of fill in order to create a public amenity or additional public open space above the standard park requirements on the waterfront.

Ensure that the loss in usable water area in the westerly part of the Marathon site between Jervis and Cardero Streets resulting from additional fill is minimized. The fill should not reduce water areas suitable for small boat moorage by more than approximately 10%, with at least 50% of the site remaining as water.

Ensure that impacts on fish habitat areas due to the filling of the foreshore are complemented by other compensating measures to ensure no net loss in fish habitat productive capacity in the general Coal Harbour area.

SHORELINE

Define the shoreline in a manner that relates to the character of the water uses adjacent to it -- incremental and varied with a fine-grained character at the western end, and more formal with less variation at the eastern end.

Ensure that the seawall treatment is of a high quality standard that relates to its urban context. It should also be visually attractive, meet health concerns, accommodate fish habitat requirements, minimize on-going maintenance costs, and be structurally stable.

Set the shoreline elevation at a level that allows for the possibility of a limited increase in sea levels, or can be modified in future to deal with this situation, should it occur.

Ensure that the shoreline treatment and design allows for opportunities for recreational water activities, particularly public boat rental facilities.

Figure 6. Coal Harbour Fill and Shoreline

THE BAY AND SHORELINE
5. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS / WATERFRONT WALKWAY

ISSUES

A continuous walkway would complete the link from Canada Place to Stanley Park, and thus, around Stanley Park to False Creek and beyond. This concept may override other uses at the water’s edge that would interrupt the continuity, for example some businesses and institutions will want to get directly to the water’s edge. Should walkway continuity at the water’s edge be an absolute requirement?

The existing waterfront is not effectively accessible from the existing city to the south. It is visible but people can’t easily get to it. Should north-south linkages be specially emphasized?

A variety of experience can be created along the walkway by different treatments, shoreline modifications which alter the shape and direction of the path, varying widths and adjacent activities. However, some consistency of treatment would foster continuity, a sense of publicness and ease of maintenance. Where should the balance be struck?

With new waterfront development, the distance between the existing built city and the water could be increased significantly but the ease of access to the water also can be increased dramatically. Which is most important for the southerly neighbours?

Should the continuous walkway be required up front (even with more temporary shoreline walks) to secure speedy public use of the water’s edge or should the walkway happen in tandem with the final shoreline treatment and adjacent urban development?

Is a major open space of ‘civic stature’ appropriate or desirable at the water’s edge?

FACTS

There is a steep escarpment along the Marathon site that drops up to 40 feet from the high street ends in the built area to the south, down to the waterfront level. Clear walkway continuity now exists between Cardero Street (east edge of the Westin Bayshore Hotel) to Stanley Park (approximately 2400 feet). This connects directly to the continuous Stanley Park seawall walkway.

For the Bayshore site, there is a pedestrian walkway provided along the waterfront from Denman to Cardero Street. However, the easterly one-block section of this walkway around the Westin Bayshore Hotel complex is designed in such a manner as to appear more private in character than the seawalk to the west. This discourages public use of and access to this section.

PAST POLICY

1976 CWD PLANNING POLICIES:
- Safe, convenient and attractive pedestrian access to the waterfront through pedestrian linkages at street ends and through new developments.
- Continuous waterfront walkway providing a variety of experiences.

1979 CWD ODP:
- As above, with primary access from Cardero, Bute and Burrard Streets.
- Ease of connection between all walkway systems and all developments.
POLICY

Ensure that a continuous public pedestrian walkway is located at, or in a position directly associated with the water's edge, with consistency of treatment and a design which separates pedestrians and cyclists.

Provide a minimum 25-foot-wide walkway and a minimum 25 feet additional landscaped and/or paved setback along the walkway. The overall width of walkway and setback may vary, but should be at least 50 feet wide, except for minor variation to achieve public interest and urban design objectives.

Ensure that the walkway in front of the Westin Bayshore Hotel is upgraded to meet the public access and quality standards planned for the rest of the Coal Harbour area.

Ensure that the waterfront is highly accessible to pedestrians from a variety of points in the downtown, generally through pedestrian linkages at street-ends and through new developments, with primary access from Cardero, Bute and Burrard Streets. (see figure 7 on page 9)

Continuity of the walkway over the short term is important and construction of temporary walkways that detour around existing but interim industrial functions on the harbour should be provided by the developers prior to completion of the entire development. (see figure 8 below)

Given that phased development of the seawall/walkway may occur, encourage continuity of the waterfront walkway and other public amenities between the Bayshore and the Marathon sites as a part of the first phase of the Marathon development.

Provide an interesting variety of waterfront walkway experiences related to the nature of adjacent uses. These experiences include active interaction with water users adjacent to the Cardero Street small boat harbour, passive quiet near waterfront park space, and connections to gathering places in the commercial precinct and urban activities adjacent to hotel/retail areas.

Provide a variety of opportunities for public access out from the waterfront walkway over the water to view marine activities.

Ensure that the treatment of the walkway reflects the overall objective of achieving a major public presence on the waterfront, incorporating a diversity of activities and opportunities and a variety of marine uses.

While commercial uses could be located along the walkway to add interest, ensure that they do not break its continuity or limit waterfront access. The design and location of waterfront plazas should enhance water-related activities.

Ensure that the waterfront walkway provides emergency vehicle access and access for people with disabilities.

Ensure that a separate, adequate sized, two-way bicycle path designed for slow speeds is provided through the Coal Harbour area on the waterfront where possible and with appropriate signage.
6. RESIDENTIAL - LOCATION AND DENSITY

ISSUES

What portion of the Coal Harbour area is best suited to residential use and most compatible with continuing adjacent water and port activities? Is the microclimate there acceptable for residential use, especially in terms of the shadowing impacts from adjacent dense office tower development to the south?

Different densities contribute to differences in area character. What neighbourhood character is appropriate in the Coal Harbour area?

What density range will ensure livability for the appropriate population mix, and is equitable with major comprehensive community developments elsewhere in the core area? What density range is fitting in regard to adjacent densities now in place near Coal Harbour? What densities are required to meet the City’s housing growth objectives?

FACTS

The westerly area of Coal Harbour is closer to nearby local shopping amenities and the neighbouring West End residential area. The easterly portion of the site (e.g. Bute/Burrard) is closer to existing port activities and the Downtown commercial core.

Net densities for recent, adult-oriented, downtown projects approved by Council range from 150 - 300 upa at 4.0 - 6.0 FSR, depending on whether these are individual projects (higher densities) or larger neighbourhood areas (lower densities). The West End has an overall density of about 150 upa and 2 - 3 FSR. The portion of the West Endfronting the south side of Georgia Street between Cardero and Chilco Streets, which is immediately adjacent to the westernmost part of the Coal Harbour area (Bayside site), has been recently rezoned to RM-6 with a maximum net density of 2.5 FSR. New zoning for Downtown South could have net densities up to 200 upa and 5 FSR.

An escarpment site on the north side of the 1300 block West Pender Street adjacent to the Marathon site has been recently rezoned for high density residential use at a net FSR of 5.1, based on the gross site area.

Storage and shipment by rail of dangerous goods from the Coal Harbour area was discontinued in 1986.

South False Creek has an overall net density of 57 upa and 1.3 FSR.

The Pacific Place site in North False Creek has been recently rezoned with an overall net density of up to 100 upa and 2.7 FSR.

The Granville Slopes Neighbourhood Concept Plan has been recently endorsed by Council at an overall net density of up to 150 upa and 4.0 FSR.

The Station/Lafarge site in East False Creek has been recently rezoned with an overall net density of 120 upa and 3.3 FSR.

PAST POLICY

1978 DRAFT CWD ODP (based upon policies approved in 1976):

- Residential use encouraged, particularly within the western Sub-areas.
- Total residential population in the Coal Harbour portion of the Central Waterfront should be approximately 7,200 in 4,500 units (more than 80% of anticipated total CWD population).
- Residential density in Sub-area 1 (Cardero/Bute) should be 2.5 GFSR maximum, not to exceed 140 upa (gross). This typically translates to about 5.0 FSR net and 200 upa net.
- Residential density in Sub-area 2 (Bute/Burrard) should be 1.7 GFSR maximum, not to exceed 100 upa (gross). This typically translates to about 3.5 FSR net and 130 upa net.
1979 CWD ODP (Revised):
- Residential use was deleted from the By-law because of concern about dangerous goods movement and residential safety.

POLICY

RESIDENTIAL LOCATION
Encourage residential development in those areas ideally suited for residential uses (primarily at the western part of the area) and allow other uses in areas less suitable for residential uses and/or better suited to other uses (primarily at the eastern part of the area). (See figure 9 on page 11)

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
Recognizing the high density context of the immediately adjacent downtown and West End areas, the overall City objective to encourage residential opportunities close to downtown work places to minimize transportation impacts, the relatively small size and narrowness of the site, and its high amenity potential next to the large expanse of the Burrard Inlet waterfront - allow high average residential densities in the Coal Harbour area comparable to those permitted on or near other waterfront locations in the downtown peninsula. These densities are subject to livability criteria being met and an overall community design proving acceptable.

Encourage a density transition in the Coal Harbour area that relates to its downtown and waterfront context. Allow higher densities at the eastern and rear portions of the site adjacent to the high-density Downtown District. Encourage lower densities adjacent to the waterfront edge and at the western part of the site that is closer to the West End and Stanley Park.

Density is only one measure of community character. Other aspects that will be considered in evaluating residential communities include the creation of areas of distinctive character, the creation of identifiable spaces with a sense of private enclave, appropriate integration of community/commercial services, linkages, and open space character, as well as other good site planning principles.

Residential neighbourhoods throughout the area should have diversity in densities and other traits in response to neighboring characters, area-specific characteristics and household mix.

The appropriate measures of density should include both units per acre which suggests population projections for services, and floor space ratio which suggests the bulk of development.

All housing designed for households with small children should meet the criteria contained in the Council-approved publication "Guidelines for High Density Housing for Families with Children". All housing should meet general livability criteria, normally applied in a downtown setting.

Provide a density incentive to encourage the provision of affordable rental accommodation in the Coal Harbour area.
Calculate social and family requirements on the base density only, excluding the rental housing component from social and family housing requirements.

DENSITY TARGETS
The average net base density, not including the rental housing incentive, for all residential development in the Coal Harbour area should not exceed 2.75 FSR.
Within this total target average, the following should be the various average target base densities for major residential development areas in Coal Harbour not including the rental housing incentive:

(i) Bayshore site (Denman to Cardero Street) - up to 2.00 FSR net;
(ii) Marathon west site (Cardero to Jervis Street) and including the escarpment properties along the north side of the 1300 to 1500 blocks West Pender Street - up to 2.75 FSR net; and
(iii) Marathon east site (Jervis to Thurlow Street) - up to 3.5 FSR net.

Provide a density incentive of 0.5 FSR net for the construction of rental accommodation, with units not larger than 750 square feet (net), over the entire Coal Harbour site between Denman and Thurlow Streets.

The finally approved average densities may range marginally below or above these figures, based upon the detailed design process confirming that residential livability concerns as well as other public objectives are well satisfied.

For projects targeted for households with children, the typical net density should be in the range of 50 - 80 units per acre. Given standard units sizes, typical net FSR will be 1.5 - 2.2. Where site conditions are particularly advantageous and subject to livability criteria being met, density for such housing could range up to 110 units per acre, or about net FSR of 3.0.

For projects targeted for households without children, the typical net density should be in the range of 90 - 165 units per acre. Given standard unit sizes, typical net FSR will be 2.5 - 5.0. Where site conditions are particularly advantageous and subject to livability criteria being met, density for such housing could range up to 200 units per acre, or about net FSR of 6.0.
7. RESIDENTIAL - HOUSEHOLD AND INCOME MIX

ISSUES
Is this area suitable for households with small children? Would enough children be accommodated to make it practical to provide schools and desirable children's services?

Should the City seek to achieve housing in Coal Harbour suited to a range of household types and incomes, including moderate and low income, or should the population mix be left to the developer and the market?

Are there other groups for which a special target proportion of Coal Harbour housing is appropriate?

FACTS
In Vancouver, housing for households with young children is expected to have size, design and accessibility characteristics different than housing for households without young children. These traits are described in the Council-approved publication "Guidelines for High Density Housing for Families with Children".

About 60% of G.V.R.D. and 25% of City households contain children. About 50% of downtown workers live in households with children.

About 50% of the dwelling units on the south shore of False Creek are suited to households with children. About 33% of the dwelling units are occupied by households with children. In the market sector about 12% of the households have children.

In the West End about 5% of the total dwelling units are occupied by households with children.

If the same target household and income mix were applied as have been approved for Pacific Place (see below) and the same estimating formula used (45 elementary school students per non-market family unit and .20 elementary school students per market family unit), there could be about 200 elementary students in the Coal Harbour area (based on a total of 2700 units). Assuming, however, present and future potential residential development in the 'West End North' area (north of Robson Street, including the Georgia/Alberni Corridor and Golden Triangle areas), about 70 additional elementary students could result in a total of about 270 elementary students in the longer term. About 200 students are needed to support a full-service K-7 elementary school, with about 125 - 140 students required for a K-3 school annex.

The closest elementary school is Lord Roberts at Cardero and Comox, approximately one kilometer away. The school has some potential for an increase in enrollments, and could accept up to 150 more students if required and if present class size conditions remain constant. Potential growth in the West End could take up 50 of these spaces by the time Coal Harbour is built. Recent changes recommended by the Royal Commission on Education (e.g. dual entry kindergarten program) could also affect elementary school enrollment and demands on educational services in the West End/downtown core area, that would have impacts on Coal Harbour. It should also be noted that these schools are fully utilized for other V.S.B. programs, such as ESL courses, and space would have to be found elsewhere to accommodate these programs should additional elementary classes need to be provided.

A 'core-needy household' is a low income household: 1. Whose income lies in the lowest 40% of the range of incomes in the City of Vancouver for its type of household; and 2. Which must spend 30% or more of its gross income to acquire adequate and suitable housing at the lower end of market rental housing rates.

About 40% of the city's rental units are occupied by core-needy households.

About 20% of all households are core-needy households.
PAST POLICY
- None applicable. The draft CWD ODP recommended in 1978 had no specific population mix policies.

POLICY

SOCIAL DIVERSITY
Achieve a diversity of household types and incomes, including seniors, households with children, special needs, singles and couples, in each Coal Harbour community while recognizing that this diversity will vary by area based upon site characteristics.

HOUSEHOLD MIX
Overall, achieve a minimum of 25% of the units as suitable for households with children, and establish an area target of housing enough families with young children to support at least a K-3 school annex located on the Marathon site.

INCOME MIX
Achieve housing for households of low and moderate incomes as well as higher incomes.

Overall, achieve a minimum of 20% of the dwelling units on-site in each major development area to be available to core-need households under the non-market programs, with 50% of the core-need to be for households with young children.

Allow for payment-in-lieu alternatives to non-market housing mix on the escarpment sites along Pender Street where because of their small size it is not practical to provide these units, as determined by the City.

Non-market housing should be equitably distributed throughout each major development area and integrated into each neighbourhood.

Non-market housing funding for Coal Harbour should represent a net gain in funding and unit allocation over that provided by current funding levels. Senior levels of government should be encouraged by the City to develop appropriate new and/or increased programs to achieve this.
8. PARKS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

ISSUES

How best, where and in what amount and configuration should parks and other public open spaces be provided to serve the residents, workers and visitors of the Coal Harbour community?

What kind of park spaces are suitable in the heart of the city — many small ‘breathing’ spaces; a major civic space; primarily neighbourhood parks to serve locals; or green spaces as part of grand boulevard treatments and pedestrian parkway systems? Should at least one significantly sized park space be required?

Should required parks’ standards for Coal Harbour be the same as for those of other nearby inner-city residential communities including the West End, False Creek South, and Pacific Place, or should they be different?

Given the adjacency of the westerly part of Coal Harbour to the large expanse of Devonian and Stanley Parks, should additional neighbourhood park space be required on the Bayshore site? Alternatively, should a pay-in-lieu option be considered instead, which could be used to upgrade facilities in nearby parks, or provide more parks nearby?

Should special attention to art and monuments in public open spaces be a priority in this inner-city, waterfront setting?

Should major parks be provided up front or in tandem with phased development?

Park space downtown is generally felt to be deficient for workers’ needs. To what extent should the Coal Harbour area contribute to these open space needs of downtown workers?

FACTS

In this document, neighbourhood park space refers to land dedicated to and under the care and custody of the Park Board but excludes waterfront walkways and other regional park spaces. Public open space refers to open-air amenity space that is easily and clearly accessible to the public for 24 hours of the day, including enclosed atrium spaces.

The existing average provision of neighbourhood park space in the city is 2.75 acres/1000 population. The overall provision of all park space, excluding golf courses, in the city is 6.18 acres/1000 population.

The provision of neighbourhood park space for South False Creek and Fairview Slopes residents is about 3.0 acres/1000 population. The provision in the West End is about 3.0 acres/1000 population, based on the inclusion of 95 acres of Stanley Park and English Bay beaches. The provision in the Downtown Eastside is about 2.0 acres/1000 population.

A residential population range for the Coal Harbour area has been discussed varying from about 3000 to 5000 people, depending on the overall residential density approved. For the Marathon site, based upon revised residential population projections of 3,500 people maximum and assuming neighbourhood park provision of 2.75 acres/1000 population in addition to a 25 foot wide shoreline walkway, approximately 9.6 acres of useable public neighbourhood parks would be needed in addition to plazas and other private and semi-public open spaces associated with development. For the Bayshore site, based on preliminary population projections of 1500 people maximum and the same assumptions, about 4.1 acres of useable public neighbourhood parks would be needed.

Except for Stanley Park, West End parks, and Downtown Eastside parks, there are only 5 publicly-owned or dedicated parks or open spaces associated with the downtown area (not including plazas). These are: Portal Park 0.3 acres; Discovery Square 0.3 acres; Cathedral Square 0.6 acres; Victory Square 1.0 acres; and Robson/Courthouse Square 2.8 acres. This totals approximately 5.0 acres of public downtown parks and open space.

Figure 11. Downtown Peninsula Parks and Major Public Open space

PAST POLICY

1979 CWD ODP:
- Major public open space should be provided at locations in close proximity to the intended primary pedestrian access points to the Central Waterfront (e.g. Cardero, Bute, Burrard).
- Approximately 16 acres of public open space should be provided in the Coal Harbour portion of the CWD (based on site size of Sub-areas 1 and 2).
- Each new development should strive to provide publicly-accessible open space equivalent to at least 40 percent of the development area.
- Different types of open space to include public pedestrian walkway at water’s edge, pedestrian circulation systems, and a variety of public places for active and passive recreational uses.
POLICY

Ensure that parks and other public open spaces of the highest quality are an integral part of the Coal Harbour community, and that they are treated to enhance and reinforce the marine character of the Coal Harbour waterfront. The major park space should be at the water's edge, and its sense of publicness should be enhanced by establishing strong visual and pedestrian connections between adjacent access streets and the waterfront.

Provide parks and other public open space of a size, location and configuration to meet the needs of residents and workers; that provide attractions for visitors in ways which are compatible with local residential and commercial environments; and that take full advantage of the waterfront setting.

Select land which, in location and design potential is suitable for parks and open space use, not because it is unsuitable for development.

In size and configuration, neighbourhood parks should accommodate both active and passive activity and be capable of modification to meet changes in community recreation needs. Park and open space design should differentiate areas used mostly by local residents from those used regularly by outsiders.

Locate some parks to enhance and reinforce access opportunities from the existing city.

Ensure that private and semi-public open spaces are sufficient in size and configuration to provide adequate spaces between buildings, adequate play spaces, and adequate circulation. Dedicated park space should not generally be depended upon to satisfy these needs nor should these spaces generally be considered in fulfilling neighbourhood park requirements.

Maximize sun exposure on public parks and open spaces particularly during high-use periods.

Ensure that the development of parks and public open space occurs concurrently with the residential development which they are intended to serve, except to the extent that it is considered to be in the public interest for phasing.

Neighbourhood parks should meet minimum size criteria and preferably be located at natural grade, but if located on top of structured parking on account of the new sloping grade proposed for the site, then City ownership will be required of the land on which the park is constructed. Parking structures with parks on top should be designed to accommodate full landscaping of the park space, including the planting of large trees.

Encourage the provision and integration of public art into the design of parks and public open spaces. Ensure that these art features are of a quality and character that is appropriate to this high profile waterfront location.

For the Bayshore site, develop the foot of Cardero Street as a street-end park, integrated with the Marathon site to the east.

With respect to park size, function, and location, many options are possible. The following outlines a concept that would achieve a number of objectives including meeting neighbourhood park space requirements, providing a variety of smaller park spaces, and creating a major civic shoreline park to respond to downtown workers' and visitors' needs.

**Figure 12. Coal Harbour Parks and Open Space Concept**

**SPECIFIC TARGETS**

Neighbourhood park space should be provided at a minimum of 2.75 acres/1,000 resident population in addition to the waterfront walkway. Park requirements for the rental housing incentive will be provided, but will also be used for density calculation purposes.

For the Coal Harbour area, at least 22 acres of parks and other public open spaces (e.g. plazas, viewpoints and amphitheatres) including the waterfront walkway should be provided. Of this total, at least 6 acres should be provided on the Bayshore site, and 16 acres should be provided on the Marathon site. A major waterfront park should be provided on the Marathon site of at least 6 acres in size.

Measured at the equinox noon period, at least 50 percent of the seawalk and major public park and open space areas should be in sun.

For the Coal Harbour escarpment sites where adequate neighbourhood park provision is not feasible because of their small size, consider the application of a payment-in-lieu option to provide for these needs of the residential development.

For the Bayshore site neighbourhood park provision, consider the application of a payment-in-lieu option to provide for these needs of the residential development, should it prove feasible or be in the public interest to upgrade facilities or acquire additional park space on nearby sites.

**PARKS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE**
9. STREETS

ISSUES

Creation of a new community of up to 15,000 residents and employees will greatly increase the need for transportation services in the area. Transit services will have to be upgraded, and streets will have to be extended. Facilities to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and service vehicles will be required.

The existing area to the south has congested streets, which are at capacity. The development of Coal Harbour requires adequate roadways to avoid placing unacceptable new burdens on existing streets in the downtown and West End. A critical requirement is the ability to access the area from the south and east without penetrating the downtown core. What street pattern does this result in?

In developing housing, through traffic is noisy and polluting, so environmental areas of low traffic are desirable. Continuous roads can create environmental difficulty, but cul-de-sacs are inadequate for volumes generated in higher density developments. What street pattern does this result in? Can traffic management assist in resolving this conflict? Is residential use suitable in a heavy traffic environment?

With competing demands on the street system from a traffic and housing perspective, is the idea of a continuous east-west artery extending at the level of Cordova Street, as called for in the ODP, still appropriate? Is a waterfront roadway at a lower elevation appropriate? Is continuity of the port roadway appropriate?

Adequate access to all sites for all modes of transport and service functions is vital. Good linkages to the adjoining downtown area are necessary. Vehicular access close to the water's edge for visitors and tourists is also desirable. The greater the accessibility, usually, the greater also is the space needed for roadways, with increased traffic impacts. Where should the balance be struck? Should some movement be separated from other movement, if possible?

A variety of modes provides choice, facilitates accessibility and can preserve environmental quality. The street system must be adequate, with traffic management measures to assist in achieving livability. Should a pedestrian pathway system, in conjunction with or separated from roads, be a priority? Should bicycle needs be overtly accommodated?

In the West End, the well-developed lane system provides good access to properties, allowing the streets and sidewalks to be highly landscaped and free of servicing activity. How will servicing, loading, garbage collection, parking access, etc. be accommodated in Coal Harbour?

FACTS

Possible arterial connections to the city street grid occur at Cordova Street, Hastings Street, Burrard Street, Thurlow Street, and Bute Street.

Minor connections are available at Canada Place Way, Jervis Street, Broughton Street, Nicola Street, Cardero Street, and Denman Street.

The Port service road east of Burrard Street is subject to complex legal agreements between the Port, Marathon, Canada Place, and the City, which may affect the use and function of the lower level road within the Marathon site.

Coal Harbour development on the Marathon site will cut off any future opportunity for a third crossing to Burrard Inlet directly from the downtown core, and will reduce options for a dedicated waterfront transit right-of-way.

In addition to its service function, while providing a second access to developments, a separate service road would reduce the maintenance and disruption on the primary street system.

The north side of Georgia Street, west of Cardero Street, was widened in 1985 to provide for an additional westbound bus-only lane.

Access from the Bayshore site to Denman Street south of Georgia Street is restricted in rush-hour periods by mandatory right or left turns at Georgia Street for southbound traffic.

Access from the Bayshore site to Cardero Street south of Georgia Street is restricted by a single southbound lane between Georgia and Alberni.

PAST POLICIES

1979 CWD ODP:

- Extend downtown street system; develop continuous lower-level service road as close to the escarpment as possible; extend Cordova Street to Bute Street in the long term; provide continuous upper-level roadway; develop continuous transit right-of-way along waterfront; provide safe, convenient, and attractive pedestrian access to the waterfront and a continuous walkway in proximity to the shoreline.

Figure 13. Existing CWD ODP Roads System
POLICY

Provide a transportation system that adequately services the Coal Harbour development and is integrated into the existing movement patterns of the city. This should be done in a manner which protects new residential development and environmentally sensitive areas from excessive through traffic.

Ensure that Coal Harbour traffic does not add unduly to downtown congestion, particularly in the Pender and Georgia Street corridors. Furthermore, the Coal Harbour traffic should not add through traffic to the established West End residential areas.

Recognizing that this area is located adjacent to a densely populated, well developed portion of the downtown, provide a street system that links Coal Harbour neighbourhoods with convenient connections to downtown access streets. This street system should connect to access streets to the south and east that avoid the congested downtown core, and should also discourage through traffic in the residential area.

Provide opportunities for vehicular access to the waterfront for both water users and visitors.

Ensure that the design of the street system gives attention to safety, security, and appearance needs. Allow for some extension of the existing below grade service system to Thurlow Street to meet port and commercial area servicing needs, with the potential of a driveway arrangement servicing the properties no more westerly than Bute Street.

Ensure that any extension of the below grade service system meets basic security, appearance, and other environmental concerns. Any ramp connections between the upper and lower movement systems must be designed to integrate well with their surrounding environment and to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Ensure that adequate servicing of new development is an integral part of the new street system design.

Provide a high standard of public access to the waterfront.

Ensure that careful provision is made for the requirements of pedestrians, bicyclists, and the physically disabled. Provide bicyclists with adequate routings on streets and in proximity to walkways.
10. PUBLIC TRANSIT

ISSUES

More residents downtown can reduce peak hour commuter problems because residents can walk to work or use the transit system. Better transit service will have to be provided to serve the development. What is the potential transit ridership generated by the development? What quality of service is required?

Should a corridor be preserved for a future transit link? (e.g. street car, waterfront trolley, people mover) The proposed residential density of Coal Harbour cannot support a people mover by itself.

Should transit be a special priority? Are there possibilities for other transit modes such as ferry linkages to nearby areas?

FACTS

Existing bus routes servicing the Coal Harbour area are the #1 Beach/Gastown loop service via Burrard and the #19 Metrotown/Stanley Park route via Pender Street. These routes are within acceptable walking distance of Coal Harbour.

A bus-only westbound lane exists adjacent to the Bayshore site on Georgia Street from 3 to 6 pm, Monday to Friday, as far as Cardero, and full-time west of Cardero.

The proposed office/commercial developments at the east end of the Marathon site are within a 2 - 3 block walking distance of the two Skytrain stations at Burrard (at Dunsmuir) and at Waterfront (Granville & Cordova), and the Seabus terminal.

A study was done by City staff prior to Expo '86 regarding the feasibility of people-mover systems in the downtown peninsula. It concluded that they would be viable only if the West End area was served so as to provide a minimum population base of approximately 20,000 people. The Coal Harbour area on its own is not sufficient to support this type of public transportation system. However, if combined with the West End, it could support a viable service.

PAST POLICIES

Transit service is a high priority within the City, and the Region. City Council has established targets that will require substantial increases in the proportion of transit usage.

On July 29, 1986, after reviewing a preliminary report on possible people mover systems and negative reaction at a West End public meeting, City Council moved: "THAT Council take no further action with respect to the Downtown People Mover."

1979 CWD ODP:

- A continuous transit right-of-way is required along the entire length of the Central Waterfront to accommodate a future waterfront transit system.
- Transit access for the City bus system from downtown streets to the Central Waterfront must be provided at suitable points.
- Waterfront transit should be close to the shoreline if possible, with a stop in the vicinity of the Bayshore Inn.

Figure 14. Existing and Proposed Bus Routes
POLICY

Ensure that the street system provides flexibility for the extension of transit to service the Coal Harbour development, including a corridor for future transit systems from the Skytrain system in the east to Stanley Park/West End in the west, as well as future extensions.

Consider walking distance to transit services when designing buildings (e.g. provide public access through large developments).

Consider all new transportation services for Coal Harbour within a larger downtown and West End transit system context.

Encourage an increase in service frequency along nearby bus routes to satisfy increased demand from Coal Harbour residents.

Relocate the east/west segment of the No. 1 bus route to the Cordova Street extension, between Granville and Burrard, to serve the development better.

Consider relocating the north-south segment of the No. 1 bus route further west. Similarly the No. 19 bus route could be relocated north to Hastings Street. (Both of these proposals require examination in the context of the downtown transit network).

Encourage the development of a convenient ferry system for passengers between Coal Harbour, Stanley Park and major activity areas along the Central Waterfront District.

Consider an interim waterfront transit system that can service high level demand periods in waterfront areas (i.e. weekends and summer months) in a flexible manner on surface routes.

Figure 15. Potential Transit Corridors

PUBLIC TRANSIT
11. PARKING AND LOADING

ISSUES
Adequate parking and loading should be available to serve the needs of Coal Harbour development. Adequate parking will avoid unacceptable burdens on adjoining neighbourhoods, and adequate loading will avoid unacceptable impacts on local streets. Yet, excessive provision of parking could detract from the use of transit and other modes. Should parking standards match those elsewhere downtown or be different?

Good vehicular access and on-site parking is desirable for each development site, including visitor parking for parks, the walkway and retail; but, could some parking be collected in one or more strategic locations? Is a special visitor parking target necessary?

Should extra parking for Canada Place be built into the Marathon development area?

FACTS
Commercial parking requirements were recently updated for the downtown with a new by-law that reflects today's goals and needs.

Downtown peninsula residential developments have just been surveyed and appropriate standards for parking demand can be established based upon recent experience, as follows: 0.5 spaces/unit and 1 space/100 m² of gross residential floor space.

The Downtown Peninsula, excluding the West End, is subject to both maximum and minimum parking standards.

Coal Harbour is outside the payment-in-lieu area which includes most of the downtown office core and where parking standards may be waived upon receipt of money for provision of off-site parking.

Canada Place is clearly deficient in parking by at least 200 spaces. Some other areas and developments near Coal Harbour are also deficient in parking.

Figure 16. Existing Public Parking close to Coal Harbour
PAST POLICIES

1983:
- Parking and loading to be provided in accordance with the provisions of the Central Waterfront District ODP. This included severely restricted office commercial parking and limitations on the amount of parking that could be provided for other uses. No minimum requirements were specified.

1986:
- Parking and loading provided in accordance with the Parking By-law. Non-residential development subject to a minimum and a maximum parking rate. Rates set in accordance with City mode split objectives for the Downtown Peninsula. Residential parking based on the number of units (two size categories); hotel parking based on the number of rooms.

POLICY

Provide adequate parking and loading to serve proposed developments, yet discourage the provisions of excess parking that may detract from transit usage.

Provide parking in accordance with the By-law.

For residential development, ensure that parking meets residents’ needs on-site.

Provide dedicated visitor parking for residential developments that is conveniently located and accessible.

Incorporate on-street parking into roadway designs where practical.

Ensure that parking is easily accessible and secure for both residents, workers and visitors, is visually unobtrusive, and if possible is located below grade level.

Provide convenient loading, bus storage, and emergency access to public-oriented waterfront uses (e.g. charter boat operations).

Provide convenient parking and loading facilities for marina residents/users, hotel guests/users, and visitors to public places/facilities in Coal Harbour.

Provide parking at sites of demand where possible. Where not possible, explore centralized parking facilities located away from, but convenient to, the waterfront to serve visitors and retail users.

Encourage the provision of additional parking to help compensate for existing deficiencies in adjacent areas such as Canada Place.
12. BUILT FORM, HEIGHT AND CHARACTER

ISSUES

How best should the built form respond to the overall built form of the downtown peninsula (now and in the future); waterfront scale; need for sun penetration on open spaces, and internal livability issues such as noise, privacy and private views? Built form must also be guided by considerations of preservation of public and adjacent private views, as well as views to landmarks such as the Marine Building and the Canada Place ‘sails’. How should these factors be balanced?

For the residential area, what types of buildings are appropriate? How will the blocks be divided up into sub-components (buildings) to ensure an appropriate degree of comfort, identity, safety, and security for residents?

What general and maximum building heights are appropriate to meet views and other livability objectives? What should be the height limits and distributions? In particular what heights and forms are appropriate near the water?

The datum for measuring heights in the Marathon site is proposed to be an official established building grade linking the top of the escarpment and a new base rather than the existing base level 101. Is this appropriate?

Given the size of the developments, it is probable that various parcels will be sold or leased to other developers to build. What degree of uniformity versus diversity is desirable between individual developments in terms of massing and character?

Much of the sense of place in the area will be created by the design and treatment of the streetscape and the bases of buildings. A major complicating factor will be the handling and integration of the new ‘artificial’ base surface and grade transitions. Should the development as a whole have a special streetscape treatment? Should it be a single theme or be changed in various areas? To what degree should it relate to the overall treatments in upland areas? How will awkward grade changes be avoided? How will full handicapped access be assured? How will the constraints placed on landscaping by the artificial base surface be dealt with?

To what extent should the proposed built form and landscaping treatment of Georgia Street and existing character of Stanley Park be carried through to the new developments adjacent at the westerly part of Coal Harbour?

FACTS

Orientation to key views and amenities is in the opposite direction as compared to sun access. Water and mountain views are to the north. Sun shines from the south. This means that the most valuable public and private open spaces will tend to be shadowed.

Building heights are usually measured from the ‘base surface’ of a site rather than an ‘assumed’ base grade. Generally, parking above the base surface on a site is included in density calculations.

The height of existing towers in the adjacent Downtown District range from 300 to 450 feet measured from their real grade at the top of the escarpment at least 10 - 40 feet above the Marathon site. However, the tallest downtown building immediately adjacent to the site is the Marine Building at 330 ft. in height.

There is a virtual ‘wall’ of closely spaced buildings on the north side of Hastings between Burrard and Bute which face the Marathon site. These buildings are built to average densities between 9.0 and 12.0 FSR.

The development west of Bute to Cardero is less dense, with potential development sites having a maximum allowable density of 6.0 FSR.

The height of the existing Bayshore tower is 180 ft. and the towers proposed adjacent to the Bayshore site in the West End area along the southside of Georgia Street are zoned to a maximum of 190 feet.

The escarpment drop varies from about 10 to 40 feet between the existing city at the top of the Coal Harbour lands and the water level, with the maximum difference at the eastern end of the site.

PAST POLICY

1979 CWD ODP:

- Scale transition from existing buildings, generally decreasing towards the water; location, height and massing should minimize noon-hour shadowing.
- The Cardero to Bute sub-area should be medium and low rise structures not exceeding 120 feet, relaxable to 300 feet upon consideration of overshadowing, views, and related environmental criteria. Development north of the Downtown area along the southside of Georgia Street are targeted for the development.

OTHER:

- High density residential buildings in the inner-city are generally required to satisfy a range of livability criteria, including a minimum separation between ‘facing’ towers of 80 feet. Additional livability factors come into play if children are targeted for the development.

POLICY

BUILT FORM

Ensure building massing:

- contributes to street edge definition, through ‘street wall’ buildings particularly on north-south streets and along the waterfront promenade. Shape street walls to provide ample, hospitable public streetscapes with landscaping, allow gaps for views through and sun access to open spaces, and have some setback from the property line to accommodate landscaping and semi-private open spaces.
- allows some views north through blocks from street level, breaking continuity of east-west street edges as necessary.
- maximizes sun exposure to the waterfront walkway and public open spaces during the high use periods -- mid-day for office workers, late afternoon for residents.
- allows some sun penetration to semi-private and private open spaces during high use periods.
- can be broken down into individual buildings of reasonable size (in terms of number of units, etc.).
- creates a comfortable low to mid-rise environment along the public waterfront.
- balances creation of private views for new buildings with preservation of views for existing and likely future buildings to the south.
- spaces high buildings carefully in relation to adjacent downtown towers to maximize separation and view protection from the south.
- allows opportunity for the semi-private outdoor amenity spaces needed by the various types of user groups including resident adults, children, and office workers.
- configures and locates towers to fit into the overall built form of Downtown/West End, particularly respecting transition of heights from the downtown core toward north and west, and the typical overlapping of towers as seen from a distance.
- avoids overly bulky office buildings and provides slimming as height increases.
- uses building tops to provide interest and character to the city skyline, but has respect for the landmark buildings already there.

For tall buildings on this waterfront site, require comprehensive wind studies to ensure that potential downdraft wind conditions are mitigated and nearby public open spaces meet acceptable criteria.

Allow parking development below the new base surfaces to be exempt from FSR.

Ensure development patterns and guidelines foster safety and security.

HEIGHT
Regulate heights generally as follows:
• allow building heights to be measured from new artificial base surfaces, but require very careful consideration and agreement on the configuration of these base surfaces to ensure gradual transitions to the waterfront.
• require ‘street wall’ buildings to be at least 35 feet in height except in areas where views would be impacted.

- in the Bayshore site (Denman to Cardero) adjacent to the park and the waterfront, allow a mix of low and medium rise buildings up to 120 ft. Adjacent to Georgia Street and other internal locations and subject to careful evaluation of building massing objectives, allow some towers up to a maximum of 190 ft.
- in the existing CWD Sub-area 1 (Cardero to Bute), allow a mix of low and medium rise buildings up to 120 ft. Subject to careful evaluation of building massing objectives, allow some towers up to a maximum of 230 feet with a possible increase to 300 feet between Broughton and Bute.
- in the existing CWD Sub-area 2 (Bute to Burrard), allow a mix of low and medium rise buildings up to 120 ft. Subject to evaluation of building massing objectives, allow some towers up to a maximum of 300 feet.
- generally locate the higher towers towards the southern edge of the site, away from the water’s edge.

CHARACTER
Develop guidelines to deal with a high degree of coordination required of potential separate developers.

Develop a high quality streetscape and building base treatment that provides for urban design continuity and coherency; long term maintenance; visual interest and character area definition; appropriate, feasible landscape; and full access for the disabled.

Develop a domestic street edge character and small-scaled residential ambience for the residential neighbourhood west of Thurlow Street. This should especially include locating as many entry doors to individual units as possible directly onto the street, so as to provide both ‘eyes on the street’ and a sense of neighbourhood.

Ensure that the commercial ambience of the retail development at the westerly end of the site reflects a marine character appropriate to the variety of adjacent waterfront uses, and reinforces the atmosphere of the working small boat harbour.

Ensure the built form at the westerly end of the Bayshore site responds to the park atmosphere adjacent and the emerging ‘gateway’ character along Georgia Street.

Ensure that open spaces are positively shaped as imageable places rather than simply being left over after building design has been determined. Also ensure and that the edges around public open spaces are animated and add to the character of the area.
13. VIEWS

ISSUES
Public views to the water from street ends and other public spaces, and views through Coal Harbour to landmarks, could be put at risk by dense street level development and bulky towers spaced close together. However, too much space between buildings could result in poor street edge definition and sense of place. In the past, northerly street end views of water and mountains have been emphasized; what about potential westerly street end views? Are all street end views of equal value, or should some of them perhaps be expanded as a trade-off for reducing others?

Should special value be given to the water views seen from Burrard Street as the only remaining major north-south street enjoying this amenity?

Should views of particularly important mountain features such as the Lions, from other public places in the downtown adjacent to the waterfront be protected?

Development could frame and preserve or obliterate private views now enjoyed by existing and future neighbours situated along the escarpment and Georgia Street to the south. Differing built form options create differing trade-offs of lower and higher level views. Can appropriate views be maintained without some loss of density?

FACTS
Vancouver residents, workers and tourists value views of mountains and water as evidenced by the Goals for Vancouver survey, real estate values, and postcard images of the city.

There are existing views of the water and mountains at virtually all of the street ends abutting the site. Major panoramic views exist from Burrard Street, Georgia Street, north of Hastings, and from Portal Park at the foot of Thurlow. Burrard Street is the last remaining major north-south street in the downtown to have a water view.

Principal landmarks include the Marine Building and Canada Place (e.g. ‘sails’). These landmarks are currently seen from Stanley Park, Burrard Inlet (e.g. Seabus), and the western part of Coal Harbour.

The Vancouver Rowing Club building is an historic landmark presently seen from the western part of Georgia Street, through the Bayshore site.

Private views are spectacular all along the escarpment and the western part of Georgia Street -- some 25 existing buildings; 16 potential buildings; 15,000 potential workers and residents.

The proposed new artificial base surface connecting the escarpment to the water’s edge potentially has impacts on the views downwards to the water.

PAST POLICY
1976 PLANNING POLICIES:
- Current corridor views along existing N-S streets should be maintained.
- Roof areas should provide accessible terraces including, wherever possible, public use.
- Nothing specific to maintain private views.

1979 CWD ODP:
- As above, plus new development should provide new opportunities to view waterfront activities wherever possible.
- A 50 view preservation cone is established at each side of the ends of north-south streets (from the CWD/DD zoning boundary).

Figure 17. Existing CWD ODP Street-end Views
POLICY

Ensure that the development preserves most current views and maximizes potential views of the city’s natural setting and unique features contributing to its special identity, in the following categories:

PUBLIC STREET-END VIEWS

Ensure that all northerly corridor views along existing N-S streets to the water and mountains are maintained. Allow only minor relaxations to the minimum 5 degree angle from each side of the extension of existing streets at the CWD zoning boundary or Georgia Street west of Cardero Street within the following guidelines:

- the view reduction is essential to the overall quality of the waterfront development; and/or
- the view reduction is not detrimental to the overall quality of the existing street-end view from the downtown; and/or
- the physical design of the portion of the waterfront development which causes the view reduction is of quality and will enhance the physical character of the immediate surroundings; and/or
- an alternative access to view waterfront activities, Stanley Park, Burrard Inlet and/or the North Shore mountains is provided as a trade-off at a location in the vicinity of a particular street end and is easily accessible to the public from downtown.

Consider enlarging some street end views to greater than a 10 degree angle as a trade-off for the reduction of others.

Ensure that the new artificial base surface and street grades are contoured to maximize preservation of views downward to the water from north-south streets.

Have particular regard to the protection of existing northerly views of the Burrard Inlet and Coal Harbour water areas seen from major pedestrian and vehicular-used sections of Burrard Street as far south as Georgia Street.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE VIEWS

Provide new opportunities in new development to view waterfront activities, Stanley Park and/or the North Shore mountains wherever possible. In particular, views from existing public places such as Portal Park should be protected. Certain public views exist to natural features having particularly important significance to the city’s identity and character, such as the Lions and Crown, Grouse and Seymour mountains, and should be protected. Some panoramic views should be maintained to at least 45 degrees.

LANDMARK VIEWS

Ensure that new development respects views from public streets and open spaces through to important landmarks, particularly the upper portions of important buildings, such as the Marine Building and Canada Place ‘sails’.

PRIVATE VIEWS

Balance the new private views created for the on-site development with reasonable preservation of private views from existing and likely future development (office and residential) south of the site, in consultation with the affected owners.
14. OFFICE / HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

ISSUES

There is a surplus supply of land for office use in the city. Expanding the office land supply is not necessary and may draw development away from other emerging office precincts. But completing the office precinct to the water’s edge is also beneficial.

Permitting offices on lands suitable for residences reduces opportunities to redress the imbalance between housing and employment in the city.

Growth in office space will increase demands on roads and transit leading into the city.

Some areas of the Burrard waterfront are unsuitable for residential use but are suited to commercial, cultural and institutional uses.

Offices in the Coal Harbour area would add physical and economic diversity.

Office densities in Coal Harbour could reflect nearby densities or could be lower in order to keep building forms well below existing buildings to the south. What is best? What is fair?

Considering the large public investment in the Skytrain system, should consideration be given to concentrating higher density office development in close proximity to downtown station locations?

Should hotel uses be encouraged throughout the Coal Harbour area, or should they be developed only in locations that are less suited to residential use and more to mixed-use commercial development?

Should hotel uses be clustered together in locations that enjoy good access to tourist-oriented amenities and downtown shopping?

FACTS

OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

Currently there is 21 million sq.ft. of office space in downtown Vancouver.

There is approximately 125,000 sq. ft. of existing office development in the escarpment properties along the north side of the 1300 - 1500 blocks West Pender Street.

Total office development potential for the downtown under current zoning is 50 million sq.ft. However, potential sites considered available and suitable for AAA office development in the core area (generally north of Nelson Street, from Cardero to Beatty) were assumed to require a minimum 150-foot frontage necessary to accommodate a typical office tower development. The approximate number of 50 sites identified have a total potential of approximately 15 million sq. ft.

Assuming the proposed residential rezoning of the Downtown South and other CD-1 site-specific rezonings approved or under consideration, the total office development potential in the downtown will decrease by at least 3 million square feet. Therefore, even assuming a 2.0 million square feet increase for Pacific Place, and a maximum office potential increase on the Coal Harbour site of approximately 830,000 square feet for a total of 2.8 million square feet, no net increase in downtown office potential would result.

Growth in downtown office space has averaged 750,000 sq.ft. per year over the past 5 years.

If downtown redevelops to its current zoning limit, there could be more than 250,000 downtown office workers. Currently, there are about 100,000.

The easterly portion of the Marathon site between Burrard and Thurlow Streets is within a 1 - 2 block walking distance from both the ‘Waterfront’ and ‘Burrard’ Skytrain stations.

The easterly portion of the Marathon site is one of two areas (the other being the Apex site in False Creek) adjacent to the downtown that are proposed in the Central Area Plan for limited additional office capacity. This is in order to focus future office development in areas where transit services can best minimize other transportation impacts.

HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

There are presently three waterfront hotels in and adjacent to the area -- Westin Bayshore, New World Harbourside and Pan Pacific -- with approximately 1500 rooms and an average 75% annual occupancy rate. An additional 478 room hotel is under construction as part of the Waterfront Centre project.
Selected Vancouver area hotels have capacities as follows:

(I) Waterfront Locations
- Granville Island Hotel: 54 rooms
- Westminster Quay: 126 rooms
- New World Harbourside: 422 rooms
- Pan Pacific: 507 rooms
- Westin Bayshore: 520 rooms

(II) Non-Waterfront Locations
- Wedgewood: 95 rooms
- Coast Georgian Court: 180 rooms
- Hotel Georgia: 314 rooms
- Meridien Hotel: 397 rooms
- Hotel Vancouver: 550 rooms

The existing Westin Bayshore Hotel at the westerly part of the Coal Harbour area has been established for over 20 years and is a major visitor-oriented commercial facility benefitting the City’s tourism objectives. Approximately 385,000 sq. ft. of hotel development exists in the Bayshore site.

PAST POLICY

BAYSHORE CD-1 (BY-LAW NO. 4065):
- Uses permitted by existing zoning include hotels, convention centre, and office buildings, but amount not specified and subject to Council approval by resolution.

1979 CWD ODP (MARATHON SITE):
- Development of new urban uses, including offices and hotels, encouraged. Medium-scale office buildings encouraged particularly in Sub-area 2 (Bute-Burrard) with higher allowable densities.
- Commercial densities in Sub-areas 1 and 2 are limited as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Maximum Office Gross FSR (includes office)</th>
<th>Maximum Commercial Gross FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Land Develop. Area</th>
<th>Total Office Development Potential (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Total Commercial Development Potential (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-area 1 (Cartero/Bute)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20 ac.</td>
<td>87,120</td>
<td>435,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-area 2 (Bute/Burrard)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20 ac.</td>
<td>653,400</td>
<td>1,306,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 ac.</td>
<td>740,520</td>
<td>1,742,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY

OFFICE USES
- Allow office development only on sites that are well-served by existing transit services and that are not environmentally suited to residential, in order to extend or maintain existing land-use patterns and to add diversity.
- Extend the downtown core office precinct towards the water’s edge so that a non-residential, prestige environment is created within which visitor-oriented facilities and public attractions can be focussed to provide activity on the waterfront.

Do not allow major office development on those scarce sites located directly adjacent to the waterfront that are more suited for alternative visitor-oriented hotel or other commercial development, in order to provide more 24-hour activity on the waterfront and to reinforce tourism growth objectives.

HOTEL USES
- Encourage new hotel development in conjunction with new commercial and public uses to provide more diversity and 24-hour activity on the waterfront and reinforce the Trade and Convention Centre activities. Concentrate these new hotels at the easterly end of the Marathon site close to the downtown shopping core, Canada Place, transit facilities and other tourist-oriented amenities.
- Allow for redevelopment and limited expansion of the existing Westin Bayshore Hotel, including the additional supply of facilities that can serve both the hotel and residential populations.

DENSITY TARGETS

Bayshore Site
- Restrict office development to that serving local or marine related needs. New commercial office and hotel development in this area should not exceed 150,000 sq. ft. of which office should not exceed 50,000 sq. ft. In any one sub-area, commercial development density should not exceed net FSR 3.0. Office development should not be permitted adjacent to the waterfront or the park unless it is small-scale, marine oriented, and needed by the marine operation. These targets should be reviewed at the ODP stage when more detailed development planning for the Bayshore site has occurred.

Marathon Site
- Within the existing CWD Sub-area 1 (Cartero to Bute), restrict office development to that serving local or marine related needs, or to resolve a residential interface problem. Maximum office development in this existing Sub-area should not exceed 75,000 sq. ft. On any one office site, office development density should not exceed net FSR 5.0.
- Within the existing CWD Sub-area 2 (Bute to Burrard), allow office development only to the east of Thurlow Street, as a limited extension of the downtown office-commercial core. Maximum commercial development – including office and hotel – in this existing Sub-area should not exceed 1,850,000 sq. ft. and an FSR of 6.0 net on the higher density sites located adjacent to the Downtown District zoning edge. Commercial development on sites adjacent to the water’s edge should not exceed an FSR of 4.0 net.
- Within the total office/hotel commercial target of 1,850,000 sq. ft. in the existing CWD Sub-area 2, the amount of office development should not exceed 1,500,000 sq. ft., and the amount of hotel development should be at least 350,000 sq. ft. These targets should be reviewed at the ODP stage to ensure that the resultant physical form and massing is considered acceptable and meets other public objectives for this waterfront area.

OFFICE / HOTEL DEVELOPMENT
15. RETAIL / SERVICE DEVELOPMENT

ISSUES

Retail/service uses at an appropriate scale and location can provide needed goods and services for residents and workers. They will also be important in attracting a broad range of people to the waterfront, adding interest and enjoyment.

Retail development in Coal Harbour could unduly compete with nearby retail areas, reducing their economic viability and thwarting efforts to achieve retail continuity and revitalization of these areas. Alternatively, it could reinforce retail linkages and nodes in the Downtown/Waterfront (e.g., Canada Place, Sinclair Centre), and assist with the economic viability of new public facilities.

Should retail uses serve the Coal Harbour area only, adjacent areas as well, or become a regional attraction? How much retail represents this area’s ‘fair share’ in light of limited consumer demand to be distributed throughout the inner-city?

Is this an appropriate place for ‘festival’ type retailing that enhances tourist interest and takes advantage of the downtown waterfront ambience? Should streetfront retail or waterfront promenade retail be included?

Should local shopping needs, such as grocery shopping, be met on-site or can the surrounding retail areas meet these needs satisfactorily?

Are marine-oriented retail and service facilities essential to a working small-boat harbour and are they valuable as a link with the area’s history?

Should connections to underground retail malls from Marathon’s Waterfront Centre at the foot of Burrard Street be permitted?

What special concerns must be met to make the retail uses economically viable - location, visibility, parking etc.?

How will the various possible retail uses impact residential livability and public use of the waterfront?

FACTS

Specialty retail areas can have a critical mass at 120,000 sq. ft. as witnessed by the success of Robson Street at 142,000 sq. ft.

There are 30 sq. ft. of retail per capita in the city and 34 sq. ft. per capita in the West End. These numbers include local and regional-serving retail. West Point Grey has 22 sq. ft. per capita, with the majority of the retail being local in nature.

The socio-economic population mix, proportion of local versus non-local customers and proportion of spending done by residents in their local area all affect the amount of retail/service space supported per capita. These amounts will vary with location and design throughout the waterfront area.

Currently, due to a number of factors including accessibility and visibility, retail uses in the Canada Place Mall are not as successful as projected.

Existing retail uses in the area have been successful due to their direct service link to the working small boat harbour and factors such as ease of parking and waterfront location. These uses consist of 9 boat sales facilities, 40 boat charters, 3 restaurants/pubs, and 1 waterfront hotel.

Existing public markets in the region are as follows: Granville Island - 40,400 sq. ft.; Lonsdale Quay - 46,000 sq. ft.; Westminster Quay - 63,000 sq. ft.

PAST POLICY

BAYSHORE CD-1 (BY-LAW NO. 4065):

- Uses permitted by existing zoning include restaurants, tourist-oriented specialty shops, night club, merchandise mart, theatre, cocktail lounges and art gallery. Amounts not specified and subject to Council approval by resolution.

1979 CWD ODP:

- Retail, restaurant and other similar uses encouraged. Local-scale retail including small shops/restaurants particularly encouraged in westernmost Sub-area 1 (Cardero/Bute). No specific targets for amounts, but totals limited by FSR maximums for ‘urban’ uses including retail, service and hotel (total 1.0 million sq. ft. potential assuming maximum office potential is used).
POLICY

Provide retail and services adequate to serve the future residential, visitor and office populations in Coal Harbour.

Permit specialty retail development, especially of tourist/visitor interest, at the western and eastern ends of Coal Harbour in conjunction with existing hotel development and the proposed commercial area on the waterfront and assorted public facilities expected to have a broad range of appeal. At the eastern end this will reinforce the developing Canada Place/Waterfront Centre activity node.

Permit local retail at the western end of the Marathon site to serve the working small boat harbour and marinas as well as on-site and adjacent off-site residential areas.

Permit local and/or specialty retail/service uses at the western edge of the Bayshore site to continue the Denman Street retail character, along the west side of Cardero Street to provide a double-fronting retail street in conjunction with the Marathon development, and adjacent to the western marina to service the local maritime needs.

Permit limited retail/service activity related to public open space focal points.

Permit limited restaurant and entertainment activity along the promenade in locations where residential impacts are minimized and economic viability is maximized.

Discourage underground retail malls in Coal Harbour but encourage street-oriented, ground level retailing and linkages to adjacent retail areas.

Integrate retail and service outlets well into their residential or office setting.

Ensure suitable access, parking, and circulation in all retail/service areas.

DENSITY TARGETS

Bayshore Site
The amount of new local and non-local retail development should not exceed a total of 50,000 sq. ft.

Marathon Site
In the existing CWD Sub-area 1, the amount of local and non-local retail development should not exceed a total of 75,000 sq. ft.

In the existing CWD Sub-area 2, the amount of specialty or regional-oriented retail should be in the order of 150,000 sq. ft., subject to it being shown that this does not compete with other downtown areas and satisfies urban design and other functional objectives.
16. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

ISSUES

Is the anticipated residential and working population of Coal Harbour large enough to support its own array of community facilities, or could these demands be met by utilizing off-site existing services in areas such as the West End?

Community facilities for downtown workers are important in this area. Community facilities for residents are essential.

Different community facilities can serve different users. As a downtown location, this area could accommodate city-wide or regional attractions in addition to those of local interest. These facilities can be disruptive in a residential setting and can crowd a business area. Should we look toward major civic institutions? A new Maritime Museum, satellite Aquarium facility and theatres have been mentioned. What special provisions would these institutions need if included in this complex downtown waterfront?

Community facilities that combine many uses in a multi-purpose setting can efficiently share spaces and services, be flexible to the needs of a population which can vary over time and function as a social activity place. Programming conflicts and jurisdictional problems can occur in shared multi-purpose facilities.

As the population of Coal Harbour will grow gradually, should community facilities and services be delivered in tandem or provided up front? Can space be reserved now for facilities that may or may not be needed later? Can interim use of these spaces be arranged?

Financial responsibility for infrastructure and facilities is yet to be determined, but could represent a major level of commitment for the developer and maybe the City.

Public safety is a prime concern of inner-city living and may result in under-utilized area if they are perceived to be dangerous in nature. Can areas be designed to reduce these problems in a cost effective manner?

FACTS

Existing City services including, for example, police and fire, will need to adjust to the new development and population. Ideally, the number of people needed to support facilities are shown in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>community centre</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(existing West End facilities beyond capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indoor pool</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>(existing West End facility near capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branch library</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(existing West End facility near capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ice rink</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>(existing West End facility near capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary schools: K-3 or K-7</td>
<td>125-140 children, 200 children</td>
<td>(existing West End facility near capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health unit</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>(existing West End facilities beyond capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daycare</td>
<td>60 pre-schoolers</td>
<td>(existing West End facilities beyond capacity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costly variations from these standards would be necessary to adequately serve communities isolated from facilities.

Presently there are approximately 43,000 people residing in the downtown peninsula.

Existing community recreation facilities in the downtown peninsula are generally used to capacity. The West End Community Centre is well beyond capacity; except for 2nd Beach in Stanley Park and the Vancouver Aquatic Centre, there are no other public swimming facilities on the downtown peninsula or in the Downtown Eastside.

A K-7 elementary school site requires 1.5 - 3.0 acres, a K-3 annex requires 0.5 - 0.75 acres adjacent to a park where outdoor play space can be provided and which is 2.5 - 3.0 acres in size.

Approximately 600 - 800 units designed for households with children are needed to support either a K-3 or a full K-7 elementary school. False Creek South has approximately 850 units occupied by families and this generates an elementary school enrollment of approximately 250 students.

The existing elementary school population in the West End totals about 480 children, with about 265 (55%) of these in the K-3 grades.

The existing elementary school facilities in the West End could handle up to 150 more students but in less than ideal conditions and at a loss of space for community programs and future West End growth.

The Maritime Museum currently situated at Vanier Park would like to relocate to a more prominent waterfront location with better access and greater public activity, and have indicated strong interest in the Coal Harbour location. A study has confirmed the desirability of this, and that the site is suitable for the institution. A full complex is proposed that could include international displays, historic ships, working boatyard, hands-on museum, educational centre, and an entertainment plaza.
PAST POLICY

None applicable.

POLICY

Develop a services plan to provide for the educational, social, health, recreational, and cultural needs of residents, workers and visitors to Coal Harbour. This should be accomplished in the context of emerging projections for nearby neighbourhoods since Coal Harbour neighbourhoods will represent extensions of adjacent communities. It should also specifically include emergency planning programs that could be easily implemented in the event of a disaster.

Encourage this review to be a cooperative effort by the relevant agencies, with the size and programming of additional services to be determined by population needs and existing services.

Ensure that the development of community facilities and services occurs concurrently with the residential development which they are intended to serve, and if possible are provided on-site.

For the Bayshore, Marathon and escarpment sites, consider the application of a 'cash-in-lieu' option to provide for the recreational and community needs as outlined in a services plan for this area if these cannot be provided satisfactorily on site.

In general, integrate neighbourhood-serving facilities as part of the residential area and city/region-serving facilities in non-residential areas. Avoid mixing non-local uses and facilities with residential uses.

Encourage multi-purpose facilities, preferably adjoining a park and otherwise well located to serve their user population. Multi-purpose facilities are suited to situations such as Coal Harbour where individual outlets are difficult because of limited space and suitable sites.

Consider a major institution in Coal Harbour provided it has a waterfront orientation and it will enhance the maritime theme. Preserve waterfront sites for facilities which are water dependent, cannot thrive elsewhere, and will provide public attraction, variety, and interest to the waterfront.

Ensure that design guidelines of the form of development are sensitive to safety and security concerns, so as to minimize high risk environments.

Require the inclusion, as part of the Development Permit approval process, of public art features for major commercial and residential development in the Coal Harbour area.
17. INDUSTRY AND INTERIM USES

ISSUES

Should the existing seaplane operations be retained and relocated to the east end of Coal Harbour, and are proposed residential uses compatible with this transportation use given the noise conflicts?

Should a new heliport facility be considered for the easterly end of Coal Harbour, possibly in conjunction with the planned seaplane operation?

The gradual phasing out of the rail/ferry operations could result in significant noise problems in close proximity to residential uses for a considerable time. If the proposed architectural noise abatement treatment along Jervis Street (the proposed cutoff location for Marathon’s Phase 1) results in a lifeless blank facade, the urbanity of that street could be compromised.

Full development of the waterfront may take in the order of 20 - 30 years. In the interim the owners will likely wish to use portions of their sites for temporary (interim) uses which generate revenue.

Interim uses can contribute to or detract from permanent uses, the shoreline and water experience, and views across the water. If the public seawall, walkway and parks are required up front, then water-oriented interim uses could be hampered.

A working small-boat harbour may require some light industrial ancillary services and facilities. These activities may have negative impacts in residential settings.

Certain land use changes could have an impact on the adjacent Port of Vancouver, if the Port’s needs and requirements are not taken into account during the planning of the Coal Harbour area.

FACTS

The CPR has decided to initiate a phased removal and relocation of its rail and ferry operations on the Marathon site. Hazardous goods shipments have ceased since 1986. The westerly shunting tracks are rarely used and will be removed west of Jervis Street by 1990. The rail-ferry operation in the centre of the site is proposed to remain in operation until at least 1995.

In 1988 there were approximately 30,000 take-offs and landings of seaplanes in Coal Harbour. The most westerly seaplane docking terminal is at the Bayshore site, but most are located on the Marathon site east of Jervis Street.

Residential within 1300 feet of seaplane takeoff may well experience noise peaks in excess of 85 dBA. Operations are during the daylight hours only, hence evening noise would not be a problem.

Water area leases in the Marathon site are on a short-term basis (maximum 5-year period), with the expiry date for most of 1990.

Five marine-oriented industrial uses and five seaplane operations exist in the Coal Harbour area at this time.

Menchions Shipyard located at the westerly end of the Marathon site is the last remaining boat repair facility and marine ways in the Coal Harbour area capable of servicing wooden boats and a variety of vessel sizes.

Limited opportunities exist to relocate industrial and commercial operations out of Coal Harbour to other locations east of Burrard Street.

PAST POLICY

1979 CWD ODP:

- Relocation of existing rail operations encouraged (west of Burrard Street).
- Seaplanes encouraged to continue operations (as long as negative effects on the new urban uses and the vessel traffic in Burrard Inlet are minimized).
- Interim uses including marine, commercial and light industrial facilities which currently exist on the waterfront on a temporary basis can continue for 10-15 years before redevelopment occurs.
- Interim uses also can include new temporary facilities which are compatible with future urban uses.
- Significant upgrading of interim facilities may be required to improve their compatibility with new development.
POLICY

Allow long term industry in the Marathon site only to the extent that it is essential to a working small-boat harbour, is compatible with residential and retail uses, is relatively small-scaled, is self-contained, and depends upon a location at the water’s edge.

On the Marathon site, provide in the first phase of development the full range of marine servicing industrial uses that are needed to sustain a working small-boat harbour.

Restrict industry from the Bayshore site except for the limited use of boat repair facilities in marinas that are meant solely for the purpose of marina tenants on a short term, small-scale basis.

Facilitate interim uses -- some of these may be of an industrial nature -- provided they are compatible with anticipated permanent uses, the shoreline and water experience, and views across the water.

Discourage new interim uses that are not movable, low-intensity or low in capital investment and thereby avoid extending their life expectancy.

Encourage the relocation of the existing seaplane transportation services to a new, shared, centralized marine terminal facility at the eastern end of the site near the foot of Burrard Street. Integrate this with other public-oriented waterfront uses planned as part of the emerging Canada Place/Burrard activity focus.

Provide special acoustic treatment to residential units situated near or adjacent to industrial uses such as railyards, boat repair facilities or seaplane terminals.

Allow for the continuing effectiveness of the adjacent Port of Vancouver through proper planning and consultation with the Vancouver Port Corporation.

SPECIFIC TARGETS

In the Marathon site, in the order of 20,000 sq. ft. of space for marine repair and servicing facilities is encouraged and may be permitted.
18. OTHER CONCERNS - SOILS, UTILITIES & ENVIRONMENT

ISSUES

Various issues related to engineering utilities and services, as well as soils quality, have not yet been completely defined at this early stage. Clearly, however, Coal Harbour is expected to meet the same conditions of environmental quality and servicing standards as adopted for False Creek and elsewhere in Vancouver.

There are areas of soils in Coal Harbour which may require special treatment to address residues left by previous industrial users.

Proposed major structures over fill may need to be pile supported, and unstable fill areas may need to be stabilized to prevent slumping in the event of an earthquake.

The required engineering services and utilities for Coal Harbour are not yet constructed, and they may require special treatment to counteract unstable fill situations.

Water quality in Coal Harbour should be improved before there is safe direct water contact.

Increased traffic on land and water may increase noise and pollution.

Responsibilities for clean-up costs are not clear in an area such as this, which has a long history of industrial activity and multiple jurisdictions.

Development of the area will add to the waste disposal problems currently being experienced in the city.

Figure 23. Coal Harbour Existing Utilities
FACTS
A preliminary soil analysis of the Marathon lands in Coal Harbour has been done by Marathon Realty Company and a report is available on the subsoil conditions and groundwater situation. The analysis found that fill varies from 8 - 28 feet in depth, some areas are unstable for engineering services, fill material varies in permeability, parking below 8.6 feet (geodetic) will need flood protection, some unsuitable fill may need to be removed, and Hard Bottom is approximately 15 - 35 feet below the existing grade. Additional work has been undertaken to determine soil quality.

Some areas of the site may be less suitable for certain uses based on the soil composition.

The Provincial Ministry of Environment will review soils reports, assess any risks, and advise on appropriate treatments.

An agreement will be required with Marathon Realty Company and the owner of the Bayshore property requiring completion of major infrastructure and cost-sharing with the City.

City engineering standards are specified as part of the subdivision process and become pre-requisites to subdivision approval.

Pre-1956 City sewer outfalls in Coal Harbour release raw sewage into Coal Harbour, which does not flush well.

Marathon and the Bayshore have responsibility for soil remediation and other environmental cleanup on their sites. However questions of jurisdiction and responsibility for costs remain for other environmental improvements needed in the Coal Harbour basin.

Recycling and energy conservation policies have been adopted in the False Creek ODP.

PAST POLICY
None applicable.

POLICY

GENERAL
Develop a comprehensive environmental improvement plan for the Coal Harbour basin dealing with water quality, sewage disposal, soils treatment, noise and other environmental impacts.

Restrict any land development until the soils are deemed to be clean of contaminants according to acceptable standards.

Ensure that appropriate recycling and energy conservation programs and policies are adhered to in the Coal Harbour area.

Ensure that appropriate indoor recycling facilities are provided so that source separation can take place, for both residential and commercial developments.

SOILS AND WATER
Ensure that the health and safety aspects of the soils on a development site and on other sites on which the development will depend for parks, community facilities, schools, engineering services and access are resolved to the City’s satisfaction before decisions are made about future interim or permanent uses on the site.

In dealing with soil and water contamination, resolve the effects on flora, fauna and fish, as well as people.

Ensure there is full public disclosure of all completed reports, plans, and studies addressing soil conditions and contaminants in the Coal Harbour area.

Precede Public Hearings for any area rezoning which permits development on the Coal Harbour development sites by the release to the public of the risk assessment and risk management decisions and the remedial plan approved by the Ministry of Environment.

The City’s Subdivision Approving Officer will not consider any subdivision plans for the purpose of development prior to the release to the public of the risk assessment and risk management decisions and the remedial plan, including standards to be achieved, approved by the Ministry of Environment.

Monitor carefully the water quality in Coal Harbour.

ENGINEERING SERVICES AND UTILITIES
Ensure that engineering services and utilities adequately serve the development demands.

Respect existing services and utilities in planning the future development of Coal Harbour.

OTHER CONCERNS - SOILS, UTILITIES & ENVIRONMENT