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1.0 Application and Intent

On July 9, 2002 City Council adopted the Downtown Transportation Plan, which included a direction to reconfigure the traffic loops at the north end of the Granville Bridge in order to improve connections between the downtown and False Creek, and make better use of valuable land.

These Policies and Guidelines embody the plan developed by consultants and a multi-departmental staff team during 2006 and 2007. Their work included detailed road geometrics, massing and urban design studies, and economic evaluation. During the course of the planning, staff has also processed private rezonings on the “Vancouver Centre Lodge” site and the “Yale/Cecil” site, using the evolving Granville Loops Policy Plan.

These policies apply to the properties within the study area that are assumed to have redevelopment potential over the next 15-20 years and wish to rezone from the existing DODP zoning. The Best Western Hotel at 718 Drake and the rental residential building at 600 Drake are relatively new and if they were to rezone within this time frame, staff would have to develop policies for their redevelopment within the context of this plan. Black Top Cabs has approximately 11 years left on its lease in the loops and the plan has a phasing option which allows them to remain in place for that period. It is important to note that the existing zoning remains unchanged and landowners may choose to redevelop under that zoning, as opposed to redeveloping under the policies found herein as the Granville Loops Policy Plan.

A separate document outlines in more detail the Council-adopted Public Benefits Strategy associated with this area plan.

1.1 Purpose

These Policies and Guidelines are intended to guide the redesign of the street system, reconfiguration of land parcels, and redevelopment of the Granville Loops area. They are to be used to:

• guide design and evaluation of future CD-1 rezoning of sites within the study area, and of subsequent development permit applications
• provide information on new street configuration and intentions regarding the public realm
• provide the parameters for future potential disposition and/or sale of the City-owned lands within the area.

1.2 Area Location

The area to which these Policies and Guidelines apply is located at the north end of Granville Bridge and is bounded by Pacific, Seymour, Drake, and Howe streets as shown in Figure 1.
The new streets proposed for the area have been unofficially named East Rolston, West Rolston, and Rolston Way, in order to be able to have reference points. When Rolston Crescent is rebuilt, it is expected that the naming of the new streets will be undertaken by the City’s official street naming committee.

1.3 Existing Conditions

The area is the “gateway” to downtown Granville Street, an important retail, commercial, and entertainment district with a long history and a unique cultural and physical character within the city. View cones have been adopted that recognize the importance of the vista down this street (see Figure 2). The other surrounding areas are mainly occupied by high density residential development lining important access streets to the downtown (see Figure 3). The topography slopes down from north to south and is complicated by a variety of bridge structures and grades (see Figure 4).

Existing zoning of the Loops area is Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP), Area C, which allows consideration of:

- a range of commercial, cultural, and institutional uses, as well as residential use;
- a maximum density 5.0 FSR overall, with up to 3.0 FSR residential within the total; and
- a maximum height of 300 ft., additionally limited along the eastern side of Granville to a range of 120 to 130 ft. by Viewcone 12.2 (see Figure 2).

Figure 3 shows existing subdivision, uses, and traffic volumes within the study area. There is one building on the Vancouver Heritage Register, the Yale Hotel, listed as a category B building. There are 44 SRA units in the Yale, 106 SRA units in the Old Continental Hotel, and 50 SRA units in the Cecil Hotel (now closed). In addition, there are 192 affordable small suites in 600 Drake Street on land leased from the City.
1.4 Topography

The topography of the area varies significantly and will influence both building and street design (see Figure 4). However, in this constraint lies the opportunity to reconnect the area in a more coherent fashion by recontouring land and providing a new ground plane.

1.4.1 Rebuild Rolston Crescent, partially on fill, to connect up to the existing bridge structure.

1.4.2 Allow fill or structures on sites adjacent to the rebuilt streets to connect properly to the new street system.
2.0 Overall Concept

2.1 Goals

The overall concept for the area reflects a number of broad goals.

2.1 Enhance Connectivity

- Reconfigure the streets to allow better pedestrian and cyclist connections from downtown to False Creek by removing the barriers created by the Loops, while maintaining important traffic circulation routes.
2.2 Create a Distinctive Form and Character

- Create a distinctive built form that creates an improved “gateway” to Granville Street, the historical high street of Vancouver and major entertainment district.
- Ensure built form that recognizes the scale of the Granville Street corridor but is also compatible with the surrounding highrise Downtown South area.

2.3 Optimize Land Use and Development Potential

- Rationalize existing parcels and lot lines, as well as facilitate development at densities that are comparable with overall density under existing zoning.
- Emphasize residential use, as in the surrounding Downtown South, Granville Slopes, and False Creek North areas.
- Encourage preservation and/or upgrading of the current private affordable housing.
- Incorporate a replacement for the City-owned Old Continental Hotel non-market housing, and if possible, capacity for additional non-market housing.

2.4 Improve the Public Realm

- Provide a domestic feel to the new streets in the area by requiring residential use at grade on East Rolston and West Rolston streets.
- Maintain the vitality of the existing streets by requiring non-residential at grade on Granville, Drake, and Pacific streets.
- Improve the existing public realm along Granville, Howe, Pacific, and Seymour pedestrian routes.

2.5 Allow for Phasing

- Allow for the preservation of existing uses in the area through the potential for a phased redevelopment.
- Allow for new development to occur prior to the new road scheme being constructed.

2.6 Recover Public Costs and Support Public Benefits

- As far as is consistent with good urban design, achieve densities on City-owned sites that will cover the cost of reconstructing the street/utility system, replacing the Old Continental Hotel non-market housing, and return property value to the Property Endowment Fund.
- Develop a priority list of other public benefits to be supported if rezonings generate additional Community Amenity Contributions.

2.2 Overall Concept Description

The concept sees the freeway-like, elevated traffic loops at the north end of the Granville loops replaced by an H-configuration of grade-level streets that connect with the surrounding streets and the bridge (Figure 5).
The existing circulation pattern of the loops would be maintained, which is important for access to several areas of downtown, however, the circulation will be accommodated in an urban context. The new East and West Rolston Streets will be narrower than typical streets, but are expected to accommodate anticipated vehicle volumes. Pedestrians will be able to walk down these townhouse-lined streets to False Creek, using improved pedestrian crossings on Pacific Street (Figure 6). Granville Bridge frontages will benefit from a normal streetscape, with larger sidewalks.
The building massing creates a “valley gateway” with somewhat lower buildings on the Granville-fronting sites, flanked by higher towers on the Howe and Seymour edges of the area. This responds to the adopted planning direction for Granville Street further north, which is to ensure that the corridor retains its distinctive mid-rise scale. The paired taller towers are currently recommended at 300 ft. While this is a similar maximum to the surrounding area, given the scale and location of nearby towers these two new buildings will be quite prominent in marking the entry to downtown. (As noted in Section 5.0, there is the future possibility of considering additional height on these two sites, pursuant to further planning related to heights in the downtown generally.)

The land uses reflect those in Downtown South, emphasizing residential but requiring commercial along the Granville frontage. In all, there could be about 1 million square feet of new development added to the approximately 200,000 sq. ft. of existing development that is anticipated to remain in the Best Western Hotel, 600 Drake, and the Yale Hotel. This will mean that the current area population of approximately 400 residents housed in roughly 350 units, will rise to about 1500 residents housed in 1300 units. Out of the 1300 units, 25-30% will be non-market SRA or affordable rental units (split approximately equally between these two types of housing).
3.0 New Streets and Development Sites

3.1 Street Reconfiguration

The primary goal of the street reconfiguration is to extend the City’s street grid system into the site, providing improved access to and through the parcels in the Loops area for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. Although the existing traffic volumes on the loops are relatively light (Figure 3), they serve an important function within the downtown street network. The plan maintains this circulation, but transforms it from a highway form to an urban context.

3.1.1 Construct a new ‘H’ street system which connects to the surrounding street grid system, as illustrated in Figure 7. Roadway widths will be narrower than typical, reflecting the existing narrow dimension of the Rolston Crescent right-of-way, and the increased road density relative to a typical downtown block. Two new north-south streets would be formed by the plan: East Rolston would be one-way southbound, and West Rolston would be one way northbound.

3.1.2 Provide enhanced vehicular and pedestrian access across Granville and Pacific streets through the construction of street crossings. The Granville crossing would be fully signalized, as would the Pacific crossing at East Rolston.

3.1.3 Design pedestrian connections and improvements from Howe and Seymour streets to the new ‘H’ street system, in order to provide alternative connections and upgrade the existing pedestrian environment, as illustrated in Additional Background Information.

3.1.4 Consider a reduction of the roadway on Granville Street in front of existing developments south of Drake (Best Western, Yale, and Cecil hotels), in order to achieve wider sidewalks or to establish parking/drop-off bays.

3.1.5 Consider the relocation of bus stops in order to rationalize the area to be serviced upon eventual redevelopment.

3.1.6 Extend Pacific Street bike routes from east of Seymour Street to Howe Street.

Figure 7 Proposed Circulation
3.1.7 Provide a range of high quality bike facilities, with a preference for separated bike facilities, on streets to be designed, as well as connections to the Granville Bridge and to existing and future bike routes on nearby streets (possible options are shown in Additional Background Information).

3.2 Parcel Reconfiguration and Development Sites

3.2.1 Figure 8 shows portions of existing parcels (owned and/or leased) required for the new streets, and areas of current street right-of-way that will be available to be incorporated into development sites. This should be achieved through right-of-way agreements, land sales, and/or dedications. Resulting development site dimensions and dedicated street rights-of-way will be approximately as shown in Figure 9.

3.2.2 New development on sites B1, B3, C1, and C3 should dedicate 10 ft. to the Granville Street right-of-way for wider sidewalks and below grade bridge access for bridge inspection and maintenance. Developments should be built to the new property line to provide a direct ‘deck’ connection from the existing bridge deck to buildings, with no development or parking structure allowed above or below the extended bridge deck.

3.2.3 In some locations, surface rights-of-way on development parcels may be utilized (at the discretion of the City Engineer) to allow for additional sidewalk space, especially where parcel size means that parking plates would be seriously impacted by dedication requirements.
4.0 Land Use and Density

The current zoning allows a wide range of uses, but limits residential use to 3.0 FSR within the total maximum 5.0 FSR. These policies focus on residential use, but allow for compatible non-residential uses as well - an approach similar to adjacent areas. Rezonings with significantly more residential density than 3.0 FSR will be considered, within the massing guidelines and floorspace maximums proposed in this document. While non-residential uses are required at grade on Granville, Drake, and Pacific (with the exception of residential lobbies, amenity space, and circulation space), the expected non-residential floorspace will be modest within developments and the area overall. Figure 10 illustrates the ground level uses.
4.1 **Residential Use**

Residential use should be included on all sites in order to meet the overall goals and concept, including the ability to provide an economic return that will support the costs of infrastructure reconstruction and provision of public benefits.

4.1.1 Residential uses (except lobbies, amenity space, and circulation space) should not be located at grade on Granville, Drake, and Pacific streets.

4.1.2 Residential dwellings with front doors and windows should be located along the new East and West Rolston Streets to the maximum extent possible, in order to achieve the desired domestic feel for the streets.

4.1.3 Residential development should meet normal City acoustic standards, and provide an acoustic report. Noise impacts can be mitigated through the use of setbacks, soundproof construction, and/or advantageous unit orientation.

4.1.4 Privacy should be enhanced when distances between residential portions of buildings are under 60 ft., through appropriate screening and careful orientation of units.

**Figure 10 Grade Level Uses**

Residential required

•••• Non-residential required

(Active uses preferred)
4.2 Affordable Residential

4.2.1 Existing non-market housing units at the Old Continental Hotel are to be replaced with new non-market housing on site B3, noting that the standards for unit size and quality will be determined by the City’s Housing Centre along with the Social Development Department. Funding will be provided through the redevelopment of the City-owned sites in the Loops. The building envelope on this site is designed to allow for the replacement of all of the units of the Old Continental with significantly larger units than the existing units. Additional SRA units could be provided by decreasing unit size slightly.

4.2.2 Private sites with existing SRAs (Yale Hotel and Cecil Hotel) are subject to the Council-adopted SRA Bylaw and policies and have been considered in recently approved rezonings.

4.2.3 Encourage the retention of affordable rental units in the area.

4.3 Other Uses

4.3.1 The following non-residential uses may be provided at grade or on the second floor on Granville, Pacific, and Drake streets:

- Office uses.
- Service uses, limited to neighbourhood public house, barber shop/beauty parlour, laundromat or dry cleaning establishment, repair shop-class B, photo finishing or photography studio, restaurants, and business/art schools.
- Retail uses, limited to adult retail store, grocery or drug store, and retail store.
- Institutional uses and cultural/recreational uses but excluding arcade, casino-class 1, or bingo hall.

4.3.2 Existing transportation uses, limited to taxicab or limousine stations, are permitted in below bridge deck locations on Pacific Street.

4.3.3 Non-residential uses should be relatively small in scale, with pedestrian-friendly retail, service, or similar uses preferred at grade. While it is not necessary to try and introduce the 25 ft. frontage rhythm called for in the Granville Street (Downtown South) Guidelines for the area further north, any retail or service frontages greater 75 ft. should be carefully designed and detailed.

4.4 Density

4.4.1 The final determination of the amount of floor space permitted on the various sites will be an outcome of evaluation of specific rezoning proposals that meet these Policies and Guidelines. However, Table 1 provides an estimate of what may be achieved in the massing described in these Policies and Guidelines.
Table 1  Approximate Achievable Floor Space in square feet (Refer to Figure 9 for site locations and dimensions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area*</th>
<th>Floor Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>23,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Site areas are net of dedications, but include surface rights-of-way
** Includes 25,000+/- s.f. of renovated Yale Hotel

Note: Site B3 is the replacement site for the Old Continental Hotel

The amount of development in Table 1 is similar to what could be typically achieved in Downtown South blocks. However, compared to typical blocks in surrounding areas, those in the Granville Loops have a higher proportion of land dedicated to public street. If this area were to have the normal street and lane dedications typically found in Downtown South, the average net density of both existing and future development would be approximately 5.5 FSR. With all of the dedications required in this area, the average net density of both existing and future development is approximately 7.0 FSR. The average net density of just the development shown in Table 1 is approximately 7.6 FSR.

4.4.2 Sites abutting Granville Bridge may incorporate parking that is above grade but below the bridge deck. The above table does not include the floor space that will need to be permitted for this parking. The CD-1 zonings should be written to include the appropriate floor space for this purpose. (Floor space used for parking that is located at or below grade is conventionally excluded from calculation, and this should also be the case for these sites where ‘grade’ will effectively be the bridge deck.)

5.0 Built Form and Character

Figure 6 shows the overall built form concept in diagrammatic form, and Figure 11 shows the cityscape as one approaches from Granville Bridge. The intention is to create a “valley gateway”. Lower building massing is located on the Granville sites, relating to massing permitted further north along Granville (90 ft. maximum), with taller towers (300 ft.) on the Howe and Seymour sites, relating to the maximum heights allowed for adjacent Downtown South highrises. The proposed buildings have been located so as to maintain appropriate spacing from existing and potential towers on adjacent sites, to allow for views between buildings, and to preserve privacy.
The towers on sites A and D should be designed to be reflective of each other, but not necessarily copies of each other. This anticipates that they may be built at different times and by different developers. Similarly, the mid-rises on sites B3 and C3 should have similar massing but not be copies of each other. This reflects the fact that one will be market housing and the other will be non-market, on top of the factors mentioned above. The towers on sites B1 and C1 should frame the Granville portal, but the same principles apply for similar massing but also individual expression.

(Note: Heights and view cones in the downtown area will be reviewed during 2009/10 as part of the Capacity Options Review. The objective of the Review is to ensure there is sufficient floor space capacity for future jobs, as well as to support public objectives such as affordable housing, social and cultural amenities, heritage bonuses, and density transfers. The question of whether heights greater than 300 ft. should be considered on sites A and D, to form a more emphatic “gateway”, significantly higher than surrounding buildings, will be considered during the course of this work, which will include public consultation.)

Figure 11 Granville Loops Gateway from Granville Bridge

5.1 Heights and Floorplates

5.1.1 Maximum building heights should generally be as shown in Figure 12. Because of elevated structures, sloping ground, and the fact that grades will change in the future, the official building grades in the area are complex. The entire area slopes down approximately 25 ft. from the corner of Howe and Drake to the corner of Seymour and Pacific. For the sake of simplicity, heights in Figure 13 are measured from nominal “grades” as follows:

- Sites B1 and C1 from ground levels on Pacific
- Sites B3, C3, F, and G: from deck or street levels on Granville
- Sites A, B2, C2, D, and E from ground levels on East or West Rolston

In the drafting of the CD-1 zonings the best way to specify maximum heights in the regulations will be determined.
Figure 12  Maximum Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Lowrise</th>
<th>Midrise</th>
<th>Highrise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105'</td>
<td>180'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>180'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>300'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>220'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30' Proposed in feet  12 Existing in floors
5.1.2 Flexibility in maximum heights should be considered to a modest extent, where there can be significant improvement in building form as a result.

5.1.3 On portions of some sites, building heights will be limited by adopted Viewcone 12.2, as illustrated in Figure 2. Specific calculation of permitted heights will be necessary and all portions of the building will need to be below that level.

5.1.4 Streetwall height along the Granville frontage should be a minimum of 40 ft., with the exception of park or public open space.

5.1.5 Tower floorplates (i.e. portions of buildings above about 70 ft. in height) should be a maximum of 6500 sq. ft. gross (including elevator cores, storage, stairs, enclosed balconies etc., but excluding open balconies).

5.1.6 Flexibility in floorplate maximum should be considered for purposes of achieving non-market housing, on-site heritage preservation, and/or on sites where view cones impose height limits.
5.2 Setbacks and Dedications

5.2.1 New development on sites B1, B3, C1 and C3 are required to dedicate 10 ft. to the Granville right-of-way, for wider sidewalks and below-deck access to the bridge structures, as illustrated in Figure 14. Developments should be built to the new property line to provide a direct ‘deck’ connection from the existing bridge deck to the buildings. Design and construction details of the resulting deck platform will be determined at rezoning stage.

5.2.2 Granville Street north of Rolston Way - development should generally be built to the property line.

5.2.3 East and West Rolston streets - space should be provided in order to allow for provision of 10 ft. wide sidewalks and 4’ landscaped setbacks. This space may be secured as dedicated property, surface right-of-way, setback, or a combination of the above, to be determined at the time of rezoning.

5.2.4 Rolston Way - space should be provided to allow for provision of 12’ and 14’ wide sidewalks, with the wider sidewalk on the south side.

5.2.5 Howe and Seymour Bridge ramps - buildings should set back 25’ in order to provide a landscaped buffer that provides some privacy for residential units, but also opens up the sidewalks next to the ramps for visual surveillance and safety. A 10’ setback also applies to the Howe and Seymour bridge ramps to allow for free and clear access to the bridge for inspection and maintenance.

5.2.6 Howe and Drake streets adjacent to site E - setbacks should allow for landscaping and/or seating areas, as well as street trees.

5.2.6 Pacific Street - sufficient space should be provided to allow for the incorporation of the Council-adopted Pacific Boulevard public realm plan.
5.3 Orientation and Streetscape Character

5.3.1 Pedestrian access to development directly adjacent to the bridge should be required from the bridge deck level as illustrated in Figure 14.

5.3.2 Buildings should generally be oriented away from the bridge ramps as illustrated in Figure 15.

5.3.3 Main Building entries and secondary entries should be located as illustrated in Figure 15.
5.3.3 Ground floor levels of buildings on Drake, Pacific, Howe, and Granville streets should provide visual interest for pedestrians through the use of large windows, detailing, etc.

5.3.4 Townhouse dwellings with front doors and windows should be provided to the extent possible along East and West Rolston streets.

Figure 15 Building Entries

5.4 Heritage

5.4.1 The Yale Hotel should be retained and upgraded, and receive heritage designation through use of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement. Any bonus density should be accommodated on the site rather than transferred further afield.

5.4.2 Granville Street signage should fit in with the heritage character of signage along the street to the north and adhere to Part 12 Granville Street Sign District of the Sign By-law.

5.5 Views

5.5.1 New development should be designed and landscaped to provide for attractive near views for existing adjacent developments, as well as for new units.
5.6 Livability

5.6.1 Habitable rooms must have access to daylight and, as much as possible, to direct sunlight.

5.6.2 Developments near odour sources such as restaurants should provide odour mitigation through the use of techniques such as alternative ventilation to opening windows.

5.6.3 Private and semi-private open space should be provided where possible, utilizing balconies, roof decks, and terraced spaces on building podiums.

6.0 Parking & Loading

6.1 Access

6.1.1 Access to parking and loading for development sites should be located off East and West Rolston streets.

6.1.2 Developments should share access points when possible, in order to minimize sidewalk crossings as illustrated in Figure 15, noting that detailed geometric design will be undertaken for all parcels at the rezoning stage.

6.1.3 Convenient passenger drop-off and emergency access should be provided to both residential and commercial uses.

6.2 Location and Design

6.2.1 Parking should be located at or below grade, in the usual manner. However, on sites B3 and C3 which abut Granville Bridge, parking should be allowed above grade but below bridge deck level, as means of using this otherwise unlivable frontage and as illustrated in Figure 16. Section 4.4.2 above, notes that floor space for this purpose will be included as floorspace in CD-1 rezonings over and above floorspace listed in this plan.

6.2.2 Curbside parking should be provided where possible, in order to serve street level businesses and enhance the residential ‘feel’ of the area.

6.2.3 Commercial loading spaces should be designed to minimize visual impact and sidewalk crossings. Off-street or underground loading is encouraged.

6.2.4 Effective screening of loading, garbage, and recycling facilities should be provided, especially when considering the lack of lanes and the front address character of the streets in the area.

6.2.5 Residential loading should be provided as conceptually illustrated in Additional Background Information.
7.0 Roads and Utilities

7.1.1 The new ‘H’ system street plan will be undertaken as a direct cost of the redevelopment of the City-owned sites in the Loops.

7.1.2 Above ground Hydro service should be placed underground where possible.

7.1.3 The water and sewer system should be upgraded where required.

8.0 Public Realm Treatment

The Pacific Boulevard “Great Street” concept design was adopted by Council in 2005 and is being implemented in stages as adjacent development and funding sources permit. In the area of the Loops, the currently approved design calls for a multi-way boulevard on the south side and an expanded sidewalk and public realm on the north side of Pacific. In addition, pedestrian crossings linking to the “Under the Granville Bridge” project south of Pacific will be required. A crossings illustration is shown in Additional Background Information (Note: refinement to the concept will occur prior to finalization of design).

A reconstruction of Granville Street from Drake to Cordova was completed in 2009. It involved a full redesign of sidewalks, street trees, street furniture, lighting, and other street elements. Granville Street in the Loops area will be as compatible as possible with this design.

8.1 Streetscape

8.1.1 The Howe to Seymour portion of the Pacific Boulevard design should be implemented in conjunction with the development of the new road configuration and development on sites A, B, C, and D. Funding should come from the redevelopment of City-owned sites in the Loops.

8.1.2 The design of the public realm for Granville south of Drake to the Howe/Seymour ramp intersections, should relate as closely as possible to the detailed design for Granville Street north of Drake. The opportunity to include street trees on the deck by using planters should be investigated. Funding should come from the redevelopment of City-owned sites in the Loops.

8.1.3 Street trees and street furniture should be provided where possible along East and West Rolston streets, as well as Rolston Way, subject to a fully detailed street design for the area.

8.1.4 Good vehicular and pedestrian access should be provided across Granville and Pacific streets through fully designed intersections and crossings, as conceptually illustrated in Additional Background Information.

8.1.5 Pedestrian scale lighting for both on-street and off-street linkages should be provided.

8.1.6 The grades of the sidewalks adjacent to the bridge ramps should be improved where possible to provide better lighting, increase security, improve visibility, and provide a smoother transition to the adjacent properties and the mews connecting to East and West Rolston streets. This work should be paid for by the redevelopment of the City-owned sites in the Loops.

8.1.7 The Granville Bridge sidewalk extensions are to be constructed as a condition of rezoning of sites B1, B3, C1 and C3.

8.2 Public Open Space

8.2.1 Public open space should be provided on the City-owned portion of land adjacent to site F at the corner of Rolston Way and West Rolston, as illustrated in Figure 9 (Note: It is confirmed that Site F is a development site, as noted in illustrations and policies in Sections 4 and 5).
8.2.2 The mews between site A and E are designed to serve as pedestrian space, vehicular access, and residential loading, as conceptually illustrated in Additional Background Information, and secured by right-of-way agreement.

8.2.3 The mews access to site D should provide vehicular access, residential loading, and be designed to incorporate a pedestrian connection to the Seymour sidewalk, as conceptually illustrated in Additional Background Information, subject to a right-of-way agreement with 600 Drake, and secured by an overall right-of-way agreement for the mews.

9.0 Environment

9.1 Green Buildings

Through revising certain bylaws and regulations, the City has adopted a Green Building Strategy that will see all “Part 3” development achieve a level above the equivalent of LEED Certified, with emphasis on the City’s green priorities of energy and water conservation.

With respect to rezonings over the past few years, there has been no Council-adopted Green Building standard. However, many of the major ones have voluntarily met the equivalent of LEED Silver with emphasis on the City’s green priorities. Council approved policies in 2008 making this mandatory for all rezoning involving buildings to which LEED is applicable. The expectations related to Green Buildings are expected to continue to evolve.

9.1.1 Rezoning proposals should meet Green Building policies that are in force at the time of rezoning.

9.2 Soils

9.2.1 Provincial regulations regarding soil quality apply. Site profiles, Ministry of Environment approval, and legal agreements may be required for rezonings, subdivision, or development application.

9.3 Solid Waste and Recycling

9.3.1 Appropriate garbage and recycling facilities should be provided for both residential and non-residential uses, according to normal City standards.

10.0 Public Benefits

The term “public benefits” refers to the range of facilities and amenities that serve or enrich communities, and that the City provides or actively supports. These are:

- Parks
- Community Centres (including ice rinks, aquatic facilities)
- Childcare facilities
- Cultural facilities
- Non-market and affordable housing
- Heritage building retention and rehabilitation
- Libraries
- Pedestrian and cycling improvements
- Public realm improvements
- Neighbourhood Houses

The City has a number of means of funding these benefits:

- Capital Plan spending.
- Floor space bonuses:
  - Some zoning permits consideration of additional floor space to compensate for the inclusion social and cultural amenities or non-market housing;
- Heritage policies permit consideration of additional floor space to compensate for costs of retaining heritage buildings, as well as floorspace transfers, subject to various limitations.

  • Development Cost Levies:
    - DCLs are fixed rate levies that all new development pays on a per square foot basis to contribute to covering the costs related to growth;
    - DCL funding may be spent only on parks, childcare, replacement of low cost housing, and transportation infrastructure (pedestrian, cycling, or transit-related) in fixed percentage proportions.

  • Community Amenity Contributions:
    - CACs are voluntary contributions from rezoning projects that help address growth costs, area deficiencies, and/or other community needs and impacts;
    - CACs may be provided “in kind” on site or off site, or may be a pay-in-lieu cash contribution to an amenity.

Development in the Loops area will pay Development Cost Levies, contribute to the Public Art Program, and the rezonings may also have the capacity for Community Amenity Contributions.

10.1 Two purposes will have first call on revenues generated from development on the City-owned lands (sites A, B, C, and D):

  • the construction of the new streets and public realm, including implementation of Pacific Boulevard “Great Street” improvements from Howe to Seymour, improvements along the Howe and Seymour edges, and the improvements to Granville Street within the Loops.
  
  • replacement of the Old Continental Hotel non-market housing units.

10.2 As noted in section 5 above, retention and rehabilitation of the Yale Hotel should be supported with additional density within the rezoning of site G.

10.3 As part of potential rezonings of site E and F, payment-in-lieu of on-site CACs will be accepted to be used in the general area.

10.4 Beyond the above policies, a Public Benefits Strategy was approved by Council which allocates CACs from site E (targeting parks and childcare) and sets policy for future rezonings and consideration of potential CACs. It addresses what additional benefits are to be supported based on an assessment of demand generated by the redevelopment, needs in adjacent areas, feasibility of delivering the benefit, and overall funding that is likely to be available.

11.0 Phasing

A phased approach may be necessary because of the size, complexity of the street reconstruction, capital funding, and/or existing tenancies and lease agreements. The options introduced (Figure 17) are concepts that will require further staff review if a phasing plan is to be implemented. Private rezonings at 1304 Howe and 1300 Granville have been designed so that they can occur prior to redevelopment of City owned sites or reconstruction of the street system.

The proposed phasing plan is shown in Figure 17 and allows for the east side of the bridge loops to be reconstructed prior to the west side. Site D would be the first parcel available for redevelopment and its sale could potentially fund the loops reconstruction. Option A shows maintaining the existing access point (an underpass below the east loop), whereas Option B shows a new access point to the west loop which would be an at-grade intersection. The benefit of not requiring the underpass to the east loop is that the easterly portion of Rolston Way could be constructed on fill, in what would be the final design state. It may also be possible in Option B to fully construct Rolston Way (not illustrated) depending on grades, detailed design, and operational issues.

This phasing plan could allow existing tenants to stay in place for the full term of their lease. However, if Black Top cabs relocated prior to the end of their lease in 2022, the phasing would
be free to consider the entire Loops area. If this was the case, a new phasing plan may need to be considered to reflect not only the factors mentioned above and the general market conditions, but also the condition of the Old Continental building and the opportunity to replace it on site B3.

Figure 17  Phasing Options

[Diagram showing two phasing options: Option A and Option B]
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