

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-26	16:43	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>I am concerned about the safety and health of people living high buildings, including impediments created by shading of the surrounding environment. Please reconsider this initiative and allow for more collaborative planning where residents and neighbours have a voice in each building plan.</p> <p>Respectfully, Katarina Halm</p>	Katarina Halm		
2025-11-26	16:51	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I do not support this plan.</p> <p>It is being proposed with too little consultation with the neighbourhoods involved, and the city in general.</p> <p>The Plan ignores and overrides plans devised by local neighbourhood associations.</p> <p>One-size-fits-all zoning is poor planning. It ignores the established values in existing neighbourhoods, without consulting those who live there about their chosen alternatives.</p>	William Hall	West Point Grey	
2025-11-26	16:59	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The one-size-fits-all approach of towers everywhere without any local planning context</p> <p>Ignores local area plans that were carefully planned over many years</p> <p>Out of character with most of the areas identified for this initiative</p> <p>No future public hearings and proposals would go directly to Development Permits</p> <p>Only 30% will be actual social housing, the rest will be 70% expensive market rentals</p> <p>Potentially includes supportive housing at very large scales that have proven to be a failed model</p> <p>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)</p> <p>There is much more opposition to this proposal than support, as shown in previous public feedback.</p>	Timothy Gage	Kitsilano	
2025-11-26	17:02	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Please reconsider the initiative and provide more time for community input.</p>	Richarde Halm	Dunbar-Southlands	

2025-11-26	17:46	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>ONCE AGAIN THE ABC COUNCIL IS PUSHING THROUGH LEGISLATION WITHOUT PROPER PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT THAT WILL EFFECT THE CITY FOR YEARS TO COME. THIS IS NOT A SOCIAL HOUSING INITIATIVE. It is another example of ABC council bowing to the desires of developers. 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.	Kathryn Shaw	Kitsilano	
2025-11-26	19:39	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Re:Social Housing Plan, Nov 26 2025</p> <p>I greatly disagree with the Social Housing Plan, but think more social housing in Vancouver would be good. First, the Social Housing Plan is incorrectly densifying, Point Grey in Kits- ie MacDonald to Alma between 2nd and Broadway, which is incorrect, as this area is eco-dense, and should have zero density, except some 4 story buildings on the main arterial streets, because this entire area has 100s of diverse trees, 100s heritage Single Family Homes, and should be one area preserved from ugly sterile new Condo Buildings, so Vancouver has some diversity in housing and robust Urban Nature, linking us to our West Coast rain forest and Indigenous connection – ie promoting Urban Eco Diversity of Trees and Nature is one type of Reconciliation.</p> <p>Second, social housing, needs to be in areas, which are affordable for such low to moderate income residents to shop and work, in theory.</p> <p>Third, my guess is this plan, like the Missing Middle and Broadway Plan and all new buildings, will incorrectly not have 1 to 1 car parking, where the incorrect is removing the right for residents to choose to own a car, to drive out of the city to wild Nature, for increased socialization, for freedom to not be “chained” to a “substandard” Urban Public Transit system – ie too small sky train, too crowded buses, not easy travel, not safe to use at night, etc</p> <p>Fourth, we need public meetings,for community input, which this plan removes incorrectly.</p> <p>Fifth, this plan echos Vancouver City Hall's...."condo mania",- ie building the entire city into a “sea of condos”, which is not a livable city in the future, because density everywhere brings “corporate stores”, less creative architecture, less community, less diversity of architecture, more social stress, maybe increased crime. We should build density in to the middle of the city, not density all over. Most Condo Density, should be east along Hastings from Hastings and Main, or east along South West Marine drive heading to Knight or Renfrew street, etc., removing the Broadway Plan altogether, which only needs spot zoning, as Broadway is a very mixed use area already.</p> <p>Sixth, the “Villages” concept of density developing in already great “shopping villages” with low one to two storey buildings, like 4th Ave, South Granville- ie 3rd to 16th, Main street – ie Broadway to 25th, or Commercial Drive, is incorrect, as removing these1 to 2 storey old stock buildings with new 4 to 6 or 8 storey Condo buildings will have “continuous store fronts” which are sterile, cold, ugly, glass and steel, cubes, only good for “corporate stores” and not small family businesses or unique alternative stores. Most store fronts should be</p>	K. van Drager	Fairview	

				<p>wood or stone, because they are warm materials. Also, low 1 to 2 storey buildings, like Granville Island, is loved by tourists, shoppers, because its “intimate”, great for heritage, great for tourist, makes the city grounded. Why does Vancouver City Hall, circa 1990's destroy most old buildings, and then claims it has a Heritage Department? Also, removing the entire building, but just keeping the facade, is not Heritage, it is like giving you a magazine, with just the cover.</p> <p>Seventh, market rentals in this plan, are still too expensive- ie new one bedroom \$2,500 / month, when it should be \$1,500 /month.</p> <p>Eight, please clarify what is “social housing”, because, some confuse it with “supportive housing”. Also, if this Plan, is too create “social housing” everywhere, this may be too much like “social engineering” ?- ie “ the government dictating where social economic classes live”, instead of the Free Market. I prefer the Free Market, and businesses in the community, community character, recreational facilities, parks, jobs, secondary suits, etc, deciding on “residential income or cultural” make up in an area, rather than a government “plan” like this Social Housing Plan, because urban planning should just be about “housing”, not “social politics” - ie social engineering is incorrectly an agenda designing people lives, not letting peoples input building a city organically and more naturally.</p> <p>Ninth, Vancouver needs to build the sewer, electrical, roads, and other infrastructure first , before “instant mass density” - ie density all over, like this plan.</p> <p>Tenth, how many 3 bedrooms will be in your plan for families? Is your Plan, like the Broadway Plan, Jericho Plan, Renfrew Plan, Heather Lands Plan, Senwka Plan, Grandview Plan, 10th Safeway Plan, and almost every Condo Tower, with less than 5% of three bedrooms. Does Vancouver City Hall, and BC NDP and Federal Liberals expect almost no families to live in Vancouver in the future? Because to have just 2 bedrooms for a family, may be too small.</p> <p>Eleventh, “instant density” for density sake, like this plan and all City Plans circa 2015, is not “good urban planning”. Good urban planning happens more organically, evolves over time,with community and business input, and leads to “livability and affordability”. Will this plan create a more “livable” and “affordable” Vancouver? If not. This is not a great urban density plan.</p>			
2025-11-26	21:49	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The ultimate shut down of democracy in this city with this ill conceived density development proposal that will fundamentally impact thousands of residents without any respectful or due process of notification, is unacceptable.</p> <p>Under the guise of providing social housing, this misleading title aims to provide only 30% social housing, and the City’s definition of social housing is not based on the average income of Vancouverites.</p> <p>This initiative is not based on sound Planning practices that should take into account the diversity and individuality of Vancouver’s distinct neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The one size fits all reign of current staff and council is unprofessional, undemocratic, and dismisses what is on the ground, and what is most needed in this increasingly unlivable city.</p> <p>The SHI as presented, is premature and devoid of detailed studies of impacts, including shadowing, and consideration of alternative and creative approaches to provision of livable, affordable housing.</p> <p>ie All levels of government purchasing unsellable, undesirable small condo units, renovating and combining units to provide livable social housing, with supports when needed in situ.</p> <p>Thank you. Please reject, and send this SHI back to staff.</p> <p>Joan Jaccard</p>	Joan Jaccard	West Point Grey	
2025-11-26	22:18	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose this initiative. Vancouver has already had about 80% social housing in the greater Vancouver region. Vancouver has more than its share.</p>	Fiona Guan		
2025-11-27	08:04	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the initiative since social housing built in the city had caused so many problems and increased crimes in the neighbourhood. We need a safe and clean environment. This initiative will not solve the problem instead causing more chaos and damages.</p>	Sofia Zhu	Marpole	
2025-11-27	08:38	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p>	Michael Geller	Dunbar-Southlands	

			<p>Re: Social Housing Initiative</p> <p>As a former Program Manager- Social Housing for CMHC in the 1970s, and architect/ planner and developer for the subsequent five decades, I believe social housing should be allowed everywhere throughout the city.</p> <p>That said, I have serious concerns with a key aspect of the Social Housing Initiative, namely the proposal to blanket rezone approximately one third of the city to allow highrise buildings up to 20 storeys in height and 6 FSR without the need for any public hearings.</p> <p>My first concern relates to the urban design consequences of juxtaposing highrises along quiet low-scale neighbourhood streets at ten times the height and density of existing homes. While taller buildings are appropriate when clustered in a neighbourhood or sited along major streets and transition zones behind these streets, wedging towers along these charming, neighbourhood streets is inappropriate for so many reasons.</p> <p>My second concern is why are we even proposing towers in these locations? The city defines social housing as that which is 100% owned by governments or non-profits with at least 30% of the units affordable to those with incomes at or below the ‘Housing Income Limits (HILs). Housing income limits are the maximum household incomes to qualify for subsidized or affordable housing programs and vary by unit type, location, etc. In Vancouver, those in greatest need for subsidized social housing include the unhoused, families with children, and seniors.</p> <p>The unhoused have nowhere to live and often need supportive housing. However, 15-20 storey towers with 100 to 150 suites are the wrong building form for these households. Research has concluded that to be successful, buildings providing this type of supportive housing should be limited a maximum of 60 units in a low or midrise building.</p> <p>Similarly, 20 storey towers at a 6 FSR are not the right solution for low-income families with children. As clearly set out in the highly regarded city publication Housing Families at Higher Densities (which has been adopted by Council on three different occasions) “Family housing developments should be compatible in scale, character, and materials to their surrounding neighbourhood.”</p> <p>Many low-income seniors are also seeking homes. When I oversaw the social housing programs at CMHC, we funded thousands of suitably designed self-contained suites for seniors in highrises. But today, the greatest need is not for more self-contained apartments. Rather it is for new buildings offering levels of care.</p> <p>As Dan Levitt, the Seniors Advocate has often reported, the waitlist for long-term care in B.C. has ballooned. Between 2016 and 2025, the number of people waiting to be admitted has tripled. Average wait times have doubled over this period.</p> <p>The need to build more care facilities is particularly urgent since so many low-income seniors are occupying expensive hospital beds since there is nowhere else for them to go. These care facilities require horizontal building forms rather than highrise buildings.</p> <p>To conclude, while I agree Council should allow social housing everywhere in the city, I cannot understand why city staff are recommending such extensive blanket rezoning for highrises, especially when only 30% of the units may be providing subsidized homes.</p> <p>Just as most of the areas coloured yellow on the city map could be suitable for buildings up to six storeys in height, I would recommend allowing six-storey buildings in many of these areas as well. If there is justification for a tower, let it go through a rezoning process with an opportunity for the public to have a say.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<p>In a recent discussion with someone in the know, I questioned why city staff would be recommending housing initiatives that just did not make sense from a planning perspective. He told me this initiative did not originate with city staff. It was directed by the province.</p> <p>While I would like to know if this is true or not, regardless of the answer, I would urge Council not to approve this Social Housing Initiative as proposed and send it back to staff for further consideration.</p> <p>Respectively submitted,</p> <p>Michael A. Geller Fellow, Canadian Institute of Planners. Registered Professional Planner, Retired Architect, Architectural Institute of British Columbia.</p>			
2025-11-27	08:47	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I was shocked and upset to learn today that this initiative is being considered without transparent public consultation. This initiative and others like the Broadway Plan are shortsighted, kneejerk reactions to complex housing needs and are bulldozing over previous careful area planning systems. There is a lot of evidence that midrange and luxury housing needs will actually decrease in the coming years and it would be a tragedy to install more environmentally awful concrete and glass towers in what are currently cooler, treed and comfortably dense city areas. We don't need more housing, only more low rent, accessible housing. So how about we work on building what we need. Instead of 10,000 units - 8,000 of which are not social housing, how about re build or repurpose only the 2,000 that will work toward solving the problem? The infrastructure for these projects doesn't exist. The neighbourhood roadways are already clogged with vehicles and there is no place to put the inevitable increase in traffic and parking needs of these developments. There is not adequate parkspace to accomodate the increased load of people, dogs and children that these developments will generate. It's naive to believe that people will utilize transit routes and not have cars. Transit in the Lower Mainland is simply not accessible enough for many users to be an adequate alternative to driving.</p> <p>I strongly oppose moving forward on this current initiative and appeal to the council to take a step back and a few deep breaths and approach this problem with cooler heads, much more research and with an eye to the livable city that we all desire.</p>	Christine Balkwill	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	10:05	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the massive scope and scale of the social housing initiative under consideration. Residents have no inkling that, if approved, this will potentially upzone up to 32% of the city's residential land area to 20 stories under the rubric of addressing our critical need for social housing. 'Social housing' is a misleading misnomer for allowing huge towers with 70% market rate rentals, with no opportunity to have public hearings on these developments. This is outrageous and well beyond the scope of the platforms councilors were elected on.</p>	Jane MacFadgen	Dunbar-Southlands	

2025-11-27	10:20	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I believe social housing belongs in all neighbourhoods, but all neighbourhood residents and businesses must be involved in planning for new buildings. I am firmly opposed to this latest of a stream of zoning changes imposed with a laughably small amount of true public engagement.</p> <p>Please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vociferous opposition to many Broadway Plan tower proposals supports the concept that large buildings do not belong on narrow side streets.• Reliance on outdated and misguided VSB projections has resulted in the approval of many towers where no school space exists or will exist. Any further densification should start where kids can attend a neighbourhood school.• No matter how you slice it, a 30% minimum of units at social housing rates realistically produces a project that is 70% market rental. That is what you want neighbourhoods to shut up and swallow.	Sal Robinson	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	10:32	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Subject: A thought experiment</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I have a thought experiment that I would like you to consider. Imagine you are Councillors for the borough of Brooklyn — a haven for NYC families and a beloved part of the City, recognized throughout the world for its creative neighbourhoods and heritage brownstones. Do you:</p> <p>a) Encourage livable and family-friendly density near transit so more people can enjoy Brooklyn while preserving its unique role and identity within NYC;</p> <p>or</p> <p>b) Blanket rezone all of Brooklyn for 20-storey rental towers?</p> <p>Please make the smart choice at Thursday’s hearing — reject Staff’s recommendation on Social Housing and ask them to focus on making our neighbourhoods better AND more affordable instead of trying to erase them. Nobody voted for this.</p>	Simon Vallee		
2025-11-27	10:59	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council members: I'm writing in to state my opposition to this motion for many reasons. Why were people who live in this area not informed of the public hearing? A huge number of residents will find out after it's too late that tens of thousands of parcels of land across the city have suddenly been re-zoned to social housing. Why was there no meaningful conversations with Vancouver citizens? And there will be no public hearings allowed should this be approved. Every city has a duty to provide social housing to its citizens in need — but not like this. This is another blanket approach that has already been shown to be a failed policy in Vancouver. It could mean the potential loss of homes for hundreds, if not thousands of renters living in affordable and/or secondary suites. This ill-advised plan should be shared with the the public for more insight. Please do not incorporate it with the Official Development Plan.</p>	Evelyn Jacob	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	11:01	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>See online version. https://coalitionvan[.]org/posts/20251127-vancouver-social-housing-initiative-public-hearing/ Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) to Mayor Ken Sim and Councillors, Re: Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative (Public Hearing November 27)</p> <p>While we acknowledge the need for social and affordable housing, we are writing to oppose “Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative” going to Public Hearing November 27 since this initiative takes the wrong approach.</p> <p>Some of the many concerns about this proposal are:</p>	Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN)		Attachment 1

- There was no meaningful consultation with affected residents.
- The area affected is very significant. While not stated in the documentation, staff revealed just the day before the Public Hearing that the policy affects 52,729 land parcels in Vancouver —, nearly 26 square kilometers, and over 49% of Vancouver’s residential land area. Residents living with any form of ownership or renting in these areas received no notification of the policies or even the Public Hearing.
- The one-size-fits-all approach of random towers is without any local planning context.
- The policy ignores local area plans, which had been carefully planned by neighbourhoods over many years.
- These towers are out of character with most of the areas identified for this initiative.
- Public oversight and a democratic means of having a say will be undermined, public hearings would be prohibited, and proposals would go directly to Development Permits, in some cases to be decided by one person, the Director of Planning.
- Only 30% will be social housing, the rest will be 70% expensive market rentals.
- The supposed “viability” of projects is based on pro-forma spreadsheets that are not subject to independent scrutiny, so the public and even Council cannot be assured of the value for value.
- Supportive housing at large scales have proven to be a failed model; but if approved, this initiative significantly reduces opportunities for meaningful community input and influence in outcomes.
- This initiative risks displacing 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).
- Opposition to this initiative is greater than support, as shown in the public feedback. The June/July 2025 engagement, when more details were finally provided, shows the majority of respondents were opposed.
- The initiative undermines the intent of the Heritage Conservation Area Bylaw and First Shaughnessy area that are intended for more density through heritage retention options for multifamily conversions and complementary infill, not out of scale towers.
- The initiative contradicts or ignores many policies and programs put in place by three levels of government 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.

We encourage Council NOT to approve this initiative due to its many flaws, and NOT to incorporate it into the Official Development Plan. Instead, initiate a proper, transparent, open public discussion on the objectives of the Social Housing Initiative, and work with communities to find better solutions than what are proposed here.

Sincerely,
Co-Chairs Larry Benge & Dorothy Barkley
CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

*Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods
Arbutus Ridge Community Association
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours
Dunbar Residents Association
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee
Grandview Woodland Area Council
Greater Yaletown Community Association
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association
Kits Point Residents Association
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
Oakridge Langara Area Residents
Residents Association Mount Pleasant

				Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc. Strathcona Residents Association Upper Kitsilano Residents Association West End Neighbours Society West Kitsilano Residents Association West Point Grey Residents Association West Southland Residents Association			
2025-11-27	11:02	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	See enclosure	David Pickell	Kitsilano	Attachment 1
2025-11-27	11:20	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I oppose the social housing initiative. This initiative is a power money grab that will deplete the character of our neighborhoods, give big money to developers (eg Ken Sim supporters) and will not make a shred of difference in solving the housing crisis. It does not even intend to do that. This is a pozi scheme to reap untold millions out of rezoning with the failure to provide what is needed most- social housing. the 30% number for "below market value" is also a sham as this is a big money maker for the developers any way this is marketed. We need coop housing and the provincial, federal and local governments have the ability to grant land for this purpose as has been done in the past in false creek. These are the solutions that will provide affordable stable housing for families and people who need it most and this is where the city initiatives should be focused. I am opposed to the so called "Social Housing Initiative"! Shame on all of you!	Diane Martin	West Point Grey	
2025-11-27	12:07	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	This so-called Social Housing Initiative goes against everything Vancouver has stood for. It violates personal property rights. It goes against Vancouver's Community Visions policy, a long standing policy of planning neighbourhoods that was undertaken with the planning department and hundred of citizens at great expense. It violates all environmental policies, including the city's and BC Hydro's policy to encourage solar panels on roofs. Moreover, social housing should be built for and by the city, province or federal government on public property, that will actually provide social housing in perpetuity. The policy of subsidizing private developers with funding or extra zoning is not the way to provide long term real social housing.	Imbi Harding	Dunbar-Southlands	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-27	12:18	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The city council’s 11th hour (updates and changes have been made until 24 hours prior) hearing on the ‘Social Housing Initiative’, amounts to, effectively, a hostile takeover of city bylaws and zoning. If approved, and the architects of this mindboggling plan are doing everything to push this through, it would upend over a century of city planning and zoning to effectively re-write and whitelist ~ 50% of residential land area to be zoned and pre-approved for development of 6 to 20 stories mega-towers. This will effectively “break” Vancouver neighborhoods and make this City unrecognizable from its current state. This attempt of effectively cancelling all existing zoning and neighborhood planning is akin to what is happening south of the border: Replacing a (relatively) functional system based on evidence, science and broad social agreements with a perverted, hyper-capitalistic and self-serving new order (“Immigrants cause American decline”, and will be locked up without due process, “Vaccines cause autism”, January 6th insurrectionists are “freedom fighters”, and “Climate change is a hoax”).</p> <p>However, Ken Sim and his shadow cabinet of “Yes People” do not try to use the grand-standing of the Trump administration when to throwing Vancouver into the abyss of their secret rezoning and development nightmare: They are trying to sweep this move, unprecedented for any world metropolis (overnight rezoning of ~50% of neighborhoods without permit requirement!!) under the rug. No stakeholders have been informed of this move, no letters to residents were sent, and no announcements were given to media outlets. This has, make no mistake, all signs of a hostile takeover.</p> <p>Who will recognize Point Grey, Dunbar, Kitsilano, Marpole, etc. neighborhoods with 20 story towers on their residential streets? Who has planned the infrastructure, support systems, made environmental impact studies or even pretended to use due diligence?</p> <p>This eye-popping proposal, of course, is propelled by the preposterous lie that building more housing will lower real estate or rental prices. All while, for years of academic research and market analysis, there has NOT been a single peer reviewed study that shows a link between the two (also see https://dunbarnews[.]ca/money-not-affordability-growing-on-dunbar-streets/).</p> <p>Simply, while Ken Sim and his development buddies have profited of tax-payer subsidized developments, housing is not a commodity and the supply-and-demand doctrine of the free market does not apply to it; so building more has NOT brought down prices, and will NOT EVER. Instead, Ken Sim, David Eby and their predecessors permitted for decades the influx of unregulated foreign investments and ongoing money laundering of illegal foreign funds through our casinos (what the Cullen Commission calls “the Vancouver model” https://cullencommission[.]ca/files/reports/CullenCommission-FinalReport-Full.pdf), which have led to this catastrophic housing affordability crisis, epitomized by million-dollar one-bedroom apartments that no one can afford or can live in, and by megalomaniac mansions owned by Oversea entities (who knows who ...) that are almost always empty.</p> <p>The failure of our politician to reign in this criminal activity has made Vancouver money (sales tax, property tax) and lined the pockets of the representatives as proxies to the development industry; now they are trying to go in for the “final blow”: open up all of Vancouver to the “total rezoning & development war”. Welcome to hell.</p> <p>Again: Vancouver city council is trying to make (one of) the most sweeping re-zoning attempts in the history of any major city worldwide: dramatic changes to infrastructure, zoning, and housing type (height 20 stories!) in ~ 50% of all of its neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It is a move beyond bold. It will NOT, science says, contribute to housing affordability. It will raise billions of \$ in profit for developers – and it will leave Vancouver unrecognizable. It is, for all intents and purposes, a declaration of war onto our city. And while the “architects” are trying to sweep this under the rug, we cannot let this go unchallenged. Every single city council member has a name and a responsibility and we must hold every single one of them accountable.</p>	Oliver Prange	West Point Grey	

2025-11-27	13:09	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>The Structural Dysfunction</p> <p>The crisis stems from a misalignment of mandates and funding.</p> <p>1. The Unfunded Mandate and Fiscal Imbalance</p> <p>The foundation of the infrastructure deficit is the provincial school tax system. Vancouver generates significantly more school tax revenue than it receives back in funding. This surplus is redistributed across the province. Simultaneously, the Province mandates aggressive housing targets and Transit-Oriented Area (TOA) densification while withholding the capital funds needed to support that growth. This amounts to an unfunded mandate.</p> <p>The City's Social Housing Initiative exacerbates this by accelerating density—mandating 35% family-sized units (Report, p. 8)—while waiving Development Cost Levies (DCLs) (Report, p. 12), further eroding the local capacity to fund infrastructure.</p> <p>2. The VSB's Crisis of Planning and Governance</p> <p>The VSB appears focused on short-term asset monetization rather than long-term stewardship, operating with flawed data and a lack of transparency. The proposed disposal of the Carleton school site exemplifies this failure.</p> <p>Ignoring Growth Mandates: The Carleton site is 650m from SkyTrain, squarely within a TOA growth zone. Disposing of school land where the Province and City mandate density is a fundamental failure of planning (Carleton Alert).</p> <p>Manufacturing "Surplus": The VSB utilized a self-fulfilling prophecy: close the school (2016), eliminate the catchment so families cannot register (2020), and then declare the land "surplus" (Carleton Alert).</p> <p>Data Integrity Concerns: There are serious allegations that the VSB manipulates data to understate future need. VSB planning models reportedly counted 6,670 fewer school-aged children than the 2021 Census. Furthermore, the VSB reportedly removed denominator columns from capture rate data, making verification impossible (Carleton Alert). By undercounting the population, the VSB justifies closures and sales.</p> <p>Lack of Transparency: The VSB allegedly filed for subdivision in 2022 without public disclosure, and the Privacy Commissioner ordered the release of 217 illegally withheld pages regarding the disposal (Carleton Alert).</p> <p>3. The "Taxpayer Trap"</p> <p>The current delegation creates a severe fiscal risk. When the VSB sells land based on flawed projections, the proceeds enter VSB reserves. However, when growth necessitates a new school site in that area, the Vancouver Charter (Section 562.1) dictates that the City of Vancouver is responsible for acquiring the land at current market rates. The taxpayer sells low and buys high.</p> <p>Toward a More Appropriate Delegation: Structural Reform</p> <p>The City cannot rely on "better coordination" (Appendix E, p. 46) when the underlying structure is broken. A more appropriate delegation requires structural reform across three pillars:</p> <p>1. Integrated Public Land Management: Ending Asset Liquidation</p> <p>The VSB cannot be the sole arbiter of what constitutes "surplus" public land. Authority over educational assets must be integrated with municipal growth planning.</p> <p>Moratorium in Growth Zones: Implement an immediate moratorium on the disposal of VSB lands within TOAs and the "Neighbourhood Centres/Villages" identified in the Social Housing Initiative, pending independent review.</p>	Vik Khanna	Renfrew-Collingwood	
------------	-------	---------------------------------------	--------	--	------------	---------------------	--

				<p>Joint Authority and Municipal Veto: The authority to dispose of VSB land must require joint sign-off by the VSB and the City of Vancouver. This ensures asset management aligns with the Official Community Plan and prevents the permanent loss of strategic public land.</p> <p>Public-to-Public Transfer at Book Value: If VSB land is transferred to the City for other public uses (including social housing or future school acquisition), the transfer must occur at book value, recognizing that the land is already a public asset. This prevents the monetization of public land at the taxpayer's expense.</p> <p>2. Provincial Fiscal Accountability: Growth Must Pay for Growth The Province must take fiscal responsibility for the infrastructure impacts of its housing mandates.</p> <p>Fair Share Funding (The "Vancouver Dividend"): A guaranteed percentage of the school tax revenue generated in Vancouver must be retained locally to fund the capital expansion required by provincially mandated growth.</p> <p>Provincial Liability for Acquisition: The reliance on the Vancouver Charter to force the City to acquire future school sites must be revised. If Provincial mandates drive densification, the Province must bear the primary financial responsibility for the associated educational infrastructure costs, including land acquisition.</p> <p>Infrastructure-Linked Funding: Provincial and Federal housing funds (like the Housing Accelerator Fund) must include dedicated streams for educational infrastructure.</p> <p>3. Mandatory Data Integrity and Joint Forecasting Planning cannot proceed based on conflicting, opaque, or manipulated data.</p> <p>Independent Forecasting: Eliminate the reliance on proprietary models that facilitate the undercounting of student populations. Establish an independent forecasting body, jointly overseen by the City and VSB, mandated to use Statistics Canada data and unified student yield projections as the baseline.</p> <p>Radical Transparency and Auditing: Mandate the full disclosure of all data and assumptions related to enrollment projections and asset management, subject to independent audit, addressing the governance failures highlighted in the Carleton case.</p> <p>By implementing these structural reforms, Vancouver can move beyond the current dysfunctional cycle of siloed planning and fiscal imbalance, creating a framework where housing growth and educational infrastructure are developed concurrently and sustainably.</p>			
2025-11-27	13:46	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I strongly oppose this initiative because it puts the safety of our neighbourhood at risk. As well, the building cost which are on a rise will put a dent in the government's budget.	Shilan Huang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2025-11-27	13:48	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I strongly oppose this initiative because the infrastructure needed to support the density added by these social housing initiatives is not in place. Currently we are seeing much more traffic locally in Vancouver and by adding social housing initiatives around Vancouver, roads need to be expanded to no limit to keep cars able to move on the streets.	Suizhu Fu	Dunbar-Southlands	
2025-11-27	13:49	Vancouver's Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Submission to Vancouver City Council – Opposition to the Social Housing Initiative</p> <p>From: Richard K Lowy, Resident of Kitsilano / the Kits Neighbourhood Public Hearing – November 27</p> <p>Mayor and Councillors,</p>	Richard Lowy	Kitsilano	

My name is Richard Lowy, and I am a lifelong Vancouver resident. I live in Kitsilano, one of the neighbourhoods heavily affected by this proposed Social Housing Initiative. I am writing to state—in the strongest terms—my opposition to this plan.

I love this city. I grew up here. I’ve raised family here. I’ve watched Vancouver evolve, sometimes for the better, sometimes not—but always with a sense that our leaders understood the value of neighbourhood character, thoughtful planning, and genuine public involvement.

This proposal breaks with all of that.
It takes Vancouver down the wrong road.

🔒

1. What This Means for Kitsilano

Kitsilano has always been a neighbourhood that blends heritage homes, low-rise apartments, small-scale rental buildings, and walkable streets. It is one of the most iconic areas in Vancouver—beloved for its human scale, sunlight, livability, and community.

Under this initiative:

- 20-storey towers could be built on side streets throughout Kits
- These projects would require no public hearing
- Residents like myself would have no opportunity to raise concerns before it’s too late
- Renters in older low-rises and suites could be displaced with no clear relocation plan
- Sunlight, views, and the neighbourhood’s unique coastal character could be irreversibly damaged

This is not planning.
It is not thoughtful growth.
It is simply blanket permission to build out-of-scale towers with minimal oversight.

If this passes, Kitsilano as we know it will be transformed—not over decades, but almost immediately.

🔒

2. I’ve Lived Here All My Life — I Know This City

Vancouver has always been a place that valued consultation and neighbourhood identity. Growing up here, I remember:

- Community meetings where residents’ voices mattered
- Respect for existing neighbourhood plans
- Sensible transitions between low-rise streets and higher-density areas
- A recognition that the city’s character—our sunlight, parks, and local feel—was part of what made Vancouver special

This initiative abandons all of that.

Nearly half of Vancouver’s residential land—including Kitsilano—is about to be upzoned for 6-storey and 20-storey buildings, with:

- 52,729 parcels affected
- No direct notifications sent to residents
- No meaningful outreach
- A definition of “social housing” that is 70% market rental

			<p>This is not how you treat the people who built their lives here.</p> <p>We are not obstacles to development. We are the community you are supposed to serve.</p> <p>🔗</p> <p>3. Vancouver Needs Affordability — But This Is Not It</p> <p>I fully support the creation of real social and affordable housing. That is not what this plan delivers.</p> <p>Under the City’s definition, a building can be labelled “social housing” even if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 70% of units are full market rental• Only 30% are below market• The project is run by a non-profit in name only <p>Calling this “social housing” is misleading. It creates density without delivering affordability.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the initiative risks displacing tenants who already rely on some of the most affordable rental stock in the city—older walk-ups, basement suites, and long-standing community rental buildings.</p> <p>The City is offering density without protection. Height without affordability. Development without democracy.</p> <p>🔗</p> <p>4. This Plan Erodes Neighbourhood Character and Trust</p> <p>One of the main reasons people love Kitsilano—and why people love Vancouver—is that it feels human. Walkable. Livable. A balance of gentle density and mature streetscapes. A neighbourhood where low-rise living and community ties still matter.</p> <p>Placing 20-storey towers into the middle of that fabric—without public hearings, and without the input of the very people who live here—is a complete betrayal of how planning should work.</p> <p>It tells residents that their voice doesn’t matter. It tells long-term Vancouverites that their history in this city means nothing. It tells us that the neighbourhoods we have spent decades caring for are now open to unrestrained overdevelopment.</p> <p>🔗</p> <p>5. This Is Not the Right Road for Vancouver</p> <p>I’m speaking today not just as someone from Kitsilano, but as someone who has called Vancouver home for their entire life.</p> <p>This city has always prided itself on thoughtful planning, public participation, and the belief that different neighbourhoods have different identities worth preserving.</p> <p>If Council approves this initiative, you are erasing that legacy.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>You are setting Vancouver on a path where massive citywide changes are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• behind closed doors• without proper notice• without proportional affordability• without community support• and without any meaningful democratic process <p>Vancouver deserves better than that. Kitsilano deserves better than that. All of us deserve better than that.</p> <p>🔗</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>I urge Council to reject this initiative and return to the values that have shaped Vancouver for generations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transparency• Community involvement• Respect for neighbourhood character• Real affordability—not policy that labels itself “social housing” while delivering mostly market rentals <p>This proposal is wrong for Kitsilano, wrong for Vancouver, and wrong for the future of the city I’ve called home my entire life.</p> <p>Thank you for hearing my concerns.</p> <p>Richard K Lowy Resident of Kitsilano Lifelong Vancouverite Submitted for the Public Hearing – November 27</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-27	14:30	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>I am a lifelong Vancouver resident. I am 75 years old, born and raised in this city, and have lived through decades of change and growth. I walk the streets of Kitsilano every day, operated retail businesses in Kits and South Granville for over 30 years, and have always valued the strong sense of community that makes this city unique.</p> <p>Over the past five years, I have become increasingly concerned with the pace and scale of development in Vancouver. The city is growing too fast, with towers and high-density developments rising without consideration for neighbourhood character, community connection, or livability. The green spaces, quiet streets, and human-scale neighbourhoods that once defined Vancouver are being overshadowed. The sense of community that I have always cherished is slipping away.</p> <p>Alongside this, I have noticed a decline in safety and public order. I was personally attacked at the London Drugs on Broadway and Vine by a homeless individual, and there were no consequences. Security staff had to let him go. Incidents like shoplifting and other crimes feel more common, and I, like many other residents, feel increasingly unsafe in the city I have called home my entire life.</p> <p>The City is focused on building more and more housing and commercial space, yet it is not keeping pace with the essential services that support a healthy, livable city: public safety, social support, employment opportunities, and programs to address homelessness. Overbuilding without addressing these fundamental needs erodes quality of life and leaves residents feeling neglected and unheard.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this Social Housing Initiative. Growth is necessary, but it must be balanced, responsible, and centred on the wellbeing of the people who live here. Before approving large-scale developments and initiatives like this one, the City must ensure that our communities, our safety, our green spaces, and our neighbourhoods are protected.</p> <p>Vancouver is a beautiful, unique city—but we risk losing what makes it special if we continue down this path. I urge Council to slow the pace of development and focus on supporting residents, services, and community wellbeing first.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my perspective.</p> <p>Sarji Gill Lifelong Vancouver Resident Kitsilano</p>	Sarji Gill	Kitsilano	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-27	14:46	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>This is to state my strong opposition to the Social Housing Initiative. I urge you not to approve this initiative or to incorporate it into the Official Development Plan.</p> <p>It is a stealth initiative, being brought in behind people’s backs without a serious attempt to ensure its consequences are known. The city’s information failure and lack of media coverage means the vast majority of Vancouverites will be astounded that a 20-storey tower can suddenly be built beside their homes with minimal notice and no public hearing.</p> <p>This is no small initiative, as it affects 49% of Vancouver’s residential land area. More than 17% of that area will be upzoned for six-storey buildings, and nearly 32% for up to 20 storeys.</p> <p>This is all being done under cover of the misleading words “Social Housing.” In fact, as you and I know – but most of the public doesn’t -- only 30% of this new housing must even be below market. So this initiative effectively rezones half of the city for nice-sounding housing, 70% of which can be as brutally expensive as anywhere.</p> <p>Here’s where I have to say that I don’t oppose social housing, which of course any right-thinking person doesn’t. Everyone knows that we must provide decent, livable housing for those who unfortunately are not able to meet today’s sky-high housing costs.</p> <p>But there are better ways to do it than suddenly making it feasible to plunk 20-storey towers willy-nilly around the city without even bothering to let the public know what you’re doing.</p> <p>Most residents, if properly consulted, would be willing to make space for genuine social housing – not 79% market under the guise of ‘social’ – in their neighbourhoods. Maybe it won’t be 20 storeys, and maybe not even six, but there are more innovative and humane ways of adding this needed housing to all our communities.</p> <p>Please rethink this badly developed, badly publicized, and badly thought-out plan. Please vote it down.</p>	Carol Volkart	Dunbar-Southlands	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-27	14:48	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>I understand Council is considering a sweeping rezoning to permit 20-storey social housing towers across large parts of the city. Before such a significant change is approved, I ask that you reflect on the following points:</p> <p>1. Kitsilano’s identity is worth protecting. Kitsilano is one of the most distinctive neighbourhoods in the world — defined by its natural beauty, walkability, and creative energy. It’s an environment that has inspired homegrown innovation, from Lululemon to countless small businesses. Rather than reshaping it into a vertical extension of downtown, we should be asking how to build upon what makes it thrive.</p> <p>2. Pause and measure the impact of what’s already in motion. The Broadway Plan has already rezoned an enormous portion of the city — an undertaking unlike anything Vancouver has seen before. Wouldn’t it be wise to evaluate how that plan is performing before expanding the same model to other neighbourhoods?</p> <p>3. True global cities celebrate their neighbourhoods. Cities admired for their livability — whether it’s Copenhagen, Tokyo, or even Singapore — maintain the human scale and cultural fabric of their communities while adding density in thoughtful ways. Endless clusters of high-rise rental towers owned by distant investors do not create the kind of world-class neighbourhoods that attract people and ideas.</p> <p>4. Our local economy has been overshadowed by real estate speculation. Decades of overreliance on real estate have left Vancouver with high costs, limited opportunities, and a fragile economic foundation. The city’s vitality depends on diversifying — supporting technology, creativity, and entrepreneurship — not doubling down on a single industry that has already distorted our priorities.</p> <p>5. Residents never gave a mandate for this scale of change. City staff have acknowledged this proposal lacks broad public support. It was not part of any candidate’s campaign or platform. Transforming entire neighbourhoods through major rezoning requires explicit democratic consent — not administrative quiet approval.</p> <p>Vancouver’s strength lies in its people, its neighbourhoods, and its balance between urban life and nature. Let’s not lose that identity in the pursuit of height for height’s sake. I encourage Council to focus on smart, inclusive, and locally grounded growth that enhances our city’s long-term livability.</p>	Lance Morginn	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	15:21	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	No	Daniel Vallillee	West Point Grey	

Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-27	15:24	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	<p>Wholesale re-zoning will allow a rush of development that is likely to create chaos in quiet neighborhoods. A lack of infrastructure would complicate matters even further. The city should not accelerate developments that are rushed and be more careful in thinking projects through.</p> <p>One illustration on NOT thinking things through. The Bute-Robson public square is now complete after 2 years of construction. New very smooth pavement was put in on the south side of Bute on the steep hill that leads down to Robson.</p> <p>Question: Did any genius city planner think about what will happen to pedestrians, especially the elderly, during winter when the sidewalk will get slippery from ice?</p> <p>I hope this doesn’t lead to a slew of lawsuits against the city. Anyone who walks in this area could have told the city to think about ice on the sidewalks during winter!</p>	Stephen Lowy	Downtown	
2025-11-27	15:27	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	We are overdeveloping the West Side	Brian Jessel	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	15:27	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	I have lived in the charming Kitsilano neighbourhood for the past decade, and I truly love its character and sense of community. It is deeply concerning to see plans for a 20-story building, as it would significantly alter the scale and feel of this cozy, beloved neighbourhood. Vancouver’s unique charm comes from its human-scale streets and approachable spaces, and I hope the city will preserve that character for current and future residents.	Kumiko Morginn	Kitsilano	
2025-11-27	16:16	Vancouver’s Social Housing Initiative	Oppose	Need proper neighbourhood consultation and planning before a blanket rezoning for 6 story buildings and 20 story high rises throughout indiscriminately. 70% market rate in these buildings will just lead to more empty condos and will not in fact address social housing issues. Public hearings and permits were developed for a reason... to propose fast tracking projects without contextual planning is short sighted. There has been no meaningful consultation with anyone other than those in the development industry with vested interests.	Zaria Stoffman	Dunbar-Southlands	