

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-24	20:47	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The draft ODP that the public just responded to specified areas of the City that are “Residential Multiplex” allowing up to 3 storeys. Yet the Social Housing plan allows for anywhere from 6 storeys up to 20 storeys in these same areas, with NO public hearing required. So, even though under the ODP my area of Kits has a maximum height of 3 storeys and only allows for "single-detached homes, duplexes, townhouses and multiplexes", it turns out that under the Social Housing Initiative a non profit could plunk a 6 to 20 storey development next door to our 4 suite rental house without any public input, and with only 30% "social housing" in a so-called "100% social housing" development, the rest being unaffordable market rentals. Don't ask me how they could afford such a development even with 70% market housing, given the price of acquiring the land, but the door is left wide open to the possibility. And, we could also very well be demovicted in the process from our still affordable rental if the non-profit somehow managed to acquire the property if sufficient Government funding was available, even if highly unlikely,. (One has to consider even unlikely scenarios when evaluating and responding to a City proposal.)</p> <p>Surely, I should have a say at that time as to what happens next door, on my block or in my neighbourhood? Or have we now gone so far beyond the concept of democratic process that citizens are now supposed to approve and consent to giving up all their democratic rights in the future for the sake of expeditiousness?</p> <p>We were asked to respond to the ODP based on the criteria outlined in the plan, which I and many others did in good faith. I was told by one of the City Planners at the Kits Neighbourhood House open house that once the ODP plan was approved, ANY changes to the proposed zoning would require a public hearing, What she neglected to tell me was that the City planners were already working on a plan to totally change the ODP by actually allowing up to 20 storey towers in my neighbourhood, so the entire ODP public consultation exercise was basically useless and a waste of time. There was no mention anywhere of the Social Housing plan that City planners were obviously well aware of and ready to present to Council to vote on. I was essentially, if not lied to, certainly misled, as were all the others who took the time to complete the ODP survey and give their feedback.</p> <p>The ODP survey has recently closed and NOW we’re being asked to respond to something completely different - up to 20 storey towers with no public hearings in areas where 6 to 20 storey developments not allowed for in the ODP, and supposedly not allowed for without a public hearing?</p> <p>How is this disingenuousness by public officials in the least bit ethical, legal or even possible?</p>	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	
2025-11-25	02:03	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>It's obvious from this initiative + the City's rubber-stamping of rezonings + the B.C. Government's Bill 47 (2023) that the City of Vancouver and the housing industry want to make life so unpleasant that we Dunbarites will sell our properties to hi-rise developers.</p> <p>We, of course, will then be homeless. As an OAS pensioner (and paying \$18,000 in gross property tax), I feel we should be entitled to at least the same services you offer the homeless on Hastings Street.</p> <p>In our case I ask that the Initiative be amended to recognize the harm that it will do to the Dunbar district - some of which is listed below - and to include the planning and establishment of a 'gated community'</p>	Henry Wrinch	Dunbar-Southlands	

			<p>for the Middle Class, BEFORE the Social Housing Initiative is started.</p> <p>Specific impacts issues:</p> <p>* Affordability: the social housing is being placed in the most expensive areas of Vancouver where detached houses cost \$3+ Million.</p> <p>That would make the social housing cost more than it should if located in another area. Further, I recall there was an inventory of 2500 condos in Metro Vancouver. They could be repurposed for social housing. The Feds should pay.</p> <p>* Property devaluation: some Dunbar houses, such as 5281 Dunbar, already can't be sold except by a huge discount of 5% to 10% or more from their July 1, 2024 assessed value. Depending on how indigenous land claims get settled, house values could drop further.</p> <p>The Social Housing Initiative will make matters worse by driving away buyers who prize the high quality of life in low density areas.</p> <p>* Shading:</p> <p>1) a 20-storey building at Dunbar will increase shading of my backlot food garden.</p> <p>Statistics Canada says food prices from grocery stores rose 3.4% in October, outpacing the overall annual inflation rate of 2.2% for the month.</p> <p>There are no food banks/community gardens near Dunbar, so the social housing residents will have to afford the full brunt of the food price increases.</p> <p>2) A house near me (3723 W 39th) has 44 solar panels on the roof and garage. They may have to go, along with Vancouver's green image.</p> <p>* Traffic congestion & parking: citizen reaction to what happened when Costco opened in New Westminster recently (cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/new-costco-traffic-jams-new-westminster-9.6989347) may get less than civil in future as planners completely ignore them.</p> <p>* Discrimination:</p> <p>None of towers are located inside the Shaughnessy district where Vancouver's ultra rich live. Proof that Canada is a plutocracy.</p> <p>* Emigration of highly skilled talent.</p> <p>See cbc.ca/player/play/video/9.6984911 .</p> <p>There is a precedent for push-back: West Vancouver's mayor Mark Sager has the guts to oppose the NDP's housing targets (cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/west-vancouver-bc-province-standoff-housing-targets-9.6976820).</p> <p>Other push-back could include a boycott of Vancouver businesses.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-25	02:33	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE THIS.</p> <p>The City’s own (limited and flawed) public consultation earlier this year showed strong public opposition to such massive blanket upzoning that ignores neighbourhood context in favour of the objectionable one-size fits all approach.</p> <p>In that consultation, 20% of comments were supportive, 23% mixed/neutral, and 57% negative.</p> <p>A frequent concern was that the towers were too tall and out of place in low rise areas.</p> <p>I completely share that view. A hard unrelenting NO to 20 storey towers allowed across 30% of the city, including low-rise residential areas. If this initiative is approved, these towers could be built without warning or notice to residents and without any public consultation.</p> <p>These towers would create huge problems for neighbourhoods: parking issues, plummeting property values for neighbours, difficulty finding a buyer for a low rise home with such a tower built next to it (and if that happened next to me, I would want to sell and move as fast as possible).</p> <p>And then there is shadowing, which has not even been mentioned in the Social Housing documents.</p> <p>Shadowing from 20 storey towers contravene government policies and programs to expand use of solar energy and Vancouver’s own climate goals. I have been thinking of following the example of my neighbours who have solar panels on their roof. But if this social housing initiative is approved, solar panels would be far too risky for me to invest in because my neighbourhood would then be zoned for 20 storey towers. For more on this: https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2025/11/23/social-housing-initiative-bad-for-solar-pv-climate-policy/</p> <p>These towers will only have 30% social housing with the rest going for as high as the market will bear. That is NOT social housing. That is market wolf housing disguised in social sheep’s clothing.</p> <p>Focus should be on coops, 100% social housing, use of city-owned land so land cost is controlled etc.</p> <p>There are much better, more livable, less intrusive, more respectful-to-neighbours, less city-ruining ways to provide social housing. One innovative idea is found at the link given above, to renovate the glut of unsold condos for social housing.</p> <p>I challenge you to plan this city creatively instead of further destroying it with yet more of the same old unpopular towers.</p>	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey	
2025-11-25	17:24	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>As I understand this proposal, the Novemebr 25 is yet another project that primarily benefits developers (i.e. 70%+ market units in a building ridiculously described as "social housing") while gratuitously destroying neighbourhoods and trampling on previously negotiated planning processes and frameworks.</p>	Robert Gourley	West Point Grey	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-25	18:15	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I strongly oppose unfettered 20 storey construction. 4-6 storey construction in existing traditional single family residential neighbourhoods will be a reasonable . There is no one size fits all. Local area plans should be taken into account. 20 storey towers are out of character in most areas proposed. Where is the green space going to come form with these increased densities. We're already displacing renters from perfectly good lower rent three and four storey apartments. We should be supporting BC forest industry (and be more climate aware) by emphasizing development using mass timber construction rather than concrete towers.	Mark Stoakes	Riley Park	
2025-11-25	19:19	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	It doesn't make any sense to have 20 or more storey towers throughout a residential neighbourhood Riley Park. Density with the Broadway Plan was for towers from Broadway up to 16th Ave using the Broadway Line as the reason for density in that area. Without much public notice that boundary changed to much farther south of 16th which is all residential and part of the Main Street village. Local area plans are ignored. With public hearings, proposals go directly to planning Most development will be expensive market rentals. 70% How can it not be with the cost of building. Why is there always a feeling that the city doesn't care about the people who live in it by continually changing plans and zoning whenever it feels like it.	Alison Smith	Riley Park	
2025-11-25	20:03	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	Imagine you are Councillors for the borough of Brooklyn — an area filled with distinct heritage brownstones recognized all over the world; a haven for families and creatives in NYC; and a perfect complement to downtown Manhattan. Do you: a) Encourage livable and family-friendly density close to transit so more people can set roots Brooklyn while preserving its unique role and identity within NYC. or b) Blanket rezone all of Brooklyn for 20-story rental towers.	Simon Vallee	Kitsilano	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-25	22:16	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The mass rezoning without guardrails and consideration of the neighbourhood plans will destroy the character of Vancouver residents and visitors alike enjoy. There is much more development possible in the existing approved areas which should be fully exhausted prior to extending bulk rezoning to other areas in the city. It is reckless to continue with large scale rezoning without first measuring the impact of previous rezoning and construction on addressing affordability and housing availability.</p> <p>While I support social housing and the drive for affordable housing, this plan only serves to fuel the development industry and destroy the community. Millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent studying other city’s development and creating community plans, yet those resident supported plans are ignored in favour of these large scale approaches which only serve to enrich the developers.</p> <p>Allowing 20 floor towers off arterial streets south of 16th Avenue is unnecessary. The city infrastructure can not support this additional load.</p> <p>I strongly object to this plan, and encourage council to vote against approving these vast changes to our neighbourhood and community.</p>	Adrienne Bailly	Riley Park	
2025-11-26	10:37	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Hello. We have lived and owned our home in Kitsilano for 25 years. We rebuilt our 1930’s home and kept the historic facade to preserve the heritage aspect which IS Kitsilano. We didn’t tear down and build a contemporary box or imposing tower which disrespects the significant story of our area. While we recognize and appreciate the need for the Broadway Line, the constant threat of proposals which will ruin the character of our beloved community is exhausting. No Kits resident wants a 20 story tower among our quiet, tree lined, historic home filled streets. No Kits resident wants a “one size fits all” planning approach which eliminates our input and control over our very neighborhood! We are the ones being affected, displaced, inconvenienced, stressed and disappointed. Do you not understand the special character of Kitsilano? Do you not appreciate the historic, funky, artistic, peaceful and treasured flavor of our community? If you must build, then create maximum buildings of 6 stories, those that compliment and reflect the neighborhood-such as a craftsman style, multi-dwelling structure. Is there anyone involved in the planning or development or design process with any insight and knowledge of Kitsilano? Where is the integrity to preserve and enhance the area instead of tear it all down and turn us into the West End? We also have a say about social and supportive housing developments! Example, such a building that was proposed for 7th and Arbutus. Whose bright idea was that? Across from a school and a park?? I am grateful that other residents, such as ourselves, put up a fight and the proposal was rejected. WE live here, WE love here, WE are affected, WE suffer the consequences.</p>	Kathleen (Kathy) Baker - Sangara	Kitsilano	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-26	10:47	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>According to CityHallWatch, tens of thousands of residents in all forms of housing live in the affected areas, yet no general notification has been sent out about the public hearing. And the local mainstream media has given the matter virtually no coverage. Some of the most obvious concerns about this proposal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The one-size-fits-all approach of towers everywhere without any local planning context• It ignores local area plans that were carefully planned over many years• The plan’s architecture is out of character with most of the areas identified• No public hearing and proposals— proposals would go directly to development permits• Only 30% will be actual social housing, the rest will be 70% (i.e., expensive market rentals)• It would displace many existing tenants in current social housing or older rentals (purpose-built rentals as well as secondary suites, both authorized and unauthorized –potentially affecting tens of thousands of renters)• There is much more opposition to this proposal than support, as shown in previous public feedback• No meaningful consultation with anyone other than those in the development industry• It undermines the intent of the Heritage Conservation Area and First Shaughnessy bylaws that are intended to achieve greater density through retention options for multifamily conversions and complementary infill, not out-of-scale towers• The plan contradicts many policies and programs of three levels of government put in place to promote solar energy generation. Potential shadowing threatens the viability of existing and future solar PV installation in the entire Social housing Initiative area.	Paolo Meret	Kitsilano	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-26	11:11	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This motion was initially submitted by Christine Boyle, currently an NDP MLA.</p> <p>Bringing this motion for a public hearing without the general public being notified of the far-reaching consequences if this motion is passed is another example of both the provincial NDP with their one seat majority and the ABC majority council are examples of how local citizen voices are being muffled through stealth, speed and complexity by these two levels of government.</p> <p>I am opposed to this motion for many reasons, but my biggest concerns about this proposal include the Vancouver municipal government deceptive definition of 100% social housing which is actually 70% market housing (the sky's the limit) and 30% below market housing which is not affordable to most folks.</p> <p>Some of the many obvious concerns about this proposal are:</p> <p>The one-size-fits-all approach of towers everywhere without any local planning context Ignores local area plans that were carefully planned over many years Out of character with most of the areas identified for this initiative No public hearing and proposals would go directly to Development Permits Only 30% will be actual social housing, the rest will be 70% expensive market rentals Potentially includes supportive housing at very large scales that have proven to be a failed model as crime goes up exponentially in any of the areas where they are located This would displace many existing tenants in current social housing or existing older rentals (purpose built-rentals as well as secondary suites, both authorized and unauthorized -- potentially affecting tens of thousands of renters) There is much more opposition to this proposal than support, as shown in previous public feedback No meaningful consultation with anyone other than those in the development industry, with vested interests Undermines the intent of the Heritage Conservation Area Bylaw and First Shaughnessy that is intended to do more density through retention options for multifamily conversions and complementary infill, not out of scale towers Contradicts many policies and programs of three levels of government put in place to promote solar PV renewable energy generation. Threatens the viability of existing and future solar PV installation in the entire Social housing Initiative area and vicinity, due to potential shadowing.</p>	Barbara May	Kitsilano	
2025-11-26	12:57	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This proposal could put 20 floor buildings in the midst of single family houses. How ridiculous. Why are some areas excluded? Are their single family houses more important than others? I would like tosee these 20 floor towers on Shaughnessy residential streets.</p>	Ron Greenberg	Kitsilano	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-26	13:02	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am opposed to Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative as it currently stands.</p> <p>I ask you to defer any decision on the Social Housing Initiative until the City of Vancouver has made information concerning this Initiative more available to the residents and tax payers of Vancouver.</p> <p>This Social Housing Initiative has the potential to dramatically alter the neighbourhoods of Vancouver, without any democratic, neighbourhood consultation.</p> <p>Some of my concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- calling it a Social Housing Initiative when 70% of the units will be Market Rental and at maximum 30% may be below Market Rental, sounds like the City is not accurately acknowledging that these proposed developments are not actually meant to provide livable, affordable Social Housing.- the almost total lack of outreach by the City and the Media, to the residents of Vancouver who will be greatly impacted by rezoning decisions that they will have zero input on.- a one size fits all approach does not lend itself to creating a livable, affordable, inclusive, socially conscious and environmentally friendly city. <p>This is quite a terrifying Initiative that feels like it has been created based on input from investors and developers only, without considering the knowledge and the true needs of the residents of Vancouver. We have the opportunity to create a marvelous City for more than one segment of the population. We can only do this if we take a step back, take a breath and work together on planning our communities for the future.</p> <p>Please defer any decision on the Social Housing Initiative until the Residents of Vancouver have been allowed the opportunity to fully understand what is being proposed and allowed to contribute to the betterment of their communities.</p> <p>sincerely, Carol Van Camp</p>	Carol VanCamp	Mount Pleasant	
2025-11-26	14:25	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The one-size-fits-all approach of towers everywhere, without any local planning context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It ignores local area plans that were carefully planned over many years• The plan’s architecture is out of character with most of the areas identified• No public hearing and proposals— proposals would go directly to development permits• Only 30% will be actual social housing, the rest will be 70% (i.e., expensive market rentals)• It would displace many existing tenants in current social housing or older rentals (purpose-built rentals as well as secondary suites, both authorized and unauthorized –potentially affecting tens of thousands of renters)• There is much more opposition to this proposal than support, as shown in previous public feedback• No meaningful consultation with anyone other than those in the development industry• It undermines the Heritage Conservation Area and First Shaughnessy bylaws that are intended to achieve greater density through retention options for multifamily conversions and complementary infill, not out-of-scale towers• The plan contradicts many policies and programs of the three levels of government put in place to promote solar energy generation. Potential shadowing threatens the viability of existing and future solar PV installations in the entire Social Housing Initiative area.	Susan Burns	Dunbar-Southlands	
2025-11-26	15:42	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This affects more than 1/2 the residential property in the city. Because it is such a blanket permission, there will be many unintended and random consequences such as: loss of solar exposure for heating and electrical; loss of tree canopy; infrastructure shortfalls (water, sewer, hydro); parking chaos; insufficiency of schools, parks and community facilities. There needs to be order to support the planning of these. Community costs are being passed on to future generations.</p>	Brian Palmquist	Dunbar-Southlands	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-26	15:51	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I am opposed to the rezoning of residential neighbourhoods in order to build 20 storey apartments regardless that there must be social housing included. Those of us affected have looked after our properties for years 30 in my case) - planting, trimming, sweeping leaves off sidewalks AND PAID our properties taxes. To put these monster builds in will result in demolition of homes, reduce our sunlight and limit capture of solar energy. Not to mention our hood has limited bus service. Many homes provide students and low income individuals with housing, so we are aware of the need for low rental housing. I recommend putting on hold this decision to fill our streets with highrises at the expense of home owners, the backbone of this city. Filling the landfill with livable homes and reducing sunlight are counterproductive and bad for the environment.	Betty Kosel	Dunbar-Southlands	