

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Other

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-11	12:25	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Other	<p>Speaking notes on City of Vancouver Official Development Plan</p> <p>Good evening. My name is Françoise Raunet. I'm a Vancouver resident, a teacher and parent, and a vice-president of the Vancouver Elementary and Adult Educators' Society. First off, I want to acknowledge that, despite my concerns, there is much in the ODP that I support. As a resident of Victoria Fraserview, I appreciate that my neighbourhood was designated an "area in high need of resources". Having walkable services and real transit options would make a meaningful difference for families like mine. Right now, transit in the southeast is deeply inadequate—the 100 is packed, the 80 barely runs, and there's no connecting north south bus service past Victoria Drive. A walkable, transit connected neighbourhood is therefore something I would truly welcome.</p> <p>That being said, I'm here because I'm extremely concerned about the section of the ODP that would allow the Vancouver School Board the "flexibility it desires" to repurpose or dispose of school lands for non educational uses. I'm not asking you to scrap the entire plan—just amend this part.</p> <p>Public lands must remain in public hands. In a city where land is extraordinarily expensive, once we give it up, we will never be able to buy it back. That's why it is imperative that public land be used for public good. And that absolutely includes schools. I notice that amendments to the ODP explicitly require consultation with school boards, and only consideration of consultation with others.</p> <p>This concerns me. Unfortunately, the VSB does not have a strong track record when it comes to ensuring neighbourhood schools have space for students. Families across the city already struggle to get into their local schools, and added density will only make this worse. Despite 83,000 new homes projected in Vancouver over the next 10 years, the VSB is predicting declining enrolment.</p> <p>They voted to close Carleton Elementary—right in a Rapid Transit Area that will soon see thousands of new residents. Meanwhile, many families are sent far from home because their local schools are full. This does not inspire confidence in the Board's ability to predict space needs—or to determine which lands might be needed in the future.</p> <p>Another concern I have is that in the October 2025 ODP draft, housing was explicitly not allowed on existing school sites (except Britannia and King George). But in the January 2026 version, this language was changed to allow the VSB "to dispose of any school site" "if they deem it necessary". That is a dramatic shift, and it suggests pressure from VSB management—without consultation with teachers, staff, or parents.</p> <p>As a representative of the Vancouver Elementary and Adult Educators teachers' union, I can tell you that transparency and meaningful consultation at the VSB are ongoing problems. Decisions are often made without full information being shared with all interested parties. Hearing that the VSB wants to use school lands to "raise capital" raises huge red flags. Education land should not be treated like a revenue generating asset.</p> <p>Recent financial decisions also give me pause. The proposed 99 year lease of Fleming Elementary's basketball courts to a developer for only \$11 million is one example—it's an extraordinarily low return for the public. I doubt any taxpayers would feel like the public was getting a good deal at the rate of \$11 million dollars in exchange for 99 years of public land use. Fortunately, the deal collapsed, but the process was opaque.</p> <p>Searching public records has also revealed that the VSB has already applied for rezoning permits for a number of school sites. There is a rezoning application for a subdivision on the school field at Sexsmith Elementary, for example – two apartment towers and two townhouse clusters. They have also applied for a subdivision of the field of the recently-closed Carleton school. I have no way of knowing whether there are more of these development permits out there, since the VSB does not announce it when they apply for them.</p> <p>Furthermore, the VSB's community engagement processes are often described by</p>	Francoise Raunet	Victoria-Fraserview	Attachment 1

				<p>participants as performative. Reports labeled as “final drafts” are shown at meetings, only to have major additions appear later without consultation. Without a trustworthy, transparent process, the VSB cannot realistically assess long term community needs for school land. I worry that giving the VSB the ability to rezone school grounds for housing development whenever they feel like it will result in a lot of heartache down the road. We have already lost crucial public land before—like the Burrard Street site where the Wall Centre now stands. If we still owned that land, we could have relieved overcrowding at Elsie Roy, Crosstown, and Roberts today.</p> <p>Please amend the ODP to make sure that consultation is meaningful, with all interested parties involved and not just school boards alone. Ensure that Vancouver’s school lands remain dedicated to education and the public good. Once they’re gone, they’re gone forever.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			
2026-03-11	16:26	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Other	<p>It appears that the city failed to send mailout notices to the 100,000 properties in Vancouver citywide affected by the Official Development Plan If the ODP is approved by city council under the provincial housing legislation Bill 18 citizens will no longer be able to participate in public hearings or have any say in what happens in their neighbourhoods leaving it up to unelected city staff as to what can be approved and not approved, not necessarily council. There was only one draft OPD engagement released in October if the public was even aware of it. It was 204 pages in length with much of the language incomprehensible to the average person.</p> <p>The general public is largely unaware of the Vancouver Plan or ODP as the city provided very limited engagement to the public including a number of very conscripted online information sessions where participants were provided with little information. The city recently notified me about some road work that will be done in my neighborhood by mail but failed to provide my household with any information about the ODP although I could be affected. When I recently told my family doctor about the ODP she had never heard of it. The only reason I know about it is through the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods who keep their members informed, unlike the city it seems. In my opinion failing to notify the public is a complete dereliction of duty by city staff as Vancouverites have a right to know how the official development plan will impact their households and be able to have a say in whether or not this is something they support. It appears that the city has taken a very stealthy approach to its residents by failing to inform them of the massive changes that will happen to the city under the ODP and generally keeping them informed. It is my understanding that this failure to notify residents in other neighborhoods of changes underfoot has happened in other neighbourhoods as well. It is actions like these that make citizens lose faith in their politicians and wonder whose interests the politicians are serving, Considering the city’s poor efforts in keeping the public informed about the proposed ODP and Bill 18 it is strongly recommended that this plan be adjourned until the 100,000,00 properties impacted will be duly notified and given time to decide whether they want this plan or not or whether major changes are in order. This secretiveness at city hall may well turn out to be a major election issue in October.</p>	Barbara May	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-03-11	16:38	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Other	<p>Dear Mayor and Council</p> <p>Re: Please Restore the 100 Year Ecological Vision</p> <p>I was very pleased to see the 100 Year Ecological Vision (attached and at: https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/100-year-ecological-vision.pdf) in the Vancouver Plan. Nature is essential to people’s health and wellbeing as well as Vancouver’s economy. Not surprising, nature is very popular with around 95% support.</p> <p>As detailed below, I strongly encourage council to include the 100 Year Ecological Vision in the Official Development Plan.</p>	Richard Campbell	Kitsilano	Attachment 1

I was especially excited to see around 13 "potentially restored waterways" based on historical streams that have been buried in pipes.

Unfortunately, in the ODP, the 100 Year Ecological Vision has been replaced by an Ecological Network Vision (Map 7), which, as far as I can determine, only includes restoring 2 or 3 streams. This network mainly follows streets with blue-green features that likely won't include any surface water except when it rains.

Streams and Wetlands are Essential to Restoring Ecological Health
Without restoring streams, wetlands and other salmon habitat. As salmon is a keystone species, it is hard if not impossible for this approach to meet the Vision in the Ecology section of "Vancouver has reshaped its relationship to nature and restored its ecological health."

100 Year Vision Enables Transformation Improvements
The advantage of a 100 year (or longer) vision is that it enables transformational improvements. In the next century, almost all buildings, bridges, roads, utilities and other infrastructure will be replaced or rehabilitated at huge expense.

This means that we can essentially start with a blank slate creating the future we really want. Including restoring streams as this is enough time to restore the dramatically altered terrain and natural hydrology caused by urban development that staff points out as the barrier to restoring many streams today. Or even create new streams and wetlands that are appropriate for the current terrain.

Encouraging Large Assemblies to Reallocate Road Space to Nature and Parks
Key to restoring nature and streams in particular, is acquiring the land needed. This is the case for parks, greenways and other loved and needed community amenities. Around 35% of the land in most areas of the city, is occupied by street and alley right of ways. In some areas, such as near the ocean and large parks, it is almost 50%.

Encouraging and enabling large assemblies of land by the City, First Nations, developers and other organizations can allow the reorganization of the land to allow essential access while recovering much of this value land for nature and other priorities at a much lower cost to the City and the partner redeveloping the land. As people love streams, ponds, wetlands, forests and parks, this also increases the amount people will pay to live there. This can be used to fund non market housing to help ensure equity and other priorities including nature restoration.

Mitigating Flood Risk Should be Foundational
Also, in Map 23: Surface flood hazard areas (the last image below), not surprisingly, the Extreme Rainfall Overflow Paths often follow or are near historical streams. Of concern is that section 12. Hazardous Lands and Risk Reduction, which contains this map, was added late in the planning process. As this is critical for the safety of people and to avoid damage to homes, building and infrastructure, this should have been the foundation that the rest of the plan was built around.

Sincerely

Richard Campbell
[Redacted signature]