

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-06	10:39	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I heard about the budget allocation for the fireworks and it's a gross misappropriation of funds. The Celebration of Lights only needed 1 million from the city to provide a festival for multiple days, and didn't get that. How about you fund them, instead of building a brand new 2-3 million one night festival. Please do better. Revive the old light festival with 1 million, and save yourself a million for important things this city actually needs.	Tonianne Henry	Marpole	
2026-02-15	18:35	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>VANCOUVER OFFICIAL DENSITY PLAN : REFERRAL REPORT / Report Date: January 20, 2026 / RTS No.: 18341 / VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20 Meeting Date: February 17, 2026 :</p> <p>I greatly disagree with the Vancouver ODP - Vancouver Official Development Plan (VAN ODP), as an “unaffordable”, “unlivable”, too “all over plan”, which incorrectly “homogenizes” all architecture, all business, all culture, all landscaping, all urban design, all parks, in Vancouver, into a simplistic, simulacra, with instant, mass produced ,sterile, “sci fi” “clinical” “glass and steel”, “Medical Building Ikeaesque” type to Sea of Condo, towards a quasi “ corporate university campus” or hyper “ stylized whistler village”.</p> <p>Specifically, with this VANCOUVER ODP (2026), I greatly disagree with:</p> <p>1) “ Equitable Housing and Complete Neighborhoods” (ODP) = I disagree with this, because if all over the city, this removes “diversity of architecture and small businesses and individual character neighborhoods”, removing unique “neighborhood charm” - ie Point Grey is different than Marpole which is different than Fairview which is different than Commercial Drive, etc which has evolved over 100 years of random, creative, diverse, “mixed zoning”,- ie Jane Jacobs, by the living, expressing, input of many Vancouverites, from many ethnicity, classes, and interests.</p> <p>2.) “ Ensuring a mix of housing, jobs, shops, and services close to rapid transit” (ODP) = I disagree with this. This sounds great, but our Public Transit- sky train / busses and small street size, currently is far too small for all the - Broadway Plan, Renfrew Plan, Jericho Lands Plan, etc, of 10,000 residents around each sky train station, and overall housing density across Greater Vancouver. The Public Transit will not “function” – ie people waiting for hours for sky train and crowded buses, especially with the City removing “1 to 1 car parking” all over the city with the Missing Middle. The Sky Train can not psychically expand either. In this, I recommend removing the “ban on 1 to 1 car parking” in all new buildings, moving forwards: I request a Public Transit Survey analyzing this “ housing over- density overwhelming Transit problem?”</p> <p>3) . “ Current land use policies and processes reinforce many geographic, economic, and social inequities and create barriers that have disproportionate impacts on marginalized or excluded residents and communities” (ODP) = I disagree with this analysis, and would like Mayor and Council to ask for the specific data on these points of “inequities/ barriers”.</p> <p>Generally, the city is “equal” in terms of access of housing for many income levels all over the city already, with “lots” of “secondary suites” , “basement suites”, “sublets”, “lane-way homes”, “some duplexes”, “mixed zoning”, “old stock Low/Mid Rise”, “co-ops”, “some low income housing”, “ some government housing”, “ some student housing”, “ youth hostels”, “low income hotels” all over the city, randomly mixed, including the “West Side” - ie “economically affluent”. Yes, more “affordable rentals” and “ low income housing” is needed, but the ODP removing “old stock” and “over building all communities” with new Condo Towers, is a theoretical fix for “low income equity”, as such will “reduce the equity”, whereby the “below market rents” - ie \$2000/2500 per month for new one bedroom, in new Mid Rise/Condo Towers, will be way too expensive for “equitable low income” - ie 50,000/60,000 per year. Further, many old stock housing with “odd spaces” perfect for “equitable low rents” - ie secondary suites/ basement suites/ sublet type of suites, etc will be lost by new Condo development.</p> <p>4) “... attention to equity-denied groups. Land use policies and practices will be assessed and</p>	K. van Drager	Fairview	

intentionally transformed to ensure the benefits of living and working in Vancouver are more equitably distributed” (ODP) = I disagree with this, as this reads as potential incorrect government “social engineering” - designing who lives where and why. If so, can Mayor and Council ask the City to explain this “attention to equity-denied groups” in more detail? Further, I suggest the “free market, community businesses, community history, local community interests and cultures”, assist and create, with randomness, uniqueness, “shared equity” across the city, while keeping “diversity and difference” in the architectural designs and use of each neighborhoods- ie RS- 1 zoning and “mixed zoning” and some Jane Jacob planning principles – ie organic density, work with some heritage, gentle gentrification.

5) “Advance an equity-based approach to land use planning, where the benefits of growth and change are distributed across neighborhoods, “ (ODP) = I think if Vancouver City Hall had less “urban planning” for the last 20 plus years, we would have even more “equity”, “fun” “livable “ city, with more low income renting, more old stock buildings, more small retail businesses, more grocery shopping, more 24 hour clubs / bars / nightclubs / cafes / restaurants, more alternative theatres / galleries / arts clubs...and would not need these “ ODP complete neighborhoods”, today. I suggest, the current “so-called inequity” is a direct result of 20 plus years of “anti car polices”, “environmental urban planning”, “bicycle lanes”, “condo speculation market”, “foreign investment”, “the housing market fueling the Provincial GDP”, “over residentializing Downtown”, etc, removing this “perceived” “inequity” by City Planners or Leadership Team. Further, that intentionally attempting an “overall city equity with specific density development and ODP Plan” - ie low income housing all over the city, is a Progressive Urban Planning “myth” that there is “inequity” to be solved by an ODP. In this, emphasizing architecture and design, in Urban Planning, perhaps, is more diverse, inclusive, and greater, in being organic, natural, in flux, including some “unplanning as planning”, than emphasizing “income distribution” or “lifestyle of residents” in planning, being deliberate with new housing density- ie especially Low/Mid/High Rise Condo Towers, particularly “all over the city” and “instantly” and “ the same architecture”.

6) “ The Urban Structure Strategy • directs new housing choices to low-density residential areas rich in amenities “ (ODP). = I greatly disagree with removing “all SFH areas in Vancouver for density”, as, we need some Low density areas, - ie Single Family Home communities, and Low/ Mid Rise old stock apartments as Low/Medium density areas, to be left...as is – ie zero density, for economic, social, cultural stability of the over all city, while greatly building high density other areas of the city, so that the “high density” permits some “low density”, and the “low density releases the social pressure of high density”. Further, in low density areas, densifying the “main arterial streets” or “spot density” of 6 / 8 /10 /12 storey buildings, would provide enough density for the overall city, especially with “recycled wood” buildings and more street trees on the West Side.

7) “ Transportation High-quality walking, biking, and transit networks and connections shape the urban environment and form the backbone of complete neighborhoods” (ODP) = I question this, as more City “anti-car policy”, - ie removing 1 to 1 car parking, removing car lanes,...whereby, ultimately, if we remove car lanes, our already too small for cars / buses / bicycles / pedestrians streets will not truly function well for any transportation, which means we should instead “ radically expand” the size of some “main arterial streets”, like Granville or Broadway or Kingsway or Hastings or Knight etc, by removing two/three blocks on each side, creating “purpose built multi transit roads”, like Paris did in the 18th century with Champs-Élysées – ie large Transportation Infrastructure redesign. With larger “ almost free way like roads” crisscrossing the city, for all types of transport, we could build more Condo Density.

8) “ Consider allowing commercial uses to extend around corners onto quieter local streets to encourage continuity” (ODP). = This could work, primarily on the East side or South side of Vancouver, yet not West Side, with too much Heritage Housing and Large Urban Trees.

9) “ b) Explore street closures or plazas to enhance adjacent public spaces” (ODP) = I question this, because it sounds like reducing cars, and removing too much housing, for Vancouver which is already a small limited space.

10) “ c) Encourage small storefronts and flexible spaces to provide affordable space for

local-serving businesses;" (ODP) = Except the problem is that all new store fronts will be "continuous store fronts", which are "cold" glass and steel, thus ideal mostly for Corporate Stores, not small family businesses. Vancouver already has too many Corporate stores / Modern high end Robson Street boutiques / No Frills / medical offices, with continuous store fronts.

11) " Direction FG1.8: Villages Strengthen low-density residential neighborhoods by adding shops, services, and housing choice to provide more complete, inclusive, and resilient neighborhoods" (ODP).= I greatly disagree with any development of " Shopping Villages" - ie 4th street, Main street from Broadway to 25th, all of Commercial Drive, etc, which are strong economic engines,- ie great restaurants, cafes, small cool alternative retail, tourist areas, which need zero density, zero development. Simply leave as is, is the best urban plan, for the next 100 years.

12) " Direction FG1.9: Multiplex Areas..." (ODP). = This is the Missing Middle Multiplex "all over the city" which I disagree with, because they have no 1 to 1 car parking, not enough density, and will architecturally homogenize the city – ie remove visual and aesthetic diversity. Keep the Multiplexes to just a few areas – ie East Vancouver or South Vancouver, and build clusters of multiplexes, near clusters of "town homes" or "duplexes", and plant already large grown street trees- ie 20/30 foot tall, not thin seedlings.

13) " Direction 4.2: Make Space for Nature Identify, rehabilitate, and connect ecological systems in Vancouver" (ODP), = No, I disagree. The City did this – ie reveal a salmon stream in a small park near Kits Beach, now there is very little left of the park for people to sit in and use.

14) " Direction 5.2: People-First Streets.....Create people-first streets by transforming road space..." (ODP). = No, I disagree. This sounds good on paper, but in reality, it means, removing car lanes and removing car agency, where "cars drive the economy", not bicycles or buses. Most people who can or could live in Vancouver (yet especially Suburbia), even renters, will choose a car, over walking, buses, bicycles. In effect, this urban plan detail, "silos" people into their neighborhoods, reducing diverse socialization and economic prosperity, especially for small businesses. Plus, cars are needed to drive out of the city to "wild Nature" and the province to camp etc.

15) To note, the ODP does not mention much the following A) it's "extremely" tall, 30/40/50/60 storey Condo Towers, in the Broadway Plan, Renfrew Plan, Jericho Plan etc, which I disagree with, as Victoria, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Toronto, etc are building the exact same tall Towers, same urban landscaping, same bicycle lanes, same cities...so why is all of Canada becoming a monolithic sterile sea of unaesthetic "expensive" Condo Towers? B) density is destroying "small businesses", and replacing them with "corporate stores". An economist recently said, "small entrepreneurship" drives the B.C. Economy. If so, why is Vancouver City, and the BC NDP, incorrectly destroying "small businesses" with these "plans" and too high rents, anti- car policies, too high car parking fees, removing car parking, continuous store fronts ? C) the "below market rents" are still too expensive at \$1500 per month for a new studio, or \$2000 per month for a new one bedroom. Also, these Below Market rents are usually only 20% of the building, whereby we need 50% "below rentals" in every new building D) Most Low/Mid/tall Condo Buildings have very little "three bedroom Condo suites" - ie less than %10 in each new building, which means the VAN ODP is "anti-family". This is incorrect.

Ultimately, this ODP should be limited to one area- ie East Vancouver, or South Vancouver. In fact, in conjunction with this ODP Plan, Mayor and Council, should consider, 1.) repealing/changing the Broadway Plan to just "spot- density zoning" and "density of Condo Towers" on Main Arterial Streets in the Broadway Area as the Broadway Area is beautifully mixed zoning as is (also the Broadway Area does not need to be a "second Downtown", as the "First Downtown" currently has so much more potential for density, 2) advocate for removing/repealing BC NDP's Bill 44, Bill 46, Bill 47, as none of these omnibus urban plans work in "real space", 3) then take the entire Broadway Plan and switch it to/ plo it on... Hastings and Main heading east on Hastings to Burnaby (three blocks east past Strathcona), or Broadway and Kingsway heading east on Broadway, or Southwest Marine Drive and

Granville heading east on South West Marine Drive to Burnaby (and turning the Fraser River in some areas into a second Granville Island), 4). keep all the West Side – ie Point Grey, Kitsilano, Arbutus, Dunbar, Mackenzie Heights, Quolichena, Shauggensy, - ie west from Burrard Street, with zero density, except on Main Arterial Streets with 10/12 storey buildings, and some spot zoning, including reducing the Jericho Lands to 10/12 story condos, 5). Keep all “ shopping villages” as is, with zero density and zero development for the next 100 years, because these one/two storey buildings will be quaint tourist attractions and good for small retail businesses, 6). repeal “no 1 to 1 car parking” in all of Vancouver new buildings, 7) remove most “ground level residential housing” in Downtown, east of Granville Street to Pacific Street, and make ground level “retail businesses” - ie increase ground level retail businesses, 8). protect small and family businesses with “capped retail rents”(2010 rents) in some areas, especially for Cultural Purposes, 9). mandate all new Condo Towers/Mid Rise/ Low Rise, must not be designed like the current “sterile”, “clinical”, “mass produced”, “medical buildings”- ie lack diversity of design and aesthetic, 10). build more “recycled wood buildings” -ie 8/10/12 storey and environmental with “ethical concrete”, rain catchers, solar panels, roof top gardens, saunas, keeping all large 30/50 foot street tree canopy., 11) rethink Public Transit being overwhelmed by Housing Density. 12) Further, the “over density” in the ODP is too dense with too tall Condo Towers everywhere, - ie 20,000 residents at Jericho Lands Project, will flood Spanish Banks and Jericho Beach with too many “pet dogs” and “bicycles” per day - ie 4000 to 8000 dogs and bicycles. This will also be compounded by Senakw, with 9,000 residents and potentially 4000 to 6000 bicycles and dogs per day, at Granville Island, Kits Beach, and Seawall.

With all due respect, with forthright honesty, this VANCOUVER ODP, unfortunately as it stands, reads as a waste of - government time / public tax money / urban resources / urban heritage history, by “removing or diminishing” the history of Vancouver; its nuance mixed zoning; its economy driven by car agency and small retail businesses and 24 hour Downtown; its affordable low income housing; its diversity of culture; its large urban tree canopy, ... and ...“fun”: I can not socially, culturally, economically abide in this ODP, which reads more- ie circa 2000's, as an “ intentionally failed” “ socio-political” Vancouver City Hall government “exercise” in “ Progressive Urban Planning Theory”, not Urban Planning collaborating with Vancouver's History, Culture, Small Business Community, Residents, SFH Communities, or Urban Nature, in a realistic or economic or creative or sustainable way, moving forwards.

Revised comments sent on February 15, 2026 at 7:22 pm:

VANCOUVER OFFICIAL DENSITY PLAN : REFERRAL REPORT / Report Date: January 20, 2026 / RTS No.: 18341 / VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20 Meeting Date: February 17, 2026 :
I greatly disagree with the Vancouver ODP - Vancouver Official Development Plan (VAN ODP), as an “unaffordable”, “unlivable”, too “all over plan”, which incorrectly “homogenizes” all architecture, all business, all culture, all landscaping, all urban design, all parks, in Vancouver, into a simplistic, simulacra, with instant, mass produced ,sterile, “sci fi” “clinical” “glass and steel”, “ Ikea-esque Medical Building” Sea of Condo Tower city, towards a quasi “ corporate university campus” or hyper “ stylized whistler village”.
Specifically, with this VANCOUVER ODP (2026), I greatly disagree with:
1) “ Equitable Housing and Complete Neighborhoods” (ODP) = I disagree with this, because if all over the city, this removes “diversity of architecture and small businesses and individual character neighborhoods”, removing unique “neighborhood charm” - ie Point Grey is different than Marpole which is different than Fairview which is different than Commercial Drive, etc which has evolved over 100 years of random, creative, diverse, “mixed zoning”,- ie Jane Jacobs, by the living, input of many Vancouverites, from many ethnicity, classes, and interests.
2.) “ Ensuring a mix of housing, jobs, shops, and services close to rapid transit” (ODP) = I disagree with this. This sounds great, but our Public Transit- sky train / busses and small street size, currently is far too small for all the - Broadway Plan, Renfrew Plan, Jericho Lands

Plan, etc, of 10,000 residents around each sky train station. The Public Transit will not “function” – ie people waiting for hours for sky train and crowded buses, especially with the City removing “1 to 1 car parking” all over the city with the Missing Middle. The Sky Train can not psychically expand either. In this, I suggest removing the “ban on 1 to 1 car parking” in all new buildings: I request a Public Transit Survey analyzing this “ housing over- density overwhelming Transit problem”

3) . “ Current land use policies and processes reinforce many geographic, economic, and social inequities and create barriers that have disproportionate impacts on marginalized or excluded residents and communities” (ODP) = I disagree with this idea of “urban social inequities”. Generally, the city’ access for all incomes is “equal” in terms of “ some to many ” “secondary suites”, “basement suites”, “sublets”, “lane-way homes”, “some duplexes”, “mixed zoning”, “old stock Low/Mid Rise”, “co-ops”, “some low income housing”, “ some government housing”, “ some student housing”, “youth hostels”, “low income hotels” all over the city, randomly mixed, including the “West Side” - ie “economically affluent”. Yes, more “affordable rentals” and “ low income housing” is needed, but the ODP removing “old stock” and “building low income in all communities” with new Condo Towers, is a theoretical fix for “low income equity”, as such will “reduce the equity”, as new Condo “below market rents” - ie \$2000/2500 per month for new one bedroom, in new Mid Rise/Condo Towers, will be way too expensive for “equitable low income” - ie 50,000/60,000 per year.

4) “... attention to equity-denied groups. Land use policies and practices will be assessed and intentionally transformed to ensure the benefits of living and working in Vancouver are more equitably distributed” (ODP) = I disagree with this, as this reads as potential incorrect government “social engineering” - designing who lives where and why. Further, the “free market, community businesses, community history, local community interests and cultures”, assist and create, with randomness and uniqueness, “shared equity” across the city, while keeping “diversity and difference” in the architectural designs and use of each neighborhoods- ie RS- 1 zoning and “mixed zoning”, organic density, keeping some heritage, gentle gentrification.

5) “Advance an equity-based approach to land use planning, where the benefits of growth and change are distributed across neighborhoods, “ (ODP) = I think if Vancouver City Hall had less “urban planning” for the last 20 plus years, we would have even more “equity”, “fun” “livable “ city, with more low income renting, more old stock buildings, more small retail businesses, more grocery shopping, more 24 hour clubs / bars / nightclubs / cafes / restaurants, more alternative theatres / galleries / arts clubs...and Vancouver would not need these “ ODP complete neighborhoods”, today. I suggest, the current “so-called inequity” is a direct result of 20 plus years of City Planning with “anti car polices”, “environmental urban planning”, “bicycle lanes”, “condo speculation market”, “foreign investment”, “the housing market fueling the Provincial GDP”, “over residentializing Downtown”, etc, removing this “perceived” “inequity”.

6) “ The Urban Structure Strategy • directs new housing choices to low-density residential areas rich in amenities “ (ODP) . = I greatly disagree with removing “all SFH areas in Vancouver for density”, as, we need some Low density areas, - ie Single Family Home communities, and Low/ Mid Rise old stock apartments as Low/Medium density areas, particularly the West Side – ie Point Grey, Kits, Dunbar, etc, to be left...as is – ie zero density, for economic, social, cultural stability of the over all city, while greatly building high density other areas of the city, so that the “high density” permits some “low density”, and the “low density releases the social pressure of high density”. Further, in low density areas, densifying the “main arterial streets” or “spot density” of 6 / 8 /10 /12 storey recycled wood buildings, would provide enough density for the overall city.

7) “ Transportation High-quality walking, biking, and transit networks and connections shape the urban environment and form the backbone of complete neighborhoods” (ODP) = I question this, as more City “anti-car policy”, - ie removing 1 to 1 car parking, removing car lanes,...whereby, ultimately, if we remove car lanes, our already too small for cars / buses / bicycles / pedestrians streets will not truly function well for any transportation; I suggest the CITY should instead “ radically expand” the size of some “main arterial streets”, like Granville or Broadway or Kingsway or Hastings or Knight etc, by removing two/three blocks on each

side, creating “purpose built multi transit roads”, like Paris did in the 18th century with Champs-Élysées – ie large Transportation Infrastructure redesign.

8) “ Consider allowing commercial uses to extend around corners onto quieter local streets to encourage continuity” (ODP). = This could work, primarily on the East side or South side of Vancouver, yet not West Side, with too much Heritage Housing and Large Urban Trees.

9) “ b) Explore street closures or plazas to enhance adjacent public spaces” (ODP) = I question this, because it sounds like reducing cars, and removing too much housing, for Vancouver which is already a small limited space.

10) “ c) Encourage small storefronts and flexible spaces to provide affordable space for local-serving businesses;” (ODP) = Except the problem is that all new store fronts will be “continuous store fronts”, which are “cold” glass and steel, thus ideal mostly for Corporate Stores, not small family businesses. Vancouver already has too many Corporate stores / Modern high end Robson Street boutiques / No Frills / medical offices, with continuous store fronts.

11) “ Direction FG1.8: Villages Strengthen low-density residential neighborhoods by adding shops, services, and housing choice to provide more complete, inclusive, and resilient neighborhoods” (ODP).= I greatly disagree with any development of “ Shopping Villages” - ie 4th street, Main street from Broadway to 25th, all of Commercial Drive, etc, which are strong economic engines,- ie great restaurants, cafes, small cool alternative retail, tourist areas, which need zero density, zero development. Simply leave as is, is the best urban plan, for the next 100 years.

12) “ Direction FG1.9: Multiplex Areas...” (ODP). = This is the Missing Middle Multiplex “all over the city” which I disagree with, because they have no 1 to 1 car parking, not enough density, and will architecturally homogenize the city – ie remove visual and aesthetic diversity. Keep the Multiplexes to just a few areas – ie East Vancouver or South Vancouver, and build clusters of multiplexes, near clusters of “town homes” or “duplexes”.

13) “ Direction 4.2: Make Space for Nature Identify, rehabilitate, and connect ecological systems in Vancouver” (ODP), = No, I disagree. The City did this – ie reveal a salmon stream in a small park near Kits Beach, now there is very little left of the park for people to sit in and use.

14) “ Direction 5.2: People-First Streets.....Create people-first streets by transforming road space...” (ODP). = No, I disagree. This sounds good on paper, but in reality, it means, removing car lanes and removing car agency, where “cars drive the economy”, not bicycles or buses. Most people who can or could live in Vancouver (yet especially Suburbia), even renters, will choose a car, over walking, buses, bicycles. In effect, this urban plan detail, “silos” people into their neighborhoods, reducing diverse socialization and economic prosperity, especially for small businesses. Plus, cars are needed to drive out of the city to “wild Nature” and the province to camp etc.

15) To note, the ODP does not mention much the following A) it's “extremely” tall, 30/40/50/60 storey Condo Towers, in the Broadway Plan, Renfrew Plan, Jericho Plan etc, which I disagree with, as Victoria, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Toronto, etc are building the exact same tall Towers, same urban landscaping, same bicycle lanes, same cities...so why is all of Canada becoming a monolithic sterile sea of unaesthetic “expensive” Condo Towers?, B) current density is destroying “small businesses”, and replacing them with “corporate stores”. C) the “below market rents” are still too expensive at \$1500 per month for a new studio, or \$2000/2500 per month for a new one bedroom. Also, these Below Market rents are usually only 20% of the building's suites , whereby we need 50% “below rentals” suites in every new building D) Most Low/Mid/tall Condo Buildings have very little “three bedroom Condo suites” - ie less than %10 in each new building, which means the VAN ODP is “anti-family”. This is incorrect. E) the ODP incorrectly removes “rezoning meetings” for too many “housing projects”, which is “un-democratic”.

Ultimately, this ODP should be limited to one area- ie East Vancouver, or South Vancouver. In fact, in conjunction with this ODP Plan, Mayor and Council, should consider, 1.) repealing/changing the Broadway Plan to just “spot- density zoning” and “density of Condo

				<p>Towers” on Main Arterial Streets in the Broadway Area as the Broadway Area is beautifully mixed zoning as is (also the Broadway Area does not need to be a “second Downtown”, as the “First Downtown” currently has so much more potential for density, 2) advocate for removing/repealing BC NDP’s Bill 44, Bill 46, Bill 47, as none of these omnibus urban plans work in “real space”, 3) then take the entire Broadway Plan and switch it to/ plop it on... Hastings and Main heading east on Hastings to Burnaby (three blocks east past Strathcona), or Broadway and Kingsway heading east on Broadway, or Southwest Marine Drive and Granville heading east on South West Marine Drive to Burnaby (and turning the Fraser River in some areas into a second Granville Island), 4). keep all the West Side – ie Point Grey, Kitsilano, Arbutus, Dunbar, Mackenzie Heights, Quolichena, Shauggensy, - ie west from Burrard Street, with zero density, except on Main Arterial Streets with 10/12 storey buildings, and some spot zoning, including reducing the Jericho Lands to 10/12 story condos, 5). Keep all “ shopping villages” as is, with zero density and zero development for the next 100 years, because these one/two storey buildings will be quaint tourist attractions and good for small retail businesses, 6). repeal “no 1 to 1 car parking” in all of Vancouver new buildings, 7) remove most “ground level residential housing” in Downtown, east of Granville Street to Pacific Street, and make ground level “retail businesses” - ie increase ground level retail businesses, 8). protect small and family businesses with “capped retail rents”(2010 rents) in some areas, especially for Cultural Purposes, 9). mandate all new Condo Towers/Mid Rise/ Low Rise, must not be designed like the current “sterile”, “clinical”, “mass produced”, “medical buildings”- ie lack diversity of design and aesthetic, 10). build more “recycled wood buildings” -ie 8/10/12 storey and environmental with “ethical concrete”, rain catchers, solar panels, roof top gardens, saunas, keeping all large 30/50 foot street tree canopy., 11) rethink Public Transit being overwhelmed by Housing Density. 12) Further, the “over density” in the ODP is too dense with too many tall Condo Towers everywhere, - ie 20,000 residents at Jericho Lands Project, will flood Spanish Banks and Jericho Beach with too many “pet dogs” and “bicycles” per day - ie 4000 to 8000 dogs and bicycles. This will also be compounded by Senakw, with 9,000 residents and potentially 4000 to 6000 bicycles and dogs per day, at Granville Island, Kits Beach, and Seawall.</p>		
2026-02-16	14:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Concerns</p> <p>ODP ignores existing neighbourhoods and commercial areas</p> <p>Page 16 calls for more equitable distribution of parks , green space etc. are not addressed. There are no new large parks in the Broadway Plan area to handle the level of density planned.</p> <p>Page 15 VSB appears to be relying on mixed use public and school sites. Children need to have their own protected space not open to the public during the day. For example Crosstown shares space and challenged individuals can access the space</p>	Andrew Nichols	Mount Pleasant

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-16	17:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am very disturbed at what City Council and the Government of BC have done with housing policy over the last 2-3 years. You are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demolishing affordable housing; - destroying views and sunlight; - destroying tree canopy; - increasing traffic which is already horrendous; - undermining what were once good public recreation and other infrastructure facilities <p>All in the name of mindless "growth" - what for? So that all that was beautiful and wonderful in Vancouver's natural environment is now being destroyed more rapidly than ever.</p> <p>Do you really believe there is no alternative to this approach - or simply feel that money is indeed God?</p> <p>Tom Perry MD</p>	Tom Perry	West Point Grey	
2026-02-17	00:56	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The Vancouver ODP must be paused and carefully re-evaluated to address numerous concerns, review growth projections and assess the growing gap between supply and demand..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ODP is disconnected from reality and will have many undesirable impacts on Vancouver residents. . The ODP does not solve the housing or affordability crisis. . The ODP currently promotes limited housing types and design options. . Environmental impacts have been overlooked by the massive, excessive increases in height and density being proposed in the ODP. . The infrastructure needed for a massive influx of new residents needs to be properly planned, funded and built at the same time and at the same rate as new housing is being built. <p>It's time to reassess the human impact of the ODP on Vancouver residents. It is clear that more clarity, details, transparency and consultation are needed before the ODP can be adopted, especially as the CoV is intent on largely prohibiting public hearings, and eliminating public input and scrutiny.</p> <p>The CoV must continue to protect the rights of Vancouver constituents to engage in public consultation and have a say on city development.</p> <p>Please see attached file for more details.</p>	Annie Cassells	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1

2026-02-17	14:26	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor Ken Sim and City Council should join Mayor Sid Tobias to call for a review of Judicial Review of Provincial Housing Laws - Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216. https://www.viewroyal.ca/EN/meta/new/2025-latest-news/invitation-on-judicial-review-of-provincial-housing-laws-bills-44-47-13-15.html</p> <p>The Vancouver Official Development Plan should not go forward. It poses significant threats to democratic process and will have long lasting negative environmental and social impacts.</p>	Ariadna Fernandez	Mount Pleasant	
2026-02-25	16:16	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>oppose the plan.</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 5, 2026:</p> <p>I support the WPGRA and Patrick Condon and other prominent planners and architects that oppose the ODP- destruction plan. For all the reasons they have stated and more. Democratic feedback and participation in neighbourhood planning is critical. Transparency and accountability to residents for planning and when problems arise as a result of decisions also critical. Tower development is not the answer. Density does not equal affordability-policy does. Granville island and false creek are a good example of density done well. Jericho Coaliton plan for JL also a good plan versus towers. ODP is not a human centered plan needs to change and be centered on sustainable,livable, affordable development that nourishes community.</p>	J Myers	West Point Grey	
2026-02-26	17:49	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Withdraw the ODP: Open letter from HousingReset.ca to Vancouver on Official Development Plan (ODP) (Public Hearing March 10, 2026). (Full statement from HousingReset.ca at https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/) Copied below, unformatted. PDF attached. February 25, 2026</p> <p>To: City of Vancouver Mayor Sim and Councillors</p> <p>Re: City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) 2026-02-03 Report: https://council.vancouver.ca/20260203/documents/rr1.pdf</p> <p>The undersigned are Metro Vancouver region-based urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics, most with decades of experience, some with a background in development, who have joined together to broaden the search for enduring housing solutions. Previous letters can be found at HousingReset.ca .</p> <p>Since we recognize the importance of citywide and regional planning, we are writing to voice a few of our major concerns and strong opposition to the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) as proposed. We urge Council to refer this back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption.</p> <p>The ODP is based on the very flawed Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy that was approved in 2022 by the previous council without meaningful public participation. It continues to rely on the same flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good for the public interest.</p> <p>The following outlines a few of our many concerns.</p> <p>1. Questionable Population and Unit Projection Methodology</p>	organization Housing Reset		Attachment 1

One of the main issues is that there has been a major shift of how the Vancouver ODP and Regional Context Statement calculate population and unit growth projections.

Typically, the regional growth projections for Vancouver are used to determine the number of units required to meet that growth over a given period in the ODP, in this case to 2050. Metro Vancouver is responsible for regional projections and BC Stats does both provincial and regional projections based on data from StatsCan Census and federal immigration estimates, among other data sources. Metro Vancouver works with both the province and member municipalities in determining regional and municipal projections. For example see: [https://metrovancover\[.\]org/boards/RegionalPlanning/RPL-2025-09-11-OT.pdf](https://metrovancover[.]org/boards/RegionalPlanning/RPL-2025-09-11-OT.pdf)

However, it is unclear why a real estate firm's advice, Rennie, is included in the ODP report as Appendix G. This is highly unusual. These real-estate firm projections are adopted as the City's official projections that are substantially higher than the regional projections for the City of Vancouver.

Rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people.

Basically, build it and they will come. So the tail is wagging the dog, with the development pipeline dictating the expected population growth. This pipeline of already approved projects, and not considering much of the high zoned capacity, does not adjust for the reduction in immigration and the severe economic downturn cycle with ballooning existing supply of new units that are not being absorbed.

There is a great deal of uncertainty related to population projections at present given that they are strongly influenced by immigration levels and intra- and inter provincial migration. The ODP does not address how, for example, a significant downward shift in population growth would impact Plan content. Current regional projections show a decrease of population for 2026 before resuming to typical average growth of about 1% per year. But again, it is highly uncertain how long this economic growth correction will last.

2. Excessive Development Without Affordability

The Rennie growth analysis as shown in Appendix G of the Council report, shows that while just using the development already approved and in the pipeline, the whole growth projected to 2050 could be built out by 2034.

This would suggest that no additional development is needed to be approved beyond what is already in the pipeline, making the further development in the ODP unnecessary. However, most of what is in the development pipeline is small expensive units in large towers, not what is actually needed.

The City's needs assessment clarifies that the largest needs are for housing that is affordable to average and low wage worker incomes, especially larger units for families, but what is planned will not meet these needs. The ODP should address planning mechanisms to actually deliver housing that is economically accessible to mid and lower-income households in our City.

Instead, the City is creating far over capacity of market development beyond what is required for realistic population growth. This ODP would result in massive land inflation, speculation, and demolition of more existing affordable housing than it would build, displacing thousands of people.

3. Inadequate Infrastructure, Parks, Recreation, Schools and Amenities

The ODP includes almost no increased infrastructure, parks, recreation, schools and amenities for the massive increase in projected population growth, or any additional funding resources to support it. This will particularly affect many neighbourhoods that are already underserved yet are slated for massive growth under the ODP.

For example, the School Board is being forced by the Province to reduce the number of schools in Vancouver and won't plan for population growth until children are actually registered and on wait lists. Even then, as we are seeing with the Olympic Village that has been completed for over 15 years without a school, the province is just not providing the resources to support this growth.

The Park Board is chronically underfunded to meet current needs and there is nothing in this plan for upgrades of existing or proposed future expansion to meet the increased growth.

4. Loss of Participatory Planning, Neighbourhood Context, and Transparent Approvals Process

All of the existing community, neighbourhood and area plans are headed for major revision or elimination altogether. Every area-wide or community plan will be amended to state that the ODP is the guiding policy document, making them effectively irrelevant.

Instead of these community plan directions, they will be replaced with a limited number of housing typologies that are mostly apartments in towers of varying heights and a few areas left over of multiplexes.

Gone will be any of the heritage or character retention zones that incentivized multifamily conversions and infill. Or carefully planned ground oriented family housing that suits a specific local context.

Any rezoning, whether for a single lot or whole neighbourhood area wide, that is consistent with the new ODP will not require a public hearing going forward. Less to no public involvement in the future of their neighbourhood. No consideration of local context or livability. Fortunes made, neighbourhoods ruined.

This is the new world of one-size-fits-all zoning based on a limited choice of basic building form typologies.

Most development will be processed almost exclusively by unaccountable staff, exercising discretion, out of the public eye (and Council's), and with fewer written records. It is even staff discretion as to if there will be a development sign on the property so the surrounding community knows there is an application in process.

Such an approach provides opportunity for mistakes, favouritism, and even corruption.

5. Excessive Literal Implementation of Provincial Mandates

The City of Vancouver cannot solely blame the BC zoning bills for this one-size-fits-all approach; the Vancouver Plan already promoted this strategy. The City is now implementing the BC zoning bills very literally and even surpassing the minimum requirements of the legislation.

The City could instead be joining other municipalities in requesting a judicial review of the BC jurisdictional overreach, lack of due process or procedural fairness, lack of resources for infrastructure and amenities for the provincial mandates, and the impractical one-size-fits-all

approach throughout the province.

The City need not wait on the Province and could instead be taking the lead to properly plan with meaningful community involvement for the future of the city and defending the public interest now.

It is our understanding that the Province is having to be lenient with the previously imposed June 2026 deadline for OCP / ODP adoption so there is no need for Council to rush this through well in advance.

In conclusion, we urge the City to withdraw the Official Development Plan (ODP) and refer it back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic participatory planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future. The Vancouver Official Development Plan should have pervasive public participation that is reflected in this plan's final development, before adoption.

Signed: (In alphabetical order on two pages below)

- * Larry Beasley, CM, FCIP, Former Co-chief Planner of Vancouver, author Vancouverism
- * Lance Berelowitz, AA Dipl, RPP, MCIP, Principal, Urban Forum Associates
- * Patrick Condon, Professor Emeritus UBC School of Landscape and Architecture, author Broken City. Former head city planner.
- * Frank Ducote, Principal, Frank Ducote Urban Design, former Senior Urban Designer, City of Vancouver
- * Michael Geller, FCIP, RPP, MLAI, Ret Architect AIBC, urban planner, real estate consultant, developer and Adjunct Professor, SFU.
- * Barbara Gordon, Retired Architect AIBC and retired Director of Capital Planning, UBC
- * Penny Gurstein, PhD, MCIP (ret.) Professor Emeritus and Former Director, School of Community and Regional Planning, Co-Director, Housing Research Collaborative, UBC
- * Scot Hein, Retired Architect MAIBC/Formal COV and UBC Senior Urban Designer and Development Planner/Adjunct Professor Urban Design UBC/SFU Faculty Continuing Studies/Founding Board Member Urbanarium/Board Member Small Housing BC/Housing Advocate
- * Norman Hotson, Retired Architect AIBC, FRAIC, RCA, Hon PIBC
- * Sandy James, former City of Vancouver City Planner, Managing Director Walk Metro Vancouver
- * David Ley, OC, FRSC, PhD, Urban Geographer, Professor Emeritus UBC, author Housing Booms in Gateway Cities
- * Mike Mangan, Barrister & Solicitor (Ret.), who worked with the real estate industry for many years, authored The Condominium Manual and taught at UBC for 25 years.
- * Darlene Marzari, first a Social Planner at City of Vancouver, fought the Freeway to save Chinatown/Gastown/waterfront, City of Vancouver Councillor, BC Minister of Municipal Affairs, and established the Liveable Region Strategic Plan (1990)
- * Bill McCreery, former registered architect AIBC & AAA, helped create North & South False Creek & thousands of units of developer, public & social housing in BC, Alberta & UK, developed several Vancouver residential projects
- * Sean McEwen, Retired Architect AIBC, FRAIC. Affordable housing advocate
- * Graham McGarva, FRAIC, Retired Architect AIBC, M.A.
- * Elizabeth Murphy, private sector project manager, and senior property development officer, formerly with the City of Vancouver's housing and properties department, BC Housing and BC Buildings Corp
- * Brian Palmquist, Award winning architect and author, AIBC MRAIC BEP CP LEED AP

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Tom Phipps, Retired Senior Planner City of Vancouver (33 years) * Mary Pynenburg MRAIC (Retired) MCIP (Retired) Former Director of Planning City of New Westminster, Former Director of Planning and Development City of Kelowna, former Director of Design / Development CP Hotels * Robert Renger, BES, MCP; Consultant City Planner; Former Senior Development Planner and City's lead for UniverCity at SFU, City of Burnaby * Mary Beth Rondeau, Ret Architect AIBC Former Urban Designer City of Vancouver * Ralph Segal, MAIBC (ret.) Former Chief Urban Designer / Development Planner, City of Vancouver * Ray Spaxman, ARIBA (Rtd), MRTPI (Rtd,) FCIP, Hon AIBC, LL.D, Director of Planning, City of Vancouver 1973-1989 * Sara Stevens, PhD, Associate Professor UBC School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Chair of Urban Design, Co-founder of Architects Against Housing Alienation * Erick Villagomez, Lecturer UBC School of Community and Regional Planning, Principal, Mêtis Design Build, Editor-in-Chief, Spacing Vancouver * Army Wise, B. Comm., M.Sc., RPP, MCIP (ret), urban planner/ retired developer (President, Synergy Develop., VP Development, Goldfan Holdings), Board of Directors Toronto Economic Development Corporation (1990-1999) * David Wong, Architect, AIBC; formerly with Engineering & Planning Dept. City of Vancouver * Elvin Wyly, Urban Geographer, Housing Researcher * Andy Yan, FCIP, RPP, GISP Director, City Program, Lifelong Learning and Associate Professor of Professional Practice, Urban Studies Program, Simon Fraser University <p>*** END ***</p>			
2026-02-26	20:13	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The housing market is taking a serious downturn as we speak and it is likely that many proposed developments will not be completed. Let's put a moratorium on any new developments and focus on making sure that developments currently in progress are completed and that all units are either sold or rented out. Any unit can be sold or rented at the right price and if some developers go bankrupt, so be it. I would like the City to take advantage of such situations and buy properties at firesale prices and rent them out, or sell them to Non Profits to manage. In short: Don't proceed with the ODP. I'm pretty sure there are already enough projects in the pipeline to satisfy Provincial requirements and, if not, I'm sure the Province will be open to a reasonable compromise considering current market conditions. Thank you.</p>	Truus Kotwal	Kitsilano	

2026-02-27	08:18	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>There is still time for the City to publish (in the Vancouver Sun and other media) their biggest rezoning ever on March 10, 2026 for the Official Development Plan. Read the City Hall Watch article. The VSB and Park Board should also be involved and properly consulted prior to many projects. There are many problems with the city engagements process. Some projects are listed on Shape Your City website but many others are not . e.g changes to traffic, parking, bus routes and bus stops are not listed. The City send sometimes notification letters to small area . But many of these transportation changes affect many people who do not live in the immediate area.</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 5, 2026:</p> <p>Vancouver OPD is 199 pages</p> <p>Transportation Chapter starts at page 89/199 and goes for pages 90, 91, 92 Compared to other major cities in BC these 4 pages on Transportation provide very limited information. Most cities in BC have a current master Transportation Plan which is updated every five years. Vancouver 2040 transportation plan is very out of date completed in 2012. https://vancouver.ca/streets-transportation/transportation-2040.aspx (99 pages) Here are examples of similar reports in some other BC Cities https://www[.]victoria[.]ca/media/file/victoria-2050pdf-0 (243 pages) Mobility (Transportation is on 18 pages from pages 100 to 118 https://www[.]victoria[.]ca/media/file/dcap-transportationpdf (9 pages)</p> <p>https://apps[.]kelowna[.]ca/CityPage/Docs/PDFs/Bylaws/Official%20Community%20Plan%202040%20Bylaw%20No.%2012300/Official%20Community%20Plan%20Bylaw%20No.%2012300%20-%20Kelowna%202040.pdf (357 pages) https://www[.]kelowna[.]ca/our-community/planning-projects/2040-transportation-master-plan https://kelownapublishing[.]com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=36466 (126 pages)</p> <p>Surrey Draft: OCP https://www[.]surrey[.]ca/sites/default/files/media/documents/OfficialCommunityPlanDraft_Surrey2050.pdf (344 pages) Transportation chapter is 9 pages from 76 to 85</p>	Nathan Davidowicz	Oakridge	
2026-02-27	14:58	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Time to change this City Hall at the next election. This one doesn't seem to listen!	Meribeth Fleetham	West Point Grey	
2026-03-01	17:01	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Not enough public input. Poorly thought out. Supply numbers are heavily inflated.</p>	William O'Brien	Oakridge	
2026-03-01	20:07	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>TO: Mayor Ken Sim and Vancouver City Council RE: OPPOSITION to Generalized Land Use (GLU) Designations for the 3500 and 3600 Blocks of Trafalgar Street (West Side) DATE: March 1, 2026 FROM: Michael Cao s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am writing to formally record my opposition to the proposed "Residential Low-Rise" Generalized Land Use (GLU) designation for the west side of the 3500 and 3600 blocks of Trafalgar Street as currently mapped in the draft Official Development Plan (ODP).</p>	Michael Cao	Arbutus Ridge	Attachment 1

While I recognize the Provincial mandate to increase housing supply, the "one-size-fits-all" application of 6-to-8-storey density on this specific residential block is a technical and planning mismatch that ignores critical local constraints. I request that these blocks be re-designated as "Residential Multiplex" (up to 3 storeys) to ensure a safe and compatible transition for our neighborhood.

My opposition is based on the following grounds:

1. Critical Public Safety and Infrastructure Constraints (9m Street Width)

Trafalgar Street is an exceptionally narrow residential road, measuring only 9.0 meters in width. This is significantly below the standard width for streets intended to support high-density apartment blocks.

- Emergency Access: Standard fire truck access routes typically require a minimum clear width of 6.1 meters for two-way traffic and aerial operations. Assigning 6-to-8-storey density (Residential Low-Rise) to a 9m street—where on-street parking is active on both sides—creates a high risk for emergency service delivery and public safety.
- Traffic Load: A transition to a 3.0 FSR low-rise form would result in a massive increase in vehicle and service traffic that the narrow geometry of the 3500/3600 blocks cannot safely absorb.

2. Stark Planning Inconsistency and Contrast with Similar Streets

The "Residential Low-Rise" designation for these two blocks stands in stark contrast to the designations applied to other similar residential streets in the immediate vicinity.

- Neighbourhood Inconsistency: Neighboring residential blocks, such as those along Mackenzie Street and Valley Drive, which share almost identical topographical and character traits, have not been designated for low-rise redevelopment in the draft ODP.
- Arbitrary Zoning: This disparate treatment is arbitrary and inconsistent with the ODP's goal of creating predictable, city-wide planning standards. There is no technical justification provided as to why the 3500 and 3600 blocks of Trafalgar Street have been singled out for 8-storey density while surrounding blocks remain ground-oriented.

3. Conflict with Environmental and Climate Resilience Goals

The "Residential Low-Rise" designation permits 80–90% site coverage, which is incompatible with the existing ecological character of Trafalgar Street.

- Green Canopy Loss: These blocks contain significant mature tree canopies. Forcing high-density apartments onto these narrow lots would necessitate the removal of established trees, undermining the ODP's own target of achieving 30% tree canopy coverage citywide.
- Shadowing and Livability: Using the City's "Solar Access Guidelines," 6-to-8-storey buildings on the west side of Trafalgar would create a "wall effect," permanently shadowing the properties on the east side and destroying the internal residential block's character.

4. Lack of Neighborhood-Based Planning and Infrastructure Audit

The ODP currently lacks the corresponding capital investment plan for schools, parks, and utilities to support an influx of potentially thousands of new residents in this pocket.

- Infrastructure Gap: Our local sewer and water systems were designed for a low-density single-family context. No "Village-Specific Infrastructure Audit" has been provided to prove that the 3500/3600 blocks can support a move from 0.7 FSR to 3.0+ FSR.
- School Capacity: The ODP provides no budgetary certainty that the amenities needed for 81,000 new neighbors city-wide will be delivered concurrently with this up-zoning.

5. Recommended Action: Residential Multiplex Designation

I strongly recommend that the City simply remove the "Residential Low-Rise" designation from the 3500 and 3600 blocks of Trafalgar Street and replace it with the standard "Residential Multiplex" designation (up to 3 storeys). This "gentle density" alternative:

- Aligns perfectly with the Provincial "Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing" (SSMUH) mandates.
- Maintains a scale that is compatible with the 9m street width and the existing scale of the

				<p>residential block.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures fairness by aligning these blocks with the designations applied to the rest of the neighborhood interior. <p>Conclusion: Assigning "Residential Low-Rise" to the 3500 and 3600 blocks of Trafalgar Street is a failure of contextual planning that ignores the physical reality of our narrow street and creates an unfair planning inconsistency. I urge Council to amend the GLU Map to reflect a Residential Multiplex designation for these specific blocks before the ODP is finalized.</p> <p>Respectfully, Michael Cao and family</p>			
2026-03-01	20:29	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP).</p> <p>I would like to begin by recognizing the scale and importance of the work before Council. Establishing Vancouver’s first city-wide statutory Official Development Plan represents a significant milestone in the evolution of planning governance in Vancouver. The ODP responds to provincial legislative requirements, consolidates decades of policy direction, and seeks to provide greater clarity and predictability in how growth will occur over the coming decades.</p> <p>There is much within the ODP that deserves support. The integration of climate adaptation, ecological systems, reconciliation commitments, infrastructure planning, and long-term urban structure reflects an increasingly mature understanding of cities as interconnected social, environmental, and economic systems. The effort to move toward a clearer citywide framework is both understandable and, in many respects, necessary.</p> <p>However, I would like to respectfully draw Council’s attention to several issues that sit less within the Plan’s policy content and more within its institutional consequences.</p> <p>1. The ODP as a Governance Shift</p> <p>While presented primarily as a consolidation of the Vancouver Plan into statutory form, the ODP introduces a fundamental change in how land-use decisions will be made in Vancouver.</p> <p>Under current provincial legislation, rezonings deemed consistent with the ODP—particularly those involving residential development—may proceed without Public Hearings. As a result, adoption of the ODP effectively relocates much of Vancouver’s future land-use debate from individual project review to this single citywide decision.</p> <p>In practical terms, this Public Hearing is not only about adopting a plan. It is about determining the framework within which many future decisions will occur without further hearings.</p> <p>This places an unusually high responsibility on Council to ensure that the ODP’s structure, interpretation mechanisms, and implementation safeguards are sufficiently clear, transparent, and publicly understood.</p> <p>When decision-making authority shifts from individual project hearings to plan-level consistency determinations, maintaining democratic legitimacy depends increasingly on transparency, clarity of interpretation, and public confidence in how those determinations are made.</p>	Erick Villagomez	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2. The Central Role of Generalized Land Use (GLU)

The Generalized Land Use (GLU) designations appear to function as the operational core of the ODP.

Although the Plan correctly notes that GLU designations do not themselves create development entitlements, they will nevertheless serve as the primary test of consistency for future rezonings. In effect, they establish expectations regarding the scale and intensity of potential development across the city.

Given this role, clarity around how consistency will be interpreted becomes critically important.

I encourage Council to consider:

How determinations of ODP consistency will be communicated transparently to the public;

Whether additional reporting or explanation should accompany consistency determinations; and

How residents will meaningfully understand the implications of GLU designations affecting their neighbourhoods.

Predictability for applicants should be matched by predictability and comprehension for the public.

3. Capacity, Delivery, and Infrastructure Alignment

The ODP appropriately demonstrates sufficient housing capacity to meet anticipated provincial requirements. However, capacity alone does not guarantee delivery, affordability, or livability outcomes.

The Referral Report itself acknowledges significant infrastructure renewal pressures and fiscal constraints facing the City. As growth proceeds, alignment between land-use capacity and infrastructure delivery will become increasingly important to maintaining public confidence.

I encourage Council to ensure that implementation explicitly links growth expectations with transparent infrastructure, amenity, and servicing strategies over time.

4. Maintaining Public Trust During Transition

Vancouver is entering a transition from a historically discretionary planning system toward a more framework-based model of decision-making.

Such transitions can improve certainty and efficiency, but they also risk creating a perception — whether accurate or not — that opportunities for public participation are diminishing.

Maintaining trust during this transition will require ongoing transparency, clear communication, and visible opportunities for public understanding and engagement beyond statutory minimum requirements.

The success of the ODP will ultimately depend not only on its policies, but on whether residents feel that planning decisions remain understandable, accountable, and grounded in the public interest.

Closing

The Vancouver Official Development Plan represents an important step toward a more coherent long-term planning framework for the city. With thoughtful implementation and continued transparency, it has the potential to provide stability while supporting much-needed housing and climate resilience goals.

My comments are offered in the spirit of strengthening the Plan's legitimacy and long-term effectiveness as Vancouver navigates an evolving provincial and urban governance landscape.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Erick Villagomez

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-02	06:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>If the ODP is adopted, we will see more changes in Vancouver starting immediately and continue for the plan’s 30-year time window.</p> <p>One of the most consequential changes embedded in the ODP is procedural (the prohibition of most public hearings). A focus on more and more towers and large blocky buildings everywhere. Scrapping of community plans in favour of a “one size fits all” approach, citywide. 100,000 land parcels affected in Vancouver, is not in the public interest.</p> <p>Almost no one has been notified. The most consequential planning change in Vancouver’s history is being planned on the sly.</p> <p>Population projections are courtesy of real estate industry instead of official government numbers.</p> <p>There are no concrete plans or funding for added infrastructure like parks, community centres, or schools.</p> <p>Will there be more bailouts at taxpayers expense when developers miscalculate and get in over their heads?</p> <p>There would continue to be inadequate protections for renters, with affordable market rentals continuing to disappear in favour of small, expensive, unlivable boxes.</p> <p>There would be a focus on small expensive units largely beyond the reach of people on median incomes.</p> <p>Already there has been considerable land assembly as developers and speculators position themselves to take advantage of the ODP, and benefit from reduced oversight by the public and even by Vancouver City Council.</p> <p>If passed, the ODP will instantly and significantly reduce opportunities for residents to know about and have a say in how their neighbourhoods change. This dramatic change is premised on the Province’s presumption that the public has been adequately consulted in development of the ODP. They have NOT been adequately informed.</p> <p>Even with the inflated population projections up to 2050, the amount of development already approved in Vancouver or in the pipeline could be built out by 2034. This would suggest that no additional development actually needs to be approved beyond what is already in the pipeline, making the further development in the ODP a rash move, excessive, undemocratic, and unnecessary.</p> <p>While development industry lobbyists and “abundance” activists think it’s great, the provincial and municipal government have not been listening to other voices, like the 30 top professionals with “Housing Reset” (urbanists, planners, architects, and academics) who wrote Vancouver mayor and council calling for them to withdraw the ODP.</p> <p>The City’s planning staff rely heavily on jargon, hampering public understanding of what’s really at play.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the adoption of this ODP. It is undemocratic, and will change our city and neighbourhoods for the worse.</p>	Patrick Carruthers	Kitsilano	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-02	14:24	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the ODP, because it is heavy handed and will allow sweeping changes to Vancouver for generations to come, without having been through due process and meaningful public consultation. The city has NOT adequately informed residents or sought input to the ODP (100,000 land parcels affected, and yet almost no one has been notified). In addition, my principal concerns with the ODP are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scrapping of community plans in favour of one size fits all, across the city. The very character of Vancouver's distinct neighbourhoods will be destroyed. - Prohibition of public hearings for rezonings deemed consistent with the ODP GLU designations. - No concrete plans or funding for added infrastructure like parks, community centres or schools - Inadequate protections for renters 	Stephanie Binnington	Kitsilano	
2026-03-02	19:30	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I VEHEMENTLY oppose this ODP for the extremely compelling reasons explained here: https://cityhallwatch.wordpress.com/2026/02/25/housing-reset-open-letter-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/</p> <p>The letter at that link was written by 30 highly accomplished experts with extensive experience in planning and development in Vancouver.</p> <p>The red flags they discuss are exceptionally alarming and must be addressed before consigning this city to a flawed plan and process for decades to come.</p> <p>There is no rush - plenty of time before the provincial deadline for approval.</p> <p>So please listen to the experts, with their years and years of experience, and heed their advice to reconsider this ODP.</p>	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-03	07:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Vancouver is already the densest city in Vancouver and this proposed plan will make existing problems of traffic congestion (Vancouver is already 4th worst in North America) and lack of hospital and medical infrastructure necessary to maintain a healthy population worse. What we have seen is that council has no coherent and sensible plan to ensure balanced growth; random approvals are made for upzoning or rezoning and there is no formula to ensure adequate green space for citizens. In the past developers were expected to contribute to community amenities and now this has been dispensed with; so there are gluts of new, very dense buildings without the developers being asked to contribute towards sewer upgrades and other necessary elements. I believe there is a severe lack of forethought in this proposed plan. We already have a lot of empty storefronts in big buildings; making a neighborhood amenity on the ground floor of high rise buildings would enhance equitable services such as making a development application contingent upon providing space for a medical clinic serving older adults or a community meeting space. The tree canopy is being decimated by random high-rise development with zero thought about the negative impacts on existing residents. The homelessness strategy is inappropriate given that Vancouver taxpayers are expected to pay for homeless residents who were not born or raised in Vancouver; we attract them because we offer better services than other municipalities. I'm opposed to the homeless strategy because past examples of buying hotels to house these people have only created problems in the surrounding areas; human feces in stairs, drug dealers sitting outside the venues, large congregations of men drinking alcohol and smoking in locals parks making people feel unsafe, and increased broken windows and petty crime such as shoplifting. A better solution would be to have all municipalities be required to provide services in every city. This ODP plan is too broad and there is a lack of common sense and zero forethought in accommodating older adults. The city has 10 second crosswalk timings for 4 lanes on a busy street and that isn't long enough for anyone with a mobility issue to cross. Scrap this disjointed document that fails to address key elements to making this city worth living in and focus on metrics such as parks and green space per resident before you go dumping large number of new residents in communities lacking space in their community centre and where there are no medical clinics. Other municipalities have done better jobs by using city-owned space to create medical clinics in order to have complete neighborhoods; Vancouver needs to do this too.</p>	Susan Wilkinson	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-03	09:25	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am greatly opposed to this ODP for our beloved city. It is a lazy approach, throwing a blanket of development over the entire city, with total disregard to existing neighbourhood character, not to mention a total fail for our democratic rights or any say in how our city should evolve. Shame on all of you greedy, lazy people. There are thousands of units sitting empty in the city currently, and what's already approved and in the pipeline for development has us covered for a long time to come. You will be unhousing so many people of all ages and let the greed grow. Shame.</p>	Julia Ratzlaff	Kitsilano	
2026-03-03	13:58	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally express strong opposition to the City of Vancouver's proposed Official Development Plan (ODP). While I recognize the need for responsible, forward-looking planning, the current draft contains serious flaws that pose risks to the long-term livability, democratic oversight, and infrastructure sufficiency of our city. In particular, the experts highlighted by The Vancouver Sun warn that the ODP, as drafted, "threatens to *further remove the regulations by which councillors can make sure developers contribute the proper sewer systems, parks, schools and amenities necessary to serve a 'massive increase' in population.</p>	Brygida Cross	Kitsilano	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-03	15:30	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the ODP being recommended by Council on March 10th. This heavy handed, top down approach to future development of the City of Vancouver is based on erroneous population growth projections, does not respect the many distinct existing neighbourhoods that make our city thrive and prioritizes the interests of developers over citizens. There is also glaringly inadequate planning for parks, schools & other recreational facilities to support the additional population that is envisaged. Given the vast amounts of new housing already approved by City Council, much of it already threatening to radically alter existing communities, there is absolutely no reason at this time to proceed with further development plans as drastic & undemocratic as the proposed ODP.</p>	Lisa Tuer	West Point Grey	
2026-03-03	19:55	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Respectfully request that the Mayor Ken Sim and City Council reject the adoption of the Official Development Plan.</p> <p>Reason: Over Development that exacerbates the Affordability Crisis</p> <p>The largest needs are for housing that is affordable to average and low wage worker, particularly larger units for families (min 3-bedrooms). What is planned will not meet these needs.</p> <p>The ODP should address planning mechanisms to actually deliver housing that is economically accessible to mid and lower-income households in our City. Failure to provide adequate and affordable housing is already having significant and negative impacts across all sectors – health care, education and businesses - and the ODP will only serve to make the existing problems worse.</p> <p>The City is creating over supply of market development beyond what is required for realistic population growth and that does not meet the needs of people that live and work in Vancouver. The ODP in its current form will further exacerbate land inflation, speculation, and will lead to the demolition of even more, already existing, affordable housing than it would build, leading to even more displacement of Vancouverites.</p> <p>Please withdraw the Official Development Plan (ODP). The ODP as proposed will erode and destroy what makes Vancouver a livable city where all its citizens can thrive.</p> <p>Take the opportunity to truly prioritize planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a sustainable future. Please refer the ODP back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic participatory planning process.</p>	Ariadna Fernandez	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-03	21:31	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Hirise apartments are soulless additions to a city, they are a developers dream solution and an easy way out to increase "housing".</p> <p>Neighborhoods need people living nearer the ground, with opportunities to meet neighbours in the outdoor spaces and public amenities.</p> <p>Please do not approve this motion allowing more and more hirises that destroy neighborhoods and thus the soul of this city.</p>	Peter Saunderson	Kitsilano	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-03	23:24	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed designation of the west side of Trafalgar Street, directly across from my home at 3630 Trafalgar Street, as “low-rise” under the draft Official Development Plan (ODP) and the proposed General Land Use (GLU) map.</p> <p>Under the current zoning, the properties on the west side of Trafalgar Street are single-family homes. The proposed change to a low-rise designation would significantly increase the likelihood of redevelopment into multi-unit residential buildings. This represents a fundamental change to the character of our immediate streetscape and would have serious and lasting impacts on the residents who currently live here.</p> <p>First, Trafalgar Street at this location is extremely narrow—only approximately 8 metres wide. It was designed to serve a low-density, single-family residential neighbourhood. Introducing low-rise buildings along such a constrained corridor would inevitably increase traffic volumes, on-street parking pressure, service vehicle activity, and pedestrian congestion. The street simply does not have the physical capacity to safely accommodate the scale and intensity of development contemplated by the proposed designation.</p> <p>Second, the change would have significant impacts on privacy, light access, and overall livability. Multi-storey low-rise buildings directly facing existing single-family homes would result in overlook and loss of privacy for current residents. Increased building height and massing would reduce natural light and open sky views, fundamentally altering the residential experience for those of us who purchased homes in a single-family context.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed plan does not treat comparable nearby streets and blocks consistently. Other similar streets and neighbourhood segments in close proximity—featuring similar lot patterns, widths, and residential character—have not been designated as low-rise in the draft proposal. Our block appears to have been singled out without a clear planning rationale that distinguishes it from surrounding areas. This lack of consistency raises concerns about fairness and equitable treatment in the planning process.</p> <p>I respectfully request that Council reconsider the proposed low-rise designation for the west side of Trafalgar Street in this block and maintain its single-family status. Any land use change of this magnitude should be supported by clear infrastructure capacity analysis, consistent policy application across similar areas, and meaningful consideration of the impacts on existing residents.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Xuhao Shu	Kitsilano	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-03	23:36	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose enabling mid-rise forms (including “up to six storeys,” or similar) to extend west of Mackenzie Street beyond the existing commercial/CD-1 node at W 33rd and into the established low-density RS-1 residential blocks behind it.</p> <p>I am also concerned that, if the ODP is implemented primarily as a numeric entitlement (height and floor area) without strong design, transition, and interface requirements, the City’s ability to manage neighbourhood impacts will be weakened. In constrained locations like Mackenzie & W 33rd, clear guardrails are needed so increased permissions do not translate into lane-facing ramps, loading or servicing activity, and incompatible massing at the rear of RS-1 homes.</p> <p>The local street and lane network in this area is constrained, with narrow side streets and heavy reliance on curb parking. Allowing additional “village” intensity to creep west behind the node would predictably push parkade ramps, loading, garbage staging, and servicing access toward the residential lane and side streets. That would export ongoing safety conflicts, noise, lighting, and privacy impacts directly into backyards and the lane, which is not an appropriate outcome for this location.</p> <p>If the goal is to strengthen local retail and services, the City’s own material shows there is existing capacity within the current node, including vacant commercial space, and that tenant retention and expansion should be prioritized. Growth, if contemplated here, should be directed to under-utilized commercial sites and contained within the existing mixed-use/commercial footprint at the Mackenzie and W 33rd node rather than expanding into adjacent RS-1 blocks.</p> <p>At minimum, any redevelopment or added density must be contained within the existing commercial/CD-1 footprint at the node and must not extend west into RS-1 residential blocks. Vehicle access, loading, and servicing must not be taken from the residential lane west of Mackenzie. Parkade access and servicing must be on Mackenzie or Carnarvon, not facing the lane or adjacent homes.</p>	Henry Ma	Dunbar-Southlands	Attachment 1
2026-03-04	08:06	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Cannot believe the lack of forethought in this plan. Developers and real estate seem to want to determine the architecture of this city along with the ABC team. Disgusting	Carol Attenborrow	Fairview	
2026-03-04	09:43	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the ODP because it is fundamentally flawed. It effectively removes democratic oversight and the requirement to consult with neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The proposal goes against standards of good planning and good governance, and is not supported by a large number of experts in their fields who have personal experience with local planning issues.</p> <p>The OCD essentially gives a free hand to a development industry that has failed to regulate itself.</p> <p>The excessive building of housing for investment purposes at the expense of actual need is unethical and should not in any way be rewarded.</p> <p>This proposed ODP should be rejected.</p>	Peter Finch	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	14:15	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>1. I am only just now learning the details of this massive and unprecedented change to citywide zoning and process. I believe Planning Department staff have done everything they can to keep this on the down low in order to reduce public awareness and involvement.</p> <p>2. The idea that existing approved community plans will be replaced by this sweeping change to the entire city is a betrayal of promises the City has made over many years. It is undemocratic and promises to turn the whole city into a generic, unappealing, and mostly unaffordable dream for big developers. As one example, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan was approved by Council in 2016. Everyone was promised this would be a 30 year plan and City website information still commits to it being a plan that will last three decades. With one vote and next to no engagement with the public, the planning department is now proposing to Council that the entire thing be thrown out and replaced with what? Nobody knows. What a historic betrayal that would be.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the so-called Rupert and Renfrew Station Plan is charging ahead to decimate that east side community with next to no information for or involvement of the community there. When the City actually meaningfully engaged with citizens and neighborhoods, much of the current livability of the City was created. Those days are apparently long gone now.</p> <p>3. The plans from the current Planning Department seem to take no account of the changes in the market of the last year or two. Property sales are way down, expensive units are not being taken up, and population growth has noticeably slowed. Any city-wide plan should take account of current, real world economics and trends. The proposed city wide plan absolutely does not do this.</p> <p>Please vote against this proposal and send it back for meaningful engagement. Please listen carefully instead to the many experienced and qualified planners, academics, and former Ministers j (including past Vancouver Directors of Planning) in the Housing Reset group. Their positions are informed, reasonable, and cogent.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Blair Redlin	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-04	14:44	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed ODP for two main reasons. The barring of ongoing public input is a major problem. The second reason is the discarding of the existing neighbourhood community plans that were developed with the public.</p> <p>I agree Vancouver needs more housing, but this approach will result in more of what we have now: high rises with small units at high prices. This will not solve the problem. There are many vacancies throughout the City, because they do not meet the existing needs.</p> <p>And in closing, I will not vote for any candidate in October who supports this Plan.</p>	Mikal Shook	Grandview-Woodland	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	17:45	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to this plan for multiple reasons; I will mention four of them.</p> <p>1) The City's public engagement process feels like a joke. I never knew this was even happening until I read in the news a couple weeks ago that the public hearing was happening -- which is too late to engage with the process.</p> <p>2) this plan is setting the tone for the next 30 years and seems to completely overlook the fact that climate change will seriously and irreversibly alter our world over that timeframe. Where's the actual adaptation?</p> <p>3) There are places in the plan that point to real concerns, such as climate or housing affordability or the toxic drug supply — which the ODP erroneously refers to as an "overdose crisis" — yet the plan itself does not seem to really address these. The implementation section is where this plan really crashes and does not live up to the ideals stated near the beginning of the document.</p> <p>4) section 12 on hazardous lands and risk reduction is gobsmackingly bereft of any meaningful action to mitigate the risks mentioned. I realize there is a separate plan that gets into more specific details about climate, but even still, it seems that the best the City can do is "share information," which seems like a very low target to aim for.</p>	Rachel Penner	Downtown	
2026-03-04	18:23	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I am totally against this official development plan. Especially locking it in for 30 years. Also it is being done without the public being notified. I wish city council would let us know what they are doing. It is horrible what you are doing to our home	Samuel Mustone		
2026-03-04	18:48	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I oppose the plan as I believe it further limits community involvement in planning of neighborhoods.	Shannon De Vries	Kitsilano	
2026-03-04	19:04	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE 30 YEAR OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It is not in the best interest of our city of Vancouver , of its citizens or of sustainability. -It is undemocratic that after the decision, public input with be prohibited. -everyone i know does not want more high towers and blocky looking buildings everywhere --there are no community plans -the populations projections were done by Rennie Marketing as opposed to StatsCAN. very suspicious as its a "build and they will come approach " as Rennie stats are higher. -the plan lacks crucial for a liveable city with no infrastructure, parks, community centres or schools. Our schools and community centres are already over capacity. -it promotes mainly small but expensive units in the towers and does not help those who earn less -something is suspicious when it is not in the interest of the city of vancouver or we the citizens. it will increase land values and make affordability worse. as the pros said, its development on steroids. it ruins the quality of life in the city and ruins neighbourhods. -it can lead to mistakes, favouritism and even corruption (from letter from the pros, academics etc and professors who wrote to you) -city could be taking the lead to properly plan with meaningful community involvement for the future of vancouver and be supporting public interest. -it will do irreparable harm -the 30 year thing is against the community and community input -you are in city council and are supposed to be working for all citizens of the city, not just the most wealthy and the developers . make vancouver a liveable city , affordable and with sustainabilitiy. please remember that and do not pass this application. 	Rosanne Wozny	Riley Park	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	20:00	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	The methodology is completely flawed. Peer reviewed academic studies indicate that supply in Vancouver in recent decades has increased 20%+ faster than population growth yet lack of affordability in the housing market has only increased. Moreover, the growth projects for Metro Vancouver are greatly inflated like compared to Federal Government data. The ODP was crafted with the help of developers like Bob Rennie.	Conor Murphy	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-04	21:00	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor & Council I strongly reject and oppose the ODP as planned. My main reasons are that this ODP's approach is similar to many other supply side approaches used for at least the past decade. And the results of that approach have been abysmal on every single metric.</p> <p>If you want to keep having the same outcomes for the current and FUTURE generations of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unaffordable rents or purchase prices on a COST PER SQUARE FOOT BASIS. • Unwarranted land lifts that far outpace inflation • displaced residents • the perception of taxpayer funded tenant relocations, which in fact, lead to tenant displacement • a complete lack of democracy from the loss of input at public hearings and top-down provincial government-imposed requirements • throwing the baby out with the bathwater for all community build plans made thus far • upset electorate • a complete lack of infrastructure funding. (How long has it been since a school, pool, park or sewer/water mains {yes – part of Metro} have been built?) • large mismanagement and lack of value received for public assets given away as concessions for housing supply • opaque and secretive deals made with city assets • a lack of ground level/human scale homes despite the public wanting them (go look at your own surveys from 2015 – 2020) • cowardice to do what is right for the residents of Vancouver <p>then pass this ODP – as it ODP will bring these negative results.</p> <p>It will be a failure on these and many other metrics.</p> <p>I'm not sure how many times and in how many ways I can state this direction is completely wrong.</p>	Kathy Hochachka	Fairview	
2026-03-04	21:17	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The ODP undemocratically imposes types of housing throughout City neighbourhoods without demonstrating that there is sufficient land available to make infrastructure and essential amenities available to potential residents.</p> <p>Instead of a sweeping one-size-fits-all ODP , City planning should encourage and support all neighbourhoods to develop their own 5, 15 and 25y plans using guidance for projecting the realistic housing needs of diverse residents. World-class cities have characteristics that make them appealing to live in, and the ODP falls far short of doing that</p>	Barbara Shepherd	Kitsilano	

2026-03-04	21:42	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am horrified by the complete reversal of intent for the development of the City of Vancouver. Has everyone gone mad?</p> <p>Yes we need to plan for the future, but the lack of judgement is abominable. Building codes have been trashed, carefully nurtured Villages are now disdained, so-called housing is entirely unsuitable for middle income families. What are you all thinking? Already new "housing" construction has exceeded population growth by FOUR TIMES, yet there are approved projects to add thousands more "units". For whom? Newly built rentals are sitting empty, contractors/developers are getting sued, projects are being put on hold. Who in their right mind is going to invest in this mess?</p> <p>I am 76 and thank my deceased husband that I can afford to stay in my much too big house with its sublime garden.</p>	Wendy McGinn	West Point Grey	
2026-03-05	09:27	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Concerns re Vancouver's Official Community Plan March 10 2026</p> <p>I acknowledge all the work and effort that have gone into this document, but it contains some serious omissions. For example, I see no mention made of protecting unique or historic neighbourhood character in specific parts of the city apart from Shaughnessy, nor any mention of protecting view corridors going forward. These are two of the most important aspects of Vancouver which give it its unique charm and beauty.</p> <p>I have mentioned my concerns around the following items in the Draft Plan to City Council and Staff before, but do not see them adequately addressed or remediated in the current document. My specific concerns are as follows:</p> <p>Direction FG1.3: City Form: "Create equitable, resilient environments that have distinct identities..."</p> <p>FG1.3.4 "Mix of Buildings: Allow for a mix of building types and tenures on each block"</p> <p>FG1.3.6 "Form and Character: Shape the form and character of development through design guidelines that promote great placemaking..."</p> <p>There is a lack of effort in the current version of the Official Community Plan to preserve the distinctive character of individual neighbourhoods in the city, despite the goals expressed in FG1.3 above. There are heritage homes and streetscapes in neighbourhoods throughout Vancouver which give these quarters their distinctive charm and character, and yet I see no incentives or legislation to protect them. Putting up 6 storey boxy apartment buildings on many blocks will destroy the character of these special heritage streetscapes.</p> <p>I think there should be more exemptions than just First Shaughnessy to the current rezoning in order to protect special neighbourhoods as well as distinctive character or craftsman style homes which give Vancouver much of its unique charm. Some blocks in areas like Mount Pleasant, Kitsilano, Kerrisdale, Dunbar and a few others should receive such exemptions. Houses in these blocks could be incentivized for conversion to suites, or the design sensitive addition of infill, duplexes, triplexes, or quadplexes in keeping with the character of that street. Six story apartment buildings would on the other hand greatly detract from heritage streetscapes such as these.</p> <p>FG1.3.6 references shaping the "character of development through design guidelines that promote great placemaking". I am not aware of any design guidelines currently at play in shaping what gets built in this city, to its great detriment. I certainly feel that in heritage neighbourhoods there should be design guidelines which require new builds to fit in with current streetscapes and design, in order to maintain some semblance of unique neighbourhood character. The city needs to identify streetscapes of special heritage or character merit and work to preserve this character intact. Otherwise the look of our city will become increasingly generic and soulless, lacking a distinctive sense of either history or place.</p> <p>I will add here that I think it is too great a leap to suddenly be endorsing low rise (6-8 storey) apartment buildings in currently single family residential blocks. I am all for gently density and missing middle forms such as duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes and even rowhouses. The leap to six storey apartment buildings on most blocks throughout the city seems to be overreach and an unnecessary jump at this time for many neighbourhoods. This change will have strongly negatively impacts on many streets due to these buildings' height, bulkiness, and overshadowing.</p> <p>Direction 8.3 Heritage Stewardship:</p>	Hillary Reid	West Point Grey	

			<p>I think it is a great shame that the only way the concept of “Heritage Stewardship” is applied in this document is in relation to First Nations. This is a disservice to the heritage values of certain buildings and streetscapes throughout the city which as a result have no special protection against being destroyed and replaced by tiresomely generic streetscapes and boring monolithic structures. Much more vision is urgently required on the part of City Planning Staff and Council to rectify this omission in the current proposed Official Community Plan.</p> <p>Another glaring omission I see in the current Plan is there is no mention of retaining or protecting Vancouver’s view corridors. These are an asset that belong to all citizens, not just the few who can afford to live in expensive towers with sweeping views. Former City Planning Staff and Councillors carefully stewarded and protected these view corridors over many years. I consider it one of the great failings of the current City Staff and Council that many of these corridors have been removed from protection and from the public realm, and are rapidly being infilled and blocked.</p> <p>To prevent the further erosion of these unique views, I feel there should be a mandate in the Official Community Plan regarding their protection from here on as the city develops and densifies further. These views should be considered a public good, worthy of preservation to benefit all citizens. An example of one way this could be achieved is by not allowing highrises north of 4th Ave, as these would block the north shore views from arterial streets and nearby neighbourhoods. These views should remain a public good in the public domain.</p> <p>A final comment is on the concept articulated in the Plan of creating “People First” neighbourhoods. And yet I notice in the attendant street illustrations a preponderance of paved areas in lieu of green spaces and verges. As the city densifies, green and treed areas, however small such as roadside boulevards, will become increasingly important psychologically and environmentally. The goal of creating more green space whenever and wherever possible should be clearly emphasized in the Plan.</p> <p>In closing, I thank you in advance for your service on behalf of Vancouver citizens, and for giving serious consideration to the points I have raised, rather than just rubber stamping the current Draft Plan. We will be living with whatever is decided for a very long time, for better or worse. Let’s take the time to get it right from the outset.</p> <p>Thanks, Hilary Reid</p>			
2026-03-05	15:53	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Instead of just being negative I think that it is important to offer an alternate way to accommodate the growing population of Greater Vancouver in the future.</p> <p>Instead of displacing existing tenants and residents why not emphasize higher-density developments where no one is harmed? That is in the myriad of wasted open lands in the region, wasted land presently used for parking lots, land that has one-storey commercial buildings and land that could be reclaimed by building over existing railroad tracks and freeways (see attached proposal for housing over a freeway by Paul Rudolph.)</p> <p>Also, to stop the displacement of existing tenants and residents there should be an exploration of the idea of constructing new towns in nearby vacant lands such as on Bowen Island, in the mountains north of West and North Vancouver, and on wasted non-farm land in the Fraser Valley to Hope.</p> <p>After all, the existing extent of Greater Vancouver was established decades ago and has never increased even though the population has more than quadrupled.</p> <p>Besides, based on North American standards the City of Vancouver is already very dense.</p>	Robert Weber	Kitsilano	Attachment 1

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-05	16:00	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The ODP has arbitrary inconsistent zoning on Arbutus Street between 33rd and King Edward, particularly strata VR 452 (between Arbutus and Yew south of Nanton).</p> <p>VR 452 will be sandwiched between high density to the north at Arbutus Village and south of it; yet VR 452 has regular zoning. This parcel should be similarly zoned to higher density.</p> <p>Across the street are the Arbutus Village towers. The VR 452 parcel should be similarly zoned for high rise.</p> <p>It is ridiculous to have this kind of zoning gap in the middle of a commercial centre.</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 5, 2026:</p> <p>The village concept for 41st and Granville is poorly thought out. I oppose this plan.</p> <p>The housing north of 41st and west of Granville (aka new Shaughnessey) was intentionally protected back in the 1980s for its unique character. Because of the uniqueness of this character, there should be only limited extension of a village into this NW quadrant, particularly not as far north as 37th and not Avondale, Somerset and Connaught which have architecturally unique and classic homes. The village concept should be restricted to along 41st in the northwest quadrant.</p> <p>Instead, the village concept should be expanded south of 41st on Granville.</p>	George Hungerford	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-03-05	16:34	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my objection to Vancouver's proposed ODP. I agree with the statement sent to you by Housing Reset: "The ODP is based on the very flawed Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy that was approved in 2022 by the previous council without meaningful public participation. It continues to rely on the same flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good for the public interest."</p> <p>You have been pushing increased supply as the answer to the city's housing problems for decades. We have thousands and thousands of new housing units and massive new developments in the works, including Oakridge, Senákw, and Jericho Lands. Now you propose redeveloping the entire city without considering the current and upcoming supply. At the same time you propose to deprive the current residents of any voice in how their neighbourhoods will change. That Bob Rennie was a consultant on this proposal says it all: developers win, citizens lose.</p> <p>Reject this plan and push back against the provincial government's undemocratic interference like other municipalities have.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Caroline Adderson for Vancouver Vanishes (14 K followers)</p>	Caroline Adderson	Dunbar-Southlands	