

**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
2026-07-08	17:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council,</p> <p>We are homeowners on a 33-foot lot within the boundary of the proposed Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village. We are writing to formally oppose the Villages Planning Program by-laws as currently drafted, and to ask Council to refer this proposal back to staff for further work before proceeding to enactment. Our concerns are outlined below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan: This program rezones roughly 13,000 parcels across the city through a single, area-wide process, without the kind of neighbourhood-specific planning that has historically accompanied major density changes (e.g., Cambie Corridor, Broadway Plan). Macdonald and 16th has its own traffic patterns, tree canopy, drainage, and community character that deserve dedicated study - not a template applied uniformly across 17 unrelated areas of the city.</li> <li>2. Failure to Distinguish High Streets from Quiet Residential Streets: The plan applies substantially similar low-rise zoning treatment to sites on arterial high streets and to sites on quiet, family-oriented interior streets several blocks away. These streets serve entirely different functions today - one commercial and transit-oriented, the other residential and pedestrian-scale - and should not be planned as though they are interchangeable.</li> <li>3. Infrastructure Capacity Has Not Been Assessed: We have seen no evidence that water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, or electrical capacity in this specific area has been evaluated against the added density this plan would permit. The Development Contribution Expectation policy referenced in the staff report is explicitly preliminary and does not convey certainty about infrastructure funding or sequencing. The Broadway Plan offers a cautionary precedent here too: its own Public Realm Plan targeted 25 acres of new public space over the life of that plan, yet only about 1% of that target had been delivered after more than three years. Rezoning capacity ahead of confirmed servicing and amenity capacity is the wrong order of operations.</li> <li>4. Local Schools Are Already at Capacity: Schools serving this catchment are already full. Adding hundreds of new units without a corresponding commitment from the Vancouver School Board or the Province to expand capacity will directly affect existing families, not just future residents.</li> <li>5. The Plan Disadvantages Owners on Standard 33-Foot Lots: The floor-space-ratio structure requires an assembled site of roughly 9,000–10,000 square feet - approximately three standard 33-foot lots, or two 50-foot lots - to reach the plan's headline six-storey density. On blocks like ours with a mix of 33-foot and 50-foot lots, this creates a structural inequity: a 50-foot lot owner can reach maximum density by pairing with just one neighbour, while a 33-foot lot owner needs two neighbours to agree simultaneously. Where a 33-foot lot is flanked by 50-foot lots that don't need to participate, that owner may be effectively excluded from ever assembling to the plan's full density, simply due to lot geometry. This is not a hypothetical: it will play out differently, lot by lot, on every mixed-frontage block in this Village.</li> <li>6. Prolonged Uncertainty Risks Neighbourhood Decline: Rezoning without a clear, financeable path for most individual owners creates a long "limbo" period. Owners uncertain whether they can assemble, whether their neighbours will sell, or whether the economics will ever pencil out for their specific lot may defer basic maintenance and reinvestment for years while they wait to see how the block resolves. Multiplied across a neighbourhood, this</li> </ol>	Sarah Applebaum	Arbutus Ridge	<a href="#">Appendix A</a>

risks a period of visible disrepair - the opposite of the livability this plan claims to protect.

7. The Affordability Mechanism Is an Admitted Experiment: The City's own staff report commits only to a city-wide review of the west-side inclusionary housing requirements in 2027 - after this by-law is expected to be in force - meaning Council is being asked to lock in a zoning framework for 50 to 100 years around a mechanism it has not yet validated.

8. The Assembly Threshold Favours Large Consolidators Over Individual Homeowners: Because meaningful density requires assembling three or more lots, this plan structurally favours well-capitalized developers and land consolidators who can negotiate and finance multi-owner assemblies - not the "missing middle" of small builders and individual homeowners the plan is marketed as enabling. A single-lot owner gains little practical benefit from this rezoning unless swept into a larger assembly on someone else's timeline.

9. The Broadway Plan Shows Pre-Zoning Doesn't Guarantee Timely Redevelopment: The Broadway Plan, a comparably sweeping area rezoning approved in 2022, illustrates the gap between entitlement and delivery. Per the City's own 2025 Implementation Update, of roughly 8,400 net-new homes approved since 2022, only about 10 units were under construction and 225 completed by the end of 2025 — combined, under 3% of all approved homes had moved past paperwork into actual construction or occupancy. The general low-rise/high-rise zoning districts for the area weren't even put in place until October 2025. Pre-zoning alone has not produced broad-based redevelopment on any predictable timeline, and the Villages Plan should not be assumed to perform differently.

10. Adding Density Capacity Now Is at Odds with Current Market Conditions: The Federal and Provincial governments recently announced a program to purchase and convert over 2,200 unsold, completed Metro Vancouver condo units into affordable housing, responding to a 76% year-over-year rise in unsold new condo inventory as of May 2026. Authorizing pre-zoned density across another 13,000 parcels city-wide, while public money is being used to absorb an existing oversupply, warrants a more cautious pace.

We ask Council to:

- Refer the by-laws as they apply to the Macdonald/16th Village back to staff for further work, rather than proceeding to adoption on July 14;
- Direct staff to complete a neighbourhood-specific water, sewer, stormwater, and school-capacity assessment for this Village before any future adoption;
- Direct staff to review and mitigate the disparate impact of the lot-assembly requirements on standard 33-foot lot owners on mixed-frontage blocks; and
- Require staff to report on realistic redevelopment timelines and market absorption capacity - informed by the Broadway Plan's own delivery record and current condo market conditions - before authorizing density at this scale.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Sarah Applebaum & Shawn O'Neill

**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
2026-07-08	17:10	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed Villages Plan rezoning for the Mackenzie Street and West 41st Avenue area.</p> <p>My family has lived in our home for more than 20 years. We chose this neighbourhood because it is a stable, family-oriented community, and we believe we should have the right to continue living in the home we have built our lives around.</p> <p>My biggest concern is affordability. Property taxes are already extremely high, and blanket upzoning will likely increase land values and create additional financial pressure on long-time homeowners. Many residents have no intention of selling or redeveloping our properties. It is not fair for homeowners to face increasing costs because of redevelopment potential that we neither asked for nor intend to use.</p> <p>I also do not support blanket rezoning that fundamentally changes the character of an established neighbourhood without considering the circumstances of individual properties. I respectfully ask Council to reject this proposal or pursue a more balanced approach that protects existing homeowners while addressing housing needs.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	Parry Fung	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-08	18:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Higher-density housing should be focused on major roads and transit corridors, not residential side streets. The City should also ensure schools, parks, roads, and other infrastructure can support increased density before approving these changes.</p>	Rose Brossard	Kitsilano	
2026-07-08	18:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I live next door to the 33rd &amp; Fraser "village".</p> <p>These plans are ridiculous and should not proceed. I do not know of one neighbour who will support this.</p>	Don Van Vliet	Riley Park	
2026-07-08	18:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Oppose	Yuzhu Zhao		
2026-07-08	18:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed rezoning under the Villages Planning Program, the City-initiated Rezoning, and the Vancouver Official Development Plan amendments.</p> <p>I have lived in this neighbourhood for 22 years. My primary concern is that my home and the surrounding area will become surrounded by larger-scale developments, fundamentally changing the residential environment that long-time residents have chosen to call home.</p> <p>One of the reasons my family chose to live here was because of its quiet, low-density character, established streetscape, and strong sense of community. These qualities have made this neighbourhood a wonderful place to live for decades. I am concerned that the proposed rezoning would permanently alter the character of the area, reduce privacy, increase traffic and development pressure, and diminish the quality of life that existing residents have enjoyed for many years.</p> <p>I understand that Vancouver needs more housing, but I do not believe that growth should come at the expense of established neighbourhoods and the people who have invested in them for decades. I respectfully ask the City to reconsider this proposal and seek housing solutions that better balance growth with the preservation of existing communities and their unique character.</p>	Jian Ji Guan	Kerrisdale	

**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
2026-07-08	19:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>What problem is this solving? We can no longer say that we need more retail and housing. It's as if someone made a ChatGPT prompt to create a more unliveable city. The retail around us is already struggling.</p> <p>We live on a narrow street with shallow lots and most households have four adult adults with multiple vehicle vehicles. Some people work overnight and need their vehicle vehicles. Please amend this plan to have Parking require requirements within the property. Not like laneway houses where people immediately convert the garage to storage or another bedroom.</p> <p>How are these areas chosen? My neighbour made a great analogy -- it looks like someone took a bingo dobber to our city map.</p> <p>This council was not elected with a mandate to create villages. Please work on strengthening the villages, and the retail environment that we already have and not destroy the character of existing streets that are already getting densified per the current zoning. Thank you.</p>	Laura Rosenthal	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-08	19:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I respectfully oppose the proposed rezoning under the Villages Planning Program.</p> <p>I have been a resident of this neighbourhood for 22 years, and during that time I have seen it grow while maintaining the peaceful residential character that makes it such a desirable place to live. This proposal would fundamentally change that character.</p> <p>My greatest concern is that existing homes will become surrounded by larger-scale developments, changing the scale and feel of the neighbourhood. The quiet streets, open space, privacy, and sense of community that residents have valued for many years could be permanently lost.</p> <p>The character of an established neighbourhood is not something that can be easily replaced once it is gone. Many long-term residents chose to build their lives here because of its stable, low-density environment. I believe these qualities deserve meaningful protection.</p> <p>I recognize the importance of creating more housing, but I encourage the City to pursue solutions that respect and preserve the character of existing neighbourhoods instead of dramatically transforming them. I respectfully ask that this rezoning proposal be reconsidered.</p>	Jiu Qin Cang	Kerrisdale	

**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
2026-07-08	20:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose this cookie-cutter "Villages" plan.</p> <p>We already have enough approved development in the pipeline to meet the needs until 2050. So STOP this foolhardy plan.</p> <p>We already have unique neighbourhoods, many of which need assistance to reduce the number of vacancies. not competition from so-called "villages".</p> <p>This blanket re-zoning will have drastic consequences to many local residents, who will find they no longer control what they do to their home. It will artificially inflate land values, as we've seen in other areas.</p> <p>Very little communication or dialogue has occurred with residents.</p> <p>Tree canopies will continue to be destroyed, as is happening already with the poorly thought-out "multiplex" zoning. We've ended up with huge, ugly structures that diminish liveability.</p> <p>It will be unlikely to produce any affordable housing.</p> <p>Pay attention to the Housing Reset Group, professional planners and architects with decades of experience. In fact fire your new City Planner and get someone with some imagination and the desire to work WITH residents, instead of TOP-DOWN.</p> <p>Those of you who vote for this, will NOT get my vote for re-election.</p>	Mary Simpson	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-08	20:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Village Plan because it increases density too quickly and does provide for needed additional neighbourhood amenities such as schools, community centers, pools and libraries, etc. There is a record surplus of unsold condos, townhomes and duplexes in Vancouver – we need to be thoughtful about where and how we add density (homes for people not investment vehicles) and we should not take a "blanket approach" across the City. Communities should be involved in community planning at multiple stages, and it should not come down to 1 single public hearing for a huge rezoning plan.</p>	Spencer Peters	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-08	20:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Subject: Please reject the proposed rezoning under the Villages Plan</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I'm writing as a Vancouver resident to oppose the proposed rezoning under the Villages Plan, which would allow six-storey buildings in established neighbourhoods across the city. These are quiet, established communities with mature trees and green space — exactly what this rezoning threatens.</p> <p>Vancouver has added tens of thousands of residents in recent years, but parkland hasn't kept pace: the city has about 1.8 hectares per 1,000 residents, less than half the national average of 4.4. Meanwhile, over 4,300 completed condos sit unsold across Metro Vancouver — the highest inventory in nearly 24 years. Rezoning established neighbourhoods won't fix affordability if thousands of new units are already vacant; it will just cost us green space and neighbourhood character for housing that may not be needed in these locations.</p> <p>Where is the plan to grow green space and infrastructure at the same pace as density? Without that evidence, this reads as density for its own sake.</p> <p>I'm asking Council to reject the rezoning proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nancy Treiber</p>	Nancy Treiber	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-08	21:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I am totally opposed to the entire villages plan. It will speed the destruction of residential neighborhoods just as the densification madness does. You have transformed west side streets in to one way alternating traffic on a permanent basis. The only green visible will be the weeds growing in the cracks in the concrete. I will actively work to defeat in October every council member of whatever party who supports this ridiculous proposal and fire the planners as well</p>	Donald Yule	Kerrisdale	

**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
2026-07-08	21:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am pro affordability and increased density, but I oppose this plan. This plan ignores the needs of existing retail areas. It encourages competition with existing retail areas, thereby harming neighbourhoods that are already struggling to remain vibrant and relevant. Also, and more importantly, this plan deprives the owners of any properties in the proposed areas to improve their homes in the way they want. It undermines their rights and ignores their needs. It is a top down plan and it ignores the time tested methods of community planning that have served this city so well in the past.	Timothy Gage	Kitsilano	
2026-07-08	22:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Artificially inflates land value hence increase of property tax for owners.</li> <li>2. 50' frontage minimum requirement affecting independent right of development for house with 33' frontage.</li> <li>3. Congestive parking on residential streets.</li> <li>4. Possible erase of right of redevelopment of property of 33' frontage.</li> </ol>	Simon Kwok	Dunbar-Southlands	

**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
2026-07-08	22:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Subject: Urgent Concerns Regarding Construction Developments and Neighborhood Impact – Residents of W 58th Ave and W 57th Ave</p> <p>To the City Planning Department / Building Inspector,</p> <p>We are writing to you today as a group of long-term residents who have called this neighborhood home for approximately 20 years. We are deeply invested in the character, history, and social fabric of our community. We are writing to express our grave concerns regarding the current development trends on our street, specifically the scale and impact of the new construction projects near 1593 W 58th Ave, 1581 W 58th Ave, 1587 W 58th Ave, 1550 W 57th Ave, and 1544 W 57th Ave.</p> <p>After careful observation, we believe these developments are deviating from established zoning standards and failing to respect the existing neighborhood context. Our primary concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1. Excessive Scale and "Reverse-Priority" Massing: We are alarmed to see that new laneway structures are being built with footprints and massing that, in several instances, exceed those of the primary residences. This creates a disproportional and intrusive visual experience that completely disrupts the established streetscape and aesthetic harmony of our community.</p> <p>2. Encroachment on Privacy: The scale and positioning of these structures have severely compromised the privacy of adjacent long-term properties. Residents who have enjoyed decades of quiet enjoyment in their homes now find themselves overlooked and overwhelmed by these oversized constructions, which were clearly not designed with the privacy of neighbors in mind.</p> <p>3. Erosion of Community Harmony: The aggressive nature and overwhelming size of these projects have caused significant distress and discord within our community. Instead of fostering growth, these developments have created unnecessary tension and animosity among neighbors. The fabric of our neighborhood is being strained by building practices that prioritize developer density over the well-being and quality of life of long-term residents.</p> <p>Our Request: We cordially invite a City Planning representative or Building Inspector to visit our street to observe the impacts of these construction activities firsthand. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the compliance of these projects with established zoning bylaws and to understand what measures the City will take to ensure that future development respects the character of our established neighborhood.</p> <p>We have attached photographic documentation of the sites for your review. We look forward to your prompt response and to arranging a site visit as soon as possible. Thank you for your time and your commitment to the well-being of our community.</p> <p>Sincerely, The Concerned Residents of W 58th Ave and W 57th Ave</p>	Aihua Wu	Marpole	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a> <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> <a href="#">Attachment 4</a> <a href="#">Attachment 5</a> <a href="#">Attachment 6</a> <a href="#">Attachment 7</a> <a href="#">Attachment 8</a> <a href="#">Attachment 9</a> <a href="#">Attachment 10</a> <a href="#">Attachment 11</a> <a href="#">Attachment 12</a>
2026-07-09	00:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan. Such large-scale planning will change the original appearance of the community, create numerous problems for community services, transportation, education, and more, and weaken residents' future opportunities to participate in individual arguments, harming their interests.	jinghua xie	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-09	00:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the one-time pre-zoning of approximately 13,000 parcels of land. Planning on such a large scale could significantly alter the existing character of our community and reduce residents' opportunities to participate in public hearings for individual development projects in the future.	Cindy Chen	Dunbar-Southlands	

**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
2026-07-09	05:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I urge Council not to approve the Village Planning Program. It is being rushed through without proper consultation from citizens of Vancouver. Its blanket rezoning and policies do not account for the unique characteristics of each neighbourhood, and ignores current commercial areas. Rather than rushing the approval of this, is it not better to focus on supporting and strengthening the neighbourhood commercial areas that already exist?	Bronwyn Smyth		
2026-07-09	06:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	i oppose the city continuing to rezone and destroy what was once the beautiful city of Vancouver, with space to have sunshine - with homes that had space to breathe, and without the communistic city hall and developers trying to destroy it all.	Pamela Swanson	West End	
2026-07-09	07:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Our family, in fact three generations, have been living in this neighbourhood for almost thirty years. While the choice to move here was by chance, we come to love the quietness, beautiful environment of tree lined streets, mixture of heritage and more modern houses and convenient access to buses and shops.</p> <p>We have seen changes in the area over the years with houses being replaced by different style of low rise residential blocks, some with commercial shops. I am open to these changes as time changes and a society needs to move with demand and supply.</p> <p>I am though against blanket rezoning approach. While previous changes had been gradual with consideration for infra structure and actual needs and approved on a case to case basis, your approach would force upon us to sell to developers who are eager to make a profit.</p> <p>It is our right, as owners, to stay in our own home on our own terms. If your plan is approved, property tax will go up and it will put additional burden on us retirees who are relying on our savings to survive.</p> <p>Hope we will be able to convince you not to proceed with your plan.</p>	Siu Mok	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	08:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We already have “Villages” in Vancouver that are not being supported and encouraged by this City Council. Areas such as Commercial Drive, West Tenth, Dunbar, South Granville are in need of support for small businesses, upgrades to community centres and parks. Enough of build, build ,build. Concentrate on community. Instead of spending millions to keep downtown Granville street open put OUR money to better use.	Elizabeth Raagner	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	08:44	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There is already to much development and density in Vancouver; the city can not sustain it all. Leave the old houses and buildings. Vancouver was so nice before and now it’s a mess.	Nancy Gould	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-09	09:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning to villages in neighborhoods would only destroy the quiet neighbourhoods. The images of beautiful Vancouver streets that we all love would not be the same with multistory buildings either retail shops interspersed throughout a block. The strain on our school enrollment, parking, access to community centre classes would be unfair to established residents. We did not purchase homes on streets knowing that this would happen. It would affect our property values, daily lives, relationships with neighbours and enjoyment of our homes. We are strongly opposed to this proposal and urge the council to take into account the voices of the people of Vancouver. This only benefits the developers not the people of Vancouver.	Debbie Lam	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

**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
2026-07-09	09:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The area is covered with beautiful old growth trees and gardens, the tree canopy is so important to this area Some increase in housing may be necessary but this program is over the top and NOT necessary We have a “village” within walking distance, 10 minutes at most There is very little infrastructure to support the increase in numbers, little to no transportation other than buses. ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to this “plan”	Louanne Aplas	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	10:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Plan for densification much too sweeping. Will negatively impact character of neighbourhoods. Negative impact to tree canopy. No rapid transit in area other than bus. Current roads not adequate for plan. Stop the insanity.	Mark Aplas	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	10:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am an opposition to this plan, along with past city planners and architects. We already have villages in the city, many of which are struggling, mostly due to unreasonably high business taxes based on potential density. For example, Kerrisdale Bootery in Kerrisdale has closed after 60 plus years due to rent increases in the last 2 years which make this business unsustainable. Let’s support these struggling “villages “that are already in existence, such as 10th Ave., South Granville, Kerrisdale. They are more than enough to sustain local neighbourhoods and keep traffic local.	Sharon Fenton	Marpole	

**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
2026-07-09	10:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>As a resident of City of Vancouver I am opposed to the Villages Plan as proposed, specifically the plans that pertain to the corridor of villages proposed along McDonald/McKenzie Street from 16th to 41st Avenue. I object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearby Dunbar and Point Grey ‘villages’ are already struggling and further competition from a newly created district would create further economic challenges for these areas.</li> <li>• The current retail and services in the proposed villages along this corridor are very unstable with only the occasional multi-national brand able to operate on a long-term basis (e.g., Starbucks, Subway). Windsor Meats at McKenzie and 33rd is closing down, and this area will once again be without a food store. Other tenants in this area are also extremely unlikely to return to the area if their buildings are redeveloped. So essentially the plan destroys what villages currently exist and will lead to the demise of local independent retailers and services.</li> <li>• The 33rd to 41st Ave area is already well served by Kerrisdale and Dunbar retail areas. They may exceed a 5-minute walk for some residents, but with various modes of micro-mobility and public transit available, they are easily accessible. It is not uncommon to see a senior walk to the grocery store and take an Uber or taxi home with groceries.</li> <li>• There is very low awareness and understanding among residents of affected areas of the proposed rezoning. Furthermore, the report, only recently released, is very complex for the average citizen, and holding the public hearing in the middle of summer is not conducive to full public participation.</li> </ul> <p>Rather than proceeding with the current proposal, I urge the Mayor and Council to pause the process to allow for additional public consultation to determine the best vision for each neighbourhood.</p>	Evi Mustel	Kerrisdale	

**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
2026-07-09	11:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I am writing as a resident of Fraserview community to express my deep concern regarding the proposed tower development under Villages Plan, City-Initiated Rezoning (ODP).</p> <p>While we understand the regional need for housing, this particular proposal directly conflicts with the safety and well-being of local residents- from young children to older adults. I/we object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The City’s proposal significantly increase strain and stress on the neighborhood. The intersection at Victoria drive and East 54th Ave is highly active with seniors throughout the day. Furthermore, students from David Oppenheimer Elementary and David Thompson Secondary School frequent local crosswalks in the morning and immediately after school. Introducing the heavy traffic and congestion of a high-rise tower to this specific location creates severe safety risks. Our priority should be reducing hazards within school zones, not adding to them.</p> <p>The Villages Plan, City- Initiated Rezoning is intended to be flexible and we should use that flexibility to protect children and communities in the area. We should leverage that flexibility to protect local children and families. Instead, the City’s referral plan adds undue stress to the current population and ultimately introduces far more disadvantages than benefits for the community.</p> <p>Nanaimo’s narrow roadway already restricts fire truck access. High population density will only worsen traffic congestion, severely delaying ambulances and fire trucks trying to reach residents in need. This hinders or delays emergency access due to increased congestion on an already narrow street. Ultimately, increased gridlock on an already narrow corridor poses a critical threat to timely emergency response.</p> <p>Population growth and urban densification will significantly elevate environmental noise exposure to the residents. Driven by increased road traffic and higher infrastructure demands, ambient noise frequently exceeds recommended World Health Organization ( WHO ) thresholds, compounding the public health burden. Road traffic, a by product of rezoning effort, can easily exceed 70 dB (A) near major corridors ( according to the National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health ) Furthermore, building infill, high-rises, and upgraded municipal infrastructure introduce prolonged, localized spikes in sound levels. Chronic exposure is linked to sleep disturbance, cardiovascular stress, and cognitive impairment – affecting not only children but al the frail and vulnerable members of our community.</p> <p>Given these critical public safety and health concerns, we strongly urge the city to reject this rezoning proposal and halt any future high-rise development in our community.</p>	EL L	Fairview	
2026-07-09	11:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Village Plan because it increases density too quickly and does not provide for needed additional neighbourhood amenities such as schools, community centers, pools and libraries, etc. There is a record surplus of unsold condos, townhomes and duplexes in Vancouver – we need to be thoughtful about where and how we add density (homes for people not investment vehicles) and we should not take a “blanket approach” across the City. Communities should be involved in community planning at multiple stages, and it should not come down to 1 single public hearing for a huge rezoning plan.</p>	Julius Lee	Hastings-Sunrise	

**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
2026-07-09	11:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the construction of high-rise and high-density residential developments within established neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Instead, the City should focus on planning high-density housing on industrial or other lower-cost lands that can be comprehensively redeveloped. This approach would allow water, sewer, stormwater, and electrical infrastructure to be designed and installed efficiently before new development begins.</p> <p>Building high-density housing in established neighbourhoods places significant pressure on existing infrastructure, including water supply, sanitary sewer, stormwater systems, and the electrical grid. Upgrading these systems in built-up communities requires extensive excavation and replacement of underground utilities, resulting in substantial costs that will ultimately be borne by taxpayers.</p> <p>I believe high-density growth should be directed to areas that can support it with proper long-term infrastructure planning, rather than overburdening existing residential neighbourhoods.</p>	Tong Zhang	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	11:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>The Villages proposal prioritizes ideology over practical planning. It encourages unnecessary retail, increased density, and neighbourhood disruption while failing to solve Vancouver's housing affordability challenges.</p>	Diego Salvador	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
2026-07-09	11:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Villages initiative. While I support thoughtful growth, the creation of new housing, and the need to accommodate a growing population, I am deeply concerned that the scale of development contemplated under the Villages Plan goes far beyond what is appropriate for many of Vancouver's established neighbourhoods. The breadth and intensity of the proposed changes represent an unprecedented level of densification that threatens to fundamentally alter the character, livability, and fabric of our communities.</p> <p>The proposal raises serious concerns regarding the capacity of existing infrastructure and services. Significant increases in population density will place additional pressure on schools, parks, community centres, healthcare services, utilities, parking, and transportation networks.</p> <p>The proposed building heights and widespread upzoning will negatively affect neighbourhood livability through increased shadowing, reduced privacy, loss of sunlight, and the gradual erosion of the human-scale character that has long defined these areas. Many residents chose to live in these neighbourhoods because of their unique qualities, mature tree canopy, heritage character, and strong sense of community. These qualities should not be sacrificed without careful consideration and meaningful public consultation.</p> <p>Furthermore, recent years of extensive upzoning and densification have done little to improve housing affordability for ordinary Vancouver residents. Despite substantial increases in development opportunities throughout the city, Vancouver remains one of the least affordable housing markets in Canada. The expectation that increasing density alone will solve the affordability crisis has yet to be demonstrated in practice.</p> <p>Many recently completed developments continue to be priced beyond the reach of average families, seniors, young professionals, and essential workers. Some projects have experienced slow sales, unsold inventory, delays, or cancellations due to weak demand at current market prices. These outcomes raise legitimate concerns about whether continual increases in density are achieving the affordability goals.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned that some neighbourhoods appear largely untouched by the proposed densification efforts while others are expected to absorb substantial change. For example, there appears to be little or no comparable densification proposed within Shaughnessy. This raises legitimate questions about fairness and the equitable distribution of growth across the city. If Vancouver is to accommodate additional population, all neighbourhoods should be expected to contribute rather than concentrating redevelopment pressures on a select few communities.</p> <p>Finally, I would remind Council that you were elected to represent and serve the residents of Vancouver. The stewardship of the city's neighbourhoods, zoning, and bylaws rests with Council. Residents expect their elected representatives to advocate for balanced, evidence-based planning that reflects the interests of the communities they serve.</p> <p>For these reasons, I ask Council to reject the Villages proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sandra Stuart Kitsilano</p>	Sandra Stuart	Kitsilano	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>

**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
2026-07-09	12:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>While I support the concept of creating more liveable &amp; walkable areas within Vancouver, I oppose the amount of density that is planned and the rezoning of residential neighbourhoods near the villages to the scope that is proposed.</p> <p>With the addition of the new Marpole Community Centre and the increased density proposed with the Village at Oak &amp; West 67th, the neighbourhood does not have the infrastructure to support the vast amount of traffic that will result. Traffic control, traffic lights, parking and signage will need to increase significantly in an already busy residential area. The traffic changes in the neighbourhood that were implemented over this past year have had a negative impact for residents in the neighbourhood. More restrictions would make it worse.</p> <p>Eight new duplexes have been built on the corner of Laurel &amp; West 64th. It has added up to 16 new residential units to this neighbourhood. Few residents park in their tiny garages and most residents park on the street. The number of cars parking on the street has increased significantly, roads are narrow, increased traffic is leading to many near-misses and accidents. Adding more density into this same area beyond what is already allowed will only serve to increase congestion and traffic in Marpole, not to mention impacts on school enrolment, social service requirements and other community needs.</p> <p>Densification and affordable housing is important. However, it must be balanced with the needs of the existing residents. Apartment complexes next to single family homes won't make the neighbourhood more appealing or enjoyable.</p>	Janey Smithvan	Marpole	
2026-07-09	12:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Village Plan because it increases density too quickly and does not provide for needed additional neighbourhood amenities such as schools, community centers, pools and libraries, etc. There is a record surplus of unsold condos, townhomes and duplexes in Vancouver – we need to be thoughtful about where and how we add density (homes for people not investment vehicles) and we should not take a “blanket approach” across the City. Communities should be involved in community planning at multiple stages, and it should not come down to 1 single public hearing for a huge rezoning plan.</p>	France Harvey	Grandview-Woodland	

**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
2026-07-09	12:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the construction of high-rise and high-density residential developments within established neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Instead, the City should focus on planning high-density housing on industrial or other lower-cost lands that can be comprehensively redeveloped. This approach would allow water, sewer, stormwater, and electrical infrastructure to be designed and installed efficiently before new development begins.</p> <p>Building high-density housing in established neighbourhoods places significant pressure on existing infrastructure, including water supply, sanitary sewer, stormwater systems, and the electrical grid. Upgrading these systems in built-up communities requires extensive excavation and replacement of underground utilities, resulting in substantial costs that will ultimately be borne by taxpayers.</p> <p>I believe high-density growth should be directed to areas that can support it with proper long-term infrastructure planning, rather than overburdening existing residential neighbourhoods.</p>	Zi Feng Xie	Shaughnessy	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-07-09	12:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>You are giving developers too much leeway. In general, the plan is a good idea. Keep the commercial areas on the MAIN streets with underground parking. Parking is a problem in residential areas, and more traffic is a danger to young children. And what about senior citizens like me, who want to stay in our homes? Are we going to be forced out? And there is no mention of co-op housing, which is also a good solution. You want to increase density, yet developers can pay their way to avoid building below market rentals. Once again people will be priced out of living here.</p>	Susan Cech	Marpole	

**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
2026-07-09	12:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>With respect to the "Villages" Plan, I would urge council to oppose this proposal. As many respected planners, architects, and urban scholars have articulated, this is another idea whose origin and interests are coming from the wrong direction. There are already existing villages within Vancouver, that have developed organically, some of which have struggling retail components, mostly due to affordability. It makes no sense to force more retail into and adjacent to existing neighbourhoods; it's not solving the housing problem, but rather creating a new problem by increasing the number of empty retail spaces. The proposed apartment buildings do not allow for mixed types of housing and are only serving developers' profit-making interests. The so-called Villages plan is an artificially imposed plan that has excluded citizens from the conversation about how to shape our city; the very people who live, work, recreate, socialize, and build relationships in their neighbourhoods. There is nothing democratic about city staff (not to mention the Province) having sole authority over the future of our neighbourhoods. The "urgency" to push this plan through is manufactured. That is not the pace by which neighbourhoods are built, sustained, or lived in. If there's any urgency, it is for affordable, mixed housing, and our efforts should be directed towards affordability first. If people can't afford to live in already established neighbourhoods, the existing retail will not survive, and no amount of new, fake "villages" will solve the problem. Increasingly we are witnessing less transparency, diminished-to-no consultation with citizens, and rushed agendas by this mayor and staff, largely driven by developers' interests. If we want neighbourhoods to be liveable and their inhabitants, services, and businesses to flourish, we must involve the citizens of this city in the conversation. This Villages plan does nothing to solve affordability, is disingenuously named, and fails to recognize the existing neighbourhoods that have been built over time, through citizen consultation, and relationships that have been genuinely established and nurtured. We need to take a step back, consider whose interests are being served in this proposal, and think very carefully about what we value and how that is expressed in the built environment. Thank you.</p>	natalie mackie	Strathcona	
2026-07-09	12:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I want to have my opposition to the Village Planning Program recorded. The report presented does not recognize the current economic times that challenge the existing local commercial areas to remain vibrant. New commercial spaces are generally too expensive for small local entrepreneurs and make way for the multinational franchises. This report needs much more community consultation. I am disappointed in the direction that staff took and understand that there are significant errors and misrepresentations. I urge the members of Council to reject this report.</p>	Colleen McGuinness	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-09	13:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>As the owner of homes in 2 of the villages, one for myself and immediate family of 5 and one for my extended family, I support most aspects of the Vancouver Villages plan EXCEPT the 6 storey height and enhanced site coverage proposed availability in residential areas. I chose both the Macdonald/ 16th and East 20th areas for their lively, walkable nature while maintaining a private space to come home to and unwind in. The proposed 6 storey height allowance and enhanced site coverage significantly compromise the solar access of surrounding lots, the privacy of surrounding lots, the outdoor noise levels and the general feel of the neighbourhood. It is too extreme to go from single family homes to 6 stories. 3 stories with a 4th storey setback floor would be acceptable and would both expand living space and suite options without drastically changing the dynamic of the neighbourhood. I am in favour of all other types and models of housing proposed in the villages plan.</p>	Andrea Backman	Kitsilano	

**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
2026-07-09	14:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I disagree with the concept of villages.</p> <p>This plan is all about density when there are vacancies throughout the city.</p> <p>Allowing developers to build anything anywhere in the village is wrong. Why leave the future of the city growth in the hands of the developers.</p> <p>Continue the current approval processes so each project is reviewed.</p> <p>Allowing 6 story apartments anywhere in the Village zone creates huge parking problems. A house with one car now could become a 6 story apartment with 12 units and 12 or more cars. Not enough schools for the numbers of people.</p> <p>On the west side the costs will still be very high so the affordability goal is not reached.</p> <p>Get rid of the entire plan.</p>	Michael Arbogast	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-09	14:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>To council: Please read the literature and recommend to city staff to modify or eliminate the Villages Program. Many others would have spoken already on this topic, and we have similar concerns.</p>	Wah Gee	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-09	14:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the city of Vancouver village plan for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Permanent long term taxpaying residents, in the proposed areas areas had limited opportunity to impact the proposed legislation. Whatever happened to taxation with representation for those living in the proposed areas. There were notices in the mail to the affected residents. They have no recourse. How sad is that. That said the city continues to accept their taxes while basic services in this city suffer. (roadway maintenance, policing roadway users and enforcing basic provincial motorist laws. Poor upkeep of community pools and recreation facilities is yet another reason the city of Vancouver should focus tax revenues on upkeep and maintenance of current infrastructure.</p> <p>2) Small to medium size retailers are already suffering from a lack of business and high taxes. It is not a good idea to add more commercial units in the ground floor of these proposed villages when current commercial operators are already suffering from a lack of business.</p> <p>3) The developers currently in the business of attempting to sell their condominium units are struggling enough without having yet more units added to the supply as per the village plan.</p> <p>4) Density for density's sake will never be the answer. Proper consultation with affected stakeholders within the community who understand their neighbourhoods is paramount. The city and provinces elected officials do not. It upsets me that our taxes have been used for such an initiative.</p> <p>5) Given that homeowners cannot cut a single tree down on their property without a permit the idea of giving developers carte blanche to remove trees for their developments is in contravention of the current bylaws.</p> <p>6) The villages plan is ill conceived and poorly thought out. It seems that both the municipal and provincial governments are very out of touch with the taxpayers of this city and the province in general.</p>	Patrick / Gayleen MacDonald / Wren	Mount Pleasant	

**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
2026-07-09	15:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Subject: July 14 Council Meeting</p> <p>Provide details: What the heck is going on in City Hall? The Villages plan needs to stop. No citizen wants this destruction of our city. No one bought properties here and spent their hard earned money for this developer take over. You are supposed to represent the people of Vancouver, not the developers.</p> <p>Density isn't working due to construction costs, corporate greed etc.; locals cannot afford to live here and no one's children can afford to live here. It's a horrible situation you've created where families cannot stay together due to a housing prices.</p> <p>This villages plan is marketing and won't translate to what you say it will achieve. Density needs to be localized only to the main streets and not throughout the neighborhoods of Vancouver. No citizen wants anything but a two story house next to theirs. 4th, broadway, 12th, 16th, 25th, 41, 49th etc and Granville, oak, Cambie etc. the developers must be limited to those already high density areas.</p> <p>You are taking away the demographic rights of the citizens of vancouver by removing public hearings. How is this possible in 2026?</p> <p>You must stop being controlled by developers and represent the citizens and voters of Vancouver. Stand up for Vancouver!!</p> <p>Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge</p>	Gina Macdonald	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
2026-07-09	16:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing as a resident living within the proposed boundary of the Mackenzie Street and West 33rd Avenue Village under the Villages Planning Program. I strongly oppose the current draft of the Villages Plan, particularly the significant increase in residential density proposed for our neighbourhood.</p> <p>While I understand and support the City’s overall goals of addressing the housing crisis and creating more complete communities, I am deeply concerned that the proposed upzoning to allow low-rise apartments and mixed-use buildings (up to 6 storeys) in this primarily low-density residential area will substantially degrade the quality of life and overall living experience for existing residents.</p> <p>My main concerns include:</p> <p>Loss of neighbourhood character and livability: Our area is characterized by quiet, family-oriented streets with single-family homes, mature trees, and a strong sense of community. Introducing significantly taller and denser buildings will fundamentally alter the scale and feel of the neighbourhood, leading to a loss of privacy, increased shadowing, and reduced sunlight for existing homes. In particular, the existing tree canopy that provides vital shade will be negatively impacted, making outdoor spaces less comfortable during warmer months.</p> <p>Increased pressure on local infrastructure and services: Higher density will bring more residents, cars, and daily activity without guaranteed corresponding improvements to roads, parking, schools, parks, and community facilities. This will likely result in greater congestion, strain on utilities, and competition for limited green space. My children’s sense of safety while playing in nearby parks will decrease due to higher pedestrian and vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Impact on daily living experience: The proposed changes will reduce the peaceful, low-density residential environment that attracted many of us to this neighbourhood. Increased noise, traffic, and construction disruption during redevelopment will negatively affect families, seniors, and long-time residents who value the current quiet and spacious setting.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration for existing homeowners: While the plan aims to add housing, it appears to prioritize new development over protecting the livability of current single-family homes. Many residents, including myself, chose this area specifically for its low-density character and are worried about long-term impacts on property enjoyment and community cohesion.</p> <p>I urge Council to reject or substantially revise the draft Villages Plan for the Mackenzie Street and West 33rd Avenue area. At minimum, I recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing the proposed building heights and density;</li> <li>Refining boundaries to better protect stable residential blocks;</li> <li>Providing stronger guarantees for infrastructure upgrades, tree canopy protection, and park safety before any rezoning proceeds.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for considering my feedback. I respectfully request that the voices of current residents who will be directly impacted be given full weight in your decision-making.</p> <p>Sincerely, Yansong Zang</p>	Yansong Zang	Dunbar-Southlands	

2026-07-09	16:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal to pre-zone approximately 13,000 properties at one time. Such large-scale rezoning could fundamentally alter the existing character of our neighborhoods and significantly reduce residents’ opportunities to participate in public hearings and provide input on individual development projects in the future.</p> <p>Vancouver’s residential communities each have their own unique identity and character, which should be preserved and respected. I urge the City to carefully consider the capacity and livability of these neighborhoods, including the impacts on infrastructure, traffic, parking, schools, public services, and overall quality of life, before proceeding with such a significant planning initiative.</p>	Lina Li	Kitsilano	
2026-07-09	16:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>We are very physically, emotionally and mentally attached to our homes and multicultural friendly neighbourhoods. The surrounding environment consists of many old aged trees that we wouldn’t want destroyed. Destroying trees will affect our air quality. We don’t want to move away from all nearby convenient amenities with our growing old age. We can not accept to adapt to these relocation changes. All of our jobs are located within 10kms and we are not in a situation to lose our careers, as gas prices are skyrocketing. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Anil Ram	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-09	16:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal to pre-zone approximately 13,000 properties at one time. Such large-scale rezoning could fundamentally alter the existing character of our neighborhoods and significantly reduce residents’ opportunities to participate in public hearings and provide input on individual development projects in the future.</p> <p>Vancouver’s residential communities each have their own unique identity and character, which should be preserved and respected. I urge the City to carefully consider the capacity and livability of these neighborhoods, including the impacts on infrastructure, traffic, parking, schools, public services, and overall quality of life, before proceeding with such a significant planning initiative.</p>	DWJUN WANG	Kitsilano	
2026-07-09	16:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I strongly do not agree with Village plans in my neighborhood. The area is already so congested with the buildings on 33rd and Victoria drive.</p>	Grace Kwok	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-09	16:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Villages plan.</p>	Dina Chies	Marpole	
2026-07-09	16:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	<p>To: Mayor Sim and Councillors Subject: Villages Planning Program, Public Hearing, July 14, 2026</p> <p>I Support well-planned housing growth and affordability.</p> <p>I Oppose the proposed Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments (the Villages Plan) in its current form because it lacks sufficient community planning, infrastructure commitments, and meaningful consultation. Many of the residents of the Mackenzie Street and 41st Avenue area who will be impacted by the Village Plan are unaware of such a plan. This was evidenced at a recent informal gathering of the neighbourhood residents to discuss the proposed plan. Many residents remain unaware of the full implications of the proposed changes for their own properties and neighbourhood.</p>	Sonia Abrahamian Chrysimilides	Kerrisdale	

I Request that Council defer approval until village-specific planning is completed. The request is not intended to oppose planning for additional housing and promoting communities. Rather it is based on concerns that Council has not yet provided residents with sufficient information, neighbourhood-specific analysis, or meaningful opportunity to understand and comment on the significant policy changes being proposed. The village planning program represents one of the most consequential city-wide planning initiatives in recent decades. It proposes amendments to the Vancouver Official Development Plan, city-initiated rezonings, and amendments to several municipal by-laws that will shape land use, redevelopment potential, neighbourhood character, and public infrastructure for generations. Such decisions require a planning process that is transparent, evidence-based, and founded on informed public participation.

MAJOR CONCERNS

Lack of Meaningful Community Consultation

- Homeowners, renters, seniors, local businesses and other affected community members have not been adequately involved in shaping the future of their neighbourhood.
- Consultation focused on broad concepts rather than meaningful co-design.

Insufficient transparency

- Community feedback has not been transparently reflected in the final proposal.
- Expected development timelines
- Anticipated building forms and heights
- Density levels proposed for neighborhood
- Redevelopment sequences
- Impacts on existing homes and businesses
- Financial impacts for taxpayers
- Implementation strategy/priorities

One-Size-Fits-All Planning

- Each village has unique history, character, businesses, transportation patterns, and infrastructure.
- Applying similar planning assumptions across all 17 villages ignores local conditions.
- Village-specific planning should precede zoning and development changes.

Infrastructure Not Keeping Pace

Current infrastructure is already under pressure.

Examples include:

- Schools
- Childcare
- Parks
- Community centres
- Libraries
- Utilities
- Sewers
- Water systems
- Roads
- Public transit
- Emergency services

Questions that remain unanswered:

- Who pays?
- When will upgrades occur?
- What guarantees exist before redevelopment proceeds?

Traffic and Parking Impacts

- Increased density will significantly increase local traffic.
- Existing neighbourhood streets already experience congestion.
- Visitor and customer parking is limited.
- Construction impacts on traffic, parking and walking is very disruptive to residents and businesses and may continue for years.

Threat to Local Businesses

- Small independent businesses face displacement.
- Higher land values and redevelopment pressure increase commercial rents.
- Construction disruption may permanently close long-standing businesses.
- Village character depends on diverse local businesses, not just new buildings with some retail space allocation.

Loss of Neighbourhood Character

Residents value:

- Heritage buildings
- Mature trees
- Walkable streets
- Human-scale development
- Public gathering spaces
- Safety
- Local; businesses
- Housing diversity that reflects neighborhood needs

Rapid redevelopment risks replacing these qualities with generic development.

Tree Canopy and Environmental Impacts

- Mature trees may be removed.
- Increased hard surfaces reduce climate resilience.
- Urban heat island effects may increase.
- Green infrastructure commitments remain unclear.

Affordable Housing Questions

Support additional housing, but ask:

- How much will actually be affordable?
- Affordable to whom?
- What percentage is below market?
- How many family-sized units?
- How many rental units are guaranteed long term?

Without binding affordability requirements, increased density may simply produce more expensive housing as we currently witness.

Development Speculation

- Property speculation may accelerate.
- Rising land values create pressure on existing homeowners and renters.
- Existing affordable rental housing may disappear through redevelopment.

Heritage Protection

- Many villages contain historically significant buildings.
- Redevelopment incentives may encourage demolition rather than preservation.
- Heritage protection should occur before increased development rights.

Public Facilities

Growth should be accompanied by commitments to:

- New parks

- Schools
  - Childcare
  - Recreation facilities
  - Public plazas
  - Community gathering spaces
- These commitments should be secured before significant redevelopment begins.

REQUESTS TO COUNCIL

Defer approval of the Villages Plan. Good planning depends on public confidence. Planning decisions are more durable when the residents believe the process has been fair, transparent, and evidence-based.

- Complete village-specific planning for each community.
- Conduct meaningful consultation with residents, businesses, and community organizations.
  
- Prepare infrastructure funding plans before approving additional density.
- Establish measurable affordability targets.
- Strengthen heritage protections.
- Protect existing local businesses.
- Increase tree protection requirements.
- Publish transportation and infrastructure impact studies.
- Phase growth according to infrastructure capacity.
- 

CLOSING STATEMENT

- I support thoughtful growth.
- I support more housing.
- I support complete, livable communities.
- I do not support planning that outpaces infrastructure, lacks village-specific analysis, or fails to reflect meaningful community input.
- Council should pause the current Villages Plan, address these deficiencies, and return with a plan that balances housing needs with the long-term health, identity, and livability of each proposed village

Sincerely  
  
Sonia Abrahamian Chrysomilides  
Kerrisdale, Vancouver, BC

Sarah Applebaum & Shawn O'Neill

Vancouver, BC

July 8, 2026

Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Council City of Vancouver 453 W 12th Ave, Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4 Sent via: council.vancouver.ca contact form / email

**Re: Opposition to the Villages Planning Program By-laws — Public Hearing, July 14, 2026 (Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village)**

Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council,

We are homeowners on a 33-foot lot within the boundary of the proposed Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village. We are writing to formally oppose the Villages Planning Program by-laws as currently drafted, and to ask Council to refer this proposal back to staff for further work before proceeding to enactment. Our concerns are outlined below.

**1. No Comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan** This program rezones roughly 13,000 parcels across the city through a single, area-wide process, without the kind of neighbourhood-specific planning that has historically accompanied major density changes (e.g., Cambie Corridor, Broadway Plan). Macdonald and 16th has its own traffic patterns, tree canopy, drainage, and community character that deserve dedicated study - not a template applied uniformly across 17 unrelated areas of the city.

**2. Failure to Distinguish High Streets from Quiet Residential Streets** The plan applies substantially similar low-rise zoning treatment to sites on arterial high streets and to sites on quiet, family-oriented interior streets several blocks away. These streets serve entirely different functions today - one commercial and transit-oriented, the other residential and pedestrian-scale - and should not be planned as though they are interchangeable.

**3. Infrastructure Capacity Has Not Been Assessed** We have seen no evidence that water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, or electrical capacity in this specific area has been evaluated against the added density this plan would permit. The Development Contribution Expectation policy referenced in the staff report is explicitly preliminary and does not convey certainty about infrastructure funding or sequencing. The Broadway Plan offers a cautionary precedent here too: its own Public Realm Plan targeted 25 acres of new public space over the life of that plan, yet only about 1% of that target had been delivered after more than three years. Rezoning capacity ahead of confirmed servicing and amenity capacity is the wrong order of operations.

**4. Local Schools Are Already at Capacity** Schools serving this catchment are already full. Adding hundreds of new units without a corresponding commitment from the Vancouver School Board or the Province to expand capacity will directly affect existing families, not just future residents.

**5. The Plan Disadvantages Owners on Standard 33-Foot Lots** The floor-space-ratio structure requires an assembled site of roughly 9,000–10,000 square feet - approximately three standard 33-foot lots, or two 50-foot lots - to reach the plan's headline six-storey density. On blocks like ours with a mix of 33-foot and 50-foot lots, this creates a structural inequity: a 50-foot lot owner can reach maximum density by pairing with just one neighbour, while a 33-foot lot owner needs two neighbours to agree simultaneously. Where a 33-foot lot is flanked by 50-foot lots that don't need to participate, that owner may be effectively excluded from ever assembling to the plan's full density, simply due to lot geometry. This is not a hypothetical: it will play out differently, lot by lot, on every mixed-frontage block in this Village.

**6. Prolonged Uncertainty Risks Neighbourhood Decline** Rezoning without a clear, financeable path for most individual owners creates a long "limbo" period. Owners uncertain whether they can assemble, whether their neighbours will sell, or whether the economics will ever pencil out for their specific lot may defer basic maintenance and reinvestment for years while they wait to see how the block resolves. Multiplied across a neighbourhood, this risks a period of visible disrepair - the opposite of the livability this plan claims to protect.

**7. The Affordability Mechanism Is an Admitted Experiment** The City's own staff report commits only to a city-wide review of the west-side inclusionary housing requirements in 2027 - after this by-law is expected to be in force - meaning Council is being asked to lock in a zoning framework for 50 to 100 years around a mechanism it has not yet validated.

**8. The Assembly Threshold Favours Large Consolidators Over Individual Homeowners** Because meaningful density requires assembling three or more lots, this plan structurally favours well-capitalized developers and land consolidators who can negotiate and finance multi-owner assemblies - not the "missing middle" of small builders and individual homeowners the plan is marketed as enabling. A single-lot owner gains little practical benefit from this rezoning unless swept into a larger assembly on someone else's timeline.

**9. The Broadway Plan Shows Pre-Zoning Doesn't Guarantee Timely Redevelopment** The Broadway Plan, a comparably sweeping area rezoning approved in 2022, illustrates the gap between entitlement and delivery. Per the City's own 2025 Implementation Update, of roughly 8,400 net-new homes approved since 2022, only about 10 units were under construction and 225 completed by the end of 2025 — combined, under 3% of all approved homes had moved past paperwork into actual construction or occupancy. The general low-rise/high-rise zoning districts for the area weren't even put in place until October 2025. Pre-zoning alone has not produced broad-based redevelopment on any predictable timeline, and the Villages Plan should not be assumed to perform differently.

**10. Adding Density Capacity Now Is at Odds with Current Market Conditions** The Federal and Provincial governments recently announced a program to purchase and convert over 2,200 unsold, completed Metro Vancouver condo units into affordable housing, responding to a 76% year-over-year rise in unsold new condo inventory as of May 2026. Authorizing pre-zoned density across another 13,000 parcels city-wide, while public money is being used to absorb an existing oversupply, warrants a more cautious pace.

**Requested Action** We ask Council to:

- Refer the by-laws as they apply to the Macdonald/16th Village back to staff for further work, rather than proceeding to adoption on July 14;
- Direct staff to complete a neighbourhood-specific water, sewer, stormwater, and school-capacity assessment for this Village before any future adoption;
- Direct staff to review and mitigate the disparate impact of the lot-assembly requirements on standard 33-foot lot owners on mixed-frontage blocks; and
- Require staff to report on realistic redevelopment timelines and market absorption capacity - informed by the Broadway Plan's own delivery record and current condo market conditions - before authorizing density at this scale.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Respectfully,

Sarah Applebaum & Shawn O'Neill

