

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-06	10:44	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>November 6, 2025 Against proposal for Vancouver Social Housing plan</p> <p>Housing structures should be in keeping with the existing neighbourhood - i.e. no high rises. And affordable housing should ACTAULLY BE AFFORDABE HOUSING - not apartments that are half the size of existing affordable housing and still at least \$500 per month more. EG- current affordable housing has 600 sq ft at \$1200.</p> <p>NO EXISITING AFFORDABLE HOUSING SHOULD BE DESTROYED IN PLACE OF NON-AFFORDABLE UNITS.</p> <p>OPPOSITION FOR VANCOUVER SOCIAL HOUSING PLAN</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of this.</p> <p>I am not opposed to change. I am not opposed to building more affordable housing. I am ABSOLUTELY FOR THAT.</p> <p>But I AM 100% against negative change, and ugly change, and change done in a bad and destructive way – which this project, and other projects in the Broadway Plan, are. There is a RIGHT way to do this, and THIS is NOT the right way.</p> <p>This proposal is in an residential, family, neighbourhood community. It is a Hospital and Health Care Community – VGH, the Medical Mile, all the clinics and facilities here that thousands of people access daily, and thousands of people live here because of working here, or needing to have direct access to the life saving care from here.</p> <p>The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. The disruption from this kind of construction and negative impact on the hospital and patients being able to access it and life saving care will be HUGE – creating more congestion and traffic. This kind of project is the LAST thing needed in this area. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDBALE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.</p> <p>This tower is FAR TOO TALL (AND EXCEEDINGLY UGLY) and will block light and views, and is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and existing buildings and community. THIS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.</p> <p>There should be NO towers in residential neighbourhoods. Only towers along main transit routes (Like ON Broadway; this location) Should NOT be any taller than a maximum of 12 storeys. And these should all be at AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRICES (which NONE of these proposals are), and should also include Social Housing – which THE MAJORITY of these proposals are not.</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

			<p>The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDABLE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.</p> <p>And all of these rezoning proposals that the City are hellbent on forcing though also are not factoring in infrastructure. They are not factoring HUMANITY. They are not factoring the PEOPLE of Vancouver who live here and love here and call this their FOREVER HOMES. These neighbourhoods are already dense and there are already barely enough streets, park space, schools, health care access and GPs, for people already here. Now the City wants to build all these super tall towers and bring in 64,000+++ (one of the many high figures I have see on the news and other forms of media) to our ALREADY DENSE communities, with ALREADY STRAINING INFRASTRUCTURES.</p> <p>...and NONE of these god awful proposals being put forward (and through) are creating more parks. None will create more green space, more community space, more driving space, more parking space.</p> <p>None of them will be creating more schools, more libraries, more health care clinics, hospitals, more gyms and community centres.</p> <p>All these proposals will: Destroy existing affordable homes. Displace thousands, such as “the poor” (which include):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- veterans- seniors- low-income earners and families- mid-income earners and families- small business owners and workers- artists- medical workers who need to live in the affordable housing in these neighbourhoods for them to do their local healthcare work there- people with serious health care needs <p>All of the above “type” of humans, are of zero interest to these people.</p> <p>If you fall under the above descriptions, then you are nothing to these people and these proposals - to them:</p> <p>You are nothing. You are not Vancouver. You are not the future of Vancouver. You are useless, collateral damage, and you must go;</p> <p>So that the rich and the wealthy and the higher (“better?”) Class of people can come in; and then they will have the Vancouver, and that is the Vancouver that all these developers and proposals and the city, is envisioning.</p> <p>This is what all this really is. This is inhumane. This is utterly shameful</p> <p>The Vancouver as we have always known and loved and fought hard to protect, will be gone,</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>gone to this greed and this vision. Vancouver will be dead</p> <p>For all this vision of influx of people into these luxury towers, the city and these proposals are also not factoring in how the life for all the (wealthy only) people that these luxury high rise towers will bring.</p> <p>No, it's just all about destroying infrastructure and community. Demolishing the incident infrastructure and community (and affordable homes) that we already have, to be able to put up fancy, ugly, high rise, show-box sized apartments, fire hazard, earthquake hazard, monstrous luxury towers.</p> <p>If you want to bring in more people – you need way more infrastructure and community buildings and needs!!!</p> <p>We need: To keep the already amazing and beautiful, and in keeping with the old character neighbourhoods aesthetic, and with being able to have visual access to lots of glorious light and the amazing, majestic mountains of Vancouver. This is why we are all here!! - we are here (and put up with all the nonsense; from city hall, from life in general) because this is Vancouver. Our supernatural, beautiful, incredible Vancouver. - because of its mountains, beaches, nature.</p> <p>Take this away, and Vancouver will very quickly become just be another sh!thole concrete jungle city, with disgusting, non-green, ugly, luxury high-rise monstrosities, that no one wants to visit or live at.</p> <p>And we need to build affordable housing in the right way – low rise buildings, in keeping with the beautiful, old, character neighbourhoods of Vancouver. Need to build on uninhabited land, undeveloped land, on top of commercial buildings.</p> <p>And we need to all be doing everything we can to protect our existing affordable housing and beautiful, old, character neighbourhoods (our proper, historical, Vancouver), protect it like gold -</p> <p>Not allow the city and these types of developers to do what it wishes to do with our land and homes, and lives: Which is to “scorch earth” it all, for wealth and the wealthy. The city and developers happily demolishing historical, aesthetically pleasing, fire and earthquake safe, low-rise buildings and homes, The city and developers happily displacing thousands of people and The city and developers happily destroying thousands of lives, The city and developers happily displacing medically vulnerable residents who have to live in these homes and neighbourhoods to have access to critical life sustaining medical care...</p> <p>All this, to put these high rise luxury, small-scale sizes apartments, that only the wealthy will be able to live in.</p> <p>Who on earth is this nonsense for????? Not Vancouver and it's people Only the developers and the wealthy</p> <p>DO NOT BLOCK THE MOUNTAINS. This is the reason why Vancouver is so amazing and people choose to very work hard and call it home Without the mountains, and with these ugly luxury towers, Vancouver will just be another ugly, crappy, urban jungle. This neighbourhood is NOT a Downtown. It is NOT a City Centre.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>It is part of Vancouver’s rich history, being one of its oldest; with beautiful, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, low-rise buildings that compliment the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>THIS IS A HOSPITAL ZONE.</p> <p>There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.</p> <p>It makes ZERO sense to destroy already affordable housing for these monster towers, which will, no matter how much The City continues to claim, NOT be affordable.</p> <p>If these proposals were actually building the much needed, and more, affordable housing, then people would be absolutely on board – but not in the form of towers.</p> <p>And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.</p> <p>Even having apartments in these towers at 20% bellow market rate, they are still going be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANLTY smaller as well.</p> <p>So we will be asked to lose our beautiful, affordable homes, to be rehoused god knows where and in god knows what conditions, then eventually move into these towers and pay MUCH more and have MUCH LESS space. THIS IS PURE INSANITY.</p> <p>Do not Scorched-Earth existing, beautiful, affordable, neighbourhoods for new developments. Instead, build on undeveloped land or on top of commercial buildings.</p> <p>The video on The City website of this tower does not actually show INSIDE the building.</p> <p>If it did, it would show that the living spaces in these towers are SIGNIFICANTLY smaller than the size of the already affordable housing that The City wants to tear down to build this tower.</p> <p>A one bedroom in the already existing affordable housing in the beautiful low-rise buildings here average 600 sq ft.</p> <p>The “small scale units” in these towers will be HALF the size, if not even smaller. That is not a livable space. That is not a home.</p> <p>And why can’t the city give essential information clearly? Why hide the actual living space measurements in this floor space ratio 9.06 gobbledygook? Why can’t you just simply say how many square feet an apartment and a room is? Why so deceptive?</p> <p>The proposal states that 20% of the apartments in this tower will be at below-market value.</p> <p>BUT BELOW-MARKET RENT IS STILL UNAFFORDABLE. THIS IS NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING.</p> <p>My rent is \$1200. Others pay just \$1000, or even less. And we pay this for beautiful one-bedroom apartments that are 600 sq ft or larger.</p> <p>These apartments this luxury tower will offer are significantly smaller than this.</p> <p>So, we are being asked to give up our ALREADY AFFORDABLE, beautiful, healthy sized, homes for tower apartments that are much smaller and will cost much more.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.

THIS IS NOT HELPING THE HOUSING CRISIS, BUT INSTEAD ADDING TO IT.

And taking living space away from people with ALSO ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS.

Towers completely go against the concept of providing affordable housing and Vancouver being the greenest and most beautiful city.

And this tower is UTTELRY HIDEOUS.

These towers will not be for residents of the community. They will be for the wealthy.

They will block the natural light that is so important to all aspects of health and wellbeing.

You deprive people of space and light, this will ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS, as well as ADDING TO THE HOUSING CRISIS.

The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.

This is pure fantasy, and an insult.

Where will The City put all these Vancouver residents who are made homeless when their affordable homes are destroyed for these luxury towers to be built go? – it most certainly will not be in the same neighbourhoods.

It does not say where these displaced tenants will go for the years that it takes to tear down their homes and build these towers.

And that the tenants who are forced out of their beautiful, affordable homes for these towers will be able to move back in to them at below-market value.

As I have already said, this will STILL BE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS MORE than the rent they are paying in their already affordable homes, and the space will be much, much smaller too.

People live here because they love it and because it is ALREADY AFFORDABLE. People with low to middle income, healthcare workers, seniors, people with disabilities and essential healthcare needs.

Do we all need to apply under with The Registry for Social Housing? So that we are not forced out of our neighbourhoods by these unaffordable towers? So, is it a case of, Register for Social Housing or be homeless?

Also, many people live here because THEY HAVE TO - I am just one of those people. And there are thousands more here like me. And if I cannot afford to live here, because of losing my affordable housing to these luxury unaffordable towers, I’m completely SCREWED.

Rezoning projects like this force residents out of their homes and communities; taking them away from the essential, life-sustaining, healthcare that they need to have access to.

And forcing people who live here because they also work here is going to result in them all having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.

			<p>Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.</p> <p>I refer you to the GRENFELL TOWER FIRE IN LONDON IN 2017.</p> <p>This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.</p> <p>But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.</p> <p>TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.</p> <p>This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.</p> <p>THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.</p> <p>I live in a 3-STOREY LOW-RISE APARTMENT. We had a FIRE alarm just before Christmas. Everyone was OUT OF THE BUILDING WITHIN JUST 30 SECONDS. Think about this...</p> <p>The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.</p> <p>More floors in a tower = more people in the tower = the more extreme risk to get everyone out safety in the event of a fire; and the more the chance of safety and survival goes down – more deaths.</p> <p>There is a formula used in building risk assessment mathematics that says if you go above 6 floors, each story adds another 5 % risk (or 5% less chance of surviving a fire), and another 5% for the floor above, and so on – so each added floor adds 5% further increased risk of death in case of a fire in these towers.</p> <p>If we maintain the format of building low rise buildings that we have already existing in our beautiful neighborhoods here, then we would not have to worry ourselves with these statistics; with this rate that each floor that you build higher, the higher the risk people dying in a fire is.</p> <p>If we keep with the low rise buildings, this would not have to be even a remote concern. As I said, my building had a fire alarm in early December 2024; it's a three level story, and even myself with a disability, we were all able to get out onto the street in less than 30 seconds. THIS LEVEL OF SAFETY SIMPLY CANNOT BE ACHIEVED IN TOWERS.</p> <p>And i refer you further still to yet another terrible even that just happened, that is another clear example and reason why not to build high-rises –</p> <p>The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.</p> <p>Hundreds of people died both in those towers and died by being trapped in the debris of those towers - even more reason to stop and proper think about the (non)safety of towers. We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOUHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.</p> <p>Also, this location is close to VGH and its helicopter landing pad and towers compromise the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>flight paths of emergency helicopters. And more people mean more cars and more traffic, compromising ambulance and public access to the hospital and urgent medical centres.</p> <p>AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.</p> <p>Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.• STOP destroying Vancouver communities.• STOP destroying Vancouver residents' LIVES.• STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver. <p>* STOP making it even harder and harder for people with disabilities to be able to remain in the Hospital Zone area for their healthcare and life support needs.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Very concerned and very proud Fairview, Vancouver resident,</p> <p>Fiona O'Connell s. 22 (1)</p>			
2025-11-14	16:09	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I oppose this policy as it does not consider the fundamental democratic rights of residents to enage and participate in development in their area. It actively corrodes and devalues civic participation in favour of a paternalistic form of decision making with no concern for the community or the established Vancouver tradition of community advocacy.</p> <p>Placing a tower in the middle of a residential neighbourhood is not okay without robust and honest community feedback. Council needs to do better at enshrining our rights to have an ardent democratic forum for building neighbourhoods and not impose ridiculous legoland tower concepts on the city and residents. Towers do not equal affordable housing.Policy does.Seniors and renters are terrified of losing their affordable rental apartments to these monstrous unaffordable towers. What a shocking disregard for democratic process and community participation.</p>	Jovanka Myers	West Point Grey	
2025-11-14	16:45	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Social housing towers failed miserably decades ago in Chicago and New York City. There has to be a better plan.</p>	Ronnie Tessler	South Cambie	
2025-11-15	07:15	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I oppose this proposal as it too large a swathe of blanket zoning AND 20 stories is way too high to provide healthy living and neighborhood community. This major action has not been justified by need and does not come with set aside land for new schools or community spaces and green spaces.</p>	Susan Burns	Dunbar-Southlands	
2025-11-15	10:10	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I won't waste my time arguing why I am opposed to this initiative. THE list is long and familiar to everyone who schemed up this preposterous quixotic plan. Nobody listens to objections anyway as these public hearings are just a charade for ideologically driven councillors to ram their ideas down the throats of Vancouver residents. But I will cast my vote as OPPPOSE!</p>	Ben Cherniavsky	West Point Grey	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-15	18:36	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This proposal is extremely disappointing for multiple reasons.</p> <p>First, the loss of green space. There are protected areas, actual recreation areas and wildlife living in the area. The number of young families in the broader area leveraging that green space is high and having it is critical to mental health, wellbeing, and maintaining healthy lives.</p> <p>Second, there is insufficient infrastructure to support the increase in population. The city has already put a crazy amount of housing along the river completely inappropriately. There are no amenities to support including limited transportation.</p> <p>Third, the city continues to concentrate lower income or high density housing in south east Vancouver rather in wealthy areas on the west side. The city continues to do this without amenities.</p>	Chantelle Murnaghan	Killarney	
2025-11-17	11:13	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	Towers will have a significant impact on a neighbourhood and should be subject to review in order that all parties can assess the impact at the time of the proposed development. Mass rezoning will eliminate the possibility to control the development in the future.	Andrew Nichols	Mount Pleasant	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-17	18:36	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Building Manager Dilemma</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>Nov. 27th, 2025 6:00pm Socialize Housing Hearing at Vancouver City Hall</p> <p>I am Alejandro Derecho Jovellar, 69 year-old with Diabetes Type II and Building Manager since 2013 to the present. I have a wife, a 70 year-old who is legally blind having 2 eyes cornea transplants, and apparently needs a caregiver.</p> <p>I also have an adult daughter who has finished her post-graduate in Neuro-Science with an outstanding student loan of \$38,000 and is still doing her pre-PhD research and thesis writing at home while taking care, or caregiver for her mom. She is technically unemployed because of her mom and her pre-PhD work. She is not receiving any benefit from all governments and her federal benefits are automatically and totally charged to her outstanding student loan. Thus, she is totally dependent on us both on daily sustenance and housing.</p> <p>After I retired on June 30, 2023, I had no housing I could afford on 30% RGI. Coupled with the fact that pension adjustment took about 8 months in February 2024. With that situation, my wife and I did couch surfing for a year, until I decided to go back to work.</p> <p>The dilemma of a Building Manager is that we lost our discounted apartment when we retired, fired, or resigned. For example, if I stop working now, I would lose the 2-bedroom apartment as part of my work. I will be solely dependent on a reduced pension of \$940 and my wife \$700, instead of \$1,300 and \$1,150. I am offered a 1-bed apartment for 900 excluding utilities, but then we will be struggling for food and medication, and my daughter without any housing until she is financially capable. Yet my wife will be having difficulty moving around without a caregiver.</p> <p>With this scenario, we will receive our usual pension on July 2027 adjustment. We have to wait 18 months after we quit employment which means we have to depend on reduce pension for this period. Can you survive with that amount.</p> <p>Having told our story, we respectfully submit these calls to action:</p> <p>1) Stop 30% RGI housing converted to SAFER, or any other scheme, like low market rent;</p> <p>2) Allow seniors’ building to have a 2-bedroom affordable rent such as 30% RGI to accommodate a family member caregiver;</p> <p>3) Provide financial support or transition support for retired building managers for at least 18 months to adjust to their regular pension amount.</p> <p>Alejandro Derecho Jovellar</p>	Alejandro Derecho Jovellar		
2025-11-18	11:02	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	Gastown needs more housing and investors to remove junkies from the streets, not a social housing!	Andriy Us	Strathcona	
2025-11-18	12:56	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	Please see attached PDF submission to Council.	Gary MacIsaac	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix A
2025-11-20	16:29	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	The City of Vancouver has insufficient amenities and public spaces in the densified River District neighbourhood for existing residents and should not be developing more housing in the Champlain/Fraserview area until this is adequately addressed.	Shane McLaughlin	Victoria-Fraserview	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-22	07:34	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This policy will fundamentally change the character and quality of all residential neighbourhoods in Vancouver by allowing 20 and 6 storey buildings in beside family homes.</p> <p>99% of Vancourites do not know about this policy and how it will destroy the fabric of each neighbourhood. Citizens already distrust this council’s policies and to wake up one morning and find out that a 20 storey building is going up beside their bungalow will further erode any confidence in how this council is directing the development of our once beautiful city.</p> <p>The city’s supposed engage process has been rushed and the final report was only made public on October 30 during the build up to the budget. The survey indicates that the majority of the citizens who do know about it are opposed.</p> <p>Blanket policies like this that do not reflect the individual character of each neighbourhood will destroy the unique village like qualities that make up Vancouver.</p> <p>Yes, social housing is important and should be encouraged but not in this ham fistted way.</p> <p>Please send this ill conceived policy back to Planning and vote against this initiative.</p>	Andre Rowland	Kerrisdale	

The Vancouver Social Housing Initiative Renewable Solar Energy Generation Impacts

A Submission to Vancouver City Council for the
November 27, 2025 Public Hearing

This submission outlines several concerns about impacts on solar photovoltaic (PV) generation should the 20-storey tower re-zoning—which covers approximately half of the City of Vancouver--be approved. The relevant City of Vancouver document is:

Vancouver Social Housing Initiative Report:

<https://council.vancouver.ca/20251104/documents/rr4.pdf>

The **Public Hearing before Council** is scheduled for Thursday, November 27, 2025 at 6:00PM:

<https://link.lists.vancouver.ca/v/443/81f138bdeac23c119f6e2a7fbfb3e7be43e0ae121c893d91>

The goal of this document: To support social housing with an alternative solution that does not damage renewable solar PV generation capability in Vancouver. To request that Council immediately remove any consideration of the blanket 20-storey tower re-zoning from the Report until the following issues have been reviewed / researched and discussed. Reasonable alternatives to building new towers with their accompanying shadow areas are needed. One solution is presented in item (5) on page 5 of this document.

1) The proposed re-zoning contradicts City of Vancouver Council's prior approved Motions regarding renewable energy expansion.

These towers are being proposed with **no** consideration of solar access relevant to renewable solar energy generation. 20-storey towers will create significant shadow zones which would **render existing and future solar PV energy generation unusable**.

This new proposed development plan has no provisions for, and in fact contradicts the reasons stated for the renewable energy Motion that was adopted by Council on January 31, 2023: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20230118/documents/pspc9.pdf>

Council also received a Report on Citywide Development Guidelines in July, 2024 found here: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20240710/documents/pspc1.pdf>. Specifically,

The City of Vancouver has only examined solar access in the context of shading of parks and commercial streets but, the report says nothing about solar access for energy production or the impacts of new zoning provisions on installed and future solar PV generation.

Report to Council: Citywide Development Guidelines Early
Actions – Public Views, Solar Access,
and Residential Tower Floorplates, July 10, 2024

See Appendix C, page 49 of the PDF above. There is no mention of solar energy access via solar PV generation.

However, as noted above, Council previously approved a strong statement encouraging the expansion of renewable energy sources, including solar PV at a City of Vancouver Council meeting held on January 31, 2023. The Minutes of that meeting are included here:

<https://council.vancouver.ca/20230131/documents/regu20230131min.pdf>

where **all 10 Councillors (which, at the time, included the current BC Minister of Housing) and the Mayor were present and voted for the Motion with key provisions noted below**, on page 3:

1. Increasing the Climate-Smart Supply of Renewable Energy in Vancouver

Item 11 in the Preamble to this Motion stated:

11. Solar photovoltaic systems would not only help meet the increasing demand for renewable electricity but, together with solar hot water systems, would greatly reduce energy costs for families and businesses.

and continues with:

FURTHER THAT Council direct the Mayor to, on behalf of City Council, write to the appropriate B.C. government Ministers to expedite implementing the renewable energy-related motions tabled by the City of Vancouver and passed unanimously or near-unanimously at the 2022 UBCM convention, specifically to expand training programs for workers to install solar panels and solar hot water systems, offer consumer rebates on solar PVC (photovoltaic) panels and solar hot water systems, and require that B.C. Hydro increase feed-in tariffs to incentivize more investment in renewable energy production.

There has been, and continues to be, a significant effort by all levels of Government to **promote the expansion of renewable energy generation** with grants, interest-free loans and rebate programs for years.

2) Conflicts with Provincial Clean Energy Strategy and GHG targets

The B.C. Clean Energy Strategy released by the NDP Government in June, 2024 directly references diversification through home energy production:

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/electricity-alternative-energy/powering-our-future#3>

Increasing and diversifying our production of clean energy

With 98% of BC's electricity already coming from clean or renewable sources, our efforts are focused on increasing and diversifying the production of clean electricity, unlike many other jurisdictions that are still reliant on coal and natural gas for power production. As a start, the Site C dam is scheduled to be fully in service in 2025, adding approximately 8% more supply to BC's electricity grid (or 5,100 GWh per year).

For two decades, BC's electricity demand was relatively stable, but BC Hydro is now forecasting demand will increase by 15% or more by 2030. This is due to population growth and housing construction, increased industrial development across sectors, and more homes and businesses switching from fossil fuels to clean electricity, among other factors.

That's why in April 2024, BC Hydro issued its first competitive call for power in over 15 years to acquire approximately 3,000 GWh per year of electricity, adding about 5% more supply to BC's grid by 2028. That's enough clean electricity to power 270,000 homes or approximately one million electric vehicles per year.

BC is well positioned to add intermittent renewable sources of energy, such as wind and solar, to the electricity grid because of the way hydro-electric dams act as batteries within our integrated, flexible electricity system. Reservoirs store water and allow BC Hydro to ramp electricity production up or down almost instantly, providing a firm, reliable backup when the sun isn't shining or the wind isn't blowing. *Because the cost of wind and solar, and the time needed to construct new facilities, has dropped significantly in recent years, renewable energy sources are even more attractive for investment and electricity production.*

Diversifying BC's energy production also makes our electricity system more resilient in the long term to a changing climate and more extreme weather events, like the current drought impacting water levels in BC Hydro's reservoirs.

There are no provisions in the CoV Staff Reports for lost solar access to photovoltaic systems, either existing, future, or potential.

It may be very useful for homeowners and businesses in the proposed re-zoning areas to obtain a solar PV profile for their residence from a solar PV contractor. This profile would provide an estimate of solar energy generation available and show the potential annual energy generation, cost of that energy and benefits for grid supply from the site.

This could serve as a basis for calculating the lifetime financial and GHG reduction loss to homeowners and businesses in the shadow zone of multi-storey towers. The loss of solar generation capacity also impacts City, Provincial and Federal GHG reduction targets.

3) Damaging to BC Hydro programs

BC Hydro has an active rebate program promoting solar PV installations by homeowners:

https://www.bchydro.com/powersmart/residential/rebates-programs/solar-battery.html?utm_source=direct&utm_medium=redirect&utm_content=solarrebate

BC Hydro is currently piloting the development of Virtual Power Plants (VPPs) in Metro Vancouver. The utility of VPPs is closely related to the availability of residential solar generating capacity.

<https://vancouver.sun.com/news/can-your-home-be-its-own-power-plant-b-c-hydro-wants-to-find-out>

This issue should also be raised with the B.C. Utilities Commission, as future planning for grid capacity in Vancouver would be significantly impacted if 20-storey towers appeared with no compensation for the loss of existing, or future solar PV generation to the grid.

4) This tower re-zoning would conflict with the Federal plans for expansion of solar generation as outlined in the 2025 Federal Budget--which was passed on November 17, 2025.

<https://solarascent.ca/2025/11/05/canadas-2025-federal-budget-solar/>

Tax Credits Powering the Solar Economy

While the 2025 budget focuses on business-level incentives rather than household rebates, that funding still directly benefits homeowners. It's driving new investment, expanding supply chains, and helping bring down solar equipment costs.

Here are the highlights:

- **Clean Technology Tax Credit (30%)** – Supports commercial and community solar projects, lowering costs for installers and developers that serve the residential market.
- **Clean Electricity Tax Credit (expected ~15%)** – Opens the door for utilities to build more solar generation and battery storage, making the grid cleaner and more resilient.
- **Clean Technology Manufacturing Credit (30%)** – Encourages domestic production of solar panels, batteries, and inverters — helping stabilize prices and improve availability.

In short: while the tax credits target businesses, **the ripple effect benefits every homeowner** thinking about solar.

Re-zoning a significant area of Vancouver for towers will create widespread uncertainty for businesses and homeowners considering solar PV generation, since at any given time and location the construction of an adjacent 20-storey tower--creating an extensive shadow zone--would render a solar investment unusable. Introducing this problem makes little sense since solar PV is now the cheapest form of clean electricity generation and dominates the expansion of renewable energy systems.

<https://www.euronews.com/green/2025/10/08/solar-energy-named-the-worlds-cheapest-power-source-what-it-means-for-europe>

“Solar energy has been branded the “key driver” in the world’s transition to clean, renewable power due to its ultra-low cost.

A new study from the University of Surrey named solar energy the cheapest source of power, outranking other renewables such as wind, as well as coal and gas.”

<https://www.iea.org/reports/renewables-2025/executive-summary>

“The increase in solar PV capacity is set to more than double over the next five years, dominating the global growth of renewables. Low costs, faster permitting and broad social acceptance continue to drive the accelerating adoption of solar PV.”

5) An Alternative Implementation Approach for the Vancouver Social Housing Initiative

The City can accommodate the need for social housing while retaining solar PV generating capacity — **without the cost** and carbon footprint of tower builds and speculative land costs resulting from tower re-zoning. Here is another option:

As is apparent from media reports, the current condominium market in Vancouver has declined significantly. There are a lot of already built suites available.

<https://www.vancouverisawesome.com/real-estate/vancouver-condo-market-could-struggle-for-next-two-years-says-report-11480913>

From above:

Vancouver’s condo market is seeing low margins, rising inventory and paused projects, with developers trying different strategies to manage the current downturn, according to a Wednesday report by PwC and the Urban Land Institute....

....“It’s sort of bizarre to think about, but you’re going to see a population decline in Vancouver for the first time in 40 years, which is a different dynamic than obviously we’ve been seeing in B.C. for a long time,” he said....

....”We think slow times for condos for the next couple years, steady for office, industrial and retail ... and just a lot of questions around what can be done ... to get some of these developers active again,” Neale said.

<https://thewalrus.ca/no-one-wants-to-buy-a-condo/>

From above:

....Most of the one-bedroom condo units we saw were quite small, clocking in at under 700 square feet. A number of them featured bedrooms that were just corners of living rooms walled off by clear panels, such that going to bed each night, I imagine, would feel like being a lizard in a glass enclosure at the zoo. In one condo we looked at, the “den” was a small alcove in the wall that was perhaps no deeper than a foot. I saw an endless parade of one-wall kitchens and “Juliet balconies,” which were not really balconies but windows with railings outside.

It didn’t take long to figure out why there were so many empty units on the market: it turns out nobody wants to rent a condo, and nobody wants to buy one either. Condo rents have dropped over the past two years, and according to a recent report from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, or CMHC, condo sales have fallen by 75 percent in the Greater Toronto Area and 37 percent in the Vancouver area since 2022. The market has become so dire that buyers of pre-construction condos are having difficulty closing their purchases. Banks lend money depending on the present value of the property, and some condos are worth less now than they were when the buyers made their first deposit. As a

result, developers have been cancelling construction projects. Some experts say we should have seen this coming.

I would like to recommend that all levels of Government, and Vancouver specifically, consider pursuing the following approach to expanding social housing with allocated or anticipated social housing funding:

1) Purchase those "undesirable" new, small condo units in existing buildings at a significant discount given current market conditions.

2) **Renovate the condos to combine adjacent suites into livable social housing units** for various family sizes, then rent them out at appropriate livable rental rates. Some of those buildings will have enough units available that the social housing entity would become the majority Strata owner, if not the owner of the entire building, then convert the building from a Strata to a Co-op. This would also support local contractors with the renovation projects created.

It seems like this approach would accomplish the purpose of the Vancouver Social Housing Initiative **at much lower cost and provide housing faster** than building new construction, which, based on the data in that Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book (below) is not a really a supply problem but a **housing repurposing** problem. It would also reduce substantially the carbon emissions that are known to be created with the new construction of 20-storey towers.

<https://metrovancover.org/services/regional-planning/Documents/metro-vancouver-housing-data-book-2025.pdf>

6) Conclusion

This blanket approach to widespread City re-zoning appears to have been developed with no consideration of impacts on other Government programs which encourage installed renewable solar energy generation and future solar PV expansion.

The alternative solution to invest in existing unsold, discounted condominium projects is an option that City staff need to explore thoroughly along with a **detailed proper shadow study that evaluates lost solar PV generation capacity and energy cost across all areas designated for re-zoning**.

The Vancouver Social Housing Initiative is a great idea, however the serious negative climate impacts and loss of renewable energy capacity of the proposed implementation must be replaced with much less harmful approaches.

Gary MacIsaac
Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22 (1)