

Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-22	08:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Why would council the blanket rezoning of the city. This council continues to benefit developers at the expense of residents. This up zoning will negatively impact neighbourhoods by displacing existing residents with no protections. These ‘villages’ will directly compete with existing shopping areas already struggling. Not allowing owners to make any changes to their property is tantamount to land appropriation for developers. Also no protections for heritage or character houses is further homogenizing our city.	Andrea Baxendale	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-22	08:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Public letter from UBC emeritus July 12, 2026 Subject: Serious Concerns with Vancouver’s Plan. Dear Mayor and Council, I write to challenge key elements of the Villages Plan. Combined with the Official Development Plan and Broadway Plan, the City envisions a fully built-out future that adds around 1.4 million people to our city of 670,000. This massive oversupply is promoted as the path to housing affordability. Yet there is no historical evidence to support this claim. Vancouver has tripled its housing stock since the 1960s – more than any other major North American centre city – yet our prices remain North America’s highest, not the lowest. If adding hundreds of thousands of units truly lowered prices, we would already see it. The market, driven by globe-wide speculative inflation has failed us. Our plans are feeding this speculative beast rather than taming it. True affordability requires mandating that new housing be affordable to average wage earners, primarily through non-market housing development. I urge you to revise these plans accordingly, deeply involving residents from every corner of the city, to arrive at sustainable, equitable, and affordable housing growth. Thank you, Yours truly, Professor Emeritus Patrick M. Condon University of British Columbia School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture	Beth Carroll		
2026-07-22	08:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please do not give unregulated control of Vancouver land to developers.	Beth Carroll		

2026-07-22	09:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver has an international reputation as being a great place to connect with local neighborhoods and raise families. This approach deprives the current established residents of input into the growth and development of their area.	Lori Caldwell	I do not live in Vancouver	
2026-07-22	11:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Supplementary Submission — Correct the Funding Claim and Exhaust Existing Corridors First Mayor Sim and Members of Council, Please append these additional points to my earlier submission opposing the Villages Plan. Stop repeating the unsupported \$30-million threat The claim that rejecting or substantially amending the Villages bylaws would automatically cost Vancouver \$30.2 million is not supported by CMHC’s published record. CMHC says Vancouver has already received its third instalment of \$30,204,083 and that the City is meeting its commitments. Future payments are conditional, but the public summary does not say that rejecting this exact bylaw package automatically forfeits an entire instalment. It also records that Vancouver previously replaced one Broadway Plan milestone with another after circumstances changed. The action plan is demonstrably capable of amendment. ☐ assets.cmhc-schl.gc.ca +2 Until CMHC provides a written ruling, “approve this plan or lose \$30 million” is political pressure, not an established contractual fact. Council should immediately obtain and publish CMHC’s answers to four questions: What precise amount would be withheld if the current bylaws were rejected? Could the Villages milestone be revised, divided, delayed or replaced? Could stronger non-market housing or infrastructure commitments be substituted? Would any consequence be proportional, rather than the loss of an entire payment? Do not let advocates convert a negotiable funding agreement into a ransom note. “Abundance” is a political theory, not proof The rhetoric being used to promote this plan closely follows the American “Abundance” movement: remove regulatory barriers, authorize more private construction and assume affordability will follow. That position is being actively disputed, not vindicated. The Roosevelt Institute concludes that the agenda focuses too narrowly on regulation while neglecting economic power, distribution and who captures the resulting benefits. Brookings warns that concentrating growth in already-booming places can mainly attract additional population and raise housing prices rather than meaningfully improve local employment rates. ☐ Roosevelt Institute +1 That does not prove every zoning reform is wrong. It proves that zoning deregulation is not a complete housing, employment or affordability policy. Vancouver should stop importing American political branding as though it were settled evidence. Test the proposal against Vancouver’s wages, jobs, construction costs, population forecasts, unsold inventory and existing development capacity. Do not make residents the test subjects for another market theory whose central omissions are already well documented. Stop using essential workers as sales props In 2018, the BC Nurses’ Union reported that 10 nurses had left BC Children’s Hospital because they could not afford to live in Metro Vancouver. ☐ Facebook +1 That was eight years ago. Since then, Vancouver has authorized and built substantial market housing, yet essential workers remain priced out. More units at prices nurses cannot afford do not house nurses. They merely allow proponents to use nurses, teachers, caregivers and retail workers as sympathetic mascots for developments aimed at wealthier buyers and tenants. Require every proponent invoking essential workers to publish the projected rents, sale prices and qualifying household incomes for the housing they are promoting. Let the arithmetic speak. Exhaust the arterials before invading interior streets	Lily Chu	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1 Attachment 2

			There remains extensive low-rise, detached and underdeveloped land along Vancouver’s existing commercial streets, transit routes and major corridors, including: Kingsway, Knight Street, Victoria Drive, Fraser Street, Main Street, Cambie Street, Oak Street, Granville Street, Arbutus Street, Dunbar Street, Broadway, Hastings Street, Commercial Drive, Nanaimo Street, Renfrew Street, Rupert Street, Boundary Road, Marine Drive, 4th Avenue, 12th Avenue, 16th Avenue, 33rd Avenue, 41st Avenue, 49th Avenue and 57th Avenue—plus station areas, existing shopping centres and remaining two-storey sites downtown. Conduct a parcel-by-parcel audit before rezoning interior residential blocks. Explain why those sites have not redeveloped. Is the obstacle actually zoning, or are construction costs, financing, land prices and weak market demand making projects unviable? If developers will not build on already-zoned arterials, why would granting them another 13,000 properties magically produce affordable homes? It appears less like solving a shortage than continually expanding the menu until developers find parcels capable of producing their preferred profit. Interior lots may be attractive precisely because they can avoid operating businesses, commercial leases, loading requirements, irregular arterial parcels and complicated assemblies. They provide thousands of potentially easier acquisition targets. That may benefit developers, but it is not a sound reason to abandon coherent corridor planning. The process is also self-defeating. The City expressly recognizes that added development rights produce “land lift,” and its own anti-speculation policy warns that speculation raises land costs and harms housing and job-space affordability. Rezone more land, increase owners’ price expectations, make acquisition more expensive, then hear that projects require still greater density, lower charges and public assistance to remain “viable.” ☒ Vancouver +1 That is not an affordability strategy. It is an escalation loop. Finish the multiplex review before scaling the experiment Council has already ordered an expedited review of its multiplex rules. The initiating motion reported more than 600 submitted projects and over 280 approvals, while acknowledging concerns about excessive massing, height, lot coverage, privacy, overlook, shadows, tree loss, green-space loss and views. ☒ Vancouver Council +2 That review is not complete. Residents can already see the emerging “sandwich” effect: isolated houses stranded between substantially larger buildings, awkward transitions and incoherent streetscapes. The Villages proposal risks reproducing that problem across hundreds of blocks. Experienced planning critics have specifically warned that scattershot redevelopment will leave neglected, unwanted and orphaned buildings between out-of-scale projects. ☒ Housing Reset Why would Council massively expand an approach while still trying to repair its first iteration? Complete the multiplex review first. Require transition standards, setbacks, privacy protection, cumulative shadow analysis, mature-tree retention and a binding no-orphaning test. Evaluate actual completed projects, affordability and neighbourhood effects before multiplying the same unresolved problems. Give Kensington Park’s public view formal protection Kensington Park’s outlook is not merely a private homeowner preference. The City’s own public-art registry describes Douglas Senft’s Gates at Kensington Park as a silhouette of the North Shore mountain skyline with the city’s buildings superimposed on it. The artwork was deliberately placed there because the view is part of the park’s civic identity. ☒ Covapp +1 Yet the City is contemplating surrounding height increases without first publishing cumulative three-dimensional modelling from the park and hillside. Why is one of East Vancouver’s finest open public vistas being treated as expendable development capacity? Does Council believe residents east of Ontario Street deserve only		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				utility—more units, more concrete and less beauty? East Vancouver is entitled to thoughtful architecture, sunlight, mature trees, openness and public views. It should not be the testing ground for cheaply designed, repetitive boxes that would never be tolerated around the city’s most politically protected landscapes. Commission a formal Kensington Park view study before changing surrounding heights. Model the full build-out, not one conveniently isolated project at a time. Show the public exactly what would remain visible and what would be permanently lost. Additional actions required before any vote Council should: Publish CMHC’s written ruling on the actual funding consequences of rejection, delay or amendment. Complete a parcel-level capacity and feasibility audit of every major arterial, commercial corridor, station area and downtown low-rise site. Adopt an arterials and established centres first sequencing policy. Finish the multiplex review and enact enforceable transition and no-orphaning standards. Establish formal view-impact analysis and cumulative three-dimensional modelling for Kensington Park. Publish the estimated land lift created by the Villages rezoning, its likely effect on acquisition prices and the share of that publicly created value the City would actually recover. Council should not sacrifice established neighbourhoods because a lobby group repeats an unsupported funding threat, an American movement supplies a fashionable slogan, or developers prefer easier sites away from the very corridors the City has spent decades designating for growth. Correct the record. Finish the corridors. Fix the multiplex experiment. Protect Kensington Park’s view. Reject the Villages Plan. Sincerely, Kensington-Cedar Cottage resident Attached, East Van "Village" development vs. Norwegian Prison			
2026-07-22	12:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My name is Anthony Clarke. I was speaker #92. I wish to add my in-person presentation notes to my earlier comments submitted on-line. My presentation was made in-person at the July 22 meeting of Council. Thank you. Anthony Clarke.	Anthony Clarke	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1
2026-07-22	12:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Need social housing not expensive rental units	Feli Belingon	Sunset	
2026-07-22	12:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Why are there more high rise luxury rentals when we can’t afford to live in Vancouver?	Robert Bader	Downtown	

Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-22	12:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	ridiculous idea that has clearly not been thought about. council member are elected by the public and needs to remember that is who they are there to serve.	kathleen salbuvik	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-22	12:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There has been inadequate public input leading up to the public hearing, and if passed future public input will be frustrated. It thus hands power over the future shape of our city to developers and unelected officials. Open houses were poorly advertised and thus sparsely attended. The phase 2 survey was non-representative, with only a tiny percentage of those living in the proposed village boundaries responding. Moreover, the phase 2 survey was biased. Respondents were not directly asked whether they supported or opposed any particular Village in its entirety or the plan as a whole. Instead, they were asked about the residential and retail area boundaries, thereby creating the presumption that each Village will necessarily be going ahead in some form. And in the summary report verbiage, positive and neutral responses were grouped together. Why? The “emerging directions” section of the survey asked anodyne questions like whether providing bus stop amenities and considering future opportunities for plaza would improve public spaces. Not exactly hard-hitting, probing questions designed to get people to consider the real pros and cons of the Villages Plan.	Robert Marsh	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-22	13:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have listened to most of the speakers and read many of the online comments. The overwhelming theme from supporters is the support for more housing and they all believe that the Villages Plan will do that. But there are absolutely NO REQUIREMENTS to make affordable housing in the current plan; just a 'hope' that they will be built. The other reason people support the plan is that it is nice to live in a neighbourhood with walkable amenities. While true, the Villages Plan offers no such reality. People don't go to shops because they shops are there, people go because the shops are good, meet their and offer reasonable prices. That's why we all DRIVE to Costco. Lastly, supporters of the plan continue to claim opponents are privileged folks who don't want change and want to keep people out of their westside neighbourhoods. That is a gross generalization and false assumption. No one can prevent anyone from living in those westside homes! The reason why the westside is out of reach is the land value. The Villages Plan does nothing to lower the land value to lower the cost of building on the westside. In fact, it will cost far more to build on the westside because developers have to pay more for that land. So there is no gain in affordability to build on the westside. We see that today when 400SF units are renting for over \$2000 on the westside. Having more of these units won't make them more affordable because the developers need to make their 15% profit. So the Villages Plan offers none of the 'pipe dream' requests of supporters. They are being fooled. And if councillors vote to support the plan, they are fools too.	Agnes Lee	Arbutus Ridge	

Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-22	13:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Here are my speaking notes from today's presentation	Christina DeMarco	West Point Grey	Attachment 1
2026-07-22	13:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There are other locations in the city where this type of multi-level housing is supported vs. rezoning residential areas. Hastings Street East to Burnaby is on an existing transit line and close to shops and schools; all main corridors should be developed as the infrastructure is already there. Multi-plex or multi-story builds in traditional residential neighbourhoods benefit the developers not the residents - parking is already a tough situation in these areas not to mention why knocking down solid homes for overpriced rentals or condos? As a Vancouverite I certainly don't want to see our neighbourhoods lose their charm and culture - downtown, main traffic thoroughfares and close to transit hubs are 1000% better for development. Let's keep some of our neighbourhoods for families who enjoy their yards and community. Our city should not be a "concrete jungle" everywhere - we do not need to do this to address the housing shortage - there are better locations and options. Support the citizens of Vancouver not just big business. Thank you.	Ita Leiva	Victoria-Fraserview	