Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am very concerned about the impact of sweeping changes to zoning in the Mountain View neighbourhood, named The Fraser & 33rd Avenue Village in the draft Villages Plan. Of particular concern is the potential rise in property tax for homes in the city-initiated rezoning areas as they run the risk of being assessed based on “highest and best use.” Additionally, ongoing individual neighbourhood consultation and approval is needed to maintain neighbourhood character. If a developer wants to fundamentally transform a local block, they must be legally forced to bring that project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing. There is no reason to rush the approval of the Villages Plan at this time.	Kiki Yee	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	12:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Not needed	Emily Ng	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	12:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts. I am in complete opposition of the Villages Plan as defined. We already HAVE villages …communities with amenities nearby such as restaurants, grocery stores, community centers parks etc. How about supporting the EXISTING community “main streets” where there are empty buildings and business have had to leave because of high rent costs? For one example, look at Arbutus between Broadway and 16th. So many businesses have been there and have left. How about supporting our existing main streets by making it more affordable for small business to exist. This feels like it’s more about developers yet again building high rise buildings in pre-selected areas, thereby continuing to destroy the character and neighborhoods of Vancouver. If you feel there needs yo be high rise buildings, go back to the Broadway plan and build them on our main arteries with amenities below. We don’t want to destroy our neighborhoods any more than they already are. How many of the city council members homes are in a proposed village?	Karen Racey	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	12:07	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 properties. Such large scale planning could significantly alter the existing character of our communities and reduce residents' opportunities to participate in public hearings for individual development projects in the future.	Wanhai Li	Marpole	
2026-07-13	12:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The "5-minute" criterion is ill-conceived and not well defined. There is a great difference between 5 minutes walking and 5 minutes riding or rolling, especially given the proliferation of electric bikes and scooters. Even in the unlikely event that the new commercial centres provided the same scale of choice at the same prices as other shopping areas, residents would still need, for the most part, to travel outside their village to go to work. But there aren't appropriate plans for proper transit or needed parking, and so this will result in negative neighbourhood and environmental impacts. Moreover, the potential for harming existing commercial areas nearby, and existing business within each "Village", has not been adequately considered.	Rob Marsh	Arbutus Ridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mayor and Council, I am very concerned about the impacts and process being undertaken for the neighbourhood villages rezoning proposal. While I support additional residential density and commercial zoning to support a growing population, it should not be at the expense of existing businesses and neighbourhood character areas. These villages have likely been chosen for development because they are already, for the most part, thriving and attractive neighbourhood hubs. However, their charm could very well disappear through the redevelopment of the surrounding low density neighborhoods. Many of these neighborhoods have character heritage buildings and beautiful mature tree canopies. All of this is at risk. Existing zoning allows for gentle density options that can accommodate many new units but not at the expense of existing building stock. Why not continue to incentivize this condition? I am also concerned with the addition of a significant amount of commercial space in these “villages”. How will new commercial businesses units thrive over the long development time framework? And what will be the impact on existing nearby commercial areas - many of which currently struggle with tenancies? I also believe that holding a public hearing on such an impactful and significant zoning application in mid summer is inappropriate. Many of those that will be impacted may not have an opportunity to have their voices heard. There will be no future opportunity to provide feedback on new development projects as a result of this blanket zoning. I urge Mayor and Council to reconsider this planning initiative and oppose adoption.	Karen Russell	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, As a resident of this neighbourhood, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed Villages Plan and Official Development Plan Amendment for the Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village. My family chose to live here because it is a quiet, safe, and low-density residential community. We value its peaceful atmosphere, strong sense of community, and family-friendly environment. I am deeply concerned that this proposal would fundamentally change the character of our neighbourhood and undermine the very qualities that attracted so many residents to call it home. While I understand the need for more housing in Vancouver, I do not believe this neighbourhood is an appropriate location for this level of redevelopment. My main concerns are: * Loss of neighbourhood character. This long-established residential community would be transformed into a much denser mixed-use area, permanently changing its identity and livability. * Traffic and public safety. With several schools, parks, and a seniors' care facility nearby, our streets are already busy. Increased density will bring more traffic, congestion, and greater safety risks for children, seniors, cyclists, and pedestrians. * Parking and infrastructure. Parking is already extremely limited, and local roads, schools, utilities, healthcare services, and community facilities were not designed to support a significant increase in population. * Limited public transit. This area relies primarily on local bus service rather than rapid transit. Without major transportation improvements, increased density will only worsen congestion. * Loss of privacy and quality of life. Higher-density development will reduce privacy, increase noise, and permanently change the peaceful residential environment that existing residents have invested in for many years. I support responsible growth, but it should occur where there is sufficient transit capacity and supporting infrastructure. Existing residential neighbourhoods should not bear the burden of significant redevelopment before these essential services are in place. I respectfully urge Council to reject this amendment, or at the very least delay approval until comprehensive studies on traffic, parking, infrastructure, school capacity, and community impacts have been completed and shared with the public. Residents should not have to lose the neighbourhood they intentionally chose in order to accommodate growth that could be better directed to areas with stronger transit and infrastructure. Thoughtful planning should strengthen communities—not erase them. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Gang Wang	Gang Wang	Arbutus Ridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, As a 16-year-old student who has grown up in this neighbourhood, I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposed Villages Plan and Official Development Plan Amendment. I understand that Vancouver needs more housing, but I don't believe every neighbourhood is the right place for higher-density development. My family chose to live here because it is quiet, safe, and family-oriented. This community has given me a place where I can walk, bike, volunteer, and spend time outdoors without worrying about heavy traffic or overcrowding. There are schools, parks, and a seniors' care home nearby. Our streets are already busy during school hours, and parking is often difficult. Adding more density without first improving transportation and infrastructure will increase congestion and make the neighbourhood less safe for children, students, seniors, and families. As young people, we care about more than just building more housing. We also care about preserving safe, welcoming communities where people can grow up, connect with their neighbours, and enjoy a good quality of life. I hope Council will carefully consider the long-term impact of this proposal and protect the character of the community that so many families are proud to call home. Thank you for listening to the voices of young residents. Sincerely, Cleavon	Cleavon Wang	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	12:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The proposed densities in villages vastly exceed compatible scales in the local context and compromise the livability of the neighbourhood. The new housing proposed in these plans will not address the affordability issue for new homeowners.	Karamit Gill	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The existing Vancouver neighborhoods have evolved organically to their current state parallel with the city's past neighborhood studies hxxps://faithwilson[.]com/vancouver-neighbourhoods// Within these areas, shopping streets grew organically overtime into the rich diversity they have become now. All this is a treasure to be preserved at all costs! So why is the current ABC council and mayor proposing to saturate the entire city with bizarre 'Villages' The city has approved an ODP which places all this into grave danger. The 'Villages' proposal has far reaching negative outcomes..... 1.'Villages' will establish new pre-approved residential development of eight storey (and possibly higher?) residential buildings within the Villages designation along with compulsory street level commercial at base.....no public hearings and no way to amend or appeal. So those unfortunately located in any of these rezoned areas will be stuck with that designation. Will they now be nonconforming? Are they trapped with no appeal? Can they sell? 2. As the change in use from single family residential to either up to eight storey residential with at base commercial will trigger increases in assessed property value, will that lead to higher taxes and new restrictions? 3. Villages' will be summarily plopped into established small scale 2- 3 storey neighbourhoods so from an urban design and social point of view will be highly disruptive! 4. There are tons of street commercial already located in the existing neighborhoods so why is the new ODP adding even more stores within the Villages when the existing retail is struggling to stay open. 5. With all of this this new density pre programmed into the ODP there is no thought given to infrastructure, new schools and community amenities that will become necessary 6. And keep in mind that the Villages will be established almost everywhere all at once in existing neighbourhoods within the City of Vancouver	Rick Sheppard	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	12:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Villages Plan and Official Development Plan Amendment for the Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village. Like many residents, my family chose this neighbourhood because of its quiet streets, low-density character, and peaceful living environment. We chose to build our lives here because it offered something increasingly rare in Vancouver—a safe, family-oriented community where children, seniors, and neighbours can enjoy a slower pace of life. This proposal would fundamentally change the community we intentionally chose to call home. While I understand the need for more housing, growth should not come at the cost of established neighbourhoods that already provide an exceptional quality of life. Our area already experiences heavy school traffic, limited parking, and has schools, parks, and a seniors' care home nearby. Increasing density without the necessary transportation and infrastructure will place even greater pressure on a community that is already busy. Once a neighbourhood loses its peaceful character, privacy, and sense of community, those qualities cannot simply be rebuilt. I respectfully urge Council to reject this proposal and preserve the unique character of this neighbourhood for the families who chose to live here and for future generations. Thank you for your consideration.	Derek Wang	Arbutus Ridge	

2026-07-13	12:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the Villages Plan. See attached letter of explanation.	HUGH KER	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix A
2026-07-13	12:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Do the vancouver city council members homes, are their homes in one of these proposed villages	George Hronopoulos	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	12:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose such a large-scale planning that pre-divides approximately 13,000 plots of land at once. This could alter the original appearance of the community and the transparency of its future development, obliterate the uniqueness and individuality needs of different communities, and directly affect residents' opportunities to learn and choose about changes to their rights and life plans, as well as their participation in community building.	Edward Lin	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-13	12:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Are the vancouver city council members homes in the proposed village plans? Stick to main boulevard like Dunbar and arbutus and west 41st and don't need you to destroy the neighborhood	Corina Hronopoulos	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	12:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I write to oppose the proposed re-zoning along Rupert, Renfrew, and Boundary streets, up for vote at the July 14, 2026, city council public hearing. I have resided very near to the proposed re-zoning for nearly a decade. In that time, I have seen extensive and wide-sweeping changes to the character of the neighbourhood. Its previous character of family homes and yards has been eroded for increased density: multiplexes, taller and wider homes, basement suites, laneway houses, and decreased (private) green space. Whether or not such changes are a public good, they have resulted in decreased livability for current residents. The proposal perpetuates this. As with the city's Villages Plan, the proposal continues to raise significant infrastructure and safety issues with no meaningful answer to how they will be addressed, never mind improved. An obvious issue is traffic and parking. Due to the number of residents currently, street parking is already challenging. This has adverse impacts on the mobility-challenged, the elderly, and those families who require parking close to or in front of their homes. The proposal will exacerbate the issue and has no strategy to address it. Similarly, traffic is already quite heavy along the relevant streets as a result of proximity to the PNE and the highway. This is particularly so for Renfrew street as recent developments at the PNE such as PWHL games and new amphitheatre events and the fair have created constant heavy traffic through what is fundamentally and historically a residential area. The mall at Renfrew and East 1st is already a traffic bottleneck and a dangerous intersection. Adding retail and increased density further along these routes will exacerbate the congestion, parking issues, and the increased reckless driving and safety concerns that result. The recently re-zoned sections of Nanaimo street parallel to the proposal provide a useful point of comparison. That area now sees extensive vehicular traffic bottlenecks at peak and event times, making travel in and out of that area challenging. This has also resulted in increased vehicular emissions in the middle of a residential neighbourhood, including near schools. That area has also seen increased garbage and litter due to increased density and increased visitors.	Shaun Ramdin	Hastings-Sunrise	

				The proposed re-zoning will repeat these same problems and amplify their effect on the neighbourhood. Finally, the manner in which the proposed re-zoning is proceeding is troubling. As I understand the history of it, the proposed re-zoning is by way of the ODP of March 2026. It is therefore only recently, and essentially, an expansion to the Village Plan adopted by council in 2024. What is proposed is essentially 4-6 story mixed-use buildings interrupting otherwise residential streets. In addition to being inconsistent with the character and tradition of the relevant neighbourhoods, it is unclear what substantial positive effect this is meant to achieve. It is difficult, for example, to see why re-zoning for a few more small-scale retail opportunities is needed or even desirable. Procedurally, the proposed re-zoning coming by way of addition to and so late after the 2024 Village plan seems to confirm the cynical approach of this municipal government to development. This is particularly so given the next municipal election is only a few months away and zoning (among other ABC mandates) will certainly be an issue. Certainly, given the above, it is unclear why such an amendment to the Village Plan is now required or appropriate. To be clear, pursuing increased housing is a laudable and important initiative. But it must be done and implemented in a thoughtful, measured way, including respecting the considerations of residents who chose to live in a particular area for its already-existing qualities. The proposed re-zoning flies in the face of this and should be voted against. Respectfully, Shaun Ramdin			
2026-07-13	12:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Are the city council homes located in the village plan proposal?	Chloe Hronopoulos	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	12:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have a multiplex directly across from me on 5138 Maple . All the trees have been stripped from the property snd there is no room for new planting to the extent there was previously . Due to the unsightliness of this building I oppose the Villages program . The narrow streets and water restrictions do not support this type of development . Vancouver is a beautiful city and it is being destroyed by overbuilding.	Jane Sproul	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	12:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Doubt city council homes are located in the proposed village plans	Jonathan Hronopoulos	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	12:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly opposes this application because even people educated in planning have concerns about its interpretation. It is a very complex and technical document that needs to be explained more clearly to the average citizen. Please do not move forward with the plan until the implications are clear.	Christine Rogers	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Villages Planning program. The City should engage with each neighbourhood in collaborative community planning. Support existing shopping areas in the established city neighbourhoods. Small, independent stores are struggling, and many are going out of business due to high taxes and uncontrolled rent. The proposed new commercial streets will be competing with existing shopping areas. Has Council assessed money-laundering and opaque-ownership risks? There are 30%+ discrepancies between what the public sees and what's going to Council—that's 167 blocks and 252 homes that apparently disappeared between the Village Plan on "ShapeYourCity" and the report Council will vote on after the Public Hearing. Explain. Listen to and follow the recommendations of HousingReset.ca, an experienced group of urbanists, planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics. Developers are not urban planners. Housing Reset's letter to Council was as follows: • Recommend that City Council vote "not supported" • Existing neighbourhood centres are the best place for local shopping areas, not new commercial in villages that would compete with them. • Blanket rezoning spread too thinly will produce blight. • The proposed densities in villages vastly exceed compatible scales in the local context. • The proposed additional density in villages is not needed to meet future growth to 2050. • Solutions that enhance neighbourhoods rather than undermining them are easily achievable. Regards Ingrid Bjerkelund Vancouver taxpayer	Ingrid Bjerkelund	West Point Grey	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	12:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am a Vancouver resident, and I oppose the Villages Plan and city-initiated rezoning in its current form. I support the need for more housing in Vancouver. However, I do not support approving broad, permanent increases in development capacity before the City has clearly identified and funded the public infrastructure needed to support that growth. Parks, schools, childcare, transit, community facilities, utilities, safe streets and green space should not be left to catch up later after the zoning has already been approved. I am also concerned that the Plan does not adequately protect mature trees, established gardens, permeable soil, urban habitat and neighbourhood-scale biodiversity. Replacing mature canopy and long-established green space with young replacement trees after redevelopment is not ecologically equivalent. Finally, I am not convinced that this rezoning will produce housing that ordinary Vancouver residents can afford unless stronger non-market, below-market and public-benefit requirements are attached before enactment. More development capacity is not the same thing as affordable housing. Please do not approve the Villages Plan in its current form. I ask Council to refer it back for more detailed neighbourhood-specific planning, funded infrastructure commitments, stronger environmental protections, and clearer affordability requirements. Sincerely, Angela Hoy	Angela Hoy	Riley Park	
2026-07-13	12:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The villages plan will be detrimental to our city and the neighborhoods which exist. Listen to people like Larry Beasley who has a very good understanding of how this will adversely affect the neighborhood which exist and do the opposite of what you say it will do.	Jane Gardiner	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	13:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The proposed planning process and rezoning for the 17 villages in the City of Vancouver has three missing ingredients: 1. A recognition of Vancouver's long-standing tradition of respecting and building on the existing character and scale of individual neighbourhoods while intensifying development 2. Engaging with citizens who live and work in a neighbourhood who have knowledge and expertise to contribute to the planning process 3. Allowing sufficient time and resources for design "from the ground up" instead of 'blanket rezoning' which will be imposed across the City	Judy Oberlander	West End	
2026-07-13	13:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please see the attached letter	Jillian Lusina	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	13:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Unplanned and doing density for the sake of density. Rather than have a detailed plan building a community we have a rushed plan that lacks foresight. Needs more research and data because the plan they presented is not adequate.	Jonathan Kennedy	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	13:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Oppose	Leanne Rousell	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	13:18	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly opposed to the “Villages” re-zoning plan. This plan: • Lacks community consultation – giving only 2 weeks in the summer for people to respond • Threatens well-functioning communities that are walkable and that support local businesses • Disregards existing densification plans that include back-fill houses and laneway houses, as well as larger multi-family homes • Is not supported by population growth predictions out to 2050 Further details are included in my attached letter explaining my views in more detail. I strongly encourage the City council to vote against approving this plan. Regards, Paul Lusina, Ph.D., P.Eng.	Paul Lusina	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	13:21	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 properties. Such large scale planning could significantly alter the existing character of our communities and reduce residents' opportunities to participate in public hearings for individual development projects in the future.	Wan Hai Li	Marpole	
2026-07-13	13:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the application of zoning the Kensington-Cedar Cottage neighbourhood into a multi-storey village.	Alysha Casaclang	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	13:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	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. Sincerely, Susan Russell	Susan Russell	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	13:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am a Vancouver resident, and I oppose the Villages Plan and city-initiated rezoning in its current form. I support the need for more housing in Vancouver. However, I do not support approving broad, permanent increases in development capacity before the City has clearly identified and funded the public infrastructure needed to support that growth. Parks, schools, childcare, transit, community facilities, utilities, safe streets and green space should not be left to catch up later after the zoning has already been approved. I am also concerned that the Plan does not adequately protect mature trees, established gardens, permeable soil, urban habitat and neighbourhood-scale biodiversity. Replacing mature canopy and long-established green space with young replacement trees after redevelopment is not ecologically equivalent. Finally, I am not convinced that this rezoning will produce housing that ordinary Vancouver residents can afford unless stronger non-market, below-market and public-benefit requirements are attached before enactment. More development capacity is not the same thing as affordable housing. Please do not approve the Villages Plan in its current form. I ask Council to refer it back for more detailed neighbourhood-specific planning, funded infrastructure commitments, stronger environmental protections, and clearer affordability requirements. Sincerely, Joseph K Kitsilano	Joseph Kalousek	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	13:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Look at those multiple units on the one standard land projects, which are not accepted by the majorities because increased families in one land made the streets having no parking spaces and too crowded every street. Now you starts wild imagination of the new projects of so called villages in the already packed major cities. Should you plan the new projects of 17 villages into the periphery areas instead of the small Vancouver city? We as the residents of Vancouver oppose the villige projects strongly!!!	Feitai Cheng	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-13	13:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Major disruption to the fabric of the city and a complete loss of Vancouver's cultural and community/neighbourly landscape in residential areas. Preserve SOMETHING. Be more inventive with your expansion. Do better.	Molly Mummery	Arbutus Ridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	13:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	re/ NEW HIGHER DENSITIES Please ease the transition between - high, - medium (step levels from 3- next to low-rise res. to 6 levels-next to main arterial road) , - low (2.5 levels) .... so roofs are angled (NO flat roofs) to let sunlight into neighbours' gardens especially for the winter months. re/ OLD INFRASTRUCTURE Such HIGH DENSITY everywhere will cause Extreme pressure on city infrastructure; - minor roads will have major traffic safety control issues - sewage and water lines extreme demands - electrical and data service lines will be exploding with use (esp. microwave towers) The costs will EXPLODE with such fast high new demands and existing systems will FAIL and be hard to meet repair and maintenance demands. re/ SUNLIGHT & VEGETATION Allow MORE sunlight esp. in winter months to hit lower buildings & yards. Increase areas beside buildings for trees, trees, trees (CLEAN AIR and SHADE) !	Pamela Taylor	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	13:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Shame on our elected city officials for proposing sweeping rezoning policies across Vancouver. We already live in neighbourhoods we love, neighbourhoods with character and personality. I don't want to live in a fabricated, cookie cutter community. The proposed villages and rezoning will silence citizens by eliminating most future public hearings and community consultations, I have concerns about inadequate infrastructure funding, tax hikes, displacement of our marginalized and vulnerable populations, and there is no historical evidence that the massive oversupply of housing will create affordability.	Carrie Pitman	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	13:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am uncomfortable with the ramifications of the 17 Villages proposal as currently defined. I strongly oppose the plan as presented. A phased approach with extensive (25%) community consultation is needed with communities who currently live in the proposed village areas before proceeding. Less than 1% public consultation for such a plan is insufficient. The Commercial Street and 20th area already has a unique character with a thriving family community with healthy mix of housing and services. Upscaling as the village plan proposes will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.	Teresa (Ann) Bradbury	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	13:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	How each councillor votes on the Village Plan will be noted and remembered for the next civic election	Paul Iverson	West Point Grey	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	13:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I will note how each member of Council votes on the proposed Villages Planning Program. I will not vote for any current Council member that supports the Villages Planning Program in any future City of Vancouver elections.	Theresa Iverson	West Point Grey	
2026-07-13	13:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter titled "Request to Remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan" containing 3 signatures.	Villages Planning Program	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix B
2026-07-13	13:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	See my post previously sent to council	Brian Palmquist	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	13:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Plan is overtly aggressive, as construction of a large apartment complex along 16th has just finished and has yet to be filled. Moreover, the plan completely neglects the additional support that local public facilities like schools, community centers, and parks would need. 6 story buildings further impose upon single family homes directly across the street like mine, which the current plan fails to acknowledge or address. Local businesses that I visit would face pressure from large brands and risk closure. Overall, would destroy the culture and environment of the neighborhood.	Jialing Zhang	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	13:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan because I believe it is fundamentally flawed and will have significant negative impacts on existing village neighbourhoods. While I strongly support the objectives of creating more walkable communities and expanding housing choices, the proposal to introduce 17 village developments simultaneously in what appear to be arbitrary locations lacks a clear planning rationale and fails to adequately consider the unique character, infrastructure capacity, and needs of existing neighbourhoods. A more thoughtful, evidence-based, and phased approach would better achieve these goals while preserving the qualities that make these communities desirable places to live.	Ana Domingos		
2026-07-13	13:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter titled "Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026," containing 42 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix C

2026-07-13	13:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	If you were proposing ideas for how to make something from nothing, there are some decent ones in the Villages Plan. But that is not the reality. The impacted neighbourhoods are not a blank slate. They are where people now live who were drawn to them for the characteristics that the Villages Plan will alter drastically. The trade-offs are a lousy deal: for the residents who don't want a monolithic six-storey building looming over their home; for the homeowners whose options on how they might improve their property are restricted; for the businesses in nearby established commercial areas whose prospects this plan does nothing to improve; for all of us whose quality of life is diminished when the big old trees come crashing down. The Villages plan is not wanted and not needed. Please do not approve it.	Sal Robinson	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	13:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter referencing the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan, " containing 9 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix D
2026-07-13	14:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "Villages Plan - Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance," containing 4 signatures.	Villages Planning Program	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix E
2026-07-13	14:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	To: Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council, I am strongly opposed to the “Villages” re-zoning plan. This plan: Lacks community consultation – giving only 2 weeks in the summer for people to respond Threatens well-functioning communities that are walkable and that support local businesses Disregards existing densification plans that include back-fill houses and laneway houses, as well as larger multi-family homes Is not supported by population growth predictions out to 2050 Further details are included in my attached letter explaining my views in more detail. I strongly encourage the City council to vote against approving this plan.	Paul Lusina		Attachment 1
2026-07-13	14:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the draft land use plan for the Mackenzie Street and West 33rd Avenue Village, as proposed under the City's Villages Planning Program. While I support the broader goal of adding housing choice across Vancouver, I have serious concerns about how this specific proposal would affect traffic and parking, building scale, and the character of this neighbourhood, and I am asking Council not to proceed with this rezoning as currently drafted.	Michael Wong	Kerrisdale	

1. Traffic and parking impacts

The draft plan would allow four- to six-storey mixed-use and residential buildings on lots that are currently occupied by low-density detached homes and duplexes. Concentrating this much new density at a single intersection will materially increase the number of vehicle trips, deliveries, and pedestrian/cyclist movements through Mackenzie Street and West 33rd Avenue, both of which are also relied on as neighbourhood routes.

● I have not seen a published traffic impact study specific to this Village that models expected trip generation at build-out, intersection level-of-service changes, or effects on nearby school routes and bus service.

● On-street parking is already constrained in the surrounding blocks. The draft directions do not clearly specify minimum parking requirements for the new C-2E and R3-4 development permitted here, and reduced or eliminated parking minimums risk pushing overflow parking onto adjacent residential streets.

● For these reasons, I ask Council not to proceed with this rezoning as currently proposed. The traffic and parking impacts on the surrounding streets have not been adequately addressed and should not be left to be resolved after the fact at the development permit stage.

2. Traffic is already worse because of nearby development

This proposal cannot be assessed in isolation. Residents have observed rising congestion on the streets that feed into this area, consistent with the wave of rezoning approvals and construction already underway nearby in Dunbar and Kerrisdale – including multiple secured-rental apartment buildings recently approved or under application on Dunbar Street, at the Dunbar bus loop area, and on Arbutus Street and Granville Street in Kerrisdale. Adding a new concentration of four- to six-storey buildings at Mackenzie Street and West 33rd Avenue on top of that existing, uncounted increase risks compounding a problem the City has not yet measured, let alone addressed.

● Given the pace of recent rezonings and construction in Dunbar and Kerrisdale, any traffic analysis for this Village should use current, up-to-date baseline traffic counts rather than older counts that may not reflect today's conditions.

● Most streets in the immediate neighbourhood are narrow, local residential streets designed for low-speed local access, not for the increased through-traffic and vehicle volumes this level of density would generate.

● The cumulative effect of several nearby Villages and other developments proceeding at the same time should be modelled together, not assessed for this intersection alone as though it exists in isolation from its surrounding neighbourhoods.

● The City has not shown that the surrounding road network has capacity to absorb this additional density on top of recent growth in Dunbar and Kerrisdale. For this reason, I ask Council not to proceed with this rezoning.

3. Height and density out of scale with the area

The draft land use map contemplates buildings of up to six storeys on sites that immediately abut single-family and low-rise homes. This represents a significant jump in scale for a neighbourhood that has no rapid transit connection and was not previously identified for this level of density outside the Cambie Corridor and Broadway Plan areas.

				● A six-storey building height should be reserved for sites that can truly support it – for example, larger corner assemblies fronting the retail high street – rather than applied broadly across the Village boundary. ● The transition in height and massing between new mid-rise buildings and adjacent lower-density homes needs to be addressed through stronger setback, stepback, and shadowing controls than what the draft directions currently describe. ● For these reasons, I ask Council not to proceed with the heights and densities proposed for interior residential lots. Any development here should be limited to a scale consistent with the immediate surroundings, such as townhouses and low-rise apartments, rather than up to six storeys. 4. Loss of neighbourhood character I am concerned about the cumulative effect this plan would have on the character of the neighbourhood as a whole. This area's appeal comes from its low-rise, tree-lined streetscape and the mix of established homes that give it a distinct, walkable, small-scale feel. Replacing much of that with four- to six-storey apartment buildings would fundamentally change the visual and social character of the neighbourhood, not just the buildings directly on the high street. ● The draft directions do not adequately explain how mature street trees, existing green canopy, and the current low-rise streetscape will be protected as larger buildings, deeper excavations, and wider driveways are introduced on residential lots. ● A neighbourhood's character is shaped by more than any single building – it is the cumulative effect of scale, setbacks, greenery, and the relationship between homes and the street. I ask that this cumulative effect be studied and addressed directly, rather than assessed lot by lot. ● For these reasons, I ask Council not to proceed with this proposal in its current form. The neighbourhood's tree canopy, streetscape, and low-rise character should be protected, not treated as secondary to density targets. Thank you for considering these concerns. I support thoughtful growth in Vancouver, but this proposal is not appropriate for this area as currently drafted, given its impact on traffic and parking, building scale, and neighbourhood character. I ask Council not to proceed with this rezoning.		
2026-07-13	14:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have lived at [redacted] for 20 years. Why does the City feel it is necessary to re-zone "every where" to some how destroy the single family dwelling hood? I understand why West 41st should be zoned to allow for greater density due to location to transportation. But why "dig" deep into the adjoining single family hoods? I bought there to live in an area that should be preserved as single family with some in fill. We now have a 5% vacancy rate with empty rental dwellings. What is the urgency and push to up densify single family neighbourhoods? My perception is the City only listens to developers - and doesn't listen to people who actually live in the hoods and pay the taxes. Densifying the MacKenzie village is far to large and far to expansive. Just keep it to West 41st where there is existing commercial and transportation routes. The village concept is too big, too broad and too comprehensive and ignores those who want to live in a single family hood (with some in fill). Shelve this unnecessary up densification. Not in the City's best interests to "destroy" the concept of a single family hood.	Lorne Folick	Kerrisdale	

2026-07-13	14:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages plan for Nanaimo/Broadway has a lot of positive components and ideas. We support new buildings and amenities along Nanaimo street and fully agree with the "5 minute walk to amenities" concept. However we cannot have the neighbourhood destroyed by 6 story/high density buildings littered throughout quiet, residential streets. The densification is already happening via duplexes, tri-plexes, and laneway houses. That should be sufficient. We picked this neighbourhood in which to live because we supported this moderate and thoughtful densification plan. Neighbourhoods are meant to be family friendly...not cluttered with a hodge podge of 6 story buildings. There is also a rumour that property taxes in the future may be based on what "could" be built on a given plot of land (rather than what is actually built on it). I hope that is not true as that would have class action lawsuit written all over it. Let's keep the 3 to 20 story buildings on the main arteries and not in the residential streets.	Lance Fridfinnson	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-13	14:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am writing to formally support the arguments presented by UBC Professor Emeritus Patrick Condon in his public submission, “Subject: Serious Concerns with Vancouver's Villages Plan”. I strongly echo his warning that the City's current zoning frameworks are "feeding this speculative beast rather than taming it". Our city planners continue to operate on simplified, traditional supply-and-demand metrics. However, a major structural blind spot compromises our local planning: Canada suffers from a complete absence of empirical economic research on housing financialization. Unlike peer jurisdictions like Australia—where the public can access advanced macroeconomic modeling such as academic papers detailing the role of spillovers in the Australian housing crisis—Canadian cities are forced to draft generational zoning strategies completely in the dark. To bridge this data deficit, I have analyzed our regional market dynamics and compiled the localized visual graphs in this document at this location.. This is a blatant copy of respected Australian research that was credited for shutting down the fallacy that supply alone is enough (and in your case that theoretical unrealized supply alone is enough). It is a blatant deep copy and all it needs is seasonally adjusted hpi data.: This chart below for example is critical to assess correctly: Do you see a K with the vertical line of the K being pink: This is the stress test and the mouth of the K is investor going up with stock market (2022 dx dy increase) and the bottom lip are the local buyers supporting our lifestyle. I urge you to take 5 minutes to see the K and understand what Patrick Condon has been saying from day dot. Do you remember the last time Patrick Condon was so adamant we were all wrong. He was asking a question which was “is it worth x billion to have a single line from commercial to ubc”. No. The modern transit science supports what Patrick Condon was saying decades before science caught up. We should be in zero rush for some villages changes. Our changes are no good. We are making non-empirical changes that are making everything worse. Also we don't need these changes to increase the productivity or our economy. Why are we continuously making changes? image.png This tracking shows that our real estate market is heavily financialized by buyers—ranging from institutional players to stock-market traders and mom-and-pop landlords—who use housing strictly as an asset class. A rigorous two-market economic analysis of this dataset reveals three realities that prove blanket upzoning will backfire: Single-Family Housing Leads the Entire System: Empirical tracking confirms that price movements in the single-family detached market consistently dictate and lead all other	Sandeep Takhar	Kitsilano	Attachment 1

				housing sectors. It serves as the core driver of our regional real estate cycle. The Single-Family "Sink" Effect: Price changes do not overflow upward from investor condos into houses. Instead, speculative shocks start at the top. The single-family house acts as the economic "sink" that absorbs asset-class capital first, pulling the condo and townhouse tiers upward in its wake. The Speculative Premium Tearing Apart Affordability: Upzoning single-family footprints via the Villages Plan creates an immediate speculative incentive for asset buyers. Despite recent interest rate hikes, land values refuse to align with local household wages because buyers actively trade properties at a premium based on future development capacity rather than actual local income. Asset buyers do not need to hold properties vacant to cause damage; their high-velocity transactions treat local neighborhoods like equity portfolios, detaching home values from local labor realities. The research is about transactional “volume” of data. Investory volume is currently at 90%. I urge Council to pause the Villages Plan. We must halt blanket low-density rezoning that fuels asset speculation and pivot to mandating non-market, wage-linked, and co-op housing options to insulate our city's land from the distortions of financialization. Thank you for your time and your consideration of this critical economic data.			
2026-07-13	14:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter titled "RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: StronglyOppose," containing 13 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix F
2026-07-13	14:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Villages Planning Program and the city-initiated rezoning in its current form. While I support the goal of increasing housing supply, I am concerned that this proposal places too much development pressure on established neighbourhoods without adequate planning for infrastructure, traffic, parking, schools, healthcare, and community services. Rezoning should not proceed before these essential public services are expanded to meet future demand. In addition, this proposal may significantly change the character, livability, and stability of existing residential communities. Many residents chose these neighbourhoods because of their scale, green space, and quality of life. These community values should be respected and protected. I urge Council to slow down this process, conduct more meaningful public consultation, carefully evaluate the long-term impacts, and consider more balanced alternatives before approving such sweeping changes. Thank you for considering my comments.	Olive Wang	Shaughnessy	

2026-07-13	14:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a home-owner at [redacted]. and wish to give my opinion as to the rezoning and Vancouver development (OPD) amendment, which I oppose for our neighbourhood. 1. To begin – we are already in the "village" between Main and Fraser – all amenities and services are here now. If this amendment is meant to enhance "Village" living, it is really not warranted. 2. We live on 31 Ave. bordering on the Vancouver City cemetery. Given the current residential density, parking in not significantly obstructed for non-resident citizens of Vancouver and environs who have come to pay respects to their deceased family and friends. Denser housing will interfere with this access as residential parking will essentially take over the parking space along our avenue. For confirmation of my contention, just look at the packed parking along 30th Ave. in the next street North. It is now essentially a one-way single lane much of the time. 3. If residential density increases even more than we experience now street parking will become even more congested. At this time, older single-family homes in our area are frequently demolished and replaced with larger buildings, some now duplexes, others having basement suites and/or laneway residential buildings. Again, I urge consideration of parking congestion and traffic implications of that, which argues against further housing density increases. Dr. Donald Meen	Donald Meen	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-13	14:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the 'villages' proposal. It is a one size fits all approach which does not account for differences in each neighbourhood, especially considering a re zoning of this magnitude. It makes no sense to put 6 story buildings beside 2 story buildings.	Nancy Newman	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	14:10	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do no support the blanket rezoning as outlined in the Villages program. In addition to the other issues brought up by people with far more city planning expertise than me, I'd like to directly address the village where I live and work, Commercial & 20th Ave E. I have attended both of the rounds of city open houses on the proposal, and after reading the displays and talking to city representatives, I oppose the Villages re-zoning proposal. The Commercial & 20th Ave E Village is a vibrant, lively, thriving village with multiple housing types to serve a variety of households. It has ample small independent shops and services, public spaces and community and cultural centres for meeting and events. The Village includes people of different income levels and family sizes, and has increased its population density over the last few decades. I support continued growth in this Village as it's happening now: single family homes getting infill houses or being replaced over time with multiplex and townhouses; townhouse developments on larger lots; and high-rise apartments in low-lying areas where they do not overshadow neighbouring houses, multiplexes, or townhouses. Forcing a one-size-fits-all solution an an already functional vibrant village risks destroying an existing well-functioning village while putting excessive strain on resources (transit, parks etc) which will soon see a massive increase in use due to developments in flanking high-density-zoned areas: Commercial-Broadway Rapid Transit Area (including the Safeway redevelopment) Nanaimo Rapid Transit Area Kingsway Neighbourhood Centre The Broadway Plan The Village also contains an ecological corridor/Ecologically sensitive zone which includes Clark Park, Gibby's Field, and John Hendry Park (Trout Lake). There will be an increased demand on resources resulting from increased density in these flanking areas. For one example, busses serving the area (9, 99, 20, 22 in particular) are already above capacity at rush hour, and things will not improve with the added ridership	Kathleen Barilla	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

from the four high-density areas listed above. In addition, the math on the electrical grid capacity, sewer capacity and water service once we're surrounded by 20+ story buildings is of concern.

When talking about school and transit resources at one of the open houses, the reply was that this is a TransLink issue or a VSB issue. I find this approach a bit concerning, that you would re-zone to build housing that then would be drastically underserved for those living in the neighbourhood.

This Village already contains a variety of housing options, both in its borders and immediately outside of them:

Townhouse developments on Commercial Street:
Brix
Brix II
Stories
Cedar Cottage Townhouses – behind Commercial Street Cafe
Broadhurst Whitaker

Other townhouse developments:
The Works in Cedar Cottage on Stainsbury
Fleming Court on Fleming Street
Format on Dumfries Street

Apartment-style condos:
The Porter
Format (on Kingsway)
Mercer (on Commercial Street)
King Edward Village

Rental apartments:
The Porter
Conrad
The Victoria
The Stainsbury
Hendry Place
Clark Park by Conwest (Commercial & 15th Ave E)
Left Field (Commercial & 15th Ave E)

Senior supportive living:
AgeCare Lakeview
Chelsea Park
Chelsea Manor

Supportive housing townhouse & apartment developments:
Chelsea Corner
Hemlock Court
Helping Spirit Lodge Society
Vienna House – currently near completion

Our neighbours in single family homes include multi-generational homes and shared houses with multiple roommates and productive vegetable gardens, as well as homes with basement suites and infill houses. Blanket re-zoning to 6-story buildings throughout the neighbourhood would greatly increase property values, and therefore property taxes. You may say this doesn't happen, but we saw it when 18th Ave E was rezoned to RT-10; it happens. This would serve to either (a) push families requiring more than 2 bedrooms out of

				the neighbourhoods and into the suburbs, so there would be more cars on the road as they commute to work and (b) push people out for becoming “house-poor” with increased tax burdens on increased property values – and also encouraging landlords of existing rentals to sell, since they can’t raise the rent to offset the increased taxes. Landlords are in this for profit, and will decide based on profit – so once it becomes more sense money-wise to sell & displace their tenants, they will do this.			
2026-07-13	14:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter titled "Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan," containing 13 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix G
2026-07-13	14:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mr. Mayor and Councillors, My name is Frank Heinzelmann, and I am a Vancouver resident. I am opposed to the Villages Plan. Please abolish the plan to create new density clusters, which you mistakenly call "villages". I recognize the need to increase the supply of affordable housing for the vast majority of Vancouverites. However, I am strongly opposed to plopping high-density centres in a somewhat random fashion across Vancouver, completely overwhelming existing neighbourhoods, and taking away the basic rights of property owners in these centres, forcing people to sell only to developers. Also, your attempt to legislate ground-floor retail is a terrible idea, as it weakens the businesses in existing neighbourhood centres, which are already struggling without the additional competition these so-called villages would create. Lastly, the “everything all at once,” one-size-fits-all rezoning of 17 proposed villages, 550–600 blocks and 13,000 properties, is a disaster in the making. Whatever happened to the concept of a small test area to learn and adjust as you go along? Instead of artificially creating what you erroneously call villages, I suggest focusing on the existing and well-established neighbourhood centres. There are Vancouver’s villages or “urban hearts.” Spend time and resources to support and improve them. And yes, increase the density in these neighbourhood centres by allowing up to six stories. But do not put any restrictions on property owners by enforcing land assemblies. To the contrary, encourage a diverse set of buildings with varied-looking ground-floor retail in these established neighbourhood centres. As Scot Hein suggests in his CityHallWatch article titled “Stop Calling Them Villages”, let’s revisit the former CityPlan implementation work that was co-created in a time when city staff and the community rolled up their sleeves to imagine each centre’s future. The resulting “community sketch frameworks” from different neighbourhood centres shown in this article represent the necessary foundational work to strengthen our “actual villages.” That’s an approach that the vast majority of Vancouverites will be happy to embrace. In summary, ditch the “Villages Program Plan” and instead strengthen existing much-cherished neighbourhood centres through a determined, community-grounded, and stakeholder-involved planning effort. And if you must, pick one new neighbourhood and, with the local community, establish how to densify and diversify it over time. You might be surprised by the positive outcomes of this bottom-up community planning effort, in contrast to the draconian, top-down approach, which I consider gross overreach by city staff and government, and which led to more than 1,000 calls to abolish the villages plan. Thank you for your attention. Frank Heinzelmann	Frank Heinzelmann	West Point Grey	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I respectfully oppose the proposed Villages Planning Program and the associated rezoning and Official Development Plan amendments. This proposal represents a major change to many established neighbourhoods, yet I do not believe there has been sufficient analysis or public engagement to justify such broad policy changes. Decisions that will reshape communities for decades should be based on careful planning, transparent consultation, and a clear understanding of the long-term impacts. I am also concerned that increasing residential density without first ensuring adequate transportation, public amenities, schools, healthcare services, and utilities will reduce the quality of life for both current and future residents. Growth should be accompanied by the infrastructure needed to support it. I respectfully ask Council to reconsider this proposal, allow more time for meaningful community input, and adopt a more measured and neighbourhood-specific approach rather than applying broad rezoning across multiple areas. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.	David Yan	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-13	14:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter expressing strong opposition to the proposed Villages Plan, containing 15 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix H
2026-07-13	14:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Density should be focused on major arteries near transit and NOT into the blocks of residential homes. Residential conversion is not addressing affordability and many units sit vacant for years, failing to address housing issues. Schools in the area are already stretched and the infrastructure is not ready to support these homes on top of Oakridge, Heather Lands, Bus Depot, etc. Build out the main corridors first before zoning more Frankenstein residential monstrosities.	Robert McLean	Oakridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This proposal feels like it prioritizes developers and corporate interests over the people who have built and sustained this community for decades. The truth is, our neighbourhood isn't lacking. We already have a vibrant, walkable community with everything people need. Commercial Street is full of locally owned shops, cafés, and restaurants. Grocery stores like Famous Foods and Save-On-Foods are just a short walk away. We have a nearby library, schools, parks, and easy access to everything along Kingsway and Commercial Drive. This isn't a community waiting to be created - it already exists. Just yesterday, Commercial Street hosted a block party. Neighbours came together, families filled the sidewalks, and local businesses were thriving. That's what a healthy neighbourhood looks like. Community isn't created by $900,000 one-bedroom condos or another block of banks and insurance offices. It's created by local businesses, public spaces, libraries, schools, and the relationships between the people who live here. Many of our local schools are already at capacity, yet this proposal would add significant density without addressing the infrastructure that makes a neighbourhood function. Meanwhile, there are many areas across Vancouver that genuinely need investment, amenities, and revitalization. Those communities deserve the attention and resources being directed here. This issue is deeply personal to me. Years ago, I was renovicted from my apartment near Main Street because of redevelopment. It was a painful experience that uprooted my life. Since then, I've worked incredibly hard to build stability and put down roots in this neighbourhood. Today I pay nearly $7,000 a year in property taxes, yet I still worry that my community could once again be reshaped in ways that benefit developers more than the people who call it home. Please protect the neighbourhoods that are already thriving. Listen to the residents who have invested their lives here and understand what makes this community special. Focus growth and investment where it's truly needed instead of putting another successful, connected neighbourhood at risk.	Tanya Goehring	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-13	14:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This plan feels like an attempt to prioritize developers and corporate interests over the people who have built and sustained this community The reality is that what is being proposed isn't something our neighbourhood is missing. We already have local shopping on commercial street; the best cafe's and restaurants. If I need to grocery shop, it's only a few minutes walk to Famous Foods or a few more to go to Save On Foods. We have a library in walking distance and everything else you could think of either on Kingsway or Commercial Drive. We have a thriving, walkable community here! Last weekend there was a block party on Commercial Street. That is what a healthy neighbourhood looks like; people gathering, supporting local businesses, and creating a sense of belonging. Please don't disrupt a community that is already working. There are many neighbourhoods across the city that genuinely need investment and attention. Focus those efforts where they can make the biggest difference. The $900k 1 bedroom condos and corporate shopping block populated with insurance companies and banks is not community, local shops, grocery markets and libraries are, but we already have it, right around the corner. Not to mention schools in the area are all at full capacity. Many other communities need the attention you're giving this one, so go help them. This issue is deeply personal for me. Years ago, I was renovicted from an apartment near Main Street because of redevelopment. It was a painful experience that changed my life. Since then, I've worked incredibly hard to build a stable home here. I now pay nearly $7,000 a year in property taxes, yet I feel like I have to worry that my community could once again be transformed in ways that benefit developers more than the people who live here. Please protect the neighbourhoods that are already thriving. Listen to the residents who call this place home, and invest in the communities that truly need support instead of putting another successful one at risk.	Trevor Jacobson	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	14:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We already have many main streets particularly on the Westside of Vancouver - 4th Ave, Broadway, Arbutus, South Granville Dunbar, Point Grey 10th Ave, Main St, etc. These Main streets are surrounded by neighbourhoods were residents can easily walk for shopping, restaurants, etc. It seems that the Villages Plan is using an unnecessary Main Street development agenda to push through a developer driven plan of building 6 storey apartment buildings. Buildings are the agenda - not thoughtful urban planning which builds communities not just slaps up apartment buildings. Thoughtful urban planning takes into consideration the well being of communities and it's people - housing, green space, good infrastructure, community gathering places, environment impact, etc. The Villages Plan is all about forced fast development of apartment buildings.	Maria Stassinopoulos	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	14:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a handwritten letter opposing a Villages Plan.	Edith Lear		Appendix I
2026-07-13	14:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mayor and Council City of Vancouver Re: Villages Plan, City-Initiated Rezoning, and ODP Amendments — Public Hearing, July 14, 2026	Mike Godwin	Arbutus Ridge	

Position: OPPOSED

Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing as a Vancouver resident to urge you to vote "not supported" on the Villages Plan and the associated city-initiated rezoning, and to send this program back for a phased, evidence-based redesign.

I want to be clear at the outset: I am not opposed to density, to housing, or to change. I am opposed to *this* instrument — a single, omnibus rezoning of roughly 13,000 parcels across 17 areas, repealing eleven zoning districts in one vote, on a summer evening when most of the roughly 100,000 people who live and work on that land have no idea it is happening. A decision of this magnitude deserves better than to be waved through in July.

My objection is not sentimental. It is that this plan will not achieve the goals the City has set for it, and that it will do measurable environmental damage on the way to failing.

1. THE CLIMATE MATH DOES NOT WORK

This Council declared a climate emergency. Under the Climate Emergency Action Plan, the City committed to reducing embodied carbon in construction by 40% by 2030 — four years from now. Embodied carbon is the carbon released when materials are produced, shipped, assembled, and demolished.

The Villages rezoning is, functionally, a demolition program. It takes 13,000 parcels of existing, standing, occupied, wood-frame housing — some of the lowest-carbon building stock on the continent, already built, already paid for in carbon — and creates the economic conditions to knock it down. Every one of those demolitions is a debit against a target you have already committed to. The City has itself received reports on the scale of home demolition waste. Nowhere in this plan is there a credible accounting of the embodied carbon that this rezoning will release, nor a demonstration that the operational-efficiency gains of the replacement buildings will pay that carbon back within any timeframe that matters to the 2030 target.

The greenest building in Vancouver is the one that is already standing. This plan is built on the opposite premise, and it has never been asked to show its work.

2. THE URBAN FOREST WILL PAY FOR THIS

Vancouver's canopy cover is about 25%. The Park Board's own Urban Forest Strategy commits the city to 30% by 2050, and staff have been candid that the single largest constraint is private land — where most of our mature trees live and where development takes them.

Six-storey buildings with underground parkades on interior residential blocks do not coexist with mature trees. Full-lot excavation ends root systems. Near-total site coverage ends soil volume. A replacement sapling does not replace a hundred-year-old maple; it takes forty years to try, and it cools nothing during the four decades in between.

This matters because it is not an aesthetic question. In June 2021, the heat dome killed hundreds of British Columbians, and both the BC Coroners Service and the City's own Urban Forest Strategy acknowledge that fatalities clustered in areas with low canopy, low vegetation, and high building density. Metro Vancouver has already reported that impervious surfaces are expanding while canopy shrinks, and that densification pressure will accelerate that loss.

So I ask Council directly: what is the projected canopy outcome of rezoning 13,000 parcels? How many mature trees are lost? What is the net change in permeable surface, in stormwater infiltration, in summer surface temperature across these 17 areas? If Council cannot answer those questions tonight, Council is not in a position to vote.

3. IT WILL NOT DELIVER THE AFFORDABILITY IT PROMISES

The stated goal is housing for low- and moderate-income households. Pre-zoning does not build housing. It re-prices land. The moment Council upzones 13,000 parcels, the development potential capitalizes into land value — instantly, universally, and to the benefit of whoever happens to own the land that morning. That windfall is paid for by every future buyer and renter of the units eventually built on it.

Meanwhile, the buildings most likely to be demolished are the older RM walk-ups: the genuinely affordable, unsubsidized rental stock this city cannot replace. We will trade real affordability that exists today for hypothetical affordability that pencils only at market rents, and we will displace the tenants in between. If six-storey mixed-use does not pencil at today's construction costs and financing rates — and much of it does not — the result is not housing. It is speculative land assembly, stalled sites, boarded-up buildings, and blighted blocks for a decade.

4. IT WILL NOT CREATE VILLAGES

You cannot manufacture a high street by spreading commercial zoning across 550 to 600 blocks. Retail viability depends on concentration. Diluting it produces empty ground-floor units, not corner stores. The fact that the Chief Planner had to issue a memo on "retail high streets" weeks before this hearing tells you the retail strategy is not settled. If the core premise of a plan called "Villages" is still being clarified by memo, the plan is not ready.

5. ALTERNATIVES COUNCIL SHOULD CONSIDER INSTEAD

- Phase it. Approve three or four Villages as pilots. Measure what actually happens: units delivered, tenure mix, rents achieved, trees lost, canopy retained, embodied carbon released, businesses displaced. Then scale what works. Do not run the experiment on 14% of the city's parcels simultaneously.

- Put density where the environmental math works. Arterials, transit-oriented areas, single-storey retail with vast surface parking lots, underused commercial land, City-owned sites. These are already paved. Build there first, and exhaust that capacity before excavating treed interior blocks.

- Make retention the default, demolition the exception. Adaptive reuse, additions, infill on the same lot, deep-energy retrofits of existing walk-ups. This is faster, cheaper, lower-carbon, and it does not evict anyone.

- Adopt binding green standards *before* rezoning, not after. Minimum permeable site area. Minimum soil volume. Protected tree envelopes. A no-net-canopy-loss test at the site level. Mandatory deconstruction and material salvage. An embodied-carbon accounting for demolition. Without these, the standard zoning districts you are enacting tonight strip away the very site-specific review that currently gives staff any leverage to save a tree.

- Protect the affordable housing that already exists. Strengthen tenant relocation protections and require one-for-one replacement of demolished rental at comparable rents before, not after, the upzoning lands.

- Capture the land lift. If Council pre-zones, capture the resulting value uplift properly and

				direct it to parks, trees, childcare, and non-market housing — rather than allowing it to accrue to landowners as a public gift. CONCLUSION I am asking Council to do the harder, slower, better thing. Refer this back. Phase it. Show the carbon numbers. Show the canopy numbers. Show that the affordability claim survives contact with a spreadsheet. Give the 100,000 people affected a fall of real engagement rather than a July evening of formality. A plan that demolishes low-carbon housing, removes mature trees during a heating climate, displaces affordable tenants, and hands a windfall to landowners — while calling itself green, affordable, and community-building — is not a plan Vancouver should adopt because it is the only one on the table. We can do better. Please vote not supported.			
2026-07-13	14:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The villages plan is a clear attempt to put lipstick on a pig. "Village" is defined as "a small, clustered human settlement, typically located in a rural area". First, there are no rural areas in Vancouver. Second, these will not be small clusters of human settlement, but densely populated high-rises, situated pell-mell, meaning without any consideration to proximity to hospitals, schools, fire and police stations, community centres, not to mention the consequent loss of tree cover and other green areas. Also, in increasing the population of Vancouver, this will created a huge increase of demand on the water and sewer systems, not to mention electricity. Lastly, as we have seen with the recent condo "buy-out" fiasco (wherein the government has decided to use our taxes to buy thousands of empty condo units to prevent their developers from going bankrupt, because the units are not selling because they are too small and too expensive), the densification in these "villages" will not result in more affordable housing, as the units in the highrises will be just as expensive as the condos. They will be just as expensive because as soon as foreign buyers and real-estate conglomerates know there is more real-estate in which to invest, in Vancouver, they will, driving up prices. So, the result will be the equivalent of many "Brentwood mall" areas all over Vancouver, with loss of view corridors, and the cozy neighbourhoods that currently remain. The (very) long-term result is that Vancouver will look like many other large Asian cities: tall towers everywhere, except perhaps the section of Cornwall Avenue currently known as the "Golden Mile".	Karol Mikulash	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	14:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear City Council, I'm writing because I'm deeply concerned about the City's proposed Villages Plan, specifically the rezoning that would allow six-storey buildings in my neighbourhood. This is a quiet, safe community with mature trees, gardens, and a genuine sense of belonging. After spending 18 years living in a downtown Vancouver condo, my family was finally able to move into the Angus Drive and West 57th Avenue area. We wanted to escape the noise, congestion, lack of green space, crowds, traffic, security concerns, and the urban heat-island effect. We found exactly what we had been searching for in our new home—a peaceful place to build our lives, surrounded by trees, gardens, and a calm environment. Now, the City is proposing to rezone away the very qualities that brought us here. I recognize that housing is an important issue and that the Villages Plan raises many complex questions, including infrastructure, transportation, schools, utilities, affordability, and neighbourhood character. However, the Villages Plan proposes a blanket rezoning that would allow buildings of up to six storeys across large areas of established neighbourhoods. My greatest concern is that this significant increase in density is not accompanied by a comprehensive plan to deliver the ground-level public parks, green space, and other public amenities needed to support that growth.	Nichole Borgal	Kerrisdale	

				Vancouver has been adding density for years, yet our parks and green spaces have not kept pace. Vancouver has one of the lowest amounts of parkland per resident among major Canadian cities, and as the population continues to grow, access to parks and green space will become increasingly important. As more people arrive and more neighbourhoods are redeveloped, the pressure on our existing parks and open spaces will only become more severe. My question is straightforward: where is the plan to create new, ground-level public parks and open spaces at the same pace as density? Residents need real parks—not simply landscaped areas incorporated into private developments—to ensure everyone has access to nature, recreation, and places to gather. If the City is asking residents to accept significant changes to established neighbourhoods, there should also be a clear commitment to creating new ground-level public parks, preserving the urban tree canopy, and expanding natural open spaces as the population grows. Without that balance, we risk diminishing the quality of life that makes Vancouver such a desirable place to live. A city is more than the number of housing units it can produce. It is the neighbourhoods where people put down roots, raise families, know their neighbours, and find peace after a long day. It is also the parks, trees, and open spaces that support our physical and mental well-being and provide places for communities to gather. Once these qualities are lost, they cannot simply be rebuilt. I urge Council to defer approval of the proposed rezoning and the Villages Plan until a comprehensive strategy is in place to deliver new ground-level public parks, preserve the urban tree canopy, and ensure that green space grows alongside population growth. Growth should be thoughtful and balanced—not pursued at the expense of parks, green space, livability, and community character that make Vancouver worth calling home. We can do better than this. Our city and our communities depend on you to safeguard their well-being and quality of life by making sound planning and design decisions. Please do not let us down. Sincerely, Nichole Borgal			
2026-07-13	14:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is the letter from Colin Oloman, which includes feedback on the Villages Planning Program.	Colin Oloman		Appendix J
2026-07-13	14:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Re: The Villages Plan Public Hearing: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 at 6:00 PM Dear Mayor and Council, I am a resident of Vancouver. I am opposed to the Villages Plan for all the reasons set out in the Housing Reset Group's open letter to you dated June 18, 2026, quoted below. "1. Existing neighbourhood centres are the best place for local shopping areas, not new commercial in villages that would compete with them. Vancouver's long-established shopping districts in neighbourhood centres across the city —	Mike Mangan	Mount Pleasant	

such as Sunset, Kerrisdale, Dunbar, Broadway, Commercial Drive, Kingsway, Marpole and others—have anchored communities since the streetcar era. The City has wisely located libraries, childcare, community centres and plazas there, supported by strong TransLink service. These places already deliver convenience and conviviality.

Neighbourhood centres are the much more important, established, community-serving centres with a broad range of shops and services.

However, the Official Development Plan (ODP) identifies new shopping areas in smaller randomly placed villages that will directly compete with the neighbourhood centres shopping areas, many of which are currently struggling to survive with many vacancies.

Staff project a 140% increase in the 17 new village locations local retail floorspace—nearly one million square feet. Many established neighbourhood centres/commercial corridors, all within walking distance from these villages, already suffer 10–15%+ storefront vacancy rates and will thus be impacted very negatively by this plan to add substantially more commercial shopping areas as competition.

Instead, efforts need to be directed toward enhancing the established neighbourhood centres and Business Improvement Areas (BIAs) where businesses are supported by additional density within walking distance. Work within the existing neighbourhood framework with a series of community economic development metrics, to provide planning that builds roots in the community, not just zoning schedules.

2. Blanket rezoning spread too thinly will produce blight.

History shows that when redevelopment is left to market timing across vast areas, the scattershot development makes for a patchwork of neglected, vacant, or unwanted properties between large out of scale developments that ruins neighbourhoods. Existing residents and businesses pay the price. Destabilization of neighbourhoods will occur as the real estate industry chases sites and sets off land value increases in some areas and land value deflation from oversized neighbouring development in others. The result is widespread inequity with many individual victims, and gains in the hands of a few.

Spreading development thinly will likely result in "orphaned" buildings between out of scale new developments.

3. The proposed densities in villages vastly exceed compatible scales in the local context.

The proposed building form for residential in villages of six storeys, at a very high 3.7 FSR, is far out of scale for these local areas, and is an inappropriate fit as proposed. Further, about 750 owners have been advised by the City their properties are effectively frozen until they are redeveloped at mixed used 6 storeys with commercial at grade.

The proposed village areas cover existing neighbourhoods that are already zoned for increased density such as multifamily conversions with infill of RT5 within the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan, and Multiplex R1-1 in most other areas.

4. The proposed additional density in villages is not needed to meet future growth to 2050.

The Vancouver Regional Context Statement, and the ODP, show that there is already enough approved development in the pipeline to meet future growth to 2050. The villages are not needed to meet this growth, nor will it be affordable. It will only create damage and

				dysfunction to the existing city fabric. The current rushed timeline is completely unjustified. Thousands of city residents and business owners will come back from summer holidays and find that their properties have been rezoned, most having no idea beforehand of the proposal. Such surprises are highly unpopular, stressful and un-necessary. Note that City Council has recently had to reconsider how the Multiplex R1-1 zoning was implemented due to community impacts, lack of reasonable guidelines, and rushed implementation. This villages proposal would have much greater consequences. 5. Solutions that enhance neighbourhoods rather than undermining them are easily achievable. Council and staff need to establish a collaborative way forward by working with residents and businesses on neighbourhood-scale plans/actions that recognize the distinct character and diversity of our neighbourhoods, add housing choices, especially affordable housing, near existing neighbourhood centres, strengthen their economic viability and attractiveness, and deliver walkable, climate-friendly communities without the collateral damage that we predict. In Conclusion We recommend that City Council not proceed with the public hearing as planned in July, or vote "not supported" if it cannot be cancelled. Instead engage with each neighbourhood in collaborative community planning as proposed above.” Mike Mangan Barrister & Solicitor (Ret.)			

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Opposition to Rezoning at Mackenzie & 41st / Mackenzie & 33rd (July 14 Public Hearing) To the Mayor and Vancouver City Councilors, I am submitting this letter to urge Council to vote NO on the upcoming Villages Plan rezonings at 33rd and 41st on Mackenzie. As a resident in the area, my biggest concern is day-to-day safety and infrastructure. The traffic on 41st and 33rd is already heavily congested, especially during school drop-off and rush hours. Pushing dense, multi-unit buildings into these specific intersections will create absolute gridlock. Our neighborhood streets aren't built to handle this volume of cars, and it poses a real safety risk for kids and pedestrians. Furthermore, where is the plan for essential public benefits and services? Our local schools, parks, and childcare facilities are already stretched thin. More critically, there are simply not enough local medical clinics or family doctors to support the current population, let alone thousands of new residents. Finding a doctor or getting an urgent care appointment in the area is already a massive challenge. Adding hundreds of new households without having expanded medical infrastructure and community services ready beforehand is completely irresponsible. We chose this area because it’s a safe, quiet place to raise a family, not a bustling, polluted transit hub without basic health services. Please don't force this aggressive development on our community. Please vote against the proposal. Regards, Julian K.	Julian Kusumoto	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	14:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose this plan	Ken Hall	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	14:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled: "RE: Proposed East Villages Plan," containing 4 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix K

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I was puzzled by the CoV information session I attended at Kits Community Centre awhile back surrounding the Villages plan. It seemed poorly conceived and presented, and likely to produce poor outcomes and create friction with *existing* "village" areas in the city, many of which I frequent and feel work well as is, even with increased density. You've likely seen this letter but if not, please read it. It sums up many of my concerns. hxxps://housingreset[.]ca/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/2026-06-18-final-housing-reset-letter-on-villages-v5b.pdf I'd rather see greater effort put into reviving existing "village" hubs than creating new ones. And that effort should meaningfully include input from those most affected. Scale and built forms for some of the projects envisioned are concerning as well. Diversity is a strength. I'm watching some real monstrosities go up in our area and I don't see many really thoughtful designs. And I say that as someone who lives in a very livable but quickly-built, 30+ year-old, beige 50 unit blockbuster on Broadway! Villages evolve over time. They are not meant to be plonked down in a blanket wave of development based on population growth projections and policies that remain highly suspect during a time of rapid, radical and unpredictable changes going on in our economy and society at large. I'd like this halted and will be curious to see what a post-October council will look like and how they will move forward if the result is overwhemingly against. People are finally paying attention so perhaps there are better approaches in our near future!	Mark Mushet	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	14:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This is poorly planned and doesn’t take into consideration the local impacted resident’s interests.	Megan Sterling	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
2026-07-13	14:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have a public safety concern regarding the villages proposed at Macdonald & King Edward and Mackenzie & 33rd. Without addressing this concern, increasing density in these neighbourhoods will lead to people getting hurt. Specifically, it is related to traffic. The intersection at Macdonald and King Edward (and to a lesser extent, given less traffic currently, at Quesnel and King Edward) is extremely dangerous. In the past 12 months, I have personally seen 7 accidents at these two intersections, let alone the ones I would not have seen. The problem stems from drivers attempting to make a left hand turn onto King Edward, whether going east or west. At the Macdonald and King Edward intersection, cars wanting to turn left onto King Edward wait in the intersection and there is insufficient space for through-traffic to continue traveling safely in a north-to-south direction. This results in dangerous driving where drivers try to bypass the left-turning cars with minimal clearance. In addition, of more concern, if there are opposing cars both trying to turn left onto King Edward, these drivers are not sure whether to turn left in front of each other or after passing each other first. At the Quesnel and King Edward intersection, drivers do not fully understand right of way when entering a road with a centre median like King Edward when at the stop sign on Quesnel street. I plead for the city to consider this concern given the impact it has on the health of the residents in this area.	James Choi	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	14:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "RE: Proposed Villages Plan, containing 2 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix L

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing as a local resident living just east of Mackenzie Street in Arbutus Ridge (MacKenzie Heights), immediately adjacent to the proposed Mackenzie St & W 33rd Ave Village. I strongly urge Council to OPPOSE the blanket rezoning under the Villages Planning Program scheduled for the Public Hearing.While I understand the need for family-friendly housing, the choice of Mackenzie St and W 33rd Ave as a "Mixed-Use Village Hub" for 4-to-6 storey development is deeply flawed and detached from local realities: FIRST - SEVERE LACK OF TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE: Unlike other designated villages, Mackenzie St and W 33rd Ave has zero high-frequency transit. Our local bus routes (such as the 33 or 2) are already infrequent and disconnected from major rapid transit lines. Forcing higher density here without an immediate, massive expansion of TransLink services will lead to severe traffic gridlock and unsafe road conditions on local streets. SECOND - TOTAL DEPENDENCE ON CARS: Due to the lack of viable transit, new residents in these multi-family buildings will inevitably rely on private vehicles. The plan’s intent to reduce parking minimums will result in an uncontrollable overflow of street parking, blocking driveways, complicating emergency vehicle access, and creating safety hazards for the many seniors and children who walk in this quiet area. THIRD - ECONOMIC NON-VIABILITY OF MANDATED COMMERCIAL SPACES: The plan’s goal to create a "walkable village" by mandating continuous ground-floor retail at this node violates basic retail economics. Mackenzie St & W 33rd Ave is a quiet residential inner pocket completely isolated from arterial traffic. Forcing commercial zoning here will not attract functional grocery stores; instead, it will result in permanently vacant storefronts, commercial blight, and safety concerns, while simultaneously diluting local demand and harming established small businesses on the actual Dunbar Street corridor over 1.1 kilometers away. FOURTH - DESTRUCTION OF THE ARBUTUS RIDGE AND DUNBAR URBAN FOREST: Our specific pocket around W 33rd Ave is defined by its mature tree canopy, private gardens, and permeable soil. Allowing massive multi-family lot coverage will lead to clear-cutting of local trees, directly worsening rainwater runoff issues in an area already prone to local pooling and drainage challenges. FIFTH - NO CONCRETE INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES: Our local water, sewer, and power grids were designed over half a century ago for single-family homes. There is no funded plan in this motion to upgrade the utility pipes right beneath Mackenzie St to support hundreds of new units simultaneously. CONCLUSION: The Mackenzie St & W 33rd Ave node is a textbook example of why a "one-size-fits-all" pre-zoning policy fails. It ignores local geography, transit limits, and retail realities. I urge Council to vote "NOT SUPPORTED" on this motion and remove the Mackenzie St & W 33rd Ave Village from the blanket upzoning plan.	Hua Chen	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	14:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I support the densification of the city and many aspect of this plan, however oppose buildings of greater than 3 stories being built in residential neighbourhoods on side streets. Buildings greater than 3 stories should only be built along main streets.	Joel Bluman	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	14:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "RE: Proposed Villages Plan," containing 2 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix M

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
2026-07-13	14:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We have lived in the Kerrisdale neighbourhood since 1991. One of the reasons we bought a home here was because of its village ambience and amenities. Although we agree with some of the changes we've seen in the area over the years (such as the establishment of the Arbutus Greenway and mild densification along the 41st Avenue, Arbutus St. and Dunbar St. corridors), we strongly oppose the 17 Villages Plan (and R3-4 Rezoning in general), especially as it applies to two proposed Villages in particular: Mackenzie St & W 33rd Ave, and Mackenzie St & W 41st Ave. for the following reasons: 1) One of the consequences of the Plan will be the forced land assembly of standard 33-foot lots. This will facilitate the creation of "monster" multiplex structures that will dwarf neighbouring single or duplex family dwellings, and therefore ruin the neighbourhood character and feeling that currently exists. Some densification ("village-ification", to coin a term) has already occurred along the Arbutus St., Dunbar St. and 41st Ave. corridors. Given the proximity of these already-established village areas to the ones in the proposed Villages Plan, as well as the transit services already in place there, we feel that further development should be restricted to only these corridors (supported by more public consultation and feedback!). 2) Our property taxes will over-inflate after being overly influenced by the inevitable developer demand for land (ie. speculation), rather than being more appropriately based on dwellers market demand. This will only make it even less affordable to live in some current Vancouver neighbourhoods, not more affordable. From what we've seen, multiplex and condo buildings haven't really made it more affordable to live in Vancouver, because not only are the newly-constructed individual units still (too) expensive to purchase (especially if you want something with a little more space), but the sale prices combined with property taxes and monthly strata fees still make affordability difficult or impossible in Vancouver, especially for first-time purchasers. 3) It will cause additional and huge structural massing at the expense of tree canopy and green space, and therefore contribute to more global warming since the concrete and other solid inorganic building materials used in construction tend to be heat-traps or heat-sinks. On the other hand, retaining the tree canopy and green space allows neighbourhood environs to remain cooler and contribute less to global warming. 4) Further densification around Blenheim, Mackenzie and 33rd streets/avenues will definitely create/cause more traffic congestion, especially as all of these roads are only single lane (and not to mention narrow!) in each direction. In addition, more densification will require more parking spaces (people will still need cars to commute to work, travel to medical appointments, shop at bigger stores that can't possibly exist in a local Village, etc.). You cannot expect that everyone will walk, take transit or ride a bicycle to do their errands or make their appointments. It's unreasonable to expect that by creating local Villages, that most people will forego having a car and just do all their living within the area of the Village. 5) We feel that not nearly enough notification, education and consultation with the public has been done with this Villages Plan, and it seems that the City is trying to "ram it through" in a rush and foist it upon an unsuspecting and under-informed citizenry. More feedback from the public should be sought before a final decision on this Plan is undertaken by City Council, and the Plan as currently proposed should be scrapped, or at least significantly modified based on further public feedback.	Andrew Wong	Kerrisdale	

2026-07-13	14:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Hi Mayor Sim, After meeting you prior to your election victory, I was enamored with your views on how to improve our city. In particular, how to increase efficiency at city hall, to clean up the streets, and improve safety in Vancouver. I voted for you last election. However, I did not vote for the upzoning of my neighborhood to apartment building or condo construction. Specifically the upzoning in McKenzie Heights. Please take this as an official opposition to the Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments"	Hubert King	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	14:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The DVBA does not support the application.	Lisa Clement	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix N
2026-07-13	15:10	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not believe this plan is appropriate because it is such a massive rezoning and I think 6 storey buildings all over the Village areas is too big. I'm fine with them in the core village areas, but not everywhere. We should be supporting existing village areas, before we build new ones. This plan is not thought out well and should be shelved.	Alison Snowden	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	15:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please read letter attached re: ODP for Victoria Dr. & E61st Avenue signed by 7 residents.	Karen Chan	Victoria-Fraserview	Appendix O
2026-07-13	15:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Although the concept of local villages long term and encouraging it is a reasonable idea but Restricting what people can do with their property (ie no additions, no laneway, no multiplex etc) is a huge heavy handed overreach. City hall has no ears and it is mine as well as many many others who have witnessed first hand how tone deft city hall has become. This should be democracy “for the people by the people “ rather than what a few special interest groups want or what is the agenda of a few elected officials. Let’s get back to proper democracy rather than top down authoritarianism. You are each elected to do what your constituents want, not implement your own personal agenda or concept of what should be. Each decision should be based upon the peoples voice not your own. You must be neutral and listen rather than telling neighbourhoods how it will be. Plus how about focusing on the core basics one of which is fiscal responsibility that is seriously lacking!! Lastly, I would like to comment on the Broadway plan with high rises with no parking ???! What the heck ? People will still have cars and the sounding neighbourhoods will become a war zone for parking. Jesus ! Whose great idea was this ?? How about a rethink before you simply create another big problem that cannot be corrected. Thank you for your time. Cheers. John & Annette Hurd	John & Annette Hurd		
2026-07-13	15:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I care deeply about the future of this city — not only for my generation, but for those that will inherit it. Fifty years ago, Vancouver hosted HABITAT‘76 United Nations Conference on Human Settlements and helped launch a global conversation about the future of cities. Thirty years later, Vancouver hosted the Third Session of the World Urban Forum (WUF III) and was recognized internationally as one of the world's great livable cities. The principle that connected those two moments was simple:	Colleen Hardwick	Kitsilano	

				Cities exist to improve the quality of life of the people who live in them. That was Vancouver's understanding of livability. Livability was not defined by housing starts. It was not defined by zoning capacity. It was not defined by theoretical build-out potential. Livability was defined as quality of life for residents. Housing contributes to livability. Transportation contributes to livability. Parks, schools, childcare, community centres, local businesses, public spaces and access to nature all contribute to livability. But these are not ends in themselves. They are tools in service of a larger objective: Improving the quality of life of residents. Residents matter. If quality of life for residents remains our objective, then planning policy must be evidence-based. Population growth assumptions matter. Actual demand matters. Household formation matters. Market absorption matters. Infrastructure capacity matters. Planning should respond to demonstrated need, not simply theoretical capacity. Today we are living in a very different economic environment than the one that existed when many of these assumptions were developed. Projects are stalled. Unsold inventory exists across the region. Construction financing has tightened. Governments are discussing support for projects that cannot proceed under current market conditions. This is precisely the moment when evidence-based policy matters most. Good planning has always been about balance. Balancing growth with infrastructure. Balancing housing with affordability. Balancing new residents with the needs of existing communities. Balancing change with the qualities that caused people to love a place in the first place. Vancouver did not become internationally admired because it pursued growth for growth's sake. It became admired because it pursued livability. Because it understood that successful cities are not measured solely by what they build. They are measured by how well people live. Growth is not the purpose of a city. Growth is one of the tools available to a city. The purpose of a city is the quality of life of its residents — present and future. So the question before Council is not simply: How much growth can Vancouver accommodate? The question is: What kind of city are we trying to create, and for whom? My hope is that as Council considers this proposal, it remembers the principle that shaped Vancouver's reputation around the world and guided generations of city-building before us: "Residents matter. That is not an obstacle to planning. It is the reason for planning." Residents matter. Quality of life matters. Livability matters. And those principles should continue to guide the future of our city.			

2026-07-13	15:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Cheri Hanson [redacted] July 13, 2026 Mayor and City Councillors City of Vancouver – City Hall 453 West 12th Avenue Vancouver, British Columbia V5Y 1V4 To: City of Vancouver, Mayor Sim, and Councillors As a longtime resident of Kensington-Cedar Cottage and a journalist with an academic specialty in urban planning, I strongly oppose the 17 Villages Plan. Each Vancouver neighbourhood already has a unique character, and this plan does not take this into consideration. My family and I have lived in the neighbourhood for nearly 15 years. It is a socioeconomically diverse, thriving, multicultural, area with a harmonious mix of single-family homes, duplexes, multiplexes, low- and high-rise buildings. The neighbourhood has naturally gained significant density over the time we've lived here – all of which happened in a sustainable, organic manner. While growth is inevitable, it should respect what already works. Effective planning should reinforce an area's current strengths, rather than prescribing changes that are neither necessary nor desirable for current residents. My family and I worry that new Villages construction will be over-scaled with unaffordable new units that crowd out both longtime residents and successful independent businesses. The Cedar Cottage neighbourhood was also developed more than 100 years ago. As such, it has narrow streets, smaller-than-average lots, and a pedestrian-friendly design. Out-of-scale construction in the centre of this area would bring more vehicles than the streets can handle, while destroying the actual village-like character of this historical area. I feel this blanket plan is too soon and too widespread, and will do irreparable damage to a neighbourhood that already embodies the spirit of the 17 Villages plan. In summary, I urge you to abandon the current 17 Villages initiative and, instead, work closely with local residents to create a bottom-up strategy that considers the current setting, housing mix, traffic load, and the stated needs of local residents. Sincerely, Cheri Hanson	Cheri Hanson	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	15:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	July 13, 2026 Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing as a resident of Kensington-Cedar Cottage, home to two of the 17 proposed Village areas (Fraser Street & East 33rd Avenue and Knight Street & East 33rd Avenue), regarding the proposed Villages Plan. I want to be clear from the outset: I support the underlying goals of this plan. Increased density, a greater diversity of housing types, social and rental housing, and vibrant local hubs are all things our city needs more of. But I cannot support the plan as currently drafted, and I am asking Council to slow down and do more	Mark Dennis	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

work before moving forward.

Our neighbourhood already is a village.

Kensington-Cedar Cottage is, in many ways, the success story this plan is trying to create elsewhere. We have a high street with local retail, everyday shops and restaurants, and a genuine mix of owner-occupied and rental housing across a range of building types. This didn't happen by top-down design — it happened organically, over time, because the underlying conditions supported it. Many other neighbourhoods across the city lack exactly these things. They are dominated by single-family homes with no nearby retail, no walkable services, and little housing diversity — they lack the vitality and street life that this type of plan is meant to introduce. Designating those areas as villages, and giving them the tools to build the kind of mixed-use, mixed-tenure fabric we already have, would be transformative for them.

This is why I think the plan needs more precision, not less. Applying the same approach across all 17 proposed villages risks doing the most damage in places that are already working, like ours, while being exactly what's needed in places that are not. I understand staff have already acknowledged that conditions vary enough between villages that some may need to be paused or phased into a second stage. I would ask Council to formalize that approach: pilot the plan in a handful of village locations first — particularly in areas that currently lack these amenities and would benefit most — before extending it to all 17.

Basic questions about existing residents and lots remain unanswered.

For those of us who already live here, the plan is silent on fundamental questions. If our lot is rezoned under this plan, can we still renovate our existing house? Can we rebuild it if it burns down or needs replacing? Or does the zoning effectively sterilize the lot for anything other than redevelopment at the new density? These aren't hypothetical concerns — they affect real decisions homeowners are already trying to make, and the plan simply hasn't addressed them.

We've seen this go wrong before,

We are also concerned about a pattern that has played out elsewhere with this type of zoning: mandated ground-floor retail that sits empty for years, or gets filled by large chains rather than the kind of independent local businesses that make a neighbourhood a village in the first place — paired with condo development that is anything but affordable. Our high street works today because it evolved slowly and organically. We are worried that an aggressive, insufficiently thought-through zoning push could unleash exactly the market dynamics that hollow out neighbourhoods like ours, rather than replicate our success elsewhere.

Our ask.
We are not opposed to the Villages Plan in principle — we are opposed to approving it before these questions are answered. Specifically, we are asking the city to:
-Formalize a phased approach, piloting a small number of the proposed villages before extending the plan to all 17, prioritizing neighbourhoods that currently lack retail and housing diversity.
-Clearly answer what existing homeowners can and cannot do with their properties under the new zoning — renovation, rebuilding, and maintenance of existing structures.
-Build in safeguards against empty storefronts and chain-dominated retail, and against the plan simply producing unaffordable condo development.
- Take the time needed to get this right, rather than rushing approval on a plan with this many open questions.

				Our position is not unique. It is shared by an open letter signed by more than 30 respected Metro Vancouver planners, architects, and academics — including former Vancouver co-chief planners — who have raised similar concerns about the pace and scale of this rezoning. This is not a fringe objection — it is a broadly held concern that the plan's intentions are good but its execution is premature. Thank you for considering this letter. I hope Council will take the time to strengthen this plan before moving forward. Sincerely, Mark Dennis [redacted]			
2026-07-13	15:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a registered architect who has designed residential projects in Vancouver since 1993 I strongly oppose the 17 Villages plan. This plan has already induced a state of fear and profound discomfort amongst homeowners in these neighbourhoods. If this goes through, no one in these areas will be able to relax, enjoy and enhance their property knowing that it has simply been turned into a potential profit centre for speculators and developers. This is genuine emotional trauma and a horrible thing to do to taxpaying residents of our city. One will be expected to live a continued state of apprehensive limbo until a developer comes along and starts buying up properties on one's block. One will have to decide to sell, or risk living next to something that will ruin one's quality of life with a literally massive detriment to one's privacy and enjoyment of their property. This is completely unnecessary planner overreach and fantasy playing with people's lives and equity. Listen to the experienced former planners in The Housing Reset Group who rightfully are against this badly conceived plan. Listen to the people who actually live in the neighbourhoods and want to enjoy their lives on their properties. If a homeowner will not be allowed to add additions to create more space for one's family, or add a rental suite or laneway house to add density and income/mortgage helper, then no one will want to spend on their properties. With no remaining resale advantage to doing so, this will surely lead to a general decrepitness of residential City blocks. This is awful. We are finally seeing some adjustment to house prices happening amidst massive residential vacancies. But, rather than allowing the market to solve itself, the government is cynically proposing to buy out unsold units, protecting developers from the market forces that previously made their profits. And… the City has not even given enough time to allow recent "gentle-density" Zoning changes to take root and fulfill what was to have been their promise. Why can we not wait longer to see what those recent changes are going to do? People in the neighbourhoods are not even used to those yet! Why throw something as massive as the Villages Plan on top of an unfinished experiment? Please instead do something to help existing and struggling villages we already have such as Pt. Grey and Dunbar first. Don't overshoot the need by hundreds and hundreds of residential units. This plan will inevitably lead to calls for more immigration to fill ever more empty homes, and thus start the un-affordability cycle all over again. This is all so predictable!!! Thank you, Peter Rose Architect AIBC	organization Peter Rose Architecture + Interiors Inc.	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	15:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a long time resident and homeowner in Vancouver and wish to register my opposition to the Villages Plan being promoted by Council. The increased, outsized densification and establishment of commercial “centres” in competition with those that are valued in the community are contrary to the direction our city should be moving. I strongly urge that this plan not be adopted and that further consultation be held with local, experienced, city planners and the public to create a new plan to the benefit of all. Thank you. David Morantz [redacted]	David Morantz	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	15:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am totally opposed to this broad brush swath approach to inventing "villages" - this done in the middle of summer (!) when it is highly unlikely to attract the kind of justified debate it requires. You are in effect planning to freeze the main asset of hundreds of properties with no deliverable time frame on these invented village borders. These plans will be irreversibly put in place freezing the home ownership rights of hundreds of homeowners possibly for decades. Is this a homeowner renoviction plan? This is such overreach and the very significant financial consequences are to be sucked up by the homeowners - who in likely every case have their entire financial picture anchored by their homes for which they have maintained and dutifully paid taxes? There is no indication that the inventors of this massive blanket approach to freezing property rights have any credible clue how to invent “village” economic activity when existing businesses all over the city can barely make it. Examples that come to mind are the “village” of Dunbar street and 10th Avenue/Point Grey are still complete dead zones, while construction of mass housing projects sleep walk to completion. You have not even given gentle multiplex housing a chance, and what you are approving has no design guardrails on it at all. This is neighbourhood vandalism and the true scope of this is not generally understood.	Fiona Brodie	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	15:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	An absolutely terrible idea which will continue wrecking the present character of the city's neighbourhoods with ugly, imposing building density and destroying the city's precious tree canopy. Kill this idea ASAP.	Percival Koehl	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	15:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	* I oppose this plan in its current iteration. I am requesting council reconsider and engage in meaningful consultation with affected residents and neighbourhood organizations. *consider Independent analysis of infrastructure capacity and funding requirements. * Provide stronger protections for mature trees and green space for this increase in population. * Preservation of opportunities for homeowners to pursue smaller-scale redevelopment options, including laneway homes and duplexes, without requiring participation in large land assemblies. * Reassessment of where street-level retail is appropriate based on demonstrated commercial demand rather than applying it broadly throughout Village areas. * Clear affordability measures that ensure new housing serves a broad range of incomes to counter the land lift that will occur with this rezoning. Protection of renters in areas affected since rezoning will encourage assemblies and purchasing of low rise rental buildings (as seen with the Broadway Plan). * Transparent monitoring and public reporting on the impacts of any future redevelopment.	Stephanie Von Dehn	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-13	15:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	With regard to the Villages Plan, I strongly opposed the plan. Fundamentally, the plan will have negative impacts on the features that make Vancouver such a wonderful city to both live in and visit. Among my concerns with the plan are: • The artificial 'villages' will undermine, even destroy the existing commercial districts in Vancouver's distinct existing neighbourhoods and high streets. The existing neighbourhoods (dare I call the villages) not only make the city highly livable, they also make it interesting for visitors/tourists and encourage return visits. • The change to higher density in such a large swath of the city is an undisguised boom for development companies to the detriment of individuals property owners – especially over the long term. Not only will hundreds of people begin to be displaced from their homes, those wishing to purchase homes in the city will be competing with developers and the housing stock will be highly reduced. Where are those who are displaced expected to go? They won't be choosing to swap a house with yard for a tiny apartment, especially now that so many people need a work space at home. • The discrimination against homeowners – removing any options for homeowners to be able improve / add value to their homes by adding suites (which are typical less expensive than those in developer-built complexes), laneway houses, or doing other adjustments is unfair and feels discriminatory. This change appears to be intended to strong arm homeowners to sell out to developers. • The lack of inclusion of mechanisms for developers to have responsibilities for including and contributing to amenities such as public spaces, new parks and playgrounds, schools, and other non-commercial public spaces is concerning. This is a sample of my concerns and objections.	Charlotte French	Kitsilano	

2026-07-13	15:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Village Planning Program for the following reasons: -It will negatively affect the character of established neighbourhoods with over scaled buildings and it will adversely affect the quality of life for the residents and community - The decimation of our trees, tree canopies and green spaces. Clear cutting is taking place at a rapid pace. - Small businesses are already struggling. The focus should be on trying to have initiatives that help with existing communities to fill their vacant store/businesses and to address the needs of existing ones to make them more viable. - The infrastructure is already overloaded - sewer, water, roads and transportation. There is an existing shortage of healthcare and childcare services. - Further erosion of core services	Shelley Crawford	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	15:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Roads the existing villages of Kerrisdale and the newly established Oakridge. Effort go into ensuring that these places strive and building a new village just a few blocks away from both will hurt what already exists. Yours truly,	Arlene Gladston	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	15:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages Plan prioritizes developers' greed over residents' need. The aim of the Villages Plan is to create fast development yet claims changes will be incremental. The current zoning process allows for incremental changes promised by the plan. A faster process only serves developers by taking away the voice of the communities where they seek to bulldoze all unique characteristics away. The language of the plan is always certain when discussing about building, yet becomes vague and weak like 'consider' and 'encourage' in relation to protecting and providing the things a community needs like our parks and neighbourhood resources. This lack of commitment and real protection is only used in relation to areas that are a benefit to the people and demonstrates the city valuing developers over the people who made these distinctive spaces livable. We have seen repeatedly developers NOT held to account in the maintenance of required green spaces and public spaces, letting them go into disrepair. We have seen this through the city's allowance of tax loopholes that appear to serve the public but in reality loses the city millions while increasing developers' finances. The Village Plan includes 6 storey hotels as "unique site[s]", yet does not include the community focused small businesses that have existed for decades, the park and green spaces tended to by the public, or the family homes that have shaped each neighbourhood as unique. The plan's allowance for hotels goes against addressing the "missing middle" and providing daily needs within a 5 minute radius. The only people who benefit from a hotel in these villages are the developers who sell them. The blanket rezoning proposed by the Village Plan only serves developers and loses the taxpayers what made their homes a true community. The Village Plan provides no protection or consideration for the businesses and people who are in the neighbourhoods it targets. A blanket rezoning to allow 6 storey buildings increases the potential value of existing homes, and therefore their property taxes increase creating an extra financial burden on families and seniors; and the rezoning gives landlords incentive to increase rents or not renew leases of businesses that have served the community for decades. The very people the plan claims to support are the ones who will be hurt by it. The wait-and-assess approach to develop infrastructure that the plan takes leaves residence with increase traffic, insufficient transport, unsafe cycling, and lack of community resources like insufficient school size. The Plan contains no assessment for the needed schools, libraries and community centres despite the expected increase in population. The expansion of retail high streets and increased density transforms safe quiet roads for cycling into congested areas with increase pollution. In many of the proposed villages the sidewalk width is significantly narrower since it was built in the 1920s, which has allowed for trees with significant canopies as well as roads. The Villages Plan would require these sidewalks to be	Carolyn McLean Hearn	Dunbar-Southlands	

widened for the increase population, and remove the trees that have helped keep the area cool in heat waves and take up storm water. These trees are not replaceable by the small trees the city currently uses. These existing sidewalks demonstrate when infrastructure is built for the people it can stand the test of time, while buildings created for the benefit of developers fall into disrepair (e.g. leaky condo crisis; renovictions).

The plan only focuses on new retail and uses small businesses that have supported their community for decades as the place for these “new” villages to be. The Villages Plan will remove local community businesses through increased rent or landlord’s refusing renew leases in order to sell to developers. These business have no guarantee to be able to return to the community nor could they afford to be closed for the time of development. The only businesses who can afford to take that chance are American corporations like McDonalds or Starbucks. The city does not have adequate authority to ensure that the new retail options will meet the daily needs of the neighbourhood, with the Village Plan only expecting landlords to consider having a grocery store. There is no bylaw or municipal power that would prevent every new retail shop becoming a trading card store or vape shop. For example, on Dunbar St despite increased population growth, retailer Dunbar Produce has been closed with no other retailer occupying the space for years; essentially decreasing access to groceries. We have already seen this occur on existing community high streets and slowly erasing the diverse businesses that made an area unique.

The Village Plan does not protect green or community spaces. The plan only provides for assessment and vague guidance to protect these spaces. Community parks have been drawn within the designated rezoning area, which removes steps of review and community feedback. The Vancouver ODP Direction is not a by-law, just guidelines that can be broken. We have seen the city look to develop public green spaces before (e.g. Langara Golf Course), the Village Plan makes it easier to pave our parks.

Building more does not help the missing middle. The city has continued to build for decades in an attempt to address affordable housing, the result has been poorly made structures and empty units. We have seen this failure with the Olympic Village, Arbutus Village, and is forecasted with the new Senawk Towers. Vancouver’s empty housing due to increased building has led to the federal and provincial governments bailing out developers. Variety of housing types does not address the missing middle as the Village Plan has no control for the amount of each type of housing that is available, resulting in smaller and smaller units making it harder to have a family. The city has no current rent protections or say in the prices of homes. The Village Plan claims there will be “enhanced affordability requirement” but does not provide what this means or how it would be made possible. Services and features are allowed to not be provided given the cash-in-leu options within the new zoning structure. The Village Plan will create empty units and vacant neighbourhoods.

5 minute village is not possible or desired. The Village Plan and the city has no power to ensure desired and needed businesses and community resources will occur, so commuting greater than 5 minutes for groceries can occur. A simpler way to ensure easier access to daily needs would be to improve public transportation so wait and travel times are decreased. The daily needs as defined in the Village Plan includes work space, but not work. There are no measures that anyone living within the village would work within it, nor would have a salary that would afford the rent there, likely keeping the average 30 minute commute. Internet is identified as a daily need, yet the plan has no indication how more retailers will allow for internet connection as the few retailers who offer internet access also limit time in their location. VPL provides internet and devices for connecting to the internet yet there is nothing in the Village Plan to support the creation of libraries. A better way to a 5 minute city would be to improve transit. During lockdown we saw how being isolated within your own community causes mental and physical health declines. Our city is made of a culturally diverse network of neighbourhoods with different specialties and character. For a true 5 minute city would be one with rapid transit to allow you to connect to any part of the city

				with ease, not one that traps you within your own bubble. My predominant mode of transportation is walking, and I am impacted by at least 5 of the proposed villages. The Villages Plan makes the assumption these areas need more retail in order to be “vibrant” and “active”. This is insulting to all of us who take time to support our neighbours and local businesses who support us. These areas are only desirable for development because of the civic work and care its people have put in to make the area welcoming and livable. My community is filled with people and businesses of various backgrounds and the rezoning through The Villages Plan will bulldoze that away. The Village Plan only helps developers. Our community supports those who support our community. Vote No on The Village Plan.			
2026-07-13	15:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The “Villages Plan” is a slap in the face to the existing retail small businesses who are struggling to survive in our existing neighbourhood retail areas. Vancouver’s existing neighbourhood retail areas evolved literally from earlier villages in a natural and organic way, the way that most city neighbourhoods evolve. This top down “Villages Plan” appears to be an imported blueprint for a “new town plan” as if our existing neighborhoods didn’t exist. Existing bricks and mortar retail businesses have enough financial troubles dealing with online shopping competition to be confronted with the additional competition from the proposed new “Villages” retail areas. Request: Scrap the “Villages Plan” & think of ways to assist existing retail neighbourhood areas to survive, prosper and grow.	ARNY WISE	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	15:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver is facing a 'clearcutting' crisis. The villages plan will inevitably lead to Irreplaceable Tree Canopy Loss. The "Old Growth" urban canopy is an iconic feature of our neighborhood and provides not only clean air to it's residents, but also provides the city with an unprecedented carbon capture and storage method that would be destroyed if the "Villages Plan" is passed and implemented. The "Old Growth" urban canopy that exists today greatly benefits the local residents in terms of clean air, shade, and a huge boost to residential mental health. Not to mention, also greatly reduces flood risk and provides natural habitats to dozens, if not hundreds of vital animal and insect species. Please reconsider handing over our essential "Old Growth" urban canopy to developers who won't think twice about destroying a beloved and vital part of our community. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.	Lavender Mead	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	15:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Destroys existing fabric of locations shown in the plan. Does not seem to allow for existing single family homes to remain as is, without pressure to re-develop. Very little, if any: design consideration; blending with existing neighbourhood; scale; setbacks; yards; existing trees; nature of existing retail and what happens to them once development starts; changes to allow for increased traffic due to more people living in the village; etc.; etc.; etc.	Mark Munroe	Oakridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	15:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Planning Program and the proposed City-initiated rezoning in its current form. This large-scale plan would pre-zone thousands of properties across 17 Village areas and may remove future site-specific public hearings for projects that comply with the plan. Such a major transformation should not proceed without detailed infrastructure and neighbourhood-impact assessments, meaningful community consultation, and continued public participation in individual development decisions. I ask Council to reject or defer the proposed blanket rezoning and return with a phased, transparent and community-based planning process. Please see my attached letter for further details.	Jason Yi Liu	Arbutus Ridge	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	15:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This Plan fails to address the key goal of the policy, which is to create housing for moderate and low-income families. The multiplexes that have been developed in recent years have sat vacant for long periods of time, as there is little market demand for $2M duplexes. There is already a glut of high-rise condos and purpose-built-rentals in the area, specifically around Oak and 41st and east towards Oakridge. I am deeply concerned about loss of tree canopy, especially in our warming climate. These multiplexes and apartment buildings will result in the loss of more tree canopy. Thirdly, there will be such a surge in demand on city infrastructure in the area - from Oakridge to the new JCC - in the next few years. As a young family, I am concerned about the lack of seats in the local public schools, congestion on our main streets and overall burden to the existing infrastructure, which will not be able to keep up.	Lydia McLean	Oakridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	15:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Councillors, I'm writing ahead of the July 14 Public Hearing to urge you not to approve the Villages Planning Program as currently proposed. My concerns aren't about growth or investment in neighbourhood centres in principle — they're about how this specific plan is being done: - Scale and pace: nearly 14,000 lots across 17 villages are being rezoned in one sweep, with a timeline that critics (including a joint letter from planners, architects, and academics under the Housing Reset banner) call rushed and unjustified. - Weak consultation: many affected residents only learned of the rezoning via postcard, if at all, and much of this has moved forward without meaningful neighbourhood-level input. - Confusing/inconsistent materials: there are reported discrepancies between what's shown on ShapeYourCity and what's in the referral report to Council, making it hard for residents to even confirm whether their property is affected. - Loss of future input: for most of these properties, this may be the last Public Hearing before zoning changes take effect. - Risk to existing high streets: some planners have warned this could destabilize established commercial areas rather than strengthen them. To be clear about where I do stand: I support raising property taxes to properly fund public services in our communities — community centres, libraries, walkability improvements, and transit. I just don't think blanket rezoning of this scale, on this timeline, is the right way to get there. I'd rather see the City slow down, fix the consultation process, and invest directly in the public infrastructure that makes neighbourhoods livable. Please vote against proceeding with the Villages Plan as currently written, or at minimum defer it for a proper public process. Thank you for your consideration. Max Tennessen Vancouver, BC	Max Tennessen	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	16:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I support higher density but not this rigid plan. Why must 6 story buildings have retail on the bottom level. I support neighborhoods not villages. Wil vote differently in nov	Joanne Haramia	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	16:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Not enough information. Is it true we will not be able to add laneways or do any renovations to our homes if this goes through? I cannot get answers on this but t his is a reason to definitely not do these villages. We should have choice of who we sell to and what we do on our property and have a diversity. not be forced to sell to a developer! many other reasons too.	Penelope Noble	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	16:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	You've hear it all before from others more erudite than me. I've lived and owned a home in Vancouver for over 50 years. What was once a model of city planning for the world has been lost and an embarrassment of development and sell outs has taken over. You should be ashamed. You have NO respect for people who have loved and lived in this city. Your plans are truly driving them away. I feel like the city has turned its back on me. The "Villages Plan" is not needed. We HAVE villages but you have ignored them. Your plans for Jericho are at least as insulting. Vancouver will become (or is) the laughing stock of liveability forums. The Villages Plan is insulting and just plain unneeded. Maureen Carey	Maureen Carey		
2026-07-13	16:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The impact of the Villages Plan is profoundly undemocratic. Not only has the level of public engagement and consultation been woefully inadequate to date, but if the Plan passes future public input will be severely curtailed, especially given the prohibition on public hearings. This is exacerbated by the many details that remain to be worked out after passage of the plan. All-in-all, this in effect guarantees that one of the most substantive and wide-ranging changes in the history of the city will never receive the proper public scrutiny that it requires—and that the residents of Vancouver deserve. Power is handed over to unaccountable city staff.	Rob Marsh	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
2026-07-13	16:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver, BC, July 13, 2026 Re: Villages plan Mayor Ken Sim and councillors, We are owners of property in the Mackenzie Heights area. After reading the proposed plan for rezoning of the area we live we are distressed and concerned about the proposed changes to the neighbourhood we have lived in for the past 42 years. We feel that there are already 2 neighbourhood centers within walking distance of our home in Kerrisdale and Dunbar. Both have community centers and libraries to serve the community. The Dunbar corridor is slowly reviving as newer buildings are providing space for businesses to come into. There is no need for larger buildings to oQer services to the neighbourhood. We also feel that some of the restrictions of the plan would impact us very negatively in that our lot is a 44’ wide lot and would not meet the 50’ criteria for any redevelopment of the lot. That means only a developer that is willing to put a land assembly together would be able to purchase our property if they wanted to replace the 100 year old house on our lot. This puts all the control of the property value in the developers hands which does not have to represent true market value if the property could be sold to anyone. We feel that the 6 story buildings that are proposed will exceed what is necessary for future housing for many years to come as well as cause a disjointed look to a beautiful area. We are already seeing that so much building in the west side condo market means that places are not selling. Huge developments on the Jericho lands, the lands around the Burrard Street bridge and Oakride will supply housing to meet the demands for many years. We are already concerned that the infrastructure needed for water, sewar and transportation will not meet the needs of this development without further compounding that by too much densification in neighbourhoods. While some densification may be necessary to meet future needs the Village Plan as it stands has many flaws that we feel need to be addressed before being voted on. We feel the vote should be cancelled or at the very least further discussion with community involvement should be encouraged before a vote takes place. Sincerely, Debra and Bill Treloar D Treloar	Debra Treloar	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	16:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Subject: Opposition to the Oak Street & West 67th Avenue Village Plan Dear Mayor and Council, My name is [F U Y I], and I am the owner of [redacted]. I respectfully oppose the proposed Village Plan and rezoning. Our neighbourhood has already accommodated growth. Duplex development is already permitted, providing additional housing while maintaining the character of the community. Higher-density development should be focused along major arterial roads and commercial corridors where transportation, infrastructure, and services are better suited to support it. Expanding higher-density zoning further into established single-family neighbourhoods is not necessary. The proposed Village Plan would significantly change the character of our neighbourhood by allowing more intensive development closer to existing homes. This may increase traffic, parking demand, noise, and pressure on local infrastructure without clear community benefits. The current approach strikes a reasonable balance: Duplex zoning already provides gentle density. Higher-rise and mixed-use buildings belong along major roads such as Oak Street. Interior residential streets should remain lower-density neighbourhoods. I encourage Council to preserve the existing neighbourhood character and reject the proposed Village Plan rezoning. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, L I U F U Y I Owner, [redacted]	Fu Yi Liu	Marpole	
2026-07-13	16:18	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly opposed to the 'villages' plan. This is yet another example of broad city wide blanket rezonings that ignore the details of each neighbourhood and that fail to work with residents of these neighbourhoods to determine the appropriate form, type, and scale of development for their area. There is no need for this kind of rush in this current proposal for yet more extensive areas of 6 storey apartments for 577 blocks of the city. There is already a glut of these kinds of units sitting empty with no market. Instead, we need thoughtful policies that create much needed ground oriented family housing that fits in with adjacent neighbours. This is how new residents will be welcomed. Even worse, the plan calls for a freeze on about 600 properties where property rights are being taken away. This taking of owners' rights is totally unacceptable in our city and province. Please reject this ill thought out plan (and the similar but even more problematic Neighbourhood Centres policy that planners are proposing to implement next) and bring back meaningful consultation to determine how our city will grow in the years ahead.	Jan Pierce	Kitsilano	

2026-07-13	16:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	like the idea of walkable neighbourhoods but believe that neighbourhoods s develop their own character over time. So I oppose the Villages plan. Imposing 17 villages at the same time does not allow for the development and evolution of individual neighbourhood and community character and will in fact detract from those areas where such character already exists and should be more gently encouraged and supported.	Daniel Conner		
2026-07-13	16:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We have overbuilt and Vancouver is getting destroyed. Old trees keep your children and all your citizens healthy in mind, body and spirit. They also make a noticeable impact on temperature and water retention in the soil. We do not want an unlivable city.	E. Hammel	South Cambie	
2026-07-13	16:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a nearby resident, I am deeply concern the rezoning proposal of Victoria Drive and E 61st Ave. The inclusion of commercial spaces and multi family unirs apartments directly adjacent to the low density quiet single-family homes will severely impact our quality of life through increased ambient noise, commercial waste, and late-night disruptions. This goes against the quiet, peaceful environment we chose when moving into this single-family area. Commercial operations and high-density residential housing belong along major arterial transit corridors, not embedded inside a quiet, established residential neighborhood. Introducing a multi-storey, mixed-use commercial and residential building directly contradicts the established character of our community. Furthermore, this project will inevitably cause parking spillover onto our single-family streets, and creating severe safety hazards. I urge Council to protect our established neighborhood and reject this amendment.	Kitty Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-13	16:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This plan is rushing development into 17 areas of the city regardless of whether it would be detrimental to the current residents of those areas. Much more planning and input needed from current Vancouverites many of whom are unaware of these plans. Once done these developments cannot be undone so it is important to get it done with as much public input as possible.	Karina Conner	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	16:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	By combining 17 so-called Villages into one omnibus rezoning plan the city has made proper scrutiny by the public and by council almost impossible. The neighbourhoods involved are distinct and unique; each one requires and deserves consideration of its specific circumstances, and a neighbourhood plan specific to it. The differences between the so-called Villages are vast--the differences, for example, between transit access at Mackenzie and 33rd versus Nanaimo and Broadway is extreme. The degree of existing retail and the impact on nearby existing businesses also varies greatly between so-called Villages. And these are just two examples. Imposing uniform zoning on disparate neighbourhoods without consideration for their uniqueness will lead to destructive homogeneity, the failure to achieve intended goals, and foreseen and unforeseen negative consequences. And by jamming these disparate areas into one rezoning proposal, proper scrutiny of any of them is much more difficult. This is not a tactic employed by transparent, open government.	Rob Marsh	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	16:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am 19 years old and live in the Mackenzie & 41st area. I oppose this rezoning, and I want to raise a concern that I think deserves more attention than it has received. Rezoning land to permit larger buildings can substantially increase the market value of that land, wherever the newly permitted development is financially viable, independent of whether construction ever actually occurs. Where that increase happens, it accrues to whoever owns or can assemble the affected lots, unless the City structures the rezoning to	Kai G	Kerrisdale	

capture a meaningful share of it for public benefit.

The Plan does claw back some of this value, through Development Cost Levies, a proposed Amenity Cost Charge, and affordability requirements on some west-side projects, so I am not claiming developers would contribute nothing. But the City has not published a transparent, location-specific accounting for these two Villages showing how much value the rezoning is expected to create, how much of that would be captured through these mechanisms, and how much would simply remain private.

In economic terms, Council is being asked to approve a land value transfer without knowing its size or how much of it the public will actually see. The City should ensure that infrastructure and public spaces will be sufficient before approving large increases in development capacity. Additional green spaces, schools and community facilities do not materialize after the fact: the necessary land, funding and delivery mechanisms should be secured before zoning changes are enacted, rather than left to future capital plans that may never materialize.

Canada's purpose-built rental sector has seen a well-documented, sustained increase in ownership by REITs, pension funds and private equity since the late 1990s (see August, 2020, 2022; Office of the Federal Housing Advocate). These are institutional owners whose return expectations differ structurally from those of smaller landlords, and research associates this ownership model with higher eviction rates, though the relationship to rent levels specifically remains debated in the literature.

Without binding affordability and public benefit requirements attached before enactment, there is little to prevent newly upzoned land in these two villages from being assembled and transferred into the purpose-built rental sector ownership structure.

I do not own property, and I have no investment to protect. I am, by the City's own framing, part of the generation this plan is meant to serve, and I remain unconvinced that additional zoning capacity, on its own, translates into housing that people my age can afford. Capacity and outcome are not the same thing, and I would ask Council not to treat them as such.

Young people are often told that we must accept any rezoning proposal because development is supposedly being done for our benefit. But if the result is expensive housing that we still cannot afford, fewer public amenities per person, and more wealth for developers and corporations that already have a lot of it, then it is fair for us to question who the plan is actually helping.

I am asking Council to remove Mackenzie & 41st and Mackenzie & 33rd from the current rezoning until the City can specify, before enactment, what share of the resulting development will be genuinely affordable, and how a significant portion of the land value created by this rezoning will be captured for public benefit rather than left to accrue privately.

Sincerely,

Kai G
Mackenzie Heights / 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
2026-07-13	16:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to ask you to reject the Villages Planning Program in its current form and send it back to staff. I ask the Council to direct staff to implement a more balanced and livable approach: 1) Keep high and mid-rises on major arteries: Concentrate six-story buildings exclusively on defined transit corridors like West 4th, West Broadway, and Arbutus. This places density directly where there is transit, and amenities and substantial untapped existing opportunity for density. 2) Allow character-retaining multiplexes on single lots while protecting the unique look and feel of Kitsilano. Mandate design guidelines that require new builds that match the other homes on the block, as well as front-yard setbacks to preserve green canopy, gardens, access to sun. 3) Services and utility upgrades should be taxed / paid for by the developer. Infrastructure must be expanded at the same time (or ahead of) the construction. We need to focus density on main transit corridors to drive much-needed foot traffic back to our existing neighborhood businesses on 4th and Broadway (which are already part of our "village" in Kits). Passing the plan as currently written will only create new growth, community and livability issues.	Allan Racey	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	16:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please find herewith the attachment.	Pinardi Priambodo	Kerrisdale	Appendix P
2026-07-13	16:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rush to do this mass upzoning all at once, and to schedule the public hearing in the middle of summer when many are on vacation (or, for example, watching a soccer semi-final), is difficult to view as other than a cynical ploy to avoid proper public scrutiny. On the one hand, the message seems to be that we must move with alacrity to deal immediately with the affordability crises (which the Villages Plan will not address). On the other hand, the message is that changes under the plan will happen slowly over an extended period of time, so we need not worry about rapid neighbourhood impacts. Why then the rush to approve mass rezoning of disparate neighbourhoods? It appears that the only pressing imperative is to remove the opportunity for future public scrutiny of potentially massive neighbourhood changes.	Rob Marsh	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	16:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input. The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Please find attached my letter expanding on these concerns.	Jennifer Kendrick	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix Q

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
2026-07-13	16:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not support the 'Village Plan' - it is an excuse for quick and crude densification. The compressed timeline is shameful, especially given that these changes could significantly alter the ethos of our neighbourhoods. Quiet neighbourhoods - Vancouver has unique neighbourhoods that have evolved over a long time. Blanket rezoning allowing for up to 6-8 stories, will destroy the character of our neighbourhoods and make them less livable. We chose to live in a quiet neighbourhood, away from a city centre, away from shops and retail, and in a place where people have gardens and trees and private spaces to live. Climate resiliency - The plan focusses on housing, shops and services, it neglects climate issues and livability. We have already seen examples of multiplex designs in our neighbourhood, and we are extremely worried about the loss of green space. Where once there was a home (house,garden, mature trees) the lot is filed with house, leaving no space for garden habitats that are essential to biodiversity, climate resilience, and healthier and more livable cities. We have done everything we can on our small garden to support biodiversity, providing native plants for local and migratory flora and fauna and contributing to the climate resiliency. Climate change is no longer a distant threat, and cities are among the places most vulnerable to its impacts. The Village plan is at odds with foundational climate focussed plans that have shaped our city and attracted people to want to live here. Plans like the Greenest City Plan and the Vancouver Bird Strategy brought progressive ideas to our city that inspired others to move forward with climate commitments. The Bird Strategy Report states "A study performed in Vancouver in 2003 found that species richness declined in relation to increasing urbanization. The same study found that site-scale habitat features, like mature trees and fruit bearing plants, are correlated with increased bird diversity (Page 13). The City of Vancouver is a Nature Canada certified Bird Friendly City! The goal and responsibility of a Bird friendly city is to create the conditions for native birds to thrive in the City of Vancouver and across the region. Biodiversity matters - The type of densification permitted in the Village plan will allow for exponential loss of green space and local biodiversity. The UK Government has initiated a mandatory policy called Biodiversity Net Gain, it is an approach to development that makes sure that habitats for wildlife are left in a measurably better state than they were before the development. BNG units, are measures of natural habitat used to assess and ensure that development projects in the UK enhance biodiversity by at least 10% compared to pre-development levels. These units can be created through habitat improvements or purchased on the market if on-site enhancements are not feasible. This kind of approach is how we should be moving forward with any new development projects in our cities.	Kirsty Robbins	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	16:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am against the up zone of Mackenzie Village. I do Not think there has been enough public engagement. This will forever change this neighbourhood and it's not supported by the new numbers in student housing needed. This is based on old information.	Lara Bratlien	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
2026-07-13	16:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this application. I believe this plan is ill-thought-through and being imposed on disparate neighbourhoods throughout the city without any regard given to the particular circumstances in each area that may indicate that those neighbourhoods have different requirements in future development. This plan should be withdrawn and only reintroduced once extensive, in-person public consultations have been held with residents in each of the areas proposed for this redevelopment. I am not opposed to densification in principle, nor to the development of critical businesses, such as grocery stores, closer to where people live. I am, however, concerned about the potential to lose community-developed green spaces in the neighbourhood, and for the temporary displacement and loss of housing should eminent domain be invoked in primarily residential areas. More housing is needed. Local services are needed. But let us not do it at the expense of the longstanding character of local neighbourhoods. Let us not deprive residents of the homes to which they have become accustomed. Buy those houses which their owners wish to sell, certainly, as has, by my understanding, been the City's longstanding policy with regard to land along False Creek--but only those.	Daniel Pareja	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	16:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I've lived in one of your "Villages" (Adera St. and West 52nd) for over 20 years. The proposed village densification plan is a mistake. please DO NOT approve it. Bigger buildings, more people, less tree canopy, lower air quality and a lower quality of life should NOT be the goal for Vancouver. 10 years ago city council realized that Vancouver was loosing too much of it's urban forest to development and they voted to ban the unnecessary removal of old growth trees on private land. Now city staff are telling you to reverse that ban by expanding building envelopes to the edge of property lines. I agree with all of the canopy loss issues raised by smartdensityvancouver. Our private land trees play an important role in air quality, noise suppression, temperature regulation and other high value ecosystem services. An 80 year Cedar or Douglas fir tree on a private lot is only starting to meet it's ability to sequester carbon. With a life span of 500 to 1,000 years. It should NOT be removed for an enlarged building envelope. Those trees should continue to grow and provide the full range of ecosystem services we need. In addition to the canopy concerns, there are economic questions to this plan. Why would city councilors agree to re-zone large parts of Vancouver in favour of more apartment blocks at a time when BC developers are liquidating unsellable apartments to the government? The villages plan does not make sense. It needs to be re-worked to reduce building footprints. There needs to be a better plan to enhance Vancouver neighbourhoods. City councilors need to insist on a better plan to maintain neighbouhood character and urban canopy, while adding places to live. Please DO NOT approve the "villages plan". City planners, the civil service, and developers need to do a better job.	Susanna Carson	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Appendix R Attachment 5

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
2026-07-13	16:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the 17 Villages Plan. This is too important an issue to be rushed through. It deserves meaningful public consultation. It does not take the unique character of the communities into consideration and I am strongly opposed to the plan as presented.	Lisa Pacheco	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	16:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Focus on existing “villages” that are struggling rather than creating new ones that will be more competition. Enough with the apartment blocks which are generally ugly big boxes and certainly not affordable!! Character and heritage houses should be protected to ensure the history of our city remains preserved.	Sarah McLeod	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	16:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It is folly for the city to advance a plan that will create 5 miles of retail storefronts when so many retail spaces in Vancouver are sitting empty. And why develop new "villages" when many of the existing neighbourhood centres could be strengthened and densified without the destructive, insensitive impacts that the Villages Plan will have. Please scrap this plan and go to work on real consultation with neighbourhoods and citizens.	Susan Fisher	West Point Grey	
2026-07-13	17:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I think the Villages plan, while laudable in the idea, is poorly thought out and will primarily please developers and not the people they’re supposed to attract (mid to lower income families, immigrants and seniors on restricted incomes). Allowing for greater density in some areas is a good thing, but not at the expense of mature trees, character and historical homes and buildings, or by overshadowing neighbouring properties. Adding laneway houses, putting up duplexes or quads within neighbourhoods, or tucking in characterful 4 storey apartments along streets with room for them (think Broadway west of Arbutus where the older apartments are), help with density while still keeping communities functional and neighbourly. Big glass boxes with unaffordable retail spaces on the ground level are sterile and don’t encourage people to walk in the area. There are enough empty apartments and condos in the city that no more should be a moratorium on new ones until there is a better plan, which should include amenities and schools. With almost every elementary school in currently popular neighbourhoods, more are needed before more housing is built. As it is, many in catchment children have to commute to schools outside of their neighbourhoods and that’s only going to get worse in some areas (Cambie, Main St, Olympic Village, for example). No more pandering to the developers and their need for ever greater returns. Please support the people who would love to live in more than a small glass boxes, and who can’t afford current market rates. We need less expensive housing now, in areas that can handle 3 to 4 storeys, preferably with character and green space, or tell developers to drop their rates and suck it up like the rest of us have been doing.	Anne Montgomery	Riley Park	
2026-07-13	17:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose this villages plan. Yes density is required in Vancouver, but not in quiet residential areas. Home owners have chosen their Neighbourhoods for the residential feel, but they will now be forced to live in significantly altered neighborhoods. There are sufficient current commercial strips that can be expanded without bulldozing tranquil neighborhoods. There also doesn’t seem to be much thought or rationale into why certain streets were chosen to be included while others were not. According to the city’s plans, a street of small single family dwellings will be surrounded by massive 6 story high rises. Does that even make sense? The plan needs to consult the people who live in these neighborhoods, which this plan did not do adequately considering the massive opposition against this plan. This is our home and we need to be heard.	Tina Leung	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	17:13	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I don't support the 'Villages' plan as it's rushed and widespread. The "one-size-fits-all" up-zoning of over 300 blocks across 17 villages simultaneously lacks phased testing and is over-reaching. I also don't support the restrictive lot assemblies. Many property owners will be unable to add to or modify their homes, as the mandated mixed-use developments require large, multi-lot assemblies to proceed. This will actually diminish the character of neighbourhood instead of add to it. Vancouver can do better.	Stephanie Clark	Riley Park	
2026-07-13	17:13	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have lived at King Edward Court for 23 years. I'm a retired Early childhood educator at GF Strong. I'm a senior 80 years old. I'm very comfortable here. The rent is very affordable. This is my home and my son and granddaughter live within a few blocks. To have to move because of redevelopment would be very stressful. There are 60 people in total in this village and everyone would face the same hardship. Where do you expect us to go?	Lynn Cherry	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	17:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please, please STOP! this is not New York City, it is not Washington DC, and it is most definitely not Palm Beach Florida! This is Vancouver, Vancouver BC, the city known world wide as beautiful, welcoming, walkable, desirable, leaning toward timeless European rather than gauche and crude, ugly American style! Proposals for draconian ruination of ALREADY existing and thriving villages for Developers' Financial Enhancement does NOTHING to enhancing the quaint villages ALREADY operating near perfection. Developer's and Current Councillors are presenting themselves as a cruel, authoritarian, even draconian entity seeking "Dollars for Developing" for dollars sake alone, without attention to what is ACTUALLY needed in our lovely ciity; attention and funds for the once-thriving and now failing villages of, for example, west tenth avenue. Once a milling street of shoppers interested in special items from local and from afar, after allowing and encouraging high-rise buildings, now hosts empty shells and empty lots with floor level units begging for customers. Small extant, thriving villages flourish because they are SMALL, they offer one of a few kinds for those few in the neighbourhood who use them occasionally, whilst accomplishing most daily needs ONLINE....the contemporary shopping mode. We do not need competition within neighbourhoods, when the online competition sucks up all comers. Existing retail will only suffer and disappear with encouraged competition. What there is in these small areas serves well its' consumers; that is why they have thrived for years. Controlling immediate and future changes and uses of what owners have long saved for and bought into, smacks of, and IS, expropriation and dictatorship! This is NOT what Vancouver stands for, and proudly proclaims. Expropriation and Dictatorship, shown so obnoxiously south of our border in the past several years, is NOT WELCOME here. We in Vancouver, and Canada, pride ourselves on not falling prey to Developer Dollars. That buck needs to stop with YOU. YOU who have promised upon taking office, to speak "for the people, ALL of the people". STOP this now, rethink, revaluate, speak with citizens to hear what citizens would like for the futures of our neighbourhoods. I have received no notice at all of what is being planned as a "summer push-through" until I received a post card on July 8, essentially one skinny little week without essential time to read, comprehend, read more, contemplate, read more, consult, discuss, and come to a personal understanding of what is seeming day by day this week to be presenting Council's Deliberate Victimization and Slimy Attempt to Deceive a significantly large number of Vancouver's homeowners. Such atypical, unwelcome, and unhealthy procedure needs to pause, breathe, rethink, and re-present. Thank-you	Sandra Noble	Kerrisdale	

2026-07-13	17:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing in opposition to the proposed Villages Plan. I ask you to not approve the proposed Re-zoning and ODP ammendments. I share the many concerns already voiced to you by the likes of Brian Palmquist, Patrick Condon, Scott Hein,Larry Beasley and others. I encourage you to seriously consider the negative immediate and long term ramifications of the proposed Villages Plan, on the residents of Vancouver. A plan that appears to have been created from the top down, based on philosophies from outside of our neighbourhoods, city and country. A one size fits all approach that does not respect the wisdom and the needs of the communities that proudly make up Vancouver. Vancouver already enjoys vibrant, organic neighbourhoods, that through their thoughtful and well researched hard work over many years, stood together to advise on creating Community plans for supporting services and retail opportunities, while encouraging diverse, liveable and affordable housing to welcome new populations. As taxpayers, small business owners, homeowners, renters and concerned and committed Vancouverites, we deserve to have a say in this city we have chosen to call home. I have been following the Villages Plan, but I believe that the majority of Vancouver residents have no idea about these proposals or the impact they will have on their lives and their children's lives. Our wisdom and experience have value. Please do not shut us out of the decisions on planning our future. I urge you not to approve the Villages Plan. I ask you to scrap the concept altogether. At the very least, send it back to City Staff. Working together we have the possibility to create an amazing,Vancouver, where all communities can thrive. sincerely, Carol Van Camp	Carol VanCamp	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-13	17:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	While I applaud the city for trying to address the affordability and community in Vancouver, I oppose this particular villages ODP because (1) it's completely top-down and council has not appropriately consulted with the community; (2) city planning professionals largely agree that this is hastily done and will have unforeseen negative consequences and not achieve the goal; (3) we already have introduced significant mid-rise housing throughout the region (Granville, Arbutus, Dunbar, Broadway), with little impact on affordability, no improvement in community, and commercial centers that continue to struggle; (4) our infrastructure (schools, transit, water, electricity, etc) are already maxed out without ability to handle the increased density; and (5) in areas like the MacDonald/MacKenzie corridor, it will destroy the community feel - one of the few true family residential areas with limited congestion and all that comes with over population of an area. I believe we can do better! In my area, Dunbar, Arbutus, and Broadway have already been subject to mid-rise projects - let's figure out how to make those a success before we go adding 17 more villages. For example, the recent closing of 27th and Dunbar for a pedestrian only picnic area was a great move. So much more can be done to create draw to these areas and to make the existing projects more desirable.	Rob Chase	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	17:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Statement to Council Regarding the Proposed Marpole Village Rezoning Project Good evening, respected Councillors, City planners, and fellow community members. My name is Jing Kokko, address is 8019 Fremlin St. I'm a long-time homeowner on a single-family lot that lies inside the boundary of the proposed Marpole Village rezoning project. I have deep roots in this neighbourhood and with no plans to sell my property, tear down my house, or redevelop my land. I would like to age and live out my retirement right here in Marpole, but if I am forced out of my home, I would like to see this development be done properly with efforts to improve the community and Vancouver as a whole. I agree with the city's long term goal to create liveable neighbourhoods with improvements to local grocery, dining, and retail. However, I cannot support rushing through this large-scale upzoning plan under the current severe real estate downturn, and I do not agree that this is a project that is suitable for right now, given the current road and traffic issues. I do	Jing Kokko	Marpole	

				not wish to stop development forever, but rather aim to strike a fair balance between planned future housing needs and the protection of quality of life for existing long-term residents who have invested decades into this community. I have five main considerations I hope you will review carefully: 1. I want to highlight a long-standing critical traffic issue unique to our part of Marpole: our three local residential streets (Shaughnessy, Fremlin, and Laurel) sit very close to Oak Street Bridge, which serves as the main evening rush-hour artery for commuters returning to homes south of the Fraser River. Almost every Thursday and Friday afternoon and evening (4–8 pm), and sometimes on other days, too, drivers stuck in gridlock on the Oak Street Bridge spill over into our quiet side streets, filling every available curb space completely. These are not local residents' vehicles; they are temporary commuter cars blocking our driveways, emergency access routes, and street access for households that have lived here for generations. My husband could not drive home from work on these days. The long-standing overflow traffic from Oak Street Bridge commuters already occupies our residential side streets on these weekday evenings. In addition, running engines contribute polluted air to many Marpole homes. I respectfully ask the City to solve this headache. Our streets are no longer liveable even now. The City needs to study Oak and 70th area to figure out long-term solutions to the traffic that is becoming more and more severe. I don't think the City is aware how bad this issue is, and how much worse traffic in Vancouver will become if this redevelopment is accepted. I cannot state strongly enough: this traffic issue is very bad and completely not sustainable to the village or Vancouver you promote. Once or if development goes ahead, I ask the City to consider these solutions: 2. Please impose strict, non-negotiable height caps and expanded mandatory setbacks for all new multi-unit construction next to existing single-family home blocks. The current proposal allows buildings up to four storeys and higher in some locations. If these new structures are built too close to older homes, they will permanently block natural sunlight to our yards and living spaces and destroy our residential privacy. 3. Create more underground parking space and carefully plan public community parking restrictions; otherwise, lifelong residents will lose reliable access to parking outside their own homes. 4. Please schedule all demolition and construction work across Marpole Village in staggered, phased stages. In Marpole, many homeowners in these rezoning streets are seniors. They cannot face endless years of loud construction noise, airborne dust, and heavy delivery truck traffic. 5. Introduce a property tax relief program for Marpole single-family homeowners who choose not to redevelop their land. Upzoning automatically increases assessed land value, which will drive sharp annual property tax increases for homeowners who are affected by this development. Many of us are seniors relying on fixed retirement income. Capped taxes would allow us to stay in our homes. Finally, I would also like the city to consider the current housing market before rushing ahead with Marpole’s village. Right now, Greater Vancouver already has more than 4,300 newly built condo units sitting empty and unsold, with the vacancy rate hitting a 30-year high in our rental market. The Federal Government has been forced to step in, committing public funds to purchase 2,200 vacant condos as affordable housing for low-income households just to clear the existing oversupply. Pushing ahead with massive new high-density construction across Marpole at this moment will only create another wave of empty buildings, waste taxpayer-funded infrastructure investment, and unfairly burden local long-term residents with years of disruptive construction.		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	17:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We did not ask for this. There was no mention of this plan during the last election and it was not in ABC's mandate to make such massive changes to city zoning. It's a major and sudden departure from previous plans for our neighborhood. Changes like this make it impossible for families like mine to plan for the future. We already have densification along major arterials in our neighborhood and a nearby large townhouse complex. This is too much density too quickly without adequate infrastructure. There have also been multiple other large initiatives by this government to increase density, and it's wrong to proceed with another massive rezoning initiative without seeing the fallout from the projects that have already been approved. Even if the village plan proceeds, it doesn't make sense to approve this many villages in one step, as opposed to proceeding with one or two as a pilot project. As well, a lot of the public support for initiatives like this was due to the sudden unprecedented population surge that we had post Covid. The federal government has already taken steps to address that, and set new targets for population growth. Infact, we've actually had historic declines in population over the last few months. Fraser and 33rd area is not well connected to transit. The presence of the graveyard also impedes traffic to area, funneling it onto fewer roads. Even the 2 high streets shown in the plan for our neighborhood are not connected. This is clearly not the right neighbourhood for a plan like this. We are also going through a historic downturn in our housing market. There are thousands of unsold units. Vacancy rate is much improved and rental prices have steadily declined over the last few years. There are multiple retail spaces in our neighbourhood which have been sitting empty for months. We barely have any large trees left in our area and this plan will inevitably lead to removal of more trees from the neighbourhood. Also, there isn't that much green space in this neighborhood, and there will be too many new residents to share the space. As well, the large increase in population envisioned in the overall village plan will put further strain on our nearby natural resources, requiring additional sources of water, electricity, etc to be developed. As well, it will place additional strain on cherished amenities that are already stretched to their limits, such as access to nearby hiking trails. I oppose the village plan as a whole, and especially oppose the plan for my neighbourhood of Fraser and 33rd.	Sahriar Kabir	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	17:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly opposed to the "villages plan". Vancouver is becoming increasingly unliveable. Unaffordable apartment buildings are being scattered around without any regard for the existing neighborhood. Up zoning for higher density is simply driving up the land values. We are seeing zero increase in amenities as the density increases.increased traffic issues is NOT being addressed. People are getting evicted from affordable rentals throughout Kits and other areas so an unaffordable high rise can be built. I am very hopeful that the current major and council will be voted OUT this fall.	Barbara Porter	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
2026-07-13	17:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to strongly oppose the village as plan. we live into our cottage area close to Trout Lake. well commercial Street near the Croatian centre can be rezoned Near the major arteries. What should not be rezoned is the residential streets. For example, 18th Ave. from commercial Drive to knight Street is all residential homes. This is a hilly area. The families that have been here have been there for many generations. A large portion of the residents are from different cultural communities and speak English as a second language. None of these individuals are aware of this public carrying and the implication on their Home and land status. For example, everyone would surely be evicted when the property values go up in taxes substantially increase. This is a form of urban renewal, evicting people from middle class or even working class families. This seems to only benefit the developers. There seems to be a massive inventory of vacant condos that can be used instead. There needs to be a moderated plan where you remove 18th Ave. from this. People cannot afford to pay the high tax rates which keep going up and up. No one on our neighbourhood supports us because everyone is going to be displaced. This plan was given to the residents a week or two before and now City Hall is going to surely approve this. What about the voters? What about the residence? What about the Last fortunate? What about those that are going to be displaced? There is fundamental and significant objection to this plan and it seems the city is not listening to residents. Can you please either push this into the next council being elected Or refer it for more study to get better input. Also put a freeze on taxes for those that are going to be displaced to make sure they don't get evicted from their neighbourhoods. And have residence the ability to disapprove so that land assembly don't happen particularly in areas that are not too good for this. Thank you for your attention.	Roger H	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	17:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There are already many well functioning and integral commercial neighbourhoods in Vancouver that have evolved naturally over time. Many of them now have vacant storefronts due to unreasonably high rents (a product of City Hall's policies). What is the benefit to the neighbours of these long evolved and established high streets in our city to manufacture new Villages (a misleading title, since they will displace homes that have been in place historically and replace them with brand new overpriced multifamily dwellings overtop of commercial properties)? One possible gain is that it could be a potential marketing tactic for the developers of the Villages. However it could have the negative unintended consequence of adding more unaffordable and out of scale housing in our neighbourhoods. And the new commercial properties could very well draw business away from these long established "high streets". This Villages Plan has come to us from a top down process, with a one size fits all template. There has been no meaningful neighbourhood consultation. Longtime City planners are opposed to the plan. I agree with them that City Hall should pause this misguided plan, and rethink how to engage its citizens in a more thoughtful process of imagining ways for the city to provide more affordable housing.	Laverne Thompson	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	17:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Pushing the "Villages" plan through at this time is unpardonable. You have heard and will hear again on July 14, many of the reasons that this plan is flawed, as well as how the process is poor, if not downright deceitful. Keep working on city planning and bring forward smaller scale solutions that work for the people of Vancouver AFTER the October election.	Alison Wardrop	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-13	17:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the motion for high rises in the Kerrisdale area.	Ciela Elmore	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	17:44	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This Villages Plan should be abandoned: 1. There are far too many empty storefronts on all the exicting neighbourhood centres, especially in Dunbar where we live. 2. The Village Plan will be added competition and will guarantee the death of the Dunbar neighbourhood centre, as well as others such as West 10th Avenue. 3. The Villages Plan involves the involuntary confiscation of private properties. Although we are not personally affected by this particular plan, this smacks of some authoritarian regime, like the communists in Russia and the USSR.	Imbi Harding	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	17:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan. Those who vote for this ill conceived plan will not receive my vote this fall.	Ted Williams	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	17:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I believe these villages are already happening organically and do not need to have forced development.We already had condos, bought out by the federal government.We do not have the market for this. Please let things develop organically, or else.Do a trial with one village and limit the development to major arteries only. There is nothing that gives more community services or parking or schools , which will make the area incredibly over crowded.	Debbie Lipman	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	17:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	reposting documents in attachments for public review: ---- OPPOSITION STATEMENT Villages Planning Program — Public Hearing, July 14, 2026 Knight Street & East 33rd Avenue Village — Kensington-Cedar Cottage Good evening, Mayor Sim and Councillors Bligh, Dominato, Fry, Kirby-Yung, Klassen, Maloney, Meiszner, Montague, Orr, and Zhou. My name is Lilli Wong, and I'm speaking on behalf of residents near the proposed Knight Street and East 33rd Avenue Village, in the Kensington-Cedar Cottage neighbourhood. I'm joined in this concern by a petition of more than 4,800 residents, and by an open letter to this Council from thirty of Metro Vancouver's most experienced urban planners, architects, and housing policy experts. When the people who spend their careers designing density are asking you to slow down, that should tell you something. I want to be clear: we are not here because we oppose housing, density, or change. Vancouver needs more homes, and our neighbourhood knows it. What we oppose is being asked to accept the largest single rezoning in this city's history – nearly 14,000 lots, 14 percent of Vancouver, home to an estimated 100,000 people – on ten days' notice, during summer holidays, while much of the city was watching the World Cup final. Many of my neighbours received their first notice of this plan only two to four weeks ago. The information cards were English-only, with no translation for the many Vietnamese nor immigrant families in this neighbourhood who are now quietly wondering whether they'll still have a home here. That is not meaningful consultation. That is a formality. And this is not a one-time decision. Once this plan is folded into the Official Development Plan, most future rezonings that comply with it will never return to a Public Hearing. Tonight may be the last chance most of us ever get to speak about what happens on our own street. We're also being asked to accept a plan with no enforceable design standards, no mandatory	Lilli Wong	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

				tree protection, and no required setbacks for green space. Vancouver's tree canopy — 62 percent of which sits on private property — is exactly what our climate mitigation targets depend on, and this plan allows it to be cleared lot by lot. We're told these will be “villages,” but there's no guaranteed parking, no requirement for family-sized units, and nothing that mandates genuinely affordable rental housing. Meanwhile, our schools already have waitlists, our buses already pass full stops without room, and no funding is attached to this plan for the parks, daycares, sewers, or transit capacity that a population increase like this demands. For renters, and especially for long-term tenants in older rental buildings, there is no rental replacement guarantee. Higher assessed land values give landlords every incentive to sell, and nothing in this plan promises today's tenants can afford tomorrow's building. We are asking the Council for four things tonight. First: postpone this Public Hearing. Give residents a real opportunity – not ten days in the middle of summer – to understand what is being proposed for their own street. Second: require enforceable, neighbourhood-specific design standards – for setbacks, shadow, tree retention, and privacy – before any upzoning is approved, not after. Third: commission neighbourhood-specific analysis – real numbers on school capacity, sewer and drainage capacity, traffic, and local business impact – for each of the 17 villages, rather than one blanket assumption applied citywide. Fourth: preserve the public hearing process for individual developments in these neighbourhoods going forward, rather than eliminating residents' voice in their own community's future. We have read the report. We understand what is at stake, despite a rushed process, – for our trees, our neighbours, our children's schools, and our long-term residents who fear being priced out or displaced. We are asking you to slow down and do this properly. Our neighbourhoods deserve better than a rushed, one-size-fits-all rezoning decided in the middle of summer. Thank you, Lilli Wong			
2026-07-13	17:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a fan of rezoning for density. I am also a fan of reasonable public consultation. This fails very seriously on the second count. Per Larry Beasely's letter, it's too top down, the sterilization of existing development rights is outrageous, and the need for grade level retail is overemphasized. I am generally in favour of more four- to six-storey development, and higher in the mid-rise vernacular, and I am in generally in favour of the building heights and zones, though I think the zones could be scaled back somewhat. But the sterilization in particular is really insulting. It's exactly the kind of over-reach that causes so many people to reject increased density without careful consideration. Too bad both the public and the planners now lack respect in these sorts of conversations.	Charles Campbell	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	17:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the proposed mass rezoning and rapid densification of the 17 neighbourhood areas in the Arbutus community. While I recognize the importance of increasing housing supply and improving affordability, the proposed approach is too broad, too rapid, and insufficiently supported by a phased implementation strategy. Good city planning should balance growth with the capacity of existing infrastructure, public services, transportation networks, schools, parks, and community amenities. Rather than allowing a gradual and organic evolution of the neighbourhood through incremental redevelopment, the proposal would fundamentally transform large portions of the community in a relatively short period. Such a sudden concentration of redevelopment risks overwhelming existing infrastructure, increasing traffic congestion, reducing parking availability, placing additional pressure on schools and community facilities, and diminishing the livability that has made the Arbutus neighbourhood a desirable place to live. Incremental, lot-by-lot redevelopment allows infrastructure upgrades and community services to evolve alongside population growth. It also provides opportunities to evaluate the impacts of densification at each stage and make necessary policy adjustments before proceeding further. By contrast, mass rezoning of multiple areas at once removes this flexibility and significantly increases the risk of unintended long-term consequences that may be difficult or impossible to reverse. Meaningful public consultation should also be accompanied by careful impact assessments that demonstrate how transportation, utilities, emergency services, schools, parks, and healthcare resources will accommodate the projected increase in population. Without clear evidence that these essential services can support the proposed level of growth, the rezoning is premature. I respectfully urge Council to reject the current proposal and instead adopt a more measured, phased, and evidence-based approach to neighbourhood densification. Vancouver undoubtedly needs more housing, but growth should be carefully planned, appropriately paced, and accompanied by the infrastructure and public services necessary to support a thriving and sustainable community.	Kevin Sheu	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	17:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the application	Surpreet Singh	Killarney	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	17:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Villages Plan on the basis that it will destroy the neighbourhood and existing sense of community. The Plan would destroy existing well-built housing stock that in many cases already provides a level of density with duplexes, triplexes, suites and laneway houses. A mix of housing styles and types gives the neighbourhood its valuable character. The loss of so many trees and gardens and the replacement with expansive concrete buildings would be accompanied by a reduction in natural light and lead to an increase in levels of summer heat. This Plan does not align with green city principles - it will see the loss of many trees and existing landscaping. It would see much concrete (GHG generating) replacing trees and vegetation (carbon capture). The Plan does not include any commitment to true affordability, rather it is a veiled opportunity for increased tax revenue while adding to corporate (developer) profits. All this at the expense of already well-established liveable neighbourhoods. Instead, I favour a more organic and progressive approach that would allow for smaller 3-4 story developments with smaller footprints that are concentrated along major through-roads that promote a more open-to-the-sky street scape while retaining as much of the existing greenery as possible. The current housing market is no longer seeing the demand that supports 6-8 story developments on such a dense basis. I fear that the developments may either not proceed, and/or condos will remain empty and unsold as we are already witnessing across the nation. Expensive, unsold and empty condos is not the solution to the housing affordability problem. Dramatically smaller villages or arterial road developments would be a sensible alternative.	Martin Lawrence	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	17:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose	Jotti Singh		
2026-07-13	18:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This Villages Plan is TOO MUCH!! It will not solve the city's affordability issues or serve "the missing middle", and it will create a bunch of new problems and stresses while destroying the character and liveability of the places where these "villages" are imposed. Too much, too tall, too environmentally regressive (tree cover, permeable surfaces, and don't get me started on natural gas reg reversal), too focused on developers' short-term profits, too many pretty pictures that don't show the ugly consequences. This plan, if allowed, will trample the rights and values of good people and do lasting damage. The hideous multiplexes are already a visual, practical and environmental disaster. Please do not ruin this city for all of us. Instead, work with the neighbourhoods and draw on community knowledge. PLEASE say, "No thank you," to this Villages Plan and take some time to do something thoughtful that will keep some semblance of a liveable Vancouver into the future.	Fiona Beaty	Hastings-Sunrise	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	18:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We recently moved to the area, specifically for the small tight knit community, and this seems directly against that.	Rob Peterson	Grandview-Woodland	

2026-07-13	18:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This document did not attach in my prior upload. It is a petition of signatures from 14 opposing residents. --- Date: July 10-2026 I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026. As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan. Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions: • Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline. • Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved. • Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes. • Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning. • Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds. • Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, Including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all. Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect Local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it. Thank you. Signed, Anne Lam Lai Chui Yee Richard Chu Sam Shen Yi Gi Kim Man Wong Stephen Cho Nora G Dukes Amy Tran Darlene Bailey Mike Wong Stephen Roy Jess Werb-Roy Lena Lee	Lilli Wong	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix S

2026-07-13	18:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Councillor: I am writing to you in opposition to the "Villages" proposal and urge you to reject it in its current form and send it back to planning. It seems to be little more than a "trojan" , an attempt to disguise densification under a term that promises all redevelopment and densification in my neighbourhood will be soft and gentle, and that the quiet charm of the streets I wander will not be disrupted. The very mention of the word transports us backward in time to the cobblestones and cul-de-sacs of European cities. Ahhh, to be so fortunate. But as usual there are devils lurking in the detail. The first is that there is no acknowledgement of the existing neighbourhoods. I live just off Broadway and Nanaimo streets in Grandview Woodlands. This proposal would place me in a new "village" and change my walk to Trout lake from a stroll under 50 foot oak trees to one shadowed by 6 story buildings. There was a time when the impetus of city planning was to make more of the city green and "walkable". This does the opposite. Not to mention the impact on the city's canopy in a time of global warming, heat domes, and record temperatures. But my major concern is that "Villages" puts the cart before the horse. It simply assumes that this is an easy way to upzone much of the city, and should be implemented. In reality, our current neighbourhoods and "high" streets--Commercial Drive, the "east Village" along Hastings, much of Broadway in Little Mountain--developed organically in response to their communities .That has provided the resilience that keeps them vital and thriving through many adversaries. So why not a test run--a trial to see "if you build it, they will come". Do a trial upzone around a designated area and see if it attracts enough residents to push the density up. Then implement it throughout the city. But by far the biggest concern around housing has little to do with zoning. It is affordability. The city is awash with recent developments that are simply beyond the reach of many residents. Our children are priced out of home ownership, and have left this city for more affordable alternatives. This will have caustic effects on the services we depend upoon--schools, hospitals, governance. And the city has but one way to raise funds without raising taxes--upzoning. Hence the Villages proposal. Please turn it down. Thanks for your time Ron FisherSchula Leonard	Schula Leonard	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	18:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Statement to Council Regarding the Proposed Marpole Village Rezoning Project Good evening, respected Councillors, City planners, and fellow community members. My name is Jing Kokko, address is 8019 Fremlin St. I'm a long-time homeowner on a single-family lot that lies inside the boundary of the proposed Marpole Village rezoning project. I have deep roots in this neighbourhood and with no plans to sell my property, tear down my house, or redevelop my land. I would like to age and live out my retirement right here in Marpole, but if I am forced out of my home, I would like to see this development be done properly with efforts to improve the community and Vancouver as a whole. I agree with the city's long term goal to create liveable neighbourhoods with improvements to local grocery, dining, and retail. However, I cannot support rushing through this large-scale upzoning plan under the current severe real estate downturn, and I do not agree that this is a project that is suitable for right now, given the current road and traffic issues. I do not wish to stop development forever, but rather aim to strike a fair balance between planned future housing needs and the protection of quality of life for existing long-term residents who have invested decades into this community. I have five main considerations I hope you will review carefully: 1. I want to highlight a long-standing critical traffic issue unique to our part of Marpole: our three local residential streets (Shaughnessy, Fremlin, and Laurel) sit very close to Oak Street	Jing Kokko	Marpole	

				Bridge, which serves as the main evening rush-hour artery for commuters returning to homes south of the Fraser River. Almost every Thursday and Friday afternoon and evening (4–8 pm), and sometimes on other days, too, drivers stuck in gridlock on the Oak Street Bridge spill over into our quiet side streets, filling every available curb space completely. These are not local residents' vehicles; they are temporary commuter cars blocking our driveways, emergency access routes, and street access for households that have lived here for generations. My husband could not drive home from work on these days. The long-standing overflow traffic from Oak Street Bridge commuters already occupies our residential side streets on these weekday evenings. In addition, running engines contribute polluted air to many Marpole homes. I respectfully ask the City to solve this headache. Our streets are no longer liveable even now. The City needs to study Oak and 70th area to figure out long-term solutions to the traffic that is becoming more and more severe. I don't think the City is aware how bad this issue is, and how much worse traffic in Vancouver will become if this redevelopment is accepted. I cannot state strongly enough: this traffic issue is very bad and completely not sustainable to the village or Vancouver you promote. Once or if development goes ahead, I ask the City to consider these solutions: 2. Please impose strict, non-negotiable height caps and expanded mandatory setbacks for all new multi-unit construction next to existing single-family home blocks. The current proposal allows buildings up to four storeys and higher in some locations. If these new structures are built too close to older homes, they will permanently block natural sunlight to our yards and living spaces and destroy our residential privacy. 3. Create more underground parking space and carefully plan public community parking restrictions; otherwise, lifelong residents will lose reliable access to parking outside their own homes. 4. Please schedule all demolition and construction work across Marpole Village in staggered, phased stages. In Marpole, many homeowners in these rezoning streets are seniors. They cannot face endless years of loud construction noise, airborne dust, and heavy delivery truck traffic. 5. Introduce a property tax relief program for Marpole single-family homeowners who choose not to redevelop their land. Upzoning automatically increases assessed land value, which will drive sharp annual property tax increases for homeowners who are affected by this development. Many of us are seniors relying on fixed retirement income. Capped taxes would allow us to stay in our homes. Finally, I would also like the city to consider the current housing market before rushing ahead with Marpole’s village. Right now, Greater Vancouver already has more than 4,300 newly built condo units sitting empty and unsold, with the vacancy rate hitting a 30-year high in our rental market. The Federal Government has been forced to step in, committing public funds to purchase 2,200 vacant condos as affordable housing for low-income households just to clear the existing oversupply. Pushing ahead with massive new high-density construction across Marpole at this moment will only create another wave of empty buildings, waste taxpayer-funded infrastructure investment, and unfairly burden local long-term residents with years of disruptive construction.		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	18:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There are mainly elderly living around the neighborhood. When land is zoned for higher density use, the property taxes will be raised up. It is very difficult for elderly to pay for that and it is also very harsh for them to move to a new place. Instead of the claim of making people living closer to shops, services,restaurants and other everyday amenities, the original people living around these areas are pushed out of their homes. I don't think a lot of people like to be living close to a restaurant or bar. I would rather have a quiet time at night instead of being disturbed by the noises outside of my home.	Rosanna Chan	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	18:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It's too rushed and widespread. You can't rezone so much of the city at once. It will destroy historic neighbourhoods. It will destroy Vancouver. It is a dystopian nightmare brought on us by people with an agenda who don't want us to own cars, who don't want us to own land. It's not right, it's not Canadian and goes against freedom.	Jonathan Morris	Riley Park	
2026-07-13	18:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input. The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Please find attached more about the negative impact this Villages Plan would have on existing residents, without offering a substantive benefit to new residents.	Jennifer Kendrick	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix T
2026-07-13	18:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I did not receive a confirmation email and am resubmitting #201003497345. The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input. The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Please find attached the negative impact this Villages Plan would have on existing residents, without offering a substantive benefit to new residents.	Jennifer Kendrick	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	18:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to this plan. It is a significant change to our city proposed with a very short and opaque time line to respond or understand.	Angela MacDougall		
2026-07-13	18:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the plan. The process is deeply flawed. The plan creates density which isn't a village. At 33rd and Mackenzie, for example, a true village already exist. How councillors vote on this issue will shape my vote in October.	Shari Bender	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	19:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Having followed city politics and planning for over 55 years, this is the worst capitulation to speculators and developers I have ever seen. Those "Vancouverites " that actually live here, like our city the way it is.	John Carson	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	19:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Vancouver Villages Plan & clear-cutting policies. I vehemently intent to protect Vancouver's tree canopy. Without clearly laying out the blueprints for addition to public services, such as libraries, schools, road broadening, community centers, etc., the Villages Plan will only create chaotic congestions to the affected neighborhoods. How each councilor votes on the Villages Plan will be remembered when I vote in the October election.	Yvonne Hsu	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	19:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am against the widespread rezoning of roughly 13,000 properties. Implementing such a broad policy could significantly reshape established communities while reducing meaningful opportunities for local residents to voice their concerns during future decisions on individual development projects. Taking away residents voices is problematic especially as they are the ones living on the land and they will be the most impacted by changes so it is their right to have a say.	Aaron Li	Marpole	
2026-07-13	19:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposal to pre-zone approximately 13,000 properties in a single initiative. Planning on such a large scale risks significantly changing the existing character of our communities while also limiting residents' ability to participate meaningfully in public hearings for individual development applications in the future.	Yun Li	Marpole	
2026-07-13	19:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposal to pre-zone approximately 13,000 properties in a single initiative. Planning on such a large scale risks significantly changing the existing character of our communities while also limiting residents' ability to participate meaningfully in public hearings for individual development applications in the future.	Louie Lin	Marpole	
2026-07-13	19:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We should support existing shopping areas, where small businesses are already struggling.	Susan Alexander	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	19:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We are long time residents of this neighbourhood. We have built a community with the people surrounding it and we still believe that children need backyards/space to play. I bring my young children over to my parents house in Killarney specifically for this reason. Tearing down our neighbourhood means the community currently built here will be lost and we will have nowhere for our children to go. Please reconsider this petition and the safe spaces for families in this neighbourhood.	Andrea D'souza	Killarney	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	19:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this for these reasons: 1) the villages plan adds blanket density across swaths of the city without adding amenity or green space directly in those neighbourhoods. How does an existing neighbourhood benefit from the added density? What amenities will there be for these new residents? Our neighborhood parks are over subscribed and under maintained as it is. 2) the villages plan ignores the infrastructure upgrades required for this added density. How will the existing local road network, often with parking on both sides and room for a single lane of traffic, expect to handle the increasing traffic volumes that will come with increased density? Assuming everyone will use transit is not realistic. How will long term infrastructure upgrades (sewer, water, etc) be handled in this incremental build out? 3) is there an actual need for this added density given the massive density allowances provided by the province around TOD sites? Wouldn't it be prudent to allow these areas to be built out with homes, services and shopping to support residents? By spreading the density across entire neighborhoods reduces the likely hood that these TOD areas will be built out and therefore less likely that business can succeed in those areas. It seems like there is a lack of coordination between the City and Province on density goals here and a pause would be prudent. 4) the Villages plan seems to promote a negative view of the single family home. These single family lots already support development of duplex, triplex, and fourplex developments. This, along with the density allowances around TODs supports a diverse housing mix and diverse community. Why is it necessary to rush to add density and erase this housing diversity before it's had the opportunity to be built? It seems the City is planning for planning sake and not allowing what's already in place to grow. Shouldn't the City put there efforts towards facilitating and approving applications?	Craig Simms	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	19:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This area already has numerous home that have been built as multi-plex homes. This area is already located close to commercial establishments that cater to our needs.	Clifford Yin	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	19:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly against this proposal.	Kathleen Cheng	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	19:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Nanaimo village extends too far west. Not enough city services in this area, Britannia Community Centre needs to be revitalized first or alongside this endeavour.	Chelsea Carrasco	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	19:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This area already has stores, restaurants within walking distance.	Linda Lai		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	19:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My neighbourhood at 37th and Somerville already suffers from a lack of parking (due partially to the City not requiring any combined with properties that have a main house, 2 suites and a laneway house. There are often 3 or more cars per property in my area. The house across from ours has 6 cars. My neighbourhood also suffers from lack of light with larger, taller houses that shadow adjacent smaller houses. As well inappropriately sized street trees swallow most sunlight on many streets near me. I'd hate to see our local corner store put out of business due to new commercial uses only a block away. More and larger development means more noise, more traffic, more demand for water (!!) more crowded and messy alleys and streets, more garbage, more dog feces. I am against the Villages proposal for my neighbourhood.	Ken Bunn	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	19:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This a very bad idea!! The city passed 6 unit homes and they are ruining the neighborhood. These larger complexes will not be good. I would ask the council to go out to a neighborhood where new higher square ft lane way home has been built and see what it feels like to sit in your back yard and be surrounded by highrise buildings. I'm not sure if this will raise my taxes. If so, another reason to vote, No! These larger developments are a big stress for Vancouver residents.	Norm Tut	Fairview	
2026-07-13	20:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There are already existing villages in the city adding more will take away from and compete with commercial businesses which are currently struggling. Adding buildings of 6 stories will destroy neighborhoods. I am in the proposed Angus Dr. and West 57th village	Linda Jones		
2026-07-13	20:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Totally against Villages Plan.I have been a resident of Vancouver for 47 years and I am totally against the Villages plan.it would destroy our current concentrations around Dunbar, Point Grey and Kerrisdale. It would destroy the current mixed architecture of our neighborhoods and limit what so many people, including myself, can do with their property. Add help to the current neighborhoods. Not this. You can look elsewhere for support in the coming election if this goes through.	Karen Brumelle	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	20:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Anyone on council that votes yes for the village plan loses my vote. Plain and simple. Zero. Orr and Fry included. People love Vancouver because of the beautiful landscapes, nature, towering trees, the rainforest and forested streets, the birds and beauty. I grew up in Vancouver in the 60s with 3 corner stores within walking distance . (yes I have accumulated some wisdom being an elder) So why not build a little corner store here and there then? Disrupting an entire cities population and living in a construction zone for 25 years and clear cutting the landscape is not a direction the majority of Vancouverites want. I' grew up in Killarney , lived in Little Italy, Dunbar Kits, point Grey and now Mackenzie heights. I know this city well. Please include us the people in this planning process. Vote NO. Or I'll vote you out. Thanks for listening	Anne Talbot-Kelly	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	20:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I attended the Villages open house. Many of the other attendees and myself had questions that staff were evasive in answering. Example. The response to my nearest village at 41 and Main was that something special was being planned. I am aware the City has been acquiring property at that location. Has the City been acquiring property to other villages prior to this plan? Also, other attendees were concerned about the ongoing lack of infrastructure and services. Example lack of school capacity. Staff responded with the pathetic examples of the Olympic Village an Coal Harbour schools that took decades to build. Lets hold off any further village concepts until the City catches up to our present infrastructure deficit suck as the lack of even water.	Jim Lloyd	Oakridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	20:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	With this comment I register my strong opposition and disagreement with the proposed 17 Villages Area plan in general and the plans for Nanaimo and 1st in particular. I don't know who would consider it reasonable to conduct general consultations for a plan that particularly influences thousands of people. It is a consultation methodology that will not generate results that indicate how people view this plan or statistically represent citizens' views. The consultation process appears manipulative. The plan also does not appear well thought out. Land use planning I am familiar with begins with projections and leads to plans to address those projections. This appears more like something that a graduate student developed as a concept for a seminar. The transition phases are mysteries that are supposed to magically work themselves out. How do these 17 plans relate to existing communities? The plan does not appear to. The plan is comparable to a plan for Vancouver International Airport which states that the City will place a rocket launching pad in the middle of the north runway in the distant future, but you will make it difficult to use the runway immediately. We do not understand how the City got to this plan, and we do not think it is defensible. Thanks.	Rob Beynon	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-13	20:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We and my neighbours don’t want your Planning department’s Villages proposal imposed upon us. Insufficient public consultation and is a top down reasoning initiative that destroys existing neighbourhoods and merely inflates land values. The City needs to rethink all this and return to Community based planning processes.	Heather Wilson	Victoria-Fraserview	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	20:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to formally register my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning and densification plan that intends to allow up to six-story buildings within our established, single-family neighborhood. Our neighborhood has long served as a vital ecosystem for families, characterized by quiet streets, safe spaces for children, and mature tree canopies. Forcing six-story developments into an area designed strictly for low-density living presents several critical issues that have not been adequately addressed in the current proposal: -Infrastructure Overwhelm: Our local roads, water systems, sewer lines, and electrical grids were built for low-density use. Shifting abruptly to multi-unit complexes will stress this infrastructure. Furthermore, parking is already at a premium; introducing hundreds of new residents will inevitably lead to severe street congestion and safety hazards for pedestrians, particularly children. -Loss of Green Space and Livability: The transition from single-family homes with yards to six-story structures will strip the neighborhood of its private and shared green spaces. This drastic reduction in permeable ground will also heighten stormwater runoff risks. -Severe Livability Impacts: Buildings of this height will completely alter the neighborhood's scale, casting massive shadows over existing properties, invading the privacy of adjacent single-family yards, and permanently altering the character that drew families to this area in the first place. -Strained Public Amenities: Our local parks, community centers, and schools are already operating at or near capacity. The proposed plan lacks a concrete, funded strategy to expand these essential public services ahead of the population influx. I urge Council to reject the current proposal and send it back to planning staff for a comprehensive, localized impact assessment that includes genuine, collaborative consultation with the residents who live here. Thank you for your time, consideration, and dedication to preserving the livability of our city's neighborhoods.	Peter Kehler	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	20:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Don't agree with the lack of consultations for the Villages Plan..	Bryan Bailas	Riley Park	

2026-07-13	20:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to formally register my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning and densification plan that intends to allow up to six-story buildings within our established, single-family neighborhood. Our neighborhood has long served as a vital ecosystem for families, characterized by quiet streets, safe spaces for children, and mature tree canopies. Forcing six-story developments into an area designed strictly for low-density living presents several critical issues that have not been adequately addressed in the current proposal: -Infrastructure Overwhelm: Our local roads, water systems, sewer lines, and electrical grids were built for low-density use. Shifting abruptly to multi-unit complexes will stress this infrastructure. Furthermore, parking is already at a premium; introducing hundreds of new residents will inevitably lead to severe street congestion and safety hazards for pedestrians, particularly children. -Loss of Green Space and Livability: The transition from single-family homes with yards to six-story structures will strip the neighborhood of its private and shared green spaces. This drastic reduction in permeable ground will also heighten stormwater runoff risks. -Severe Livability Impacts: Buildings of this height will completely alter the neighborhood's scale, casting massive shadows over existing properties, invading the privacy of adjacent single-family yards, and permanently altering the character that drew families to this area in the first place. -Strained Public Amenities: Our local parks, community centers, and schools are already operating at or near capacity. The proposed plan lacks a concrete, funded strategy to expand these essential public services ahead of the population influx. I urge Council to reject the current proposal and send it back to planning staff for a comprehensive, localized impact assessment that includes genuine, collaborative consultation with the residents who live here. Thank you for your time, consideration, and dedication to preserving the livability of our city's neighborhoods.	Tina Veness Kehler	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	20:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Stop ruining our city! There is no coming back from this. We already have too many developments for housing ie. condos. Not sold or rented. Real neighborhoods where you actually know your neighbour, help your neighbour, like your neighbour, will hardly exist if this goes through. And ruins and devalues homes for owners. DONT DO IT!!!!	Bette Ainsworth	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	20:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	These comments regard the Public Hearing on the Vancouver Villages Plan (with Rezoning Amendments), set for July 14, 2026. I am aware that my many comments here (10 given below) probably require explanations, but for the sake of brevity (and that no doubt you will have heard most/all of these before by many others), I simply list them: 1) "Affordable housing" is, in a manner of speaking, an oxymoron - the current cost of property, building materials and 'living-wage' labour simply makes it so. 2) The challenge of housing affordability is a GLOBAL problem, requiring, at least to a degree, a global solution. Is there any international collaboration to seek to find a collective wisdom in solving this? (Yes, with intention of including the particular character traits that make Vancouver unique and world-class when proposing options/solutions.) 3) That 'uniqueness' and desirability that sets Vancouver apart must be acknowledged, respected, and preserved, including view, space, light, greenery, etc., all of which is being put aside with your 'Villages' proposals (including the re-zoning plans). 4) Who actually has a say in this debate? Those outside of Vancouver who want to live here are clearly being heard - what about those who already live here?	Corrie Krahn	Arbutus Ridge	

				5) There is this idea that more people should be able to live in Vancouver (and thus the development boom we are seeing already, only to be magnified by your proposals), yet the immigration 'tap' has been turned off, and the numbers used to support need for increased densification being sadly outdated. 6) To that point, while there is a perceived need to vastly increase living units within Vancouver, we are concurrently spending $billions in extending rapid transit lines (e.g. along Broadway toward UBC and out to - and soon beyond - Langley) so people can have ready access to the City and its amenities. The question is, do we need BOTH? Do we need both to be happening at the same time? 7) We are already seeing houses/ complexes built on residential properties where - (a) there is essentially NO green space from (among other reasons) the increase in sq.ft. building to property size ratio (and along with that, the seeming indiscriminate cutting down of trees, previously deemed illegal); (b) the building frontage extends WAY beyond that of the neighbouring homes; (c) there being no basements, 3 levels are built ABOVE ground, dwarfing neighbouring homes (with unfavorable/undignified visual effects). Your proposals will make this even worse. 8) Further to (7), the behemoth houses (and backyard housing structures - one would call 'lane way houses', I guess - though larger than many of the surrounding homes!) the City is allowing to be built even currently do NOTHING to solve the 'affordable' housing problem. 9) I have heard from many with expertise on these matters that the proposed density increases have given no thought to the necessary increased needs in infrastructure, including (but not limited to) - water (we are already on excessive restriction through the summer), electricity (failure to take into account increase demand from vehicular electrification and the disallowance of natural gas, etc.), transit and road capacities. 10) A (positive) suggestion is to start with seeing what impacts the current 'main corridor' developments (already taking place throughout the city), along with the rapid transit development, will have on the real estate markets, infrastructure capacities, and affordability. Then, in, say, 5-10 years, if need be, add development capabilities in the various 'villages' proposed, and continue a more slow, regulated, and controlled relaxation on development, with reassessments along the way of how these more gradual changes are positively and/or negatively impacting the many concerns raised in regards to increased housing development, rather than an 'all-in, come hell-or-high-water' approach. In conclusion, such radical changes that will affect this City for generations to come demands a more intentional voter/citizen/expert input process - the citizens, voters, (property) tax-payers, and occupants should be allowed to decide. If I was on City Council, I would be leery of being personally responsible for this Plan (and it's inevitable consequences), and remembered as such for years and generations to come. So, please scrap the current Villages Plan (with whatever amendments you are currently proposing with it) until the fall civic election and it is made an election issue (and hopefully a referendum). If you choose not to do so, it will be clearly interpreted by voters as the desire of this City Council to push through a poorly thought through, and likely damaging, plan, and will no doubt result in negative ballot-box consequences for this current cohort of Councillors. Thank you for your kind attention.			
2026-07-13	20:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Opposed !!!!!	Maureen Phillips	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	20:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live east of Nanaimo between Adanac and Napier and our lovely neighbourhood could be ruined by the imposition of your so-called Village Plan. We already have a vibrant community of neighbours who support and help one another. This includes long-term renters who are a vital part of the community and pay much less rent than if they lived in apartment buildings. We have everything we need within a 10 to15 minute walk. Hastings Street and The Drive (Commercial Drive) are within an 8 to 12 minute walk, and there are many lovely shops a few minutes away on Nanaimo Street near Charles St. Every young person I spoke with detests this plan. They say that it is cheaper to rent a suite in a house, or to have a bunch of friends rent a house than to live in an apartment building. Furthermore, there are already too many apartment buildings with no one living in them. People said they wouldn't write to the city because it was futile, they do not believe that Ken Sims or ABC councillors would care to hear their opinion. They feel hopeless. I support more affordable housing, but this is not the answer. Existing communities need to grow and evolve naturally. Not have something shoved down their throat. This plan would also destroy our wonderful local small businesses, one of the things that makes our neighbourhood so lovely. Why are you trying to ruin a good thing. This seems to be more for developers and big business than our communities and the people who need affordable housing.	Joanne MacKinnon	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-13	20:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Allowing 6 story apartment style developments to be built in existing residential areas of Vancouver would totally alter the environment of the current family homes located next to the units. Vancouverites are already adjusting to recent density changes and are not ready to accept more extreme changes at this point. Any rezoning to accommodate a Village Plan should be restricted near to an area that currently is a commercial hub and could accommodate the high density units being proposed. The plan should be tested with one Village Plan and not 17.	Allan Bustard	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	20:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As it stands, the proposed Villages and related rezoning will undo the sense of community in our Arbutus neighbourhood by allowing 6-story buildings right within existing single family home neighbourhoods. I agree that densification is needed, but the approach needs tweaking: specifically, up to 4 or 5 stories could be allowed along main streets such as W.16th Avenue, W.King Edward, etc - but within residential neighbourhoods we should be aiming for townhouses and duplexes. Using the neighbourhood around Commercial Drive as an example, they have struck a feasible amount of densification. Any more and you risk not having the infrastructure (parks, parking, etc) to support the additional densification, and the skyline - and light - becomes very obstructed. As a caring community member who is anti-NIMB, I urge you to rethink this and ensure our community remains a community. Thank you.	Kathryn Moore		
2026-07-13	20:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I want to keep the community safe and quiet.	Holly Xiao	Arbutus Ridge	

2026-07-13	20:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Councillors, I have been worrying about the unintended consequences of the Villages Plan for a long time, and especially the impact on existing neighbourhood centres. I have been a member of Friends of Point Grey Village for several years now, a citizen's group to help improve the prosperity of our ailing village. I have watched dozens of businesses come and go over the years. Very sad for the business owners and a loss for the neighbourhood. The rationale for the staff selection of the 17 villages is not clear. The staff referral report does not mention the impacts on existing neighbourhood centres, which should have been a key criterion. On the west side, it will be Dunbar Village that will bear the most severe commercial space competition impacts. The impacts across the City will be unevenly felt. The Villages Plan proposes 1,000,000 square feet of new commercial space across the City which is a staggering amount give the 10% plus storefront vacancy rates on average city-wide. Almost 1000 shops are vacant across the City. (Memo to Council - 2025 Storefronts Report.) And this figure understates vacancy rates, given all the empty lots with no buildings awaiting redevelopment, many of which are community gardens, paying much reduced property taxes. Dunbar Village has a 15% storefront vacancy rate according to the 2025 survey. Three times more than a healthy rate of 5%. Four new villages are proposed within easy walking distance to the Dunbar Village in the Macdonald/Mackenzie corridor. The Plan indicates that it will provide additional capacity for 250,000 square feet of commercial space in these 4 villages, about 25% of the total amount of new commercial space across the 17 villages. The only village of the four that makes some commercial sense is 16th and Macdonald which is already a small village and has a good grocery store. On housing mix, yes, we need a variety of new housing types and especially off arterial roads. In the Villages Plan, strata zoning is being offered for the new villages and clearly will have more market uptake than rental. This is not an option offered for existing neighbourhood centres, such as Dunbar Village. In terms of maximizing access to real complete communities, with a community centre, library, medical etc., it would make much more sense to come up with a plan to enhance Dunbar and other existing Villages first. That way you don't have to make promises to residents about potential shops that may never come. Plans do not have to take years to complete. A good plan with a good public process, including residents and businesses could be completed in 6 to 9 months. Please ask staff to get on with new plans for the old villages, and put the new proposed villages on hold. Sincerely, Chris DeMarco	Christina DeMarco	West Point Grey	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	20:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Re: Vote against the Villages Plan rezoning at the July 14 Public Hearing Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors, I am writing to urge you to vote against the city-initiated Villages Plan rezoning at Tuesday's Public Hearing. I support more housing in Vancouver, but rezoning roughly 13,000 properties across 17 areas in a single vote is the wrong way to deliver it.	Emmanuel Prinet	Kerrisdale	

The scale is the problem. This is one of the largest rezonings in the city's history, decided in one meeting. Decisions of this size deserve neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood scrutiny, not a single up-or-down vote.

We've already seen what this leads to. Under the 2023 multiplex rezoning, buildings routinely dwarf the homes beside them, blocking sunlight and privacy their neighbours have always had. Mature trees and topsoil are cleared for maximum-footprint builds that can't be undone once they're gone. Streets built for a handful of cars are absorbing a dozen more per lot, with no parking requirement to offset it. Schools and local infrastructure are already straining under growth that was never planned for at this pace.

Parks and green space haven't kept pace either. Adding density across 17 areas at once means thousands of new residents with no corresponding plan to secure the parkland and green space a growing population will need. Without dedicated funding or land set aside for new parks alongside this rezoning, existing green space will simply be stretched thinner across more people — the opposite of the "complete, connected" communities this plan claims to deliver.

It won't even deliver the affordability it promises. New units are frequently replacing existing affordable basement rentals with higher-cost suites — a net loss for affordable housing even as unit counts rise. Meanwhile, enforcement of existing building and zoning codes is already inconsistent, and this plan asks us to trust the same process at ten times the scale.

Affordability pressure is not a reason to skip the process — it's a reason to get the process right. I understand the urgency behind approving this quickly: a housing crisis is real, and delay has its own costs. But that urgency is exactly why this decision needs safeguards, not fewer of them. The economic pressure driving this vote is temporary and correctable — prices and policy can shift again. The physical and neighbourhood changes this rezoning locks in are not: mature trees, topsoil, and streetscape character removed under a pre-zoned, single-vote approval cannot be undone once building begins, and there will be no case-by-case review left to catch problems as they surface. Approving 13,000 parcels at once on today's affordability pressure trades a correctable problem for permanent, irreversible ones — and forecloses Council's own ability to adjust course if this plan's tradeoffs turn out to be wrong.

Residents have been shut out of it. Pre-zoning this many lots at once eliminates the case-by-case rezoning process that gives neighbours a chance to be notified and to appeal. Twenty-nine Metro Vancouver planners, architects, academics, and former city officials — including former City of Vancouver chief planners — have publicly urged Council not to proceed as scheduled, warning it "risks confusion, unintended damage, and lost opportunity across the city."

Density and livability aren't in conflict — Vancouver already has neighbourhoods that prove it. But that took planning tailored to each place, not a single rezoning applied uniformly across 17 areas at once.

I'm asking you to vote against this proposal, send it back for the area-by-area planning it deserves, and protect the trees, streets, and communities already living with the consequences of "one-size-fits-all" zoning.

Yours truly,

Emmanuel Prinet

2026-07-13	20:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am appalled by the lack of consultation and consideration for the Vancouver Village proposal. These massive developments are unacceptable and what is more infringe on my and many othersrights as a homeowner to potentially have any say on what is done with my home that I have invested in extensively and will be impacted by these developments. IN short the planning department at city hall is out of control and out of touch not to mention inflicting their personal views on people who happen to live within the confines of the footprint for these proposals. What is more I heard nothing about it till about three weeks ago. Shame on you. And this has been proposed I gather by people that are not even elected.	Thomas Randall	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	20:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mayor and Council, I strongly oppose the Vancouver Villages Plan and the report recommendations to amend the ODP to allow 6-storeys anywhere within the villages, not just on main arterial streets. I urge you to either not approve the report recommendations, or delay the decision until adequate consultation is completed. Adequate consultation would mean: * Sending at least one letter to notify all property owners of the 17,000+ affected parcels of the proposed zoning changes for their specific property and village they're in. * Reissuing the draft Villages plan with updated illustrations to show 6-storey buildings anywhere within the neighbourhoods, with minimum allowable setbacks and realistic street widths. * Translating the letter and draft plan to ensure equitable access for people with limited English proficiency. Reasons: I first learned of the Villages plan when I received a postcard on July 7, 2026. The postcard told us the public hearing was scheduled just 1 week later on July 14, 2026. It said registration for the hearing had already started 4 days prior, on July 3, 2026. This delayed notice is unacceptable. The postcard told us our neighbourhood is the "Knight St. & E. 33rd Ave. Village". It said Council would consider approval of the Villages plan and by-law amendments including "City-initiated rezoning of parcels to R3-1 and C2-D in this Village area." It didn't explain what R3-1 or C2-D was, or what changes would happen to our property. It didn't even show the new zones on the map of the village on the postcard. Instead, it referred us to the 80 page Villages Plan and 358 page Council report to decode this for ourselves. The Villages Plan would drastically change the ODP, which Council adopted on March 31, 2026, and which the City describes as "a city-wide land use plan that will guide how Vancouver grows and changes over the ***next 30 years and beyond.***" I supported the ODP, which calls for 4-6 storey buildings on select blocks along 33rd street, Fraser Street, Knight Street and mixed use 1-3 storey buildings in inner blocks off these high streets. These are shown in the General Land Use area map. Now, just over 3 months later, the City is proposing a critical change to the ODP to allow 4-6 storey buildings anywhere in the villages, not just high streets but narrow inner streets, with added incentives to build 6-storeys for rental buildings and social housing. With few exceptions, the illustrations in the Villages plan only show 6-storey buildings on high streets or streets with unrealistically wide setbacks, and only show 4-storey buildings on quiet residential streets. None of them show the reality that a 2-storey home could be sandwiched between two 6-storey buildings. These idealized illustrations are misleading.	Russell Black	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

				Neither the Villages plan nor the Council report sufficiently address: - The psychological impacts on residents of 6-storey buildings towering over 2-storey homes, and the social pressures property owners will feel from developers and realtors to sell their homes in land assemblies. - How the City will effectively plan for and provide services to 6-storey buildings that are expected to arise through attrition. - How narrow residential streets and laneways, already over congested, will absorb parking pressures from the added residences and visitors. I've spoken to my neighbours since I received the post card. Some haven't received it, some don't understand it, some are away on summer vacation. Letters to all property owners would correct this. I'm deeply concerned the proposed Villages plan and bylaw changes will destroy our neighbourhood. The City's consultation process hasn't informed residents enough to empower affected residents to give their feedback to Council.			
2026-07-13	20:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning will definitely increase the density of the neighborhood, which gives rise to more traffic and accidents. Really worried for criminals and parking lot occupancy. This area is an ideal place for seniors like us. The potential high residential density will break the peace of the neighborhood and inconvenience of transportation.	Carolyn Wang	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	20:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This absolutely needs more public consultation and transparency. The "survey" results conducted several years were misleading. I have attended 1 open house and contributed to aspirational survey about "do you want to live in a neighbourhood walkable services park space bla bla… of course we all do. Send out a survey to every household and retail space in your box "villages" with real questions about the existing neighbourhoods we live in, and which will be destroyed. Stop making living in Vancouver speculative! There are huge implications of villages on day to day living and impacts on families who have and want to continue to live here. The ridiculously giant overlapping villages along Macdonald from 12 to 49 is absolutely offensive to the true meaning of villages.	Karen Sadler	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	20:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This is a vibrant community. With a variety of 1 to 3 unit dwellings on the properties. With a number of laneway houses and basement suites. The new village concept will make the area over capacity and high density and take away from this sought after neighbourhood. There is one elementary school in the area and a small community centre which would not be able to accommodate the volume of people. This would have a negative impact on the neighbours and community we have worked so hard to create	Brenda Fenton	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	20:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the proposed plan and I agree with the comments submitted to the mayor and Council in the letter dated June 18,2026 Re:Housing Reset. Some comments have been made about creating a "european village feel. Villages were created out of a need over hundreds of years -not by poking a pin in a map. People move to areas because they like ambiance and feel of the neighbourhood. council needs to look at affordable housing not building multi story buildings that no one can afford. A cynic might say that these proposals are just a tax grab. My neighbourhood is Angus and 57th which does not appear in the list you provide below.	Greg jones	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	20:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly OPPOSE the Villages Plan	Tamara Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	20:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly OPPOSE the Villages Plan	Tamara Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	20:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly opposes this plan	Zachary Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	20:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly OPPOSE the Villages Plan	Tamara Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly OPPOSE the Villages Plan	Tamara Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose this plan.	Zachary Chang	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have seen two multiplexes pop up on West 35th Avenue. This is an alarming trend. When my house was built we had to conform to strict RS-5 zone for building envelope and floor space. Now those are out of the window all in the name of density. These new multiplexes rise four storeys above grade and completely overshadow neighbouring single-family houses. Please see picture attached. They completely destroy the character of the neighbourhood and privacy of the houses adjacent to the new construction. We need to stop this trend NOW and re-think how to approach increasing density in a way that retains the character of these so-called villages. You need to respect the heritage and style. Moreover, these new multiplexes are not going to be affordable units for the average families given the high cost of land and construction.	Shiuman Ho	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am in opposition to the Villages Plan and various bylaw amendments. I believe that residential low-rise buildings do not blend in harmoniously alongside existing family homes in these neighbourhoods. Higher densification of these neighbourhoods will unfortunately mean more vehicles, which leads to traffic congestion within local streets, less street parking, vehicles continuously circling around the block searching for parking, which in turn leads to unnecessary pollution. Taller buildings within residential neighbourhoods also means blocking natural light, creating shadows beside one- and two-story family homes and eliminates privacy. Higher densification also means losing the neighbourhood feel and sense of community here that we are currently very grateful to have. What we have now is what makes these Vancouver neighbourhoods a great place to live, raise children, retire and grow old in. These are just a few of the many reasons as to why I am very concerned about the Villages Plan. My partner and I live in Vancouver and have lived here all our lives. We have young children and are so grateful that we can raise them here in such a wonderful neighbourhood with amazing next-door (and throughout-the-block) neighbours. We love our peaceful neighbourhood and strongly oppose the Villages Plan and various by-law amendments. Please temporarily pause, re-think and re-evaluate the Villages Plan and amendments. We don't feel that enough public consultation and/or education was provided to residents ahead of the public hearing. Please hear us out and really consider how it will affect us, the residents that are currently living in these neighbourhoods, and for future generations to come.	Catherine Chow	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	21:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan!	Elaine Lee	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan.	E Lee	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I feel that this approach to villages appears to be a 'one size fits all'. It doesn't take into account the existing character of areas nor attempt to fit with existing businesses or development. This plan as proposed could detrimentally affect some neighbourhoods and destroy the existing charm, appeal, community and vibrancy.	Roger Stickland	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	21:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a registered owner in the Victoria Dr & E61st Ave neighbourhood, I strongly OPPOSE the application to rezone this area. If this proposal gets approved, the current members of the City Council will lose my support/vote in the next municipal election.	Thomas Chan	Victoria-Fraserview	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:18	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	If the “Villages” plan is adopted, the future localized public hearings for these areas will be eliminated and it means that the community members who live in these neighbourhoods won't have their right to shape local infrastructure, school capacities, and environmental protections. The plan is treating 17 distinct communities as a single, homogenized asset class. The proposed rezonings is striping public oversight. When a developer wants to modify a local block they must be forced to bring that specific project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing. There is no reason to push the Villages plan in the middle of summer, with minimal public notification of its significance and impacts on nearly 14,000 land parcels.	Marina Smolina	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	21:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a landowner/property tax payer in Vancouver for 50 years, the idea that you will restrict landowners as to what they can do to their properties who are in the selected area is beyond comprehension. You have initiated thanks to the province an ambitious rental program. I understand that these new buildings are not filling up. to build more and have people move to Vancouver where we cannot offer medical services such as GPs, etc does not make sense. I can't see any reputable builders being involved without major guarantees which ends up being my tax dollars.	Alexa Allen	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	21:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the application.	Elizabeth Young	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-13	21:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please see attached letter opposing the Vancouver Villages proposal, particularly for the Kensington-Cedar Cottage area and the Grandview-Woodlands areas.	E Macdonald	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	21:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose to rezoning for Village Planning for Knight Street and East 33rd Ave. I live in the 5400 block of Inverness Street. We have 6 laneway homes built plus another new laneway home in a process of applying. We share our lane with Sherbrooke Street. There are at least minimum 3 cars park on the west side of our laneway every day and night. Some days we have 6 to 7 cars park on the west and east side of the lane. These cars park there for the purpose of convenience or there is no adequate parkings in front of Sherbrooke/ Inverness. These parking already create the inconvenience of neighbors cars to drive in or out from their own garages.	Frank Lin	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There are quite a few issues with the Village Plant. 1) It ignores existing villages like West Point Grey. 2) these new villages do not offer community services like day care centres, libraries, swimming pool, and plazas. 3) it destroys the natural progression of development because so many blocks of residential houses are tied to the becoming commercial buildings with residences above. 4) there are several buildings at Alma and West 10th and Alma and Broadway that are not full. Only a few condos on the West 10th building have been sold, and all commercial units remain unsold a year after completion. The Raven on Broadway has many vacant rental units after almost a year on the market. Developers are designing units that are to small and not user friendly for most couples and families. 4) The development is not being allowed to progress naturally as needs occur but are being forced to occur. 5) These units have only 60 % parking spaces assuming that people will use transit. Families need cars to take children to daycare, ballet, hockey practices, get groceries, etc. 6) People in these communities have lost their voice and input with blanket rezoning. People live in these 22 zones and their voices have been removed with this proposal. The City appears to be forgetting about the lives of people who live in the houses affected by these 22 new "villages". What happened to family values and lifestyle.? What happened to communities having an input into the direction of their community?	Gladys Loewen	West Point Grey	
2026-07-13	21:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning will create a tremendous hardship to retired people with a fix income. The increase of taxes from R1-1 to R3-1 will be almost ten time higer. Senior resident will be forced to sell and fine alternate living accomodation. Long time renters with affordable rent will also be affected.	Margarita Jordan	Victoria-Fraserview	

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
2026-07-13	21:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in Vancouver near Copley Community Orchard a kilometre from the proposed “village” location at Commercial St & 20th Ave that frequent multiple times a week. The Draft Vancouver Official Development Plan By-law to implement the Villages Planning Program is flawed in its current form and should be sent back for revision and real community engagement. The success of Vancouver’s existing “village” areas comes from the communities that have built and sustained them over the years. Their character and vitality are the result of residents, local businesses, and neighbourhood investment - not simply zoning. The proposed Villages Planning Program focuses on increasing density while doing little to strengthen or protect the communities that made these neighbourhoods successful. Good planning should support existing communities, not accelerate redevelopment pressures that risk displacing them. Key concerns include, but are not limited to: * There has been no meaningful public consultation. Engaging less than 1% of residents on a plan of this scale is inadequate. * Renaming or rezoning neighbourhoods without delivering substantially more subsidized or below-market housing will not solve Vancouver’s housing affordability crisis. * If additional affordable rental housing is the goal, the City should require large corporate developers to dedicate a meaningful portion of new condominium projects to permanently affordable rental units. * The economics of replacement housing drive up land values, redevelopment costs, and ultimately rents, making housing less affordable rather than more affordable. * “Village” areas encourage replacement with six-storey buildings and allow privately initiated rezonings for even greater height and density. Over time, this creates the potential for much of the “Village” area to transition from single-family homes to six-storey or taller buildings. * Intensifying development along neighbourhood commercial streets will increase costs and redevelopment pressure, making it more difficult for existing local businesses to survive and continue serving their communities.	Mark Freeman	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	21:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose Village Plans. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Village Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026. I have seen beautiful village neighbourhoods ruined by areas bought up and then emptied of tenants: shops, cafes, services, etc because Vancouver Council allows this. I do not believe the areas picked by the Village schemes have the proper set of shops, cafes and resources that will support a proper village atmosphere and thriving community. I do not believe that the proper research, consultation and or thought has been put into this plan. Please vote NO on this plan.	Bridget Kowey	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not support the villages plan and encourage you to vote against it. Let the massive Broadway plan do its work. We need more duplexes and family-oriented housing, not more apartments.	James Borthwick	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the 17 villages plan/R3-4 rezoning on a number of levels! I have friends that live in the areas that are to be rezoned, and their property taxes will be exorbitant. Many of them have renovated their homes to live in for the rest of their lives and do not want to move out of their areas, but the prohibitive property taxes may make it impossible for them to stay. Also, I am very concerned about the tree canopy loss, which will accelerate urban heat and damage natural Drainage among other impacts	Margaret O'riley	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We are situated at 33rd and Mackenzie. There are already some small businesses operating in Mackenzie street with mixed success. Shopping on Dunbar street, Kerrisdale and at Arbutus village are already there and easily accessible. There are many housing and retail units that have been built in recent years on those high streets which still remain empty and unused. There are many retail spaces in the area for lease. It behooves me to understand what makes you think that adding more to the supply is going to benefit anyone. I have lived in this area my entire life. Destroying our existing neighbourhoods will destroy what makes this city special. I am not against development or progress per se, but it is better suited to the major corridors and not on the side streets of our city. Once you lose the flavour of the city it will become just like every other anonymous urban centre out there. When we purchased our home we did so because we wished to live in a traditional Vancouver neighbourhood, and I have no wish to have that decision taken away from me.	Gary Koehler	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to this villages plan because I don't feel that Vancouver citizens and residence should have a specific design imposed on them. I.e. like a cookie cutter design because in this city over the last 130 years or whatever each neighbourhood has evolved organically and each neighbourhood is unique and has unique needs and assets, and also a unique flavour and unique design. This wasn't done by an architect. This was a group of neighbourhoods that evolved over the years and I will never understand why the city wants to destroy the character of our city and make it this homogeneous One size Fits all planning concept the majority of Vancouver rights in my opinion do not want this and I believe it's being forced on us have to be House of developers and the abundant housing crew. That's why.	Garry Chalk	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	21:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please record my opposition to the Villages re-zoning plan.	Gayle Raphanel		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I support adding more housing in Vancouver. We need it. My concern is not with the goal, but with the process and priorities. The proposed Villages Plan represents a significant change to many neighbourhoods, yet it is being advanced through a broad city-wide approach rather than thoughtful, neighbourhood-specific planning. I would urge Council to slow down, engage residents more deeply, and ensure each village has a plan that reflects its unique character and opportunities. At the same time, I believe the City should devote greater attention to the quality of the housing it is already enabling. Many of the new sixplex developments appearing across the city are poorly designed and detract from the streets they occupy. Vancouver has a long history of good urban design, and we should expect new housing to contribute positively to our neighbourhoods rather than diminish them. More housing and better design are not mutually exclusive. Finally, I believe improving our existing neighbourhood shopping districts should be a higher priority. Places like Point Grey Village and Dunbar Village have tremendous potential to become vibrant, walkable community hubs. Investments in public realm, retail vitality, streetscape improvements, and thoughtful mixed-use development would strengthen these villages while making them more attractive places to live. Growth is necessary, but so are good planning, good design, and clear priorities. I encourage Council to pause this proposal, refine it through meaningful neighbourhood planning, raise the standard for new housing design, and focus on creating villages that residents will be proud of for decades to come.	Kevin Mcelroy	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	21:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Councillors, when you are considering the proposal, please keep in mind that if the Villages plan is such a good idea, it will continue to be a good idea long into the future. There is no reason to rush this through in the middle of summer, with minimal public notification of the significance and impacts of the Villages plan, and of the Public Hearing itself. My view and the view of my neighbours are that city-initiated rezonings that strip public oversight are not democratic, they are not positive for good governance of the city. If a developer wishes to fundamentally transform a local block or portion thereof, they should be required to bring that specific project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing. True neighbourhood development requires localized input and design, tree canopy protections, and community input—not sweeping, blanket upzonings that treat 17 distinct communities as a single, homogenized, machine-readable asset class for investment platforms both domestic and global. This is literally the financialization of housing. If this plan is adopted by you, future localized public hearings for these areas are legally eliminated under provincial legislation brought in as a result of industry lobbying backed by closely aligned AHV and YIMBY activists who were given an inside track. The result is that private developers will have a friction-free, machine-readable sandbox to build up to 6-to-8 storey blocks by-right, leaving communities with zero democratic recourse. How can this be desirable? They don't do this in Europe. How can this city initiated upzonings to Don't vote for this disastrous plan.	Hugh Claxton	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have been a long-time resident in the proposed Kerr St. & E. 54th Ave. Village for over 30 years. I am directly impacted by the planned mid-block connector on E. 57th and Rosemont Drive. I have a few questions and comments for council. 1. How is the city going to acquire the land required for the planned mid-block connector? Do our planners and council members know how the lives of the current residents will be negatively affected? 2. Has the planner actually measured how much walking time and distance can be saved by this mid-block connector? Did our planner survey how many people actually walk to the mall from Rosemont and 57th Ave? I personally have never walked to the mall for grocery shopping. 3. Is a new bus route planned on E 54th Avenue? Do planners know how congested E 54th Avenue is during rush hour? E. 54th avenue is very narrow for buses with parked cars. 4. Have planners and council evaluate how the increased density is going to affect the safety and security of our neighborhood? I have seen increased homelessness, break-ins, car-theft, arson, and murder in this neighborhood just in the past 10 years with densification. I do not see any significant time-savings with the planned mid- block connector. However, at least 4 to 6 houses will be significantly affected, just to save people 1-minute of walking time to the new village. My suggestion is to make sure the sidewalk on Rosemont Drive is repaved to smooth the cracks and the lighting be improved for pedestrians. To make Rosemont Drive into a real greenway for biking and walking, car access needs to be restricted to and from Kerr Street. Currently, there are many vehicles speeding down Rosemont Drive even with speed bumps installed. Many cars use Rosemont and E. 57th Avenue to get to Elliot Street during rush hour. Speeding cars and drivers not living in this neighborhood are creating hazardous situations for both pedestrians and bikers. Thank you very much for your attention.	Clare Kong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-13	21:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There hasn't been sufficient consultation and planning to support this degree of change, including potentially significant impacts on individual property owners. The city has done little to support the health of our existing neighborhoods and commercial centres, eg Dunbar and Point Grey, which are struggling. It's not at all clear how the villages plan represents an improvement. More work needs to be done to determine what problems we are trying to solve and whether the proposed solutions will get us there. City hall needs to communicate a vision for the city, beyond mindless density, to take us forward. We need to get back to the days when Vancouver was a global leader in planning, with the ambition to make big moves to achieve meaningful change.	Chris O'Riley	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the villages plan.	Kwong Keung Chan	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-13	21:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear City Council, I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of our neighborhood. One of the reasons my family chose to live here is because it is a peaceful, quiet, and well-established community. We already have access to the amenities and services we need, and the neighborhood offers a sense of stability that is becoming increasingly difficult to find. I am concerned that rezoning would significantly change the character of our community. Increased density, construction, traffic, and noise would disrupt the peaceful environment that residents have worked hard to maintain and enjoy. Like many homeowners, we are also in a difficult position financially. If the character of our neighborhood changes in ways that no longer suit our family, relocating would not be a realistic option, as housing costs in our city have become prohibitively expensive. We purchased our home with the expectation that the surrounding neighborhood would remain largely consistent with its current character. I respectfully ask that the City consider solutions that preserve established neighborhoods like ours. Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I appreciate your commitment to hearing the voices of residents and hope you will carefully consider the impact this rezoning would have on our community.	Shaina D'Souza	Killarney	
2026-07-13	21:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I certainly will not vote for any councillor who supports this	Franck Prat	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	21:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My neighbourhood, the potential site of the Victoria Dr & E 61st Ave Village, is currently very far from being a dense neighbourhood that's heavily-connected with public transit. Many members in my neighbourhood like living here because it offers a quiet respite from the busy city life. We have few cars, so the traffic is fairly calm and uncongested. Crime is low. Life in this neighbourhood caters to its seniors that have lived here for an eternity and the new families looking to experience the same benefits once enjoyed by these aging members. There is an organic growth in population in our neighbourhood that needs to be respected. New homes are regularly being built with greater density already, allowing for a slow incorporation of new families. These are welcomed additions to our neighbourhood and the community can adapt to such slow changes. An aggressive push for greater density destroys the community and pushes (and lures) people away. If a builder comes in with promises of a big payout for people willing to sell, numerous recently-built homes will likely be demolished. Such rezoning encourages greed and environmentally irresponsible behaviours. If you wish to densify, do so by encouraging revitalization on the current retail areas along Victoria Dr as well as along SE Marine Dr. Encourage solutions that allow for businesses to find new lots on those streets at an affordable rent. Build more residential spaces along those commercial areas with modern retail spaces below.	Kwong Yang Hu		
2026-07-13	22:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this proposal in its current form because of how the decision is structured, not because I oppose new housing. Bundling all Villages into one single rezoning decision denies each neighbourhood the chance to be engaged in a decision about its own future. A single vote covering all distinct areas cannot reflect neighbourhood-level opinion: some neighbourhoods may oppose the plan while others support it, but under this format a neighbourhood that disagrees can be rezoned anyway because of opinion elsewhere in the city. That is not fair, and it is made worse by the fact that this would be the last public hearing for most affected properties — meaning neighbourhoods lose the right to be consulted permanently. I ask Council to consider each Village separately through its own neighbourhood-level process rather than approving all at once.	Ann Fu	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Regarding the Villages Plan Public Hearing scheduled for July 14, I feel it is inappropriate for council to be making a decision of this magnitude when we are 3 months from a municipal election. The results of the recent civic byelection indicate that there is uncertainty as to the future council makeup. Village concept is a top-down concept that seems to reek of a bureaucratic initiative. What is the goal here? Communities are built from neighbourhoods not “villages”. Development and especially retail have been hit very hard post-COVID. Right now there should be initiatives to support.existing “villlages “ such as West Point Grey Village , Dunbar, and West Broadway from Blenheim to Larch, with a broader view of Alma to Blenheim. The decline of retail in those areas is sad to see. Waiting for development of the Jericho Lands will take too long and may not afford any benefit to any of those “villages”. With respect to development of a “Village”at 33rd and Fraser, Mountainview Cemetery cannot be developed!!! Whose idea was that?? There is already commercial development north of 30th with new retail 28th - 29 th. Let it evolve naturally. A number of the other “villages”already exist. Will changing density and zoning improve those villages from a community perspective or just a development one?	Sandra Homenuk	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	22:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council; I oppose the Villages Planning Program. Every great village and neighbourhood around the world evolves naturally and organically over time. You can't force the creation of a village. They evolve from the bottom up, not the top down. In the process of "creating" a village you would in all likelihood destroy whatever is there and the surrounding neighbourhoods, as experts who have written to you have so aptly pointed out. I agree with them and don't have much to add to their arguments. I'm not familiar with many of the planned village areas. However, I can speak to the one planned for Macdonald and 16th. This is already an area that is within WALKING minutes of several shops, coffee houses and restaurants, as well as a gas station and a medical building on the corner. A Starbucks is on the corner. Choices Market a block away. West Broadway Greektown a 5 minute walk if you're a fast fit walker, and 10 minutes if you're slower. So what more could a made up village add to all that. Surely the City has enough housing in the works already. We don't need more unaffordable market rentals. We don't need more unaffordable empty condos. I've attached a few screenshots from Apple Maps to show you what's already there at 16th and Macdonald. I'm wondering if Council have actually visited all of the proposed village areas and fully appreciate what is already there and the damage they will do if they vote for this proposal.	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7 Attachment 8 Attachment 9
2026-07-13	22:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am particularly familiar with the Kerrisdale area. The Kerridale village already exists - around 41st avenue - just blocks away from the proposed new village. the huge area of proposed increased density will ruin the lovely residential area around the existing village and is completely unnecessary.	Mary Macaulay	Downtown	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Killarney is one of the best neighborhoods in East Vancouver Already a village in itself where all facilities for families are at a walkable distance from Killarney Community Centre to the big Killarney Park Killarney High School Elementary schools Shell gas Station Community church Preschool Champlain mall Champlain library Doctors Dentist Life labs Coffee shops Restaurant So really no reason to tear down an already well established neighborhood that is thriving well All residents really take very good care of their yards and alleys and I must say it is a very beautiful neighborhood that does not need a tear down Really makes no sense I am definitely not supportive of this proposal	Shaina D'Souza	Killarney	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan in its current form because it creates a serious practical loophole in Vancouver's tree protection framework. The issue is not only individual tree-removal permits. The issue is City-initiated rezoning that changes development rights across mature residential neighbourhoods before site-specific tree retention has been properly assessed at the development-permit stage. Rezoning does not automatically remove tree protection, and a tree-removal permit is still required. However, once zoning allows larger buildings, future development permits may create larger building envelopes. Mature trees within those envelopes may then become eligible for removal, making tree loss more likely even if it is not automatic. This is the loophole. Rezoning does not cut down trees directly, but it can create the conditions that make mature tree loss a predictable downstream consequence. The City can say it protects mature trees, but if it first approves zoning that makes their removal more likely, the protection becomes weak in practice. Tree removal is then treated as a technical consequence of development rather than a core planning issue. This directly conflicts with Vancouver's climate and urban forest goals. The City recognizes that the urban forest helps protect Vancouver from extreme heat and climate-change impacts, while providing habitat, absorbing rainwater, storing carbon, and improving health and well-being. Vancouver's current canopy cover is about 25%, and the City has adopted a target to increase it to 30% by 2050. Broad rezoning in mature tree-lined neighbourhoods risks removing the very canopy the City says it wants to expand. This matters even more in the current context of extreme heat. Vancouver's own planning anticipates warmer temperatures, more extreme heat days, and longer, hotter, more frequent heat waves. Mature trees are therefore not decorative landscaping. They are essential public-health and climate-resilience infrastructure. Every mature tree is also a living ecosystem. Mature trees support birds, insects, pollinators, fungi, soil organisms, lichens, mosses, and other species. Together, they help connect small urban habitats and contribute to Vancouver's broader biodiversity network. When mature trees are destroyed, the loss is not only shade. It is habitat loss, ecosystem fragmentation, and reduced resilience. Replacement planting is not enough. A young replacement tree cannot provide the cooling, carbon storage, stormwater absorption, habitat, and biodiversity functions of a mature tree for decades. In a time of worsening extreme heat, those decades matter. I support increasing housing supply, but the Villages Plan should not be presented as a housing solution if it merely increases development capacity while weakening climate resilience, biodiversity, and mature tree protection. Council should not approve the Villages Plan unless tree retention is built into the zoning itself, before development envelopes are approved. At minimum, Council should require neighbourhood-scale canopy-impact analysis, tree-first site planning, binding retention requirements for significant mature trees, and design flexibility that allows housing to be added without destroying mature urban forest. The City should close this rezoning loophole before approving the plan. Once mature trees and the habitats they support are destroyed, they cannot simply be replaced by new plantings. The loss of mature canopy, nesting sites, soil life, shade, and biodiversity is effectively irreversible on the timescale that matters for today's residents and future generations. Thoughtful decisions today will protect Vancouver's livability, climate resilience, and biodiversity for the future.	A Rouhi	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in the Nanaimo Street and First Village proposal area. I oppose this application but I first must comment on the poor job done to notify and involve me and my neighbours about this proposal. I was involved in the development and final form of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. This plan allowed for development along arterials like Nanaimo, Hastings and First. There was a large community involvement. There has been minimal uptake and some land assemblies on Nanaimo have been on the market for many years now. There is no real "village centre" in this area even though it had been suggested by the Grandview Woodland plan. That is because the real centres are along Hastings and Commercial. Expanding the area back three blocks on the west side of Nanaimo will break up the one of the most thriving communities in the Commercial Drive area. Home sales in the area sell within a week of posting, as the community is known as a place where everyone knows their neighbours. That will not happen if your plan goes ahead. This is a poorly thought out "experiment" as there has been no discussion of where this has been tried successfully before and what the future role of planning would be in the development. You must engage the locals and make your plans clear. Sending something to my door that only uses planning jargon says we are moving from CD-1 to CD-2 just looks like an attempt to duck what is really happening. You have communication people that could change this jargon into something my neighbours would understand. I cannot accept this plan and I will not vote for a party that allows this form of hide and seek. The Grandview Woodlands plan took time and a lot of local input. Don't you want to know what the locals think? Greg Miller	Greg Miller	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	22:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages plan is ill-conceived because it does not meet the City's needs. A one-size-fits-all across all City neighbourhoods is not congruent with the culture for which the City is globally noted. It is short sighted to anticipate huge population growth without concomitant funding for amenities, green spaces, infrastructure to service growth, even over 30 years. There are already >130 development applications in the pipeline but not yet adequate planning or funding for schools, roads, community centres, sewage, water, transit, etc. let alone affordable housing.	B Lynn Shepherd	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The city of Vancouver already has wonderful neighbourhoods/villages. We live in Kitsilano, there is 4th Avenue and Broadway in Kits with good walkable retail stores, cafes, restaurants, pharmacies and a wide range of grocery stores. There is Main Street , Mountain Pleasant villages, Cambie village, West 10th village , Kerrisdale and Dunbar etc, with similar stores. We do not need further villages, we do not need ugly blocky houses with retail on the bottom floor. Established business will suffer if this plan goes ahead. Please do not destroy our beautiful city , it is becoming overbuilt.	Gerri Gunn	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	22:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Our main streets are already overcrowded since the addition of multiple large condo buildings & laneway houses in Dunbar. People now use side streets to try to avoid Dunbar/Blenheim etc, resulting in fast moving traffic ignoring stop signs on narrow side roads. Parking is at a premium. Adding more units & more cars (without adequate parking) will make all of these problems worse.	Katherine Gordon	Dunbar-Southlands	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We did not ask for this. There was no mention of this plan during the last election and it was not in ABC's mandate to make such massive changes to city zoning. It's a major and sudden departure from previous plans for our neighborhood. Changes like this make it impossible for families like mine to plan for the future. We already have densification along major arterials in our neighborhood and a nearby large townhouse complex. This is too much density too quickly without adequate infrastructure. There have also been multiple other large initiatives by this government to increase density, and it's wrong to proceed with another massive rezoning initiative without seeing the fallout from the projects that have already been approved. Even if the village plan proceeds, it doesn't make sense to approve this many villages in one step, as opposed to proceeding with one or two as a pilot project. As well, a lot of the public support for initiatives like this was due to the sudden unprecedented population surge that we had post Covid. The federal government has already taken steps to address that, and set new targets for population growth. Infact, we've actually had historic declines in population over the last few months. Fraser and 33rd area is not well connected to transit. The presence of the graveyard also impedes traffic to area, funneling it onto fewer roads. Even the 2 high streets shown in the plan for our neighborhood are not connected. This is clearly not the right neighbourhood for a plan like this. We are also going through a historic downturn in our housing market. There are thousands of unsold units. Vacancy rate is much improved and rental prices have steadily declined over the last few years. There are multiple retail spaces in our neighbourhood which have been sitting empty for months. We barely have any large trees left in our area and this plan will inevitably lead to removal of more trees from the neighbourhood. Also, there isn't that much green space in this neighborhood, and there will be too many new residents to share the space. As well, the large increase in population envisioned in the overall village plan will put further strain on our nearby natural resources, requiring additional sources of water, electricity, etc to be developed. As well, it will place additional strain on cherished amenities that are already stretched to their limits, such as access to nearby hiking trails. I oppose the village plan as a whole, and especially oppose the plan for my neighbourhood of Fraser and 33rd.	Angela Phung	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
2026-07-13	22:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Villages Planning program. The City should engage with each neighbourhood in collaborative community planning. Support existing shopping areas in the established city neighbourhoods. Small, independent stores are struggling, and many are going out of business due to high taxes and uncontrolled rent. The proposed new commercial streets will be competing with existing shopping areas. Has Council assessed money-laundering and opaque-ownership risks? There are 30%+ discrepancies between what the public sees and what's going to Council—that's 167 blocks and 252 homes that apparently disappeared between the Village Plan on "ShapeYourCity" and the report Council will vote on after the Public Hearing. Explain. Follow the recommendations of HousingReset.ca, an experienced group of urbanists, planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics. Developers are not urban planners. Housing Reset's letter to Council was as follows: Recommend that City Council vote "not supported" Existing neighbourhood centres are the best place for local shopping areas, not new commercial in villages that would compete with them. Blanket rezoning spread too thinly will produce blight. The proposed densities in villages vastly exceed compatible scales in the local context. The proposed additional density in villages is not needed to meet future growth to 2050. Solutions that enhance neighbourhoods rather than undermining them are easily achievable. Regards Pearce Wilcox	Pearce Wilcox	West Point Grey	
2026-07-13	22:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose as this one blanket for all approach is all too subjective with some proposed ones already close to existing established villages such as Dunbar, Kerrisdale, Oakridge, future Heatherland.	Olive Yu	South Cambie	
2026-07-13	22:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My family and I oppose the 17 Villages Plan. This decision is far too important. It will impact our community for years to come and should not be rushed through. Sufficient public consultation must occur. Recent changes in Kensington-Cedar Cottage need to be evaluated. Have the Rezoning and new builds actually created affordable housing? New builds drive up costs, leave apartments vacant, and drive people out of Vancouver. Sufficient infrastructure- additional schools, green space, community centres, libraries is not being invested in. This Village Plan is a cookie-cutter approach that disregards existing neighbourhood plans developed through community consultation. I ask the city to thoroughly consult the public, evaluate and avoid just plunging ahead to meet what appears to be a manipulative election timeline.	Peggy Mersereau	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-13	22:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Need more public consultations	Mandy Fung	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	22:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in arbitus ridge which is a peaceful community, I oppose this area rezoning .I don’t want to live around high-density residential or commercial buildings .	Gaifang Duan	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	22:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Good evening, Mayor Sim and Councillors. My name is David Orchard, and I live in Dunbar, near Mackenzie St and W 33rd Ave — one of the 17 proposed Village cores. Before I give you my own view: I'm not the first to raise concerns here. I agree with: - This kind of unphased, blanket rezoning risks blight, not vibrancy — a warning raised by retired City of Vancouver chief planners and senior urban designers (Housing Reset letter, June 2026) and by planning consultant Brian Palmquist. - The Village boundaries were drawn by a mechanical formula, not neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood judgment — confirmed by the City's own stated methodology (Shape Your City) and by my own comparison of the actual land use maps in the June 30, 2026 Villages Plan. - Cutting development charges won't deliver the affordability it promises, because the savings get absorbed into higher land prices rather than lower buyer costs — the economic case made by UBC professor emeritus Patrick Condon (The Tyee, July 2026). I agree with all of that — but I want to add three points of my own. First: parking, and who actually needs a car. This plan assumes density near a corner store means people won't need vehicles. That's not true for families like mine. My daughter works with disadvantaged youth on nutrition and health programs in Surrey. Transit for that commute takes over two hours each way; cycling is over two and a half — and that's before accounting for the real safety risks along the route, including Marine Way in South Vancouver and River Road in Richmond, and the conditions for cyclists in central Surrey itself. A car isn't a lifestyle choice for her; it's the only way that job is physically possible. And like many families with aging parents, we drive to every single appointment and visit for elderly relatives who can no longer drive themselves. I've seen this same blind spot from the City directly. I used to live in the Cambie corridor, and I went to the City's open house on the Cambie Corridor Plan. When I raised the question of parking and support for cars, the staff on hand — three architecture students — brushed it off, telling me everyone was simply going to switch to active transportation. They had no lived experience of what a multi-generational family actually needs, and that assumption ignores it completely. It isn't only emergencies and errands. Nobody does a November Costco run for a family of four or more by bike. Nobody takes a parent who needs a walker or a wheelchair to a medical appointment on a bicycle. It's also driving kids to their activities, the weekly grocery run, and getting out to the mountains and the outdoors this city is famous for — part of why many of us chose to live here in the first place. This plan doesn't require a single new parking space for buildings like the one proposed 18 times over on my own street, in a Village where 93% of survey respondents were already homeowners and traffic and parking concerns came up in 18% of comments — nearly double the citywide average. Multi-generational, caregiving families aren't a footnote. We're a huge share of who actually lives here, and this plan has no answer for us.	David Orchard	Dunbar-Southlands	

				Second: this is a protractor exercise, not a plan. The City's own methodology draws a roughly 400-metre circle around an intersection and calls it a Village. In mine, that shows up at the boundary itself: the awkward lots fronting the curving Puget Drive got carved out for not fitting the template, while ordinary blocks on both sides were rezoned. Seventeen of these, drawn the same mechanical way, with mandatory retail and no mention anywhere of parks, childcare, or other community amenities — that's compass-and-protractor zoning applied citywide and dressed up as neighbourhood planning. Third: why the urgency, when so much is already approved and moving slowly? Just up the road, Jericho Lands is already approved for roughly 24,000 new residents. The Broadway Plan, approved back in 2022, has capacity for up to 64,000 more residents — yet of roughly 26,000 units currently in that pipeline, only 226 have actually reached the occupancy permit stage. The Cambie Corridor Plan, approved in 2018, targets 50,000 more residents along Cambie, Oak Street, and King Edward Avenue by 2041 — and added only about 5,300 in its first decade. Add Senakw, River District, and UBC's own Wesbrook Place next door, and the City has already zoned capacity for something like 180,000 additional residents, at every stage from newly-occupied to barely-started — most of it arriving on a 20-to-30-year timeline, far behind its own targets. That slow pace is exactly the point: if growth is already going to take decades to arrive, there's no need to skip a real, comprehensive plan that actually accounts for all of it together, in favour of the compass-and-protractor approach I just described. Government is also already spending billions bailing out developers because today's unsold inventory isn't selling at the prices it was built for. Before we manufacture even more supply, I'd ask Council to explain why, when we can't yet get what's already approved built, sold, or occupied. And that doesn't even factor in the quasi bailouts of developers that are happening, with below market rates for city properties, reduction in developer paid fees including community improvements, and the simply awful Provincial and Federal plan to buy thousands of condos. The market is obviously overbuilding, even with the slow progress, so how does more supply help? So: I agree this risks blight and won't deliver the affordability it promises. But I'd add — it ignores who actually needs to drive, it was drawn by formula instead of judgment, and there's no urgency case when 180,000 residents' worth of capacity is already approved and moving slowly — which is exactly why there's time to do this properly. Send it back for a phased approach, with real analysis of community needs and impacts — such as parking, parks, community centres, and schools — and of the capacity already in the pipeline, before rezoning again, not after. Thank you for your time.		

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
2026-07-13	22:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am a resident of Prince Albert Street, one block outside the proposed Fraser Street & E 33rd Avenue Village in Kensington-Cedar Cottage. I am writing to state my opposition to the Villages Plan, the associated City-initiated rezoning, and the ODP amendments before you on July 14, and to ask that you vote NOT SUPPORTED. My family and many of our neighbours chose this corner of the city deliberately. It is quiet, modest, and full of young families — the kind of stable, rooted community the Vancouver Plan claims to value. Blanket pre-zoning of our blocks for six-storey apartment buildings, with no future public hearings, treats that community as an inconvenience rather than an asset. The land-assembly speculation this plan invites will pressure long-term families — and displace the renters living in the basement suites and older homes that make up much of this area's genuinely affordable housing. Density is not the issue; we already have it. Walk our blocks and you will see lot after lot being redeveloped into duplexes with suites, laneway homes, and now multiplexes under R1-1. Kensington-Cedar Cottage is densifying rapidly under the zoning Council enacted barely three years ago, without one additional storey of up-zoning. That gentle, distributed growth is working. This plan discards it before it has even been measured. It also discards the planning tradition that built Vancouver's international reputation. Vancouverism — the careful, design-led, neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood approach associated with Larry Beasley — earned this city its standing precisely because growth was shaped with communities, tied to amenities, and reviewed in public. Mr. Beasley himself signed the June 18 Housing Reset open letter from thirty Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics urging this Council to vote "not supported" and to pursue collaborative, neighbourhood-scale planning instead. When the author of Vancouverism formally asks Council to reject a plan as a departure from what made this city work, that deserves your serious pause. A single crude rezoning of nearly 14,000 parcels, released weeks before a mid-summer hearing, benefits land assemblers and developers with certainty while residents bear the uncertainty. Finally, I ask Council to look at where this burden lands. Three of the seventeen Villages touch Kensington-Cedar Cottage — more than any other neighbourhood in Vancouver. The City's own materials anticipate buildout dispersed over thirty years. That is a generation of scattered demolition and construction — trucks, excavation, and street closures on quiet residential blocks around Grays Park and the elementary school beside it — in an area full of small children. No other neighbourhood is being asked to absorb this on the same scale. I urge Council to vote not supported, as the Housing Reset experts recommend. Failing that, I ask that you substantially reduce and phase the plan, and remove the residential blocks east of Fraser Street from the City-initiated rezoning until genuine, neighbourhood-level consultation has occurred.	Rob Felix	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	22:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose city-initiated rezoning, I don’t like to live around high-density residential or commercial buildings, which will make our housing decline in value and bother residents.	Xianchun Yue	Arbutus Ridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose Villages planning program. It needs more public consultation and should not be rushed. This major development negatively impacts all the different communities of Vancouver. I strongly oppose this plan.	George Liem	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-13	22:44	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Planning Program	M C	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	22:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This is an ill conceived project that has not been properly planned or discussed. I don't see why this is something Vancouver needs at this point in time, and I am absolutely opposed.	Enrique Manchon	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	22:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the Villages Plan, a plan that has not been well consulted with the public. Tree canopy loss will have impacts on the environment and biodiversity. Nurturing existing neighbourhoods is the best way forward for thriving communities.	Meghan Lok	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	22:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This city plan is about more residential development but there is no plan for infrastructure. It is absolutely essential to have appropriate roads , water /sewage , transportation for people and for goods, hydro power, electrical grids, hospitals, schools, community centre amenities such as pools and tennis courts, waste collection etc that can accommodate the multi 1000's of residents you are building for. Yet we don't even have infrastructure decently sufficient for our current population. Where are the infrastructure proposals? This village plan has potential in major thoroughfares which may be able to absorb and build smartly (eg . Oak , eg 49th) but absolutely not in small one car driving lanes like Mackenzie /33rd.	Julie Mohaseb	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	22:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this proposal because the existing infrastructure in our neighbourhood is already under significant pressure. The local roads are narrow and were never designed to accommodate the amount of traffic that will come with substantially higher density. Additional residents will inevitably mean more vehicles, increased congestion, and more competition for limited parking. I support building more housing, but development should occur where the transportation network and infrastructure can support it, or only after those improvements have been made. Established neighbourhoods should not be expected to absorb this level of growth without corresponding investments in roads, transit, and public services.	Zhe Li	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-13	22:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I believe Vancouver needs more housing, but I do not think blanket upzoning is the right solution. Every neighbourhood has different characteristics, infrastructure, and capacity for growth. Applying the same zoning approach across many established communities ignores those important differences. Growth should be directed toward areas that were planned for redevelopment or have room for expanded infrastructure. Neighbourhoods that are already built out, with established homes, schools, parks, and limited road capacity, deserve planning that reflects their unique circumstances rather than a one-size-fits-all policy.	Nina Li	Shaughnessy	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	22:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My main concern is the impact this proposal will have on everyday safety and accessibility. Residential streets in this area are already narrow, and on-street parking is often full. If density increases significantly without sufficient parking or transportation improvements, vehicles will be forced to line both sides of the street, making it difficult for traffic to pass safely. This affects not only residents but also emergency vehicles, garbage collection, deliveries, cyclists, and pedestrians. Before increasing density, the City should first address these practical infrastructure challenges instead of expecting existing neighbourhood streets to absorb additional demand.	Tao Chen	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-13	22:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am concerned that this proposal places too much emphasis on redevelopment without adequately considering the long-term character of established neighbourhoods. These communities have developed over many decades and contain mature trees, existing homes, and a streetscape that contributes to Vancouver's identity. While additional housing is important, redevelopment should be carefully targeted instead of broadly applied. Once neighbourhood character is lost through widespread redevelopment, it cannot easily be restored. I encourage Council to pursue housing solutions that increase supply while respecting the existing communities that many families have invested in for generations.	Elizabeth Chen	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-13	23:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this application. These developments will radically alter and reduce the liveability of our city. There is already a lot congestion, and this application will if approved will greatly exascerbate these issues. The infrastructure is not in place to accommodate this dramatic increase in density. This application puts developers and speculators interests ahead of the concerns of residents and our communities.	John Bratlien	Kitsilano	
2026-07-13	23:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose this agenda.	Huanzhao Wu	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	23:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the approval of the Village Plan and the proposed by-law amendments for the area defined as the Village Area Naniamo St. and East First Avenue. Twenty-three years ago, I applied for a City of Vancouver Permit to add a 10-foot by 12-foot room to our home. I was told that I needed to sell 20 feet at the end of my property to the city for a laneway for a dollar. It was then that I realized regulations, policies, and by-laws are weapons that can be used by those in power. This Village Plan puts the power to shape the community in the hands of the municipal government and developers. The working class families that have been living in the area and building communities won’t have a voice in how the new community is shaped because money is power. My chidren were born in the home that I plan on retiring in and living out my days. To change the zoning and implement this Village Plan threatens that plan because others see land to be acquired where I see a multigenerational home and family. I believe that change has to happen in a city that has a housing crisis, but this plan does not have any protection for the community that exists.	Pat Currie		

2026-07-13	23:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Save the trees	David Li	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-13	23:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This plan is incomplete and leaves many important questions unanswered, particularly regarding zoning. The proposed "low-rise residential" designation covers everything from three-storey townhouses to six-storey condominiums and social housing, which is far too broad and lacks the clarity residents need. Such a wide range of potential development creates significant uncertainty about what our neighborhoods will actually look like in the future. The proposed increase in density also fails to adequately address the existing shortage of essential public services, including schools, hospitals, and other community infrastructure. Increasing the population without a clear and realistic plan to expand these services will only place greater strain on an already overburdened system and reduce residents' quality of life. Overall, this is an overly aggressive plan that does not give sufficient consideration to preserving the character of our established neighborhoods or addressing the current public service crisis. It also creates the impression that the primary objective is to increase property tax revenue by raising allowable density and land values. Higher land values can increase redevelopment pressure, making it more difficult for long-term residents to remain in their homes and potentially forcing some to sell or relocate. A successful city plan should strike a balance between accommodating growth, protecting existing communities, and ensuring that infrastructure and public services keep pace with development. Without a more thoughtful and balanced approach, this proposal risks undermining the very communities that make Vancouver a desirable place to live.	Qi Lin	Oakridge	
2026-07-13	23:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in Vancouver on Dumfries Street and 22nd Ave, on one of the western edges of the proposed “village” location at Commercial St & 20th Ave. The Draft Vancouver Official Development Plan By-law to implement the Villages Planning Program is flawed in its current form and should be sent back for revision and real community engagement. I moved to Kensington-Cedar Cottage to start a family, and immediately fell in love with the tremendous character in the neighbourhood. Homes with varied histories and decades of character carefully maintained and protected through the years. Streets lined with mature trees providing much needed shade on sweltering summer days for my black dog and I, and in a few weeks, my baby and I. Gardens and frontages carefully lovingly maintained by home owners and their many tenants. As a huge proponent of gentle density and its ability to create a sense of neighbourliness and human-scaled environments, East Van, and especially Kensington-Cedar Cottage has been the shining example of how to do this well. Very few single family homes in the area house solely one unit; with most housing 3 or 4 units per lot. Providing appropriately scaled sized housing for singles, young couples, young families, and aging seniors. This is a model that should continue to be replicated throughout Vancouver in favour of oversized development that have few design controls. Adding blanket commercial spaces throughout the neighbourhood also make little sense. Few small businesses can afford the rents of brand new commercial spaces. One of the many reasons why Commercial Street businesses have thrived is because they exist in older buildings that support affordable rental rates for those businesses. You only need to look at new commercial spaces across the city to see a very familiar pattern: Fitness centres, spas and Botox clinics, vape shops, and cannabis stores. These businesses don’t make communities thrive. They make them redundant and soulless.	Shaz Tejani	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

				Our family lives in newer four-storey townhouses on Dumfries; with garden suites at the ground level and 3-storey townhouses above. I would be remiss if I didn't mention how incredibly hot the street gets because of the lack of mature trees to provide shade. That being said, four-storeys still blend generally okay in the neighbourhood because it faces a roughly 3-4 -storey neighbourhood house and residential building. Row and townhouses that are an absolute maximum of 4 storeys would work well in the neighborhood but should not, by any means, be the singular housing form throughout Kensington-Cedar Cottage. A mix of housing forms is good planning. Retaining neighbourhood character is good planning. Consulting affected communities is good planning. This plan needs to reflect the needs of today's and tomorrow's communities. It should be brought back for further, more meaningful consultation and reflection of sound planning practice and economic analysis before being considered by Council. For example, despite living on the western corner of this village plan, I did not receive any notice of the scheduled public hearing and have had no information about any in-person or targeted consultation for our neighbourhood. We simply must do better when proposing such significant changes to the communities that people work, live, and play in. The success of Vancouver's existing "village" areas comes from the communities that have built and sustained them over the years. Their character and vitality are the result of residents, local businesses, and neighbourhood investment - not simply zoning. The proposed Villages Planning Program focuses on increasing density while doing little to strengthen or protect the communities that made these neighbourhoods successful. Good planning should support existing communities, not accelerate redevelopment pressures that risk displacing them. Key concerns include, but are not limited to: * There has been no meaningful public consultation. Engaging less than 1% of residents on a plan of this scale is inadequate. * Renaming or rezoning neighbourhoods without delivering substantially more subsidized or below-market housing will not solve Vancouver's housing affordability crisis. * If additional affordable rental housing is the goal, the City should require large corporate developers to dedicate a meaningful portion of new condominium projects to permanently affordable rental units. * The economics of replacement housing drive up land values, redevelopment costs, and ultimately rents, making housing less affordable rather than more affordable. * "Village" areas encourage replacement of an existing homes with six-storey buildings and allow privately initiated rezonings for even greater height and density. Over time, this creates the potential for much of the "Village" area to transition from single-family homes to six-storey or taller buildings. * Intensifying development along neighbourhood commercial streets will increase costs and redevelopment pressure, making it more difficult for existing local businesses to survive and continue serving their communities. I strongly oppose this plan in its current form and encourage council to listen to their constituents whose lives are impacted by these decisions.		

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
2026-07-13	23:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Another plan that will continue to shift power to developers at the expense of the public and communities and do nothing to make housing more affordable	David Carman	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-13	23:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council, I am a resident of kensington cedar cottage I am writing to state my opposition to the Villages Plan, the associated City-initiated rezoning, and the ODP amendments before you on July 14, and to ask that you vote NOT SUPPORTED. My family and many of our neighbours chose this corner of the city deliberately. It is quiet, modest, and full of young families. the kind of stable, rooted community the Vancouver Plan claims to value. Blanket pre-zoning of our blocks for six-storey apartment buildings, with no future public hearings, treats that community as an inconvenience rather than an asset. The land-assembly speculation this plan invites will pressure long-term families — and displace the renters living in the basement suites and older homes that make up much of this area's genuinely affordable housing. Density is not the issue; we already have it. Walk our blocks and you will see lot after lot being redeveloped into duplexes with suites, laneway homes, and now multiplexes under R1-1. Kensington-Cedar Cottage is densifying rapidly under the zoning Council enacted barely three years ago, without one additional storey of up-zoning. That gentle, distributed growth is working. This plan discards it before it has even been measured. It also discards the planning tradition that built Vancouver's international reputation. Vancouverism Finally, I ask Council to look at where this burden lands. Three of the seventeen Villages touch Kensington-Cedar Cottage — more than any other neighbourhood in Vancouver. The City's own materials anticipate buildout dispersed over thirty years. That is a generation of scattered demolition and construction — trucks, excavation, and street closures on quiet residential blocks around Grays Park and the elementary school beside it — in an area full of small children. No other neighbourhood is being asked to absorb this on the same scale. I urge Council to vote not supported, as the Housing Reset experts recommend. Failing that, I ask that you substantially reduce and phase the plan, and remove the residential blocks east of Fraser Street from the City-initiated rezoning until genuine, neighbourhood-level consultation has occurred. Respectfully yours.	Chad Walker	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
2026-07-13	23:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	• Irreversible Loss of Public Hearings: Under provincial Bill 18 (the Vancouver Charter Amendment Act), once a master plan like this is adopted into the city's Official Development Plan (ODP), City Council is legally prohibited from holding public hearings for any future building rezonings that align with it. Passing this now means the public is permanently locked out of having a say on future neighbourhood developments which is anti-democratic. This fundemental legal requirement means critical due diligence needs time to be undertaken by the Mayor and Council and all residents of Vancouver. This has not happened and absolutely needs to happen first before anything of this signifance is ever approved by council. • Rushed and Unprecedented Scale: Pushing blanket upzoning across 17 distinct areas and 600 city blocks simultaneously skips vital due diligence on neighbourhood infrastructure requirements like sewers, water, schools, and electrical grid capacity. It will drive haphazad, non strategic developement across 17 areas and within each area. It is the least strategic option the city could ever chose. • Supply Alone Fails Affordability: Vancouver has tripled its housing stock since the 1960s but remains unaffordable; blanket rezoning drives land speculation and higher property taxes rather than creating homes for average earners. Massive up-zoning of single family neighourhoods won't solve the critical problem of not having enough supply of affordable housing. • Threatens Small Businesses: Mandating ground-floor retail on over 500 properties creates an artificial oversupply of commercial space, risking high vacancy rates and cannibalizing existing local shopping streets. • Risks Property Neglect and Blight: Massively over-zoning the city creates massive capacity far beyond actual population growth, leading to land-banking and property neglect as sites sit in limbo waiting for future developer buyouts. • Eliminates Flexible Housing Options: Forcing a rigid requirement for 4-to-6 storey mixed-use commercial buildings strips away the flexibility to quickly build practical, missing-middle alternatives like townhouses or other gentle density options. • Destruction of Tree Canopy: Replacing existing yards with massive building footprints strips away mature tree canopies, reducing urban shade, worsening heatwave impacts, and directly undermining the city's climate resilience goals. • Loss of Gardens and Biodiversity Across the City: Eliminating residential green spaces, lawns, and local vegetable gardens destroys vital neighborhood ecosystems, wiping out urban habitats for birds, pollinators, and local biodiversity. • Erosion of Neighborhood Liveability: Cramming up to six story apartments onto local roads meant for single family homes severely increases street traffic congestion, strips away critical neighborhood parking, creates intrusive noise, blocks out natural sunlight with massive building shadows, and introduces pedestrian and cyclist safety hazards on over-burdened streets. • Requires Localized Planning: Council should reject this blunt, one-size-fits-all approach and send staff back to create community-specific plans that truly engages residents, businesses and other critical partners to create plans the effectively solve the city's challeges including work on creating true non-market and subsidized housing that truly solves the core problem of unaffordable housing. Solve the crtical problem first rather than creating significant other problems across the city.	Grant Mackay	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-13	23:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am concerned about the detrimental effects to neighbourhoods of cutting down mature trees, and building high-rises.	Suzanne Lear		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-13	23:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The unique flavour of each Vancouver neighbourhood is slowly disappearing. You can't fake a community. It requires inclusion of small family owned businesses, funky not so slick coffee shops, gardens planted and nurtured by a few neighbours, This city hall has no clue how to create density and uphold our unique west coast feel. Taking the "facade" off of older beautiful buildings to make us believe we are "preserving" our Vancouver history. We need a serious city hall and city planners overhaul.	Maureen Wilson	West End	
2026-07-13	23:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	see attached	Hugh Gusterson	Kitsilano	Attachment 1
2026-07-13	23:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	In my view there are not sufficient existing amenities such as schools, parks and community centres in the Rupert and Renfrew Area to support implementation of this type of plan and associated rezoning impacts. Implementation will therefore indeed significantly negatively impact the character of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life for existing residents in this area.	Gordon Knox	Renfrew-Collingwood	
2026-07-13	23:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	What are you thinking?!? As a 40 year resident of Vancouver who has encourage change but understands our history, why are you repeating the monster house mistakes of the 80's and 90's. You are destroying the value of single residential homes people have worked decades to beautify and improve. The day this zoning is passed, all single detached home improvements, both landscaping and homes, will be diminished in value as no one will want to live next to an over shadowing 3 or 6 storey building. All value will be simply land value and the single home improvements will be worthless. In addition, there is currently a surplus of multi- residential properties. So much extra supply that provincial and federal governments are discussing bailing out developers and condo prices have cratered. The zoning and design parameters are not thoughtfully taking into consideration over-shadowing neighbors, destroying trees, parking and street issue, water requirements. Why create extra density when you can't even keep up with water demand, traffic and street parking congestion today and multi-residential is in surplus? The foot print and height proposals for this zoning proposal are ill conceived and repeat egregious historic monster home errors of the past where multiple families resided in homes that consumed property foot prints, shadowed adjacent neighbors and wiped out trees. Please reconsider what you are doing to single detached neighborhoods and families who have worked tirelessly to improve their homes and landscape their properties. You are contemplating the destruction of single family neighbourhoods. If you vote down this proposal the you will have our future support as council. If you support it as it stands we will add our spirited and able advocacy for your removal during the next election. Consider a more moderate doing where duplex and four plex properties of no more than two stories are first trialed for a few years with reasonable design, foot print and height parameters. The current proposal is truly ill conceived. I have been a a real estate appraiser, agent, and broker and I am astounded this level of density and design is being washed through so haphazardly. You can do better!!!	Jason MacDonnell	Kerrisdale	

2026-07-14	00:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am OPPOSED to "Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments" I endorse the opinion of the Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics of HousingReset.ca and paraphrase their concerns here: "The 'everything all at once,' one-size-fits-all rezoning of 17 proposed villages, 550–600 blocks and 13,000 properties risks confusion, unintended damage, and lost opportunity across the city. - Existing neighbourhood centres are the best place for local shopping areas, NOT new commercial spaces in arbitrary villages that would compete with existing businesses in established neighbourhood centre shopping areas.. - The proposed densities in villages do not fit the scale in the local areas and will destroy the neighbourhoods on which they are imposed. - There is already enough approved development in the pipeline to meet future growth to 2050. The villages are not needed to meet this growth, nor will the proposed housing be affordable. Imposing these Villages will only create damage and dysfunction to the existing city fabric. - Real planning is needed to engage citizens in finding solutions that enhance Vancouver's diverse neighbourhoods, rather than undermining them. Plans must create varied & affordable housing choices, while strengthening the economic viability of existing neighbourhood centres, to deliver walkable, climate-friendly communities without the collateral damage this Villages proposal would create. Further, I am concerned the Villages Plan will bring destruction of the tree canopy and have deleterious effects on people and urban wild life in an increasingly warming climate.	Anna Holeton	Fairview	
2026-07-14	00:27	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please see attached letter	Amanda Vincent	Kitsilano	Appendix U
2026-07-14	00:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have lived in this neighborhood for over 30 years now. I was hoping this would be our forever home, where our kids would come back when they were grown with their kids, to show them where they grew up. I thought I loved the idea of these new village concepts, but I didn't have the whole story. I understand we need them on major roadways but encroaching them into residential streets changes the whole view. And if I am to stay here since I wanted it to be my forever home and not be able to improve or change my home in any way even though I pay property taxes and I pay for my home does not make any sense to me. am not opposed to growth or to creating more housing. I simply believe that changes of this magnitude require more thoughtful planning and meaningful consultation with the residents who have built these neighbourhoods over decades. I ask Council to take the time to ensure these plans strike a balance between meeting future needs and protecting the communities that already exist.	Kim Samain	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	00:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Opposition to the Proposed Villages Plan – Mackenzie St. & W 33rd Ave. Village Dear Mayor and Members of Council, I am a long-time Vancouver resident and homeowner in the Mackenzie Heights neighbourhood. I respectfully wish to express my opposition to the proposed Villages Plan for the Mackenzie Street & West 33rd Avenue Village.	Chantel Zhou	Arbutus Ridge	

Like many Vancouver residents, I recognize that our city faces a housing affordability challenge, and I support thoughtful and well-planned growth. However, increasing housing supply should not come at the expense of careful planning, neighbourhood livability, or adequate public infrastructure. In my view, this proposal does not strike the appropriate balance.

My concerns are outlined below.

1. Infrastructure has not kept pace with the proposed density.

The proposed increase in residential density is not accompanied by a comprehensive plan for transportation, parking, schools, parks, utilities, and other essential public services.

Without corresponding infrastructure investments, adding substantially more residents will inevitably place greater pressure on facilities that are already heavily used. Responsible planning requires infrastructure to grow alongside population—not years afterward.

2. Traffic and neighbourhood safety will inevitably deteriorate.

Mackenzie Street already functions as a major north-south arterial corridor, while West 33rd Avenue experiences significant traffic generated by nearby schools and daily commuting.

Higher residential density will inevitably increase vehicle traffic, curbside parking demand, delivery vehicles, ride-share activity, and pedestrian conflicts. I have not seen sufficient evidence demonstrating that these impacts have been fully assessed or that practical mitigation measures are in place.

3. The proposal would fundamentally change the character of Mackenzie Heights.

Mackenzie Heights is valued for its mature tree canopy, generous green space, low-rise residential character, and quiet, walkable streets.

These qualities have developed over many decades and are an important part of what makes this neighbourhood attractive to families and long-term residents.

While change is inevitable, large-scale upzoning should only occur where there is clear evidence that it is appropriate for the specific neighbourhood and supported by the necessary infrastructure.

4. A one-size-fits-all planning approach is not good planning.

Every neighbourhood has different transportation patterns, infrastructure capacity, development history, and community needs.

Applying a standardized planning model across multiple Village Areas may simplify administration, but it does not necessarily result in sound planning. Good urban planning should respond to local conditions rather than relying on a uniform city-wide template.

5. Residents deserve greater certainty and more meaningful consultation.

Many homeowners have made significant long-term financial and personal commitments based on the City's existing planning framework.

Planning changes of this magnitude should proceed only after comprehensive neighbourhood consultation, transparent impact assessments, and clear evidence that the long-term public benefits outweigh the costs imposed on existing communities.

				6. The balance between benefits and impacts has not been adequately demonstrated. I am also concerned that the proposal appears to place a disproportionate share of the costs on existing neighbourhood residents while the direct financial benefits accrue primarily to a relatively small number of redeveloped properties. The broader community will bear the long-term impacts through increased congestion, reduced parking availability, greater demand on public services, and permanent changes to neighbourhood character. Before proceeding, Council should clearly demonstrate why this balance of benefits and burdens is fair and how it serves the long-term public interest. A Better Approach I respectfully ask Council to reconsider or defer approval of the Mackenzie Street & West 33rd Avenue Village Plan until comprehensive studies have been completed regarding transportation, infrastructure capacity, public services, and neighbourhood impacts. As someone who has lived in Vancouver for many years and closely follows the local housing market, I believe that increasing housing supply alone does not guarantee improved affordability or better communities. If infrastructure, transportation, schools, parks, and other public amenities fail to keep pace, the quality of life for both existing and future residents will inevitably decline. Successful city-building is not measured simply by the number of housing units constructed. It is measured by whether growth is carefully planned, adequately supported by infrastructure, and able to preserve the qualities that make neighbourhoods desirable places to live. I respectfully urge Council to adopt a more balanced, neighbourhood-sensitive approach before moving forward with this proposal. Thank you for your time and consideration. Respectfully, Chantel Zhou			
2026-07-14	00:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not agree with having 4 Villages all along MacKenzie Street. Its over doing it. We are already very close to Dunbar Street which already have villages. Along MacKenzie Street is a quiet neighbourhood, this will destroy the peace and quiet of this neighbourhood.	Marilyn Leung	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	01:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am sending this email to oppose the Draft Vancouver Official 'Villages Plan' and the city-initiated rezoning and development plan amendments associated with it. I am a resident of Vancouver living within the area of the proposed "Fraser Street and 33rd Avenue Village", and therefore presumably subject to the new proposed Villages rezoning plan. I want to start by telling you that we already are a village, and a very successful one at that. Residents of this area know each other, help each other, and interact as a community, whether we live in houses, duplexes, townhouses, multiplexes, or apartment buildings. In addition to the four-story apartment buildings that have been added to the major routes in the neighbourhood (namely Fraser and 33rd), many of the neighbours on my street and on	Maya Yazigi	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

neighbouring streets have redeveloped their houses as multiplexes or added lane houses onto their properties, which has resulted in a natural and organic densification and an increase to the housing supply without drastically altering the feel and cohesiveness of the neighbourhood. Stacking people into 6 to 8 floor buildings will not improve the neighbourhood. That's not how a village looks or feels. In fact, no villages where people are stacked like sardines exist except in the imagination of developers. Neighbours in "our village" know each other because they live next to one another and interact frequently at many levels and while running errands in the already very shoppable neighbourhood where you can already find coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, mom and pop stores, hairdressers, dentists, pet food stores, electric appliance stores, and other businesses catering to many needs of the neighbourhood. These stores exist and can afford to function for the most part because there has not been any rezoning here that has taxed them out of existence. Any rezoning that would calculate tax on the potential use of a property rather than its current use is likely to drive most of these small businesses we rely on into bankruptcy, defeating the city's stated aim of creating walkable liveable villages. Our village is already livable and walkable. Don't mess it up.

Moreover, densification without much concern for affordability, aesthetics, or general liveability with regards to infrastructure and amenities is problematic at best if not dangerous.

Nowhere have I seen a real concern for true affordability. The notion of build supply and the prices will go down has proven to be a myth as we continue to experience lack of affordability in Vancouver relative to average incomes, and there are no provisions for a significant amount of public housing as part of these "Villages plans". So, if we are not building these "villages" to help the average worker afford a place, why are we bothering? Vancouver has already thousands of shoebox overpriced apartments sitting empty. Do we really need any more of those?

If the 'Villages plan" aims for great densification (minus the real affordability), who is going to live in our newly built unaffordable villages? And if we found people who can miraculously afford these places, what kind of infrastructure and provisions are being made to service all these additional people? Are there plans for a significant number of new schools, community centres, parks etc.? Ours are bursting at the seams right now. Shouldn't these infrastructure concerns be considered first before building so that future residents of these much-expanded villages would have their liveability needs met at the time of occupancy. Everything from sewer capacity to transit and everything in between should be a concern that is addressed first.

Also, aside from the concern about affordability and livability, is one about aesthetics. There doesn't seem to be any concern about aesthetics in the city's handling of this densification as evident by some of the smaller buildings that have sprung up since the talk about these villages began. A case in point is perhaps the ugliest building in the city that has just been built on E 30th street between Prince Albert and Fraser. I dare any member of council to drive by it and look. It is an absolute eyesore and an affront to good taste. Is this the type of building we should look forward to seeing in our new redesigned 'Villages'? Unless there is a serious look at design and committees formed to approve designs so as to live up to a certain minimal standard of aesthetics, this "villages" Plan could lead to the immense uglification of our beloved city. That concerns me as I find our city and my neighbourhood to be lovely as they are and I would hate it if a hastily pulled together plan were to jeopardize that.

Finally, the 'Villages Plans" and the rezoning related to it is a very significant plan that should have required much more public consultation, advance notices to meetings, and a genuine effort at involving the constituents who already live in the neighbourhoods of these proposed villages. As far as I am concerned, this has not been done. This is a serious matter and should really be an election issue rather than an attempt at hastily approving an ill-

				conceived project before the next municipal election. If the mayor and council believe in this vision so much, let it be an election issue. And let all Vancouver residents vote on it. Best, Maya Yazigi			
2026-07-14	01:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose to the Heather and 33rd Ave Village. There will already be a large Village and development on the "Heather Land" on 33rd, between Oak and Willow Street with many commercial and amenities, there will be an over supply of commercials in this area.	Marilyn Leung	Arbutus Ridge	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	01:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	You do not "create" new communities by destroying existing ones that are thriving. Has anyone walked around these areas? They already ARE villages. Their own unique version of community villages and somebody decided to destroy it? They are full of families, with kids playing in yards and riding bikes and yes, many have suites and lane homes. They are the kind of neighbourhoods that are filled with trees and people enjoying their lives. These neighbourhoods have history and bring much needed and valued character to our city and they have naturally evolved at a reasonable pace. These proposed "villages" aren't necessary nor do they represent good city planning and they contradict everything the City of Vancouver traditionally stood behind to protect the history, integrity and cohesiveness of neighbourhoods. This is about development greed. Everybody knows it. There was no thought process here and no consideration for all the existing families who occupy the homes in those zones. You are hiding behind words like "evolving" and "necessary" - this is not evolving - it's full blown bulldozing of some of the of most iconic neighbourhoods with zero consideration for the families who live there. All to line the pockets of developers under the false mask of "necessary densification". Many of those houses in these zones have the potential for suites and lane homes but you know what killed the inventory of suites? - Strict building codes and tenant laws. When a tenant has more rights than a landlord - the risk outweighs the gain, making it less desirable to be a landlord - perhaps revisit that conversation? How do we make it more desirable to make homeowners create rentable space in their home? Mass development is not the only answer to create housing. In terms of the villages - To impose such a drastic, life-changing, community altering decision in the manner it is being rolled out is disgraceful. This isn't fair representation or discussion nor is it in line with the integrity of our neighbourhoods that our city was once trying to respect and preserve. You didn't consult the people who live there. We felt we got slapped in the face out of nowhere. How about taking this approach: Look around? Your proposed villages do not currently exist. And it's working. There are plenty of apartments going up and more being built all over the city - in fact, it feels over developed. These units should be built in areas that make sense. Not just dropped in middle of residential blocks next bungalows. If you're a good city planner - you know that. You build where it makes sense. Busy corridors, main hubs - that's the appropriate places for those types of buildings. There is a narrative that is being pushed that we cannot sustain a city with single family homes anymore - that is false. Yes we can. We still need single family homes just like we need apartments/multi-family units. Why do you keep wanting to push single family homes out? And what about the waste? The homes in these zones are not tear-downs. Most are well-maintained, renovated or new builds. My block alone has 6 new/fully renovated homes while the others are perfectly maintained. It would be criminal to tear them down. And what about the environmental impact? Or does the environment only matter depending on the city's agenda? Then there are all the other negative impacts it will have. These neighbourhoods do not have the infrastructure to handle the the influx of people: roads, transit, sewer, power. You will not get a village and you will kill a neighbourhood. You will get a circus. There are no winners here. But the biggest red flag here: If city staff can just rezone whenever they want, wherever they want, however they want - why invest in Vancouver at all? It's like holding your citizens hostage. Do you want to build the economy or kill it? Every single Vancouver citizen should be alarmed by this. This is concerning on so many levels. This seems unethical. Who proposed this? Why? City of Vancouver: Do Better. There are 1000 better options than this.	Teresa Silvestre	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	06:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages plan and will not vote for any councillor in October who votes for it.	Susan Lamb	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
2026-07-14	06:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I respectfully oppose the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. I support increasing housing opportunities throughout Vancouver; however, I do not believe sufficient evidence has been presented demonstrating that the proposed area-wide rezoning can occur without placing additional pressure on existing infrastructure, public services, transportation systems and the urban forest. My concerns are as follows: • Area-wide rezoning without supporting infrastructure. The proposed plan significantly increases development potential across large portions of established neighbourhoods. Before approving widespread rezoning, Council should demonstrate that water, sanitary sewer, drainage, utilities and transportation infrastructure have the capacity to accommodate long-term growth. • Neighbourhood livability. Population growth should be accompanied by proportional investment in parks, schools, childcare, recreation facilities, community centres and public open space. Infrastructure should keep pace with growth rather than respond years later. • Traffic, parking and local streets. Increased residential density will inevitably increase demand for curbside parking, deliveries, ride-share services and local traffic. Many neighbourhood streets already experience parking shortages. The City should provide a clear strategy demonstrating how these impacts will be managed. • Urban forest and green infrastructure. Mature trees, private landscaping and permeable open space are defining characteristics of Vancouver's neighbourhoods. Incremental redevelopment across an entire village area has the potential to result in cumulative losses of mature trees, soil volume and green space. The City should demonstrate how the Villages Plan will achieve a measurable net gain in urban canopy, stormwater management and biodiversity over time. • Evidence-based planning. Before extending similar zoning across entire neighbourhoods, Council should publish measurable evidence demonstrating how comparable higher-density developments have performed with respect to occupancy, affordability, infrastructure demand and neighbourhood outcomes. Future policy should be informed by measurable results. • Neighbourhood character. Growth should respect the existing scale and landscape character of established residential streets through thoughtful transitions, high-quality public realm improvements and retention of mature vegetation. While I support thoughtful and well-planned growth, I believe this proposal is moving ahead before the supporting infrastructure, public amenities and environmental considerations have been adequately demonstrated. I respectfully request that Council defer approval until comprehensive servicing, transportation, infrastructure and urban forestry assessments have been completed and made publicly available. Thank you for your consideration.	Andrew Briggs	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
2026-07-14	06:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My neighborhood, Cedar Cottage, is complete as it is. We are culturally and demographically diverse, have a wide range of housing, many small businesses as well as schools and churches. We also have lots of history represented by heritage buildings and character houses with cherished gardens and old trees. Your plan, claiming to improve and complete the neighborhood, is actually designed to destroy it. I strongly oppose your plan and urge you to start talking to the community to develop together a workable and respectful approach to improve the neighborhood.	Gosia Kawecki	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	07:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this plan wholeheartedly.	Kristina Wilson	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	07:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	COV hoping to push through rezoning this way is sad and inconsiderate of the residents and local community. The reasoning behind the plan is incongruent with the neighbourhood. Especially the families in the neighbourhood, and any actual existing needs or opportunities within the local community.	Alex Meeking	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	07:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Against taking away property owners rights. Parking is an issue and you eliminated the building process for adequate parking to be part of development plan process/permit. Density plan without parking requirements, where is the common sense here?	Drew Simpson	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	07:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This plan seems like a solution seeking a problem. The city has recently undergone a comprehensive overall planning process which needs time to work. Instead of city initiated rezonings consider improving the rezoning process aligning with the overall plan. If a rezoning fits with the plan, say yes without a public hearing and without making the applicant provide details of the development - that's what the DP process is for. If the application doesn't fit within the plan, say no. No more CD-1 spot rezoning, no more exceptions. The city has a plan, let development respond to the plan for 10-15 years and reevaluate. It doesn't help that this plan is poorly designed. Density should be encouraged, not forced, in a way that makes sense in the city's context. Quiet residential streets can be infilled with multiplex and accessory buildings. If this is not happening for some reason, study that. There's no shortage of property zoned to allow this, there seems to be a shortage of developers willing to take this on. This plan doesn't address core issues that are preventing densification in a way that preserves what makes this city so livable. This plan provides no explanation of how city services will be expanded to accommodate the new neighbourhood residents proposed. Particularly on the east side our amenities are already massively oversubscribed with no obvious planning to increase capacity. Schools are full, community centers are full, pools and ice rinks and jam packed. Despite property taxes that have doubled in the last decade there is a constant erosion of the quality of services provided by the city - maybe staff are spending their time on plans nobody asked for when the time and money should be spent on things that benefit existing residents, like garbage collection, road paving, etc.	Mark Robinson	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	07:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Calling these areas "Villages" does not make them functioning village centres. Council should not approve a one-size-fits-all rezoning of thousands of properties without neighbourhood-specific planning that addresses infrastructure, schools, parks, transportation, utilities, and local character -which I noticed this plan did not address. These supporting amenities should increase with density. It should include keeping and expanding the existing library, increasing parkland, having its own medical facility (like Victoria / 41st), and senior facility. I don't oppose an increase to mid-density, but I oppose an increase without supporting infrastructure.	Mann Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	07:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Calling these areas "Villages" does not make them functioning village centres. Council should not approve a one-size-fits-all rezoning of thousands of properties without neighbourhood-specific planning that addresses infrastructure, schools, parks, transportation, utilities, and local character -which I noticed this plan did not address. These supporting amenities should increase with density. It should include keeping and expanding the existing library, increasing parkland, having its own medical facility (like Victoria / 41st), and senior facility. I don't oppose an increase to mid-density, but I oppose an increase without supporting infrastructure.	Helen Poon	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	07:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The proposed Villages Plan for Mackenzie St. & W 33rd Ave. fails to provide the necessary design guidelines required to protect the character of this historic neighbourhood. By expanding zoning without strict boundaries, the city invites haphazard development that risks destroying the area's aesthetic identity and mature canopy. Council must reject this amendment until thoughtful rules are established to guarantee a proper balance of architecture taking into account existing infrastructure, green spaces, and landscape that preserves the essence of our community. Many cities around the world demand this why is this not a priority here. As a property owner in this neighbourhood I feel the COV does not care about thoughtful design or the current owners/residents in this area	Marco Di Paolo	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	07:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Villages Plan as written. This is one of the largest city-initiated rezonings in Vancouver's history, yet it ignores the existing commercial heart of my neighbourhood. For the area labelled "Victoria & 61st," the established shopping street is Victoria Drive and 41st -not 61st Avenue. The report does not explain why this location was chosen over the existing commercial centre, or how two competing "village" areas are expected to thrive. Calling these areas "Villages" does not make them functioning village centres. Council should not approve a one-size-fits-all rezoning of thousands of properties without neighbourhood-specific planning that addresses infrastructure, schools, parks, transportation, utilities, and local character -which I noticed this plan did not address. These supporting amenities should increase with density. It should include keeping and expanding the existing library, increasing parkland, having its own medical facility (like Victoria / 41st), and senior facility. I am also concerned that the report understates the potential property tax impacts. While rezoning does not automatically increase taxes, adding redevelopment potential does increase land assessments. This forces existing residents, myself and my neighbours from their homes, and it's not a choice currently made clear to them. Residents deserve a clear and transparent discussion of this possibility before Council makes its decision. Please slow this process down and replace this blanket citywide rezoning with thoughtful, evidence-based neighbourhood planning that reflects existing communities and earns the confidence of residents.	Mary Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	07:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I feel this has been too rapid a plan without enough consideration for the properties inside the envelopes. There needs to be flexibility for the existing structures to remain “as is” within their previous zones.	Dorie Pottinger	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	07:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I worry that secure affordability will not be achieved in the Villages initiative. I do not see any provisions for securing affordable housing for middle-income families and no strategy for providing non-market housing options for lower-income people. Sadly, you cannot expect this to happen naturally, without proactive measures. Thus, we can expect no social diversity and no solution to the existing housing problem, which is not a lack of numbers of units but is a lack of the number of the right kinds of securely affordable units. I worry that this whole initiative is too soon, too widespread, and too top-down. Housing projections indicate that we have enough zoned capacity for our housing needs for several decades, so what is the benefit of adding more general capacity through new Villages zoning, especially with the high probability of setting off land value increases through speculation, that actually forestall development? I see that there has been public consultation on the general idea of Villages but no community planning or public engagement in the specific areas identified for Villages, with the actual people who will be most directly or indirectly affected. Why setoff so many downsides and unintended consequences when there is no urgency? And why not have a bottom-up initiative, carefully paced over time, rather than a top-down imperative in one massive move?	Julie Martz		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	07:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning, and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments. While I support thoughtful planning that increases housing options and creates complete, livable neighbourhoods, the current approach requires greater community involvement and a more measured implementation. My primary concerns are: A phased approach with meaningful community consultation is essential. Before implementing changes in any individual village, I urge Council to undertake extensive engagement with residents, businesses, and community organizations. At least 25% community participation should be achieved to ensure decisions reflect the priorities and needs of the people who live and work in each neighbourhood. Upscaling primary business streets may make it significantly more difficult for existing local businesses to continue operating. Redevelopment pressures, rising property values, construction impacts, and increasing commercial rents could displace the small, independent businesses that give our neighbourhoods their unique character and provide essential services to residents. These businesses should be protected rather than unintentionally pushed out. Housing diversity is important, but it should be customized to each community. I support increasing housing choices, including family-friendly, rental, and accessible housing. However, this should occur through a phased and neighbourhood-specific approach that responds to the existing character, infrastructure, local businesses, transportation, and amenities of each village. A one-size-fits-all strategy risks overlooking the unique strengths and needs of individual communities. Vancouver's neighbourhoods have evolved over many decades, and future growth should build upon those strengths through careful planning, meaningful public participation, and gradual implementation. I respectfully ask Council to reconsider the current proposal and adopt a phased, community-driven approach that protects local businesses while thoughtfully expanding housing opportunities.	Tanya Campbell	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	07:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This rezoning plan is not in the city's best interest overall. It has many flaws and would impact the areas delineated in the "villages" negatively for so many reasons already listed by the residents of those areas.	Marilia Neto		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	07:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Thank you very much for Allowing me the opportunity to comment on this proposal. I'm gravely concerned about the implications of This proposal on local neighborhoods, but its long-term impact on the environment and the social structure of the city. While I do understand and acknowledge the need to increase the availability of affordable housing I don't believe that the current proposal to rezone single-family units is the wisest way to do this. Firstly, the impact of significant numbers of individuals and families living within neighbourhoods designed for single-family dwelling will put significant impact on local infrastructure and significantly increased traffic to the point where safety will be a concern; I do not see any proposal to allow for parking stalls, which would mean individuals living in these facilities will be looking for street parking. While the intent is always that individuals will use transit, ride shares and cycling practically speaking this has not nor will happen . People will always want their own cars. Secondly, having a significant increase in people in traditional single-family, dwellings will put tremendous pressure on local infrastructure, such as fire, police, and especially schools. While there is the provision to create commercial real estate on some of these buildings, I do not believe it will be sufficient to accommodate the significant increase in individuals living in this proposed area. Finally, I am deeply concerned about the impact of this proposal on the environment as the tree canopies in many of these districts will be harmed with the construction of multi story dwellings. Studies have shown that tree cover provides cooling, improved Water retention in the soil and increased air quality, all of which is especially important in this era of global warming. We have already seen the impact of decreased rainfall in our city with the adventive level three water restrictions and harming mature trees that are present in many of the proposed 17 villages build sites will only worsen this. Finally, commercially there is already an excess of housing that is currently unoccupied, and I am not sure where the pressures are for this proposal to increase housing when there is already a glut of empty space in areas that have already been zoned for multi united dwelling. It .is for these and many other reasons that I I'm concerned about and as a result oppose this proposal. Graham Wong MD.	Graham Wong	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	07:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	stripping away public hearings for 14,000 lots is not "legalizing housing"-it is illegalizing local democracy. It silences the very community members who live in these neighbourhoods, removing their right to shape local infrastructure, school capacities, and environmental protections. true neighbourhood preservation requires localized design, tree canopy protections, and community input-not sweeping, blanket upzonings that treat 17 distinct communities as a single, homogenized, machine-readable asset class for investment platforms both domestic and global. This is literally the financialization of housing. I demand that Council reject blanket, city-initiated rezonings that strip public oversight. Tell them that if a developer wants to fundamentally transform a local block, they must be legally forced to bring that specific project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing. If the Villages plan is such a good idea, it will continue to be a good idea long into the future. There is no reason to rush this through in the middle of summer, with minimal public notification of the significance and impacts of the Villages plan, and of the Public Hearing itself. Experts called on City Council to cancel the public hearing, to no avail.	Oliver Prange	West Point Grey	
2026-07-14	08:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the rezoning from R1 to R3. This is a residential neighborhood with a school. The area is from 57th to Marine Dr, Knight St. to Nanaimo St.	Devinder Grewal	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	08:10	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	hxxps://docs[.]google [.]com/document/d/1hIhjT1Ygi7A6tyWijDmO99cTYhz3yoTluNZSWfyRpKg/edit?usp=sharing Canada is the best country in the world that is free. You are destroying this country through good intentions. Stop making changes to root cause without data and affecting production worse. Financialization is common sense and common sense is that we should not listen to bankers. I worked at king and bay for 10 years and why are the hallowed halls of the CBA in 1995 full of 10 statisticians no one knows? Stop making changes without proof and without data to production.	Sandeep Takhar	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	08:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Planning Program and its proposed blanket rezoning. This plan is fundamentally flawed. It intentionally bypasses vital democratic oversight. Stripping away localized public hearings for nearly 14,000 lots is not an exercise in legalizing housing. It is the erasure of local democracy. By pushing a sweeping, one-size-fits-all upzoning across 17 distinct areas, the city treats unique neighborhoods as a single, homogenized asset class. Furthermore, this proposal directly threatens our established community centers. Instead of supporting existing commercial high streets, many of which already suffer from high vacancy rates, this plan artificially manufactures competing retail zones. It encourages rampant land speculation and corporate land assembly. This will inevitably drive up land values while displacing legacy businesses and renters. We need thoughtful planning that respects local design, tree canopies, and community input. We do not need a rushed, city-initiated rezoning that hands frictionless development rights to private interests. I urge Council to reject this plan entirely. Any developer looking to fundamentally transform a local block must be legally required to present their specific project in a transparent, accountable public hearing.	Noah Prange	West Point Grey	
2026-07-14	08:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am very concerned about the density being proposed throughout the city, given the lack of infrastructure we have, including sewer, water, solid waste, parks, schools, and hospitals. We should not be increasing the density without addressing all of these.	Nina Henriksen	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	08:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	To clarify my position from my previous comment, I oppose the proposed Village Plan for Victoria Drive and East 61st Avenue. I participated in the public open houses and appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback. However, I have not seen clear evidence that residents' concerns have been meaningfully reflected in the proposed plan. I am concerned that neighbourhood-wide rezoning could increase property values and property taxes, making it more difficult for long-time residents, particularly those on low or fixed incomes, to remain in their homes. I also question whether new developments will provide rental options that are as affordable or below-market as some of the existing housing currently available in the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood planning should place greater weight on the voices of residents who will be most directly affected by these long-term changes. Until these concerns are meaningfully addressed, I cannot support the proposed Village Plan. Instead of broad neighbourhood-wide rezoning, the City should consider a more targeted and flexible approach that directs growth to areas where it is best supported, such as existing commercial corridors and areas with established or emerging services. This would allow neighbourhoods to evolve while respecting existing residents and the communities they have built.	Julie Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	08:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	NO one is asking for "Villages" , no one is asking for more retail on their residential streets! We already have local shopping areas that service our communities. Why not continue to support what is already here instead of creating vast land spaces with more retail which will likely add more stress on retail that already exists. We do not need to make every area of Vancouver a commercial zone.	Linda Zimmering	Kerrisdale	

2026-07-14	08:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I respectfully oppose the proposed mass rezoning and rapid densification of Vancouver's village areas, including the Arbutus neighbourhood. I recognize that Vancouver needs additional housing. However, population growth must be matched by proportional investment in the infrastructure needed to support it. Densification should not outpace the City's ability to provide essential public services. As a primary care physician working in the Greater Vancouver area for over 20 years, I have witnessed firsthand the growing strain on our healthcare system. While governments are making efforts to recruit more physicians and healthcare professionals to improve access to primary care, the greater challenge is the limited capacity of our healthcare infrastructure. Hospitals throughout the region are already under tremendous pressure. At many major Greater Vancouver hospitals, patients often wait one to two years for non-urgent CT scans. Access to MRI scans, specialist consultations, surgeries, and hospital beds is also increasingly limited. These problems cannot be solved simply by increasing the number of primary care physicians. Expanding hospital facilities, diagnostic imaging capacity, specialist services, and inpatient beds requires years of planning and substantial investment. Approving major population growth before these resources are expanded will inevitably worsen wait times and reduce access to care. Transportation infrastructure is another significant concern. From my daily commute, traffic congestion has already reached unacceptable levels. On school days, travelling only three blocks along West King Edward Avenue near Granville Street can take approximately ten minutes. This demonstrates that the existing road network is already operating near capacity. Increasing density without major transportation improvements will further worsen congestion, lengthen travel times, and delay emergency vehicles when every minute counts. Thoughtful urban planning requires more than building housing. Healthcare, transportation, schools, parks, utilities, and other public services must grow alongside the population. Otherwise, rapid densification risks reducing the quality of life for both current and future residents. I respectfully urge City Council to reconsider the current proposal and adopt a more measured, phased approach to redevelopment. Future densification should be linked to meaningful improvements in healthcare capacity, transportation infrastructure, and other essential public services so that Vancouver grows sustainably without overwhelming systems that are already under significant strain.	Kevin Sheu	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	08:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Statement to Council Regarding the Proposed Marpole Village Rezoning Project Good evening, respected Councillors, City planners, and fellow community members. My name is Jing Kokko, address is [redacted] I'm a long-time homeowner on a single-family lot that lies inside the boundary of the proposed Marpole Village rezoning project. I have deep roots in this neighbourhood and with no plans to sell my property, tear down my house, or redevelop my land. I would like to age and live out my retirement right here in Marpole, but if I am forced out of my home, I would like to see this development be done properly with efforts to improve the community and Vancouver as a whole. I agree with the city's long term goal to create liveable neighbourhoods with improvements to local grocery, dining, and retail. However, I cannot support rushing through this large-scale upzoning plan under the current severe real estate downturn, and I do not agree that this is a project that is suitable for right now, given the current road and traffic issues. I do not wish to stop development forever, but rather aim to strike a fair balance between planned future housing needs and the protection of quality of life for existing long-term	Jing Kokko	Marpole	

residents who have invested decades into this community.

I have five main considerations I hope you will review carefully:

1. I want to highlight a long-standing critical traffic issue unique to our part of Marpole: our three local residential streets (Shaughnessy, Fremlin, and Laurel) sit very close to Oak Street Bridge, which serves as the main evening rush-hour artery for commuters returning to homes south of the Fraser River. Almost every Thursday and Friday afternoon and evening (4–8 pm), and sometimes on other days, too, drivers stuck in gridlock on the Oak Street Bridge spill over into our quiet side streets, filling every available curb space completely.

These are not local residents' vehicles; they are temporary commuter cars blocking our driveways, emergency access routes, and street access for households that have lived here for generations. My husband could not drive home from work on these days. The long-standing overflow traffic from Oak Street Bridge commuters already occupies our residential side streets on these weekday evenings. In addition, running engines contribute polluted air to many Marpole homes.

I respectfully ask the City to solve this headache. Our streets are no longer liveable even now. The City needs to study Oak and 70th area to figure out long-term solutions to the traffic that is becoming more and more severe. I don't think the City is aware how bad this issue is, and how much worse traffic in Vancouver will become if this redevelopment is accepted. I cannot state strongly enough: this traffic issue is very bad and completely not sustainable to the village or Vancouver you promote.

Once or if development goes ahead, I ask the City to consider these solutions:

2. Please impose strict, non-negotiable height caps and expanded mandatory setbacks for all new multi-unit construction next to existing single-family home blocks. The current proposal allows buildings up to four storeys and higher in some locations. If these new structures are built too close to older homes, they will permanently block natural sunlight to our yards and living spaces and destroy our residential privacy.

3. Create more underground parking space and carefully plan public community parking restrictions; otherwise, lifelong residents will lose reliable access to parking outside their own homes.

4. Please schedule all demolition and construction work across Marpole Village in staggered, phased stages. In Marpole, many homeowners in these rezoning streets are seniors. They cannot face endless years of loud construction noise, airborne dust, and heavy delivery truck traffic.

5. Introduce a property tax relief program for Marpole single-family homeowners who choose not to redevelop their land. Upzoning automatically increases assessed land value, which will drive sharp annual property tax increases for homeowners who are affected by this development.

Many of us are seniors relying on fixed retirement income. Capped taxes would allow us to stay in our homes.

Finally, I would also like the city to consider the current housing market before rushing ahead with Marpole’s village. Right now, Greater Vancouver already has more than 4,300 newly built condo units sitting empty and unsold, with the vacancy rate hitting a 30-year high in our rental market. The Federal Government has been forced to step in, committing public funds to purchase 2,200 vacant condos as affordable housing for low-income households just to clear the existing oversupply.

				Pushing ahead with massive new high-density construction across Marpole at this moment will only create another wave of empty buildings, waste taxpayer-funded infrastructure investment, and unfairly burden local long-term residents with years of disruptive construction.			
2026-07-14	08:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver was built from an amalgamation of neighborhoods. One size does not fit all. Neighborhood planning matters and should not be feared. Defer for further comments.	William O'Brien	Marpole	
2026-07-14	08:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Specifically, the MacDonald & W 16th village is at location where there are very narrow streets and limited other infrastructure. Neither MacDonald Street nor W 16th Avenue are as wide as other main streets such as Granville St and Broadway. So this village in particular would create a lot of concerns for traffic, safety, access for residents. I suggest you reduce the size of the MacDonald & W 16th village by having townhomes and duplexes as opposed to low-rise apartments. This will help manage the population growth and reduce day-to-day living issues created for existing and newly welcomed residents.	Michael Cao	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	08:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Stop calling them villages	Neil Barnes	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	08:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Re: CD-1 Rezoning Application – 2611 Victoria Drive Mayor and Council, I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning application for 2611 Victoria Drive. I live one block from this proposed development and use the Trout Lake area every day for walking, recreation, and community events. As someone who experiences this neighbourhood daily, I support thoughtful growth and additional housing. However, I do not support this application because it exceeds the height and density contemplated by the City's adopted planning framework and establishes a concerning precedent for future development. My primary concern is not this building alone—it is the precedent that approving this application would establish. The Official Development Plan, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, and the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy were adopted through extensive planning and public consultation to provide certainty about how growth would occur. When individual projects are approved beyond those established limits, the integrity of those plans is weakened. Over time, incremental exceptions become a de facto new policy without the comprehensive public planning process that created the original plans. I am also concerned that this proposal intrudes into Trout Lake Public View 27.1, one of Vancouver's protected public view corridors. These protected views are a public asset that belongs to all Vancouver residents. Once a protected public view is compromised, it cannot be recovered. Allowing incremental encroachment into a protected view corridor risks undermining the City's long-standing commitment to preserving these important civic assets. I am further concerned about transportation impacts. Victoria Drive is a relatively short corridor in this location, already constrained by three signalized intersections and dedicated cycling infrastructure while serving as a key north-south route connecting to Broadway and Grandview Highway. Residents already experience congestion, delays, and conflicts between	Claire Davis	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

				vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, and transit. Adding density beyond what existing plans anticipated will place further pressure on infrastructure that is already operating under significant demand. I am also troubled by the process through which this application is being considered. Under the current provisions of the Vancouver Charter, Council is prohibited from holding a public hearing for this application despite the proposal exceeding the height and density contemplated in the cited planning documents. While I understand Council is following provincial legislation, the absence of a public hearing places even greater importance on Council carefully respecting its own adopted policies and the extensive public consultation that informed them. If significant departures from those policies can occur without a public hearing, maintaining consistency with the adopted plans becomes even more critical to preserving public confidence in the planning process. Our neighbourhood has accepted significant growth over the years. As residents of a community of primarily low-rise apartments and condominiums, we are increasingly surrounded by much taller developments. Growth is expected and necessary, but it should occur in accordance with the City's adopted planning framework rather than through successive site-specific exceptions that cumulatively alter the character and scale of the neighbourhood beyond what was publicly envisioned. I respectfully ask Council to uphold the integrity of the Official Development Plan, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy, and the City's View Protection Guidelines by refusing this application or requiring that it be revised to comply with those adopted policies. Thank you for your consideration. Claire Davis			
2026-07-14	09:13	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The city is not working with developers build affordable housing . This is just the same as the Broadway plan . What is the point of tiny cramped apartments and high cost rents . I know of a triplex that has to storage is small and still high priced . Make this an election issue	Greg Menzies	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	09:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not wish to see 6-floor apartments being built amongst single/duplex houses. This area is already very busy with limited parking on the street . I also do not wish to have to pay higher property taxes due to the rezoning.	CHIH CHAN	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	09:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The consequences of this plan will be irreversible and totally disregards the damage to existing villages and homeowners currently living in the area. It ignores the fact that not everyone wants to live in an apartment and that not everyone's friends and family will be living within these restrictive villages. It ignores the fact that the Arbutus Greenway could be developed into an attractive linear park. Of particular concern is that the Mackenzie 33rd and 4st village plan • Ignores the existing well established Kerrisdale village which offers shopping and recreational facilities. It is difficult to understand why this would not be supported and further developed. • Ignores the fact that we already have many boarded up and dilapidated single-family homes throughout Vancouver. Cambie, Oak and Granville streets are prime example. I hope you do not approve this devastating plan with all the many adverse and long term consequences for Vancouver's livability.	John DeMonye	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
2026-07-14	09:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This proposed project is totally misguided . We are already developing two massive neighbourhoods on the Jericho lands and at Oakridge . I believe we need to sit back and see how these two projects evolve in terms of your stated objectives . More importantly than your village plan in my view is the extension of the transit line out to UBC . The walkable services you speak of will naturally develop around these transportation hubs .	Barbara Gauthier	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	09:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I respectfully oppose the proposed mass rezoning and rapid densification of Vancouver's village areas, including the Arbutus neighbourhood. I recognize that Vancouver needs additional housing. However, population growth must be matched by proportional investment in the infrastructure needed to support it. Densification should not outpace the City's ability to provide essential public services. As a primary care physician working in the Greater Vancouver area for over 20 years, I have witnessed firsthand the growing strain on our healthcare system. While governments are making efforts to recruit more physicians and healthcare professionals to improve access to primary care, the greater challenge is the limited capacity of our healthcare infrastructure. Hospitals throughout the region are already under tremendous pressure. At many major Greater Vancouver hospitals, patients often wait one to two years for non-urgent CT scans. Access to MRI scans, specialist consultations, surgeries, and hospital beds is also increasingly limited. These problems cannot be solved simply by increasing the number of primary care physicians. Expanding hospital facilities, diagnostic imaging capacity, specialist services, and inpatient beds requires years of planning and substantial investment. Approving major population growth before these resources are expanded will inevitably worsen wait times and reduce access to care. Transportation infrastructure is another significant concern. From my daily commute, traffic congestion has already reached unacceptable levels. On school days, travelling only three blocks along West King Edward Avenue near Granville Street can take approximately ten minutes. This demonstrates that the existing road network is already operating near capacity. Increasing density without major transportation improvements will further worsen congestion, lengthen travel times, and delay emergency vehicles when every minute counts. Thoughtful urban planning requires more than building housing. Healthcare, transportation, schools, parks, utilities, and other public services must grow alongside the population. Otherwise, rapid densification risks reducing the quality of life for both current and future residents. I respectfully urge City Council to reconsider the current proposal and adopt a more measured, phased approach to redevelopment. Future densification should be linked to meaningful improvements in healthcare capacity, transportation infrastructure, and other essential public services so that Vancouver grows sustainably without overwhelming systems that are already under significant strain.	Kai-Yu Sheu		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	09:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing to share my strong opposition to the proposed Villages policy currently before you. Specifically, I am concerned about the plan to rezone our neighborhood, between 28th and 37th Avenues and Fraser and Knight Streets, for 6-story buildings. I chose to live in this neighborhood because it is a safe, community-oriented place where my children can experience the kind of childhood I want for them. It is a rare environment where kids can run freely, set up food stands on the sidewalk, and pop over to neighbors' houses to play. Everyone is so friendly and close that my children can literally find friends simply by walking outside. This kind of authentic, safe community is exactly what draws families here, and I am deeply worried that this rezoning plan will destroy it. I have several serious concerns about how this will affect our daily lives: Impact on Family Life: Our neighborhood is a tight-knit family community. The move to mass land assembly for 6-story buildings will likely lead to a more transient population. Replacing stable, long-term neighbors with high-density, temporary housing will erode the trust and connection we have worked so hard to build. It feels inherently unfair to dismantle a flourishing, child-friendly community for this type of development. Public Safety and Traffic: Our local streets are not designed to handle the heavy increase in traffic that 6-story land assemblies will bring. This level of growth will compromise the safety of our children who currently play on our quiet residential streets. Lack of Infrastructure: Our neighborhood is already stretched thin. We do not have the school capacity, community center programming, or city services needed to support this many new residents. It is irresponsible to push for this level of density without first ensuring our social infrastructure can handle it. Privacy and Light: Putting up 6-story buildings will block sunlight and take away the privacy of the backyards where our children play. This is a significant loss of quality of life for local families. Construction Impacts: The proposal does not address the reality of construction fatigue. Moving to mass land assembly means years of heavy machinery, constant noise, dust, and safety risks. This will make our streets noisy and dangerous for years, which is clearly detrimental to our children. I understand that the city needs to increase housing supply, but this blanket approach ignores the specific needs of our community. Rather than aggressive 6-story land assemblies, I urge the City to support Missing Middle housing like rowhomes or multiplexes. These options allow for more density while matching our current scale, which would help us grow without destroying what makes this neighborhood great. I ask that you vote against this rezoning proposal. Please work with us to find a balanced strategy that respects the current scale of our neighborhood while making sure public safety and infrastructure come first. Thank you for your time and for considering these concerns	Denise Young	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
2026-07-14	09:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There has been no noticeable improvements in infrastructure over the past three decades. We have the same schools, roads, community centres and have barely been able to keep up with maintaining existing infrastructure never mind adding more facilities. Yet the tax base from all the increased housing has added tremendous income for city hall. Add more infrastructure and preserve the rights of property owners before considering adding more housing and removing rights from property owners.	Kam Mohaaseb	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	09:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly opposed to Villages Plan. It will destroy the character of the city. Why does Kerrisdale need a second village centre when it already has one a few blocks west of the proposed one?	Alan Cartwright	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	09:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	true neighbourhood preservation requires localized design, tree canopy protections, and community input-not blanket upzonings that treat 17 unique communities as a single, homogenized, asset class for investment platforms both domestic and global. This is the financialization of housing. Council must reject blanket, city-initiated rezonings that strip public oversight. if a developer wants to fundamentally transform a local block, they must be legally forced to bring that specific project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing. If the Villages plan is such a good idea, it will continue to be a good idea long into the future. There is no reason to rush this through in the middle of summer, with minimal public notification of the significance and impacts of the Villages plan, and of the Public Hearing itself. Experts called on City Council to cancel the public hearing, to no avail.	Dan W		
2026-07-14	10:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in the proposed Kerr St and E 54th Ave Village and speak for many neighbours: we strongly oppose the village plan. This area is already too dense, with inadequate community resources to support its inhabitants. Further development will strain the schools and community centre, which already have long waiting lists. Additional commercial spaces are not necessary, as there are already shopping centres nearby such as Metrotown mall and shops along Kingsway. More housing will likely be more unaffordable, as seen by vacant new mid- and high-rises along 49th, Cambie, etc that are over $800k for a small space. We do not need or want these new villages. Vancouver already has villages: main st, commercial drive, Fraser st, Kerrisdale, etc. The city should focus on further developing these existing villages to improve quality of life. There are already shops along these areas, so it makes more sense to support those areas.	Lise L	Killarney	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	10:18	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	By adopting the Villages Plan, the city of Vancouver will be fundamentally changing from what makes it a beautiful city to live in and visit. Based on the current densification that is permitted, the large tree canopies that shade neighbourhoods will no longer exist. Across the street from me, a single lot was developed into two duplexes. All of the trees were removed. There were no new trees planted and the green area now is about 20 square meters. There is no longer shading or surface water recharge into the ground. It is all concrete and structure. The units are also not affordable, listed at $2.3 million per unit. Densification is not and will not make the city more affordable. The oversupply of apartments in Vancouver currently should be a clear indication that the city is already building too quickly and not building what residents want. What makes Vancouver a liveable city is the green spaces, the trees, grass in yards, etc. All this will be taken away with the proposed plan. The number of vacant retail spaces is a sign that just because you build it, doesn't mean that tenants will move in. The owners are charging too much rent for retail and the city fees/taxes make it difficult for small businesses to survive in Vancouver. The reality of the Villages where everything can be walked to in 15 minutes sounds great, but the reality will likely be quite different with empty retail, over-priced apartments, and no community any longer. Additionally, no thought on the current parking issues have been addressed. As mentioned above, a single lot across the road was redeveloped into two duplexes. The new driveway removed 3 parking spaces on the block (about 15%). There is now not enough parking for the current residents. Thinking that residents of Vancouver will not own cars is not realistic and parking needs to be addressed before any consideration of further densification is pushed through. The other issue with densification that appears not to have been addressed adequately is the water and sewer system. These, like the parking, will be overwhelmed. Who will be paying for the massive upgrades to the water and sewer system? Will it be the developers or will the taxes just be increased on the residents so the developers will not need to bear the costs, just reap the benefits? How will the Villages plan make the city more affordable and liveable? Based on the densification that is currently being done, prices are not coming down. However, the quality of the buildings seems to be. The new homes built across the street are only a couple month old and already showing signs of needing repair. If the city wants densification, why force through this plan that appears to be poorly thought out and has had minimal input by the residents of the city. This big of a change to the city should be voted on in the upcoming city elections. Let the residents decide, not a select few politicians. This was not what I voted for in the last election and was not on the agenda at the time. Densification along major corridors is logical, this plan is not. Put it to a vote for the people in October, don't push it through now. Forcing unwanted development is not what Vancouver or Canadians want. We want fair and open government decisions. Has the city attempted to inform the city residents of this plan? If so, why did I not receive any notifications? Were mailouts sent? Emails? What communication was used? Whatever it was did not work. Most people I know living in Vancouver are not aware of the Villages Plan, so all decisions being made are not being made with input from residents. The city needs to find better methods of informing residents and asking for input that has been done to date.	Jeff Phillips	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	10:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Good morning, I urge Mayor and Council to vote against the Villages Plan today. The Broadway Plan is already causing unprecedented displacement pressure on tenants who cannot afford the new buildings constructed under these plans. The City's TRPP is severely lacking and does nothing to allow displaced tenants the chance to stay in their neighbourhoods. I believe we need more of the right kind of housing. I do not believe that residents should be deprived of our opportunity to shape our city through these mass rezoning proposals. Please do not allow this to pass. Kind regards, Will Gladman	William Gladman	Strathcona	
2026-07-14	10:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I only learned the scope of this initiative 1 week ago. As a home owner in the affected area I am deeply concerned about the impact on my property value, ability to sell and tax increases. As a senior citizen who will likely need to sell in a 10 year time frame this is a huge worry. We have lived in our home for 40 years and have witnessed the recent upsetting changes to neighbourhoods with large boxes for apartments, tiny homes crammed on lots that no one wants to buy and destruction of the neighbourhoods in Vancouver generally. This plan is ill-conceived and must not be approved. Further cvonsultation is essential. I cannot support a Mayor and Council that approves this plan.	Val Munroe	Oakridge	
2026-07-14	10:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Calling this “gentle” density minimizes what Council is actually doing: blanket-rezoning approximately 13,000 parcels while amending the ODP and existing community plans. The buildings may be low-rise, but the legal and geographic intervention is enormous.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please see letter attached.	Jane Hungerford	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2026-07-14	10:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Council is using one enormous hearing to settle the rezoning question for thousands of properties at once. After pre-zoning, many conforming projects may proceed without another site-specific rezoning hearing, even though residents do not yet know which sites will be assembled or what will actually be built.	Stanley Lee		

2026-07-14	10:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We strongly oppose the Villages Plan, and there appears to be strong opposition overall, judging from the 1300 submissions against, versus 240 supporting (although comments like "I support affordable housing" are questionable). Will City pay any attention to this, or just bulldoze ahead with their preferred plan regardless? We don't recall being consulted or even made aware of this proposal. City would be well advised to pay attention when someone with the stature of former City Planner Larry Beasley speaks out so strongly against this proposal. As for walkability from homes to shops, where was City Hall when all the apartments were built along the Cambie corridor from King Edward to 41st? There is ZERO ground level shopping available in that entire stretch. If you live around 33rd, you have a major trek to get to Choices at 18th (thank God they are still there, for now), Safeway at King Ed & Oak, or Oakridge (eventually). The new developments are awfull. They loom over neighboring single family homes, have almost no front yard setbacks, and are totally out of character with the neighborhoods. Burnaby is dealing with this, so step up, Vancouver! Plus, these developments do nothing in the way of providing affordable housing. Have you seen the prices? Consider an analogy: when shopping for a car, on a budget, is your first thought to buy a new car? How about just leaving well-enough alone? Don't make things worse than they already are.	Jack Hunter	Riley Park	
2026-07-14	10:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Council recently adopted the ODP and is already being asked to amend it for a program that was already underway. A long-range plan should provide stability and coherence, not require major foreseeable amendments almost immediately after adoption.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Formal Submission to Mayor and Council Subject: Opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan – July 14, 2026 Public Hearing From: Elizabeth Cross, 40-Year Vancouver Resident and Homeowner at 3137 West 42nd Avenue, Kerrisdale Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing as a 40-year resident of Vancouver and a homeowner in Kerrisdale to express my strong opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan. I am deeply concerned that this initiative will fundamentally alter the character, livability, and heritage of our residential neighborhoods in ways that cannot easily be reversed. I feel literally sick whilst writing this response. I own a 1914 farmhouse-style home in Kerrisdale. Recently, while driving through my neighborhood, I was reflecting on how fortunate I feel to live only 10 minutes from downtown while still being surrounded by mature trees, historic homes, and the peaceful character that makes Vancouver unique. From my home, I enjoy the beauty of the tree canopy and the sound of the wind moving through the branches. As I approach retirement, I look forward to aging in this home and contributing to this community, not feeling pressured to leave because of aggressive land assembly and redevelopment pressures. Vancouver’s historic neighborhoods are part of what makes this city special. Cities around the world recognize the value of preserving their architectural character. For example, the historic neighborhoods of New Orleans are celebrated because their older homes, streetscapes, and sense of place have been protected and valued. Vancouver should take a similar approach by balancing housing needs with thoughtful preservation.	Elizabeth Cross	Kerrisdale	

I support vibrant communities with local shops, walkable amenities, parks, and neighborhood gathering spaces. However, I believe significant density and taller buildings should be focused along major transit routes and commercial corridors rather than introduced into established, lower-density residential streets where they will permanently change the fabric of these communities.

I strongly oppose automatic city-initiated pre-zoning that removes meaningful neighbourhood input. Across from my property, I have already witnessed the impact of rapid redevelopment. Two multiplex townhomes were built where mature trees once stood. The result is a landscape dominated by concrete, with significantly reduced green space and little remaining connection to the character of the original neighborhood. Unfortunately, the quality of this particular development also raises concerns about whether increased density is always translating into better communities.
Before accelerating further neighbourhood redevelopment, the City should carefully evaluate existing housing supply and demand. It is troubling that some apartment buildings already face challenges attracting buyers, while at the same time established single-family neighbourhoods are being targeted for major transformation. I also believe the conversation around housing affordability needs to recognize the importance of different stages of life. Many young families begin in condos or smaller homes, build equity, and eventually move into quieter residential areas as their needs change. This progression has long been part of how communities evolve. Vancouver's appeal has always been its balance: a vibrant urban centre surrounded by livable neighbourhoods. If we remove the qualities that make the city desirable, we risk undermining the very value people are seeking when they move here.

The long-term consequences of these decisions must be considered carefully. Once mature trees, historic homes, and neighbourhood character are lost, they cannot easily be restored. I fear that if we fail to protect the balance between growth and preservation today, future generations may inherit a city that is denser but less welcoming, less beautiful, and less connected to its history. I understand new trees will be planted, but this is not the answer.

I respectfully urge Council to reconsider the Vancouver Villages Plan and pursue an approach that increases housing opportunities while also protecting the character, heritage, and livability of Vancouver's established neighbourhoods.

Finally, I would appreciate a response regarding the City's public engagement process for this initiative. Could you please confirm how many times residents in my area were contacted regarding this proposal, and through what methods (such as paper mail, email, or other forms of notification)? This public hearing is the first time I became aware of the details of this plan.
Thank you for considering my concerns.

This impacts the whole city and this should be taken to a formal vote once proper consultation regarding the pros and cons are outlined.

We are Canada and do not need to follow what Europe or Asia is doing in terms of densification.

I oppose this plan and am very unhappy and sad this could actually happen.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Cross
[redacted]
Vancouver, BC

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	10:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We oppose on numerous grounds: - effect on property owner's autonomy to rebuild as they see fit. - oppose increasing densification without an overarching vision respecting the quality of neighbourhoods, traffic volumes, school classroom capacity, none of which is addressed in the reports to date in the detail one would expect.	GLEN SHERMAN	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	10:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Social-media impressions, estimated reach and website visits are publicity statistics, not public input. The City should disclose whether survey responses were unique, how many came from affected residents, how they were distributed among the Villages, and whether the respondent pool was representative.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! The City combines respondents who “liked” proposed boundaries with respondents who were “neutral” and presents the combined figure favourably. Neutrality is not support. Council should receive separate figures for approval, neutrality, opposition and uncertainty.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! The published correspondence contains irrelevant material classified as support, an entry labelled “support” whose text calls the proposal a disaster, and duplicated opposition language. Before citing raw totals, Council should require a transparent classification and deduplication audit applying the same standards to both sides.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! More development capacity does not automatically produce affordable housing. Most apartment and townhouse options will not face inclusionary requirements, some developers may pay cash instead of providing homes on site, and rents ten percent below a city-wide market average may remain unaffordable. Council should publish the number and income depth of affordable units this plan is actually expected to deliver.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! The useful development densities may depend on assembling several lots, particularly where standard 33-foot parcels are involved. That structure may favour well-capitalized land consolidators over ordinary owners and small builders. Council should disclose how many parcels are independently developable and how many require multi-lot assemblies.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This is a terrible plan for our neighborhoods and for our whole city. It will negatively impact all of us who live here.	Karly Leipsic	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
2026-07-14	10:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Objection to the Macdonald St. & W King Edward Ave Village Rezoning Proposal Dear Mayor and Council, I am a resident within the Macdonald St. & W King Edward Ave Village area for over a decade and I respectfully object to the proposed Villages Plan rezoning. While I understand the need to address housing challenges in Vancouver, I do not believe this proposal appropriately balances housing growth with the character and livability of our established neighbourhood. My concerns include: * The proposed increase in density may place significant pressure on local infrastructure, including roads, parking, schools, parks, and community services, without sufficient evidence that these services can accommodate the additional population. * Increased building heights and density could reduce privacy, sunlight, and green space for existing residents while altering the neighbourhood's established character. * The proposal may encourage redevelopment that results in the loss of mature trees and existing family homes, which contribute to the environmental quality and identity of our community. * I am concerned that the rezoning is being applied broadly across the neighbourhood without adequate consideration of the unique characteristics of individual streets and blocks. * I would like to see a more gradual, targeted approach to neighbourhood planning, supported by clear infrastructure improvements and meaningful consultation with affected residents. I respectfully ask Council to reconsider this rezoning until a more balanced plan is developed that better addresses infrastructure capacity, environmental impacts, neighbourhood character, and community feedback. Thank you for considering my comments.	Suki Chan	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	10:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Tenant protections are only meaningful if they are enforceable. Council should require a compliance budget, audits, penalties, a tenant registry, an accessible complaint process, and public reporting on displacement and successful returns. The City should also provide a comprehensive count of renters currently living in affected properties.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Proposed transit improvements are unfunded, while water, sewer, stormwater and other utility requirements will largely be assessed later through individual applications. Council should not grant city-wide-scale zoning capacity before receiving Village-by-Village infrastructure assessments, funding responsibilities and delivery schedules.	Stanley Lee		

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	10:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Schools, childcare, parks, recreation and public spaces remain dependent on future budgets and competing priorities, while the new development rights would take effect immediately. Council should require measurable service-capacity thresholds and a mechanism to pause approvals when infrastructure falls behind growth.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Council does not have to choose between blanket approval and building nothing. Begin with three varied pilot Villages, establish infrastructure, affordability, tenant-return and project-delivery benchmarks, publish the results, and return to a public Council decision before rezoning the remaining areas.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Since the YIYBY camp is playing this game, we can play the same game! Council members should disclose relevant lobbying meetings, hospitality, gifts, campaign support and employment discussions involving organizations that may materially benefit from this rezoning. The public should be able to distinguish policy judgment from outside influence or future personal opportunity.	Stanley Lee		
2026-07-14	10:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the blanket rezoning of 17 neighbourhoods in Vancouver. I feel that each ‘village’ targeted has their own unique characteristics and dynamic. This has been created by the people and businesses that live and occupy the area. To push through this rezoning without in depth consultation with each neighbourhood does a disservice to the very nature of what makes Vancouver a unique and vibrant city.	Jill Moberg	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	10:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly disagree with the direction of the Villages Plan. It is misleading as it shows the proposals in isolation from other proposed density increases along and around arterial streets. The term 'village' is misused and the plans ignore other commercial areas close-by, such as Broadway and Dunbar in the west. It is unrealistic to expect the amount of new, street level commercial space prospering alongside the existing areas. Instead, more attention should be given to reinforcing the existing areas and revitalising areas such as West 10th Ave between Discovery & Tolmie. Blanket approval for 6 storey development within these new "village" areas is wrong.	Mike Woodbridge	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	10:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the village plan	Catherine Macdonald	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	10:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This program will Destroying Vancouver's city image	emily wu	Kitsilano	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	10:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	this plan does nothing to bring affordability to the city and ignores the concerns of citizens. I already live in a walkable neighbourhood - some stores are having trouble staying afloat and extra competion for mandated retail space will not help. Densification possible without 6 story apartments everywhere, too expensive and small for families. Do not approve this.	Judith Neamtan	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	10:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This plan is too broad and does not take into account unique geography of each street/neighborhood. 6 storey buildings at the top of a hill have a significantly higher negative effect on everything downhill from it that a 6 story building on flat land. The intersection of knight st and 33rd ave already has a small commercial section and would not benefit from larger buildings. A 6 storey building across the road from Kensington Park will reduce the enjoyable nature of the park/view. There are many duplexes in this neighborhood recently built/bought with the idea that the neighborhood didn't have any adjacent multi level building zoning. There are larger commercial zones in three directions from this intersection and for this reason and the above I believe the villages plan is not in the best interest of residents of the knight st/33rd neighborhood. There is nuance to every neighborhood and I do not believe this plan should be trying to cover so many areas at once. The small details that matter to residents and the culture of each neighborhood will get overlooked. I oppose this development plan and rezoning changes.	Sara Vine	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	10:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I'm a resident of Dunbar, and the erosion of neighborhood fabric we have seen throughout Vancouver due to multiplex development has been unfathomable. Imagine the further devastation under a "Villages" plan. There is already untenable density, horrific higher density design, destruction of tree canopy, financial / equity erosion, street parking congestion, and capacity for massive property tax spikes on zoning changes. Furthermore, there are already existing villages which are struggling - why add more. I urge you to hear the voices of the communities impacted by this who very strongly oppose this.	Todd Scarlett	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	10:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	While I support the plan as it was presented to residents a few years ago, I do not support the version presented before Council today. The proposal to rezone thousands of properties across the City without due consultation with residents is unethical and should be rejected. We were consulted on the version of the plan that just proposed zoning designations, not actively rezoning all properties. I do not support the City rezoning people's properties, they should instead plan for a future desired zoning designation and when a developer has assembled a sufficient lot assembly then they can rezone the properties site by site. If these sites are to be rezoned the City is taking away home owners rights to renovate, create infill housing, and to develop multi-plex housing. This goes against the idea of gentle density and prevents home owners from exercising their development rights under Bill 44 and 47. This proposed plan should be rejected by Council and sent back to the Planning department for revision. I am a Senior Planner for a neighbouring municipality and it is my opinion that a Planner's role is to enable organic growth throughout the City, not to dictate exactly what should be built in the future. The development industry is going through an historic drawback, there is not the appetite for redevelopment meaning that many of these properties will not be redeveloped for many many years. In that time people's right to use their property as they would like, and as they had understood they could when they purchased, will be hindered unnecessarily.	Jessica Devlin-Cross	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	11:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors, I am writing to request that you reject the Villages Planning Program, as it would be very detrimental to our existing neighbourhoods and the retail businesses and services on our high streets. It would mean losing more affordable secondary suites, and eroding our urban forest canopy. For more on why this is so, please refer to the excellent letter by the Housing Reset Group of distinguished city-building urbanists, which includes former Vancouver planning directors and senior planners who understand and appreciate Vancouver's neighbourhoods and city-wide needs to a much greater depth and extent than our current chief planner—a recent transplant from Calgary, a city that has recently rejected similar developer-driven one-size-fits-all land-use planning. In sharp contrast to the CityPlan Community Visions and Community Plans, to which many thousands of Vancouverites contributed their ideas and gave their consent, these drastic land-use changes are being promulgated by and for developers and their aspirations for greater profitability. These hastily proposed changes neglect the requirement for genuine affordable housing options and the public amenities and crucial infrastructure needed to support a growing population. This is both irresponsible and a disgrace to the principle of public engagement in decision-making for which Vancouver was once rightfully acclaimed throughout the world. Sincerely, Ned Jacobs.	Maryann Code	Riley Park	
2026-07-14	11:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Several Villages near my area. It is bad enough that the ugly multiplexes are destroying the look of another beautiful part of Vancouver. And they do not add anything next to a lovely older home. We like the stores we now have, and don't need more density to support the current shops. I will still drive to my wonderful dentist who is miles away, and shop in West Van for my special pies, And go to West 4th for other things. You will never stop people from using their cars. Please stop dictating what we want and where it will happen. Listen to the people. Please. Thank You.	Anita Seymour	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	11:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Hello: I am a lifelong Vancouverite and former planner with the City of Vancouver and other organizations in Metro Vancouver. I do not support the proposed "Villages Plan", as it would work against the renewal of existing neighbourhood centres, negatively impact the character and livability of the affected neighbourhoods, and would add far too many housing units without the necessary city services. Community building starts with "community", and only after careful planning and deep engagement, moves onto "building". This has not (yet) been done in this case. Thank you.	Martin Yeomans	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-14	11:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live at the corner of 21st Ave. and Puget St. which is the border of your ODP plan. If your plan is to allow apartments or row houses being built in this area, I strongly oppose to it. The Council consider developing the huge forest-like areas called "Pacific Spirit Regional Park". You have huge areas along 16th Ave. after passing Blanca ST. and also huge areas along S.W.Marine Drive between Camosun St. and West Brook Mall	Francis Yum Yan Lee	Arbutus Ridge	

2026-07-14	11:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	in my opinion, this city villages plan is absolutely ignoring the rights and consideration of thousands of detached family owned homes. If the city wishes to create villages then do so at the corner of major intersections only, but leave our detached wonderful community homes alone. Our Mountain View neighborhood area from Windsor Street to Knight Street, along E. 33rd Ave, has evolved into such a wonderful family community area in the past 16 years my family has lived here. We do not want to see 3 to 6 story townhome or condo developments replacing family owned detached homes because we do not have the infrastructure in place to support such increased residential population. Forget about the fact that such developments are such an eyesore on side streets that should be filled with old, renovated, or rebuilt detached family homes. A great example is the new condo development that has been built on E. 33rd Ave between St Catherine St. and Prince Albert St. It does not fit in at all to our community and is an absolute eye sore.	Craig Burnham	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	11:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Public Feedback Submission – Villages Planning Program (Draft Villages Plan) Submitted by: Jamie Wang Date: July 12, 2026 Re: Proposed Village Areas at Victoria Drive & East 61st Avenue (2.8.1) and Kerr Street & East 54th Avenue (2.8.3) Introduction I am writing to provide feedback on the Draft Villages Plan, specifically regarding the proposed Village designations at Victoria Drive & East 61st Avenue and Kerr Street & East 54th Avenue. While I support the City's objective of accommodating future growth and increasing housing opportunities, I am concerned that these two locations do not currently possess the transportation, infrastructure, commercial services, or community facilities necessary to support the level of intensification contemplated under the Draft Plan. Effective planning requires aligning land-use changes with infrastructure capacity and neighbourhood context. Based on existing conditions, these locations appear poorly suited for significant increases in density compared with areas that already benefit from stronger transit service, commercial activity, and transportation capacity. _____ 1. Transportation and Road Capacity Concerns Transportation infrastructure should be capable of supporting the additional residents, visitors, service vehicles, and daily trips generated by higher-density development. Current conditions suggest that this may be challenging in both proposed Village locations: • East 54th Avenue experiences regular congestion during rush hours. • Traffic frequently backed up at Victoria Drive and East 54th Avenue intersection. • The corridor contains limited turning capacity and constrained road widths. • The Draft Villages Plan does not identify specific road widening projects, intersection upgrades, or major transportation improvements associated with these locations. Without corresponding transportation improvements, additional density may place further pressure on an already constrained road network, potentially increasing travel delays and reducing overall mobility within the surrounding neighbourhood. _____ 2. Parking and Neighbourhood Impacts Parking demand is already evident throughout many residential streets in the area as many residents have secondary suites and laneway homes where renters' vehicles require street parking space.	Jamie Wang	Victoria-Fraserview	

As higher-density developments often provide less parking per dwelling unit than traditional low-density housing, there is potential for increased reliance on on-street parking.

Potential outcomes include:

• Greater competition for limited residential street parking;
• Increased parking spillover onto neighbouring streets; and
• Additional pressure on residential curb space.

The Draft Plan does not clearly identify how these impacts would be mitigated should significant new housing be introduced in these locations.

_____

3. Limited Transit and Community Service Capacity

A fundamental objective of village-style development is to support walkability, transit use, and access to daily services.
However, several characteristics of these locations raise questions about whether they currently meet those objectives:

• Neither area is located near a SkyTrain station.
• Public transit options are more limited than in many existing growth areas.
• Victoria Drive and East 61st Avenue lacks the scale of commercial services typically associated with a neighbourhood centre.
• Champlain Square already functions as the primary commercial hub for the surrounding area and has finite capacity to accommodate additional demand.

Before significant density is added, it would be prudent to demonstrate that local services, transit connections, and commercial amenities can support the projected population growth.

_____

4. Risks to Existing Rental Housing

The Kerr Street and East 54th Avenue area includes older purpose-built rental housing that provides an important source of affordable and long-term rental accommodation.

Redevelopment of these sites could result in:

• Tenant displacement;
• Loss of existing affordable rental units; and
• Extended construction-related disruption for current residents.

Protecting existing rental housing is an important planning objective. Any proposal that could reduce the availability of established rental stock should be carefully evaluated and justified by clear public benefits.

_____

5. Neighbourhood Context and Compatibility

Both locations are characterized primarily by low-density residential development, mature landscaping, and family-oriented housing.

The introduction of substantially larger buildings may alter the existing physical character of these neighbourhoods through:

• Increased building scale and massing;
• Greater traffic activity;
• Reduced privacy for adjacent properties; and

• Potential loss of mature trees and green space associated with redevelopment.

Good planning seeks to ensure that new development is compatible with its surrounding context. The scale of change proposed should reflect existing neighbourhood conditions and infrastructure capacity.

_____

6. Why These Locations Should Be Reconsidered

The central issue is not whether Vancouver should plan for growth. Rather, it is whether these specific locations are the most appropriate places to accommodate that growth.

Based on current conditions:

• Transit access is limited relative to major transit corridors.
• Transportation infrastructure is already constrained.
• Commercial and community services are limited.
• Established rental housing could be placed at risk.
• Significant infrastructure upgrades have not been identified as part of the proposal.

For these reasons, the planning rationale for Village designation at these locations remains unclear.

Growth can be more effectively directed toward areas that already possess strong transit connectivity, established commercial districts, and infrastructure capable of accommodating increased density.

_____

Request to Council

I respectfully request that Council:

1. Reconsider the proposed Village designations at Victoria Drive & East 61st Avenue and Kerr Street & East 54th Avenue.
2. Prioritize growth in areas with stronger transit access, commercial services, and transportation capacity, including established commercial corridors such as Victoria Drive between East 49th Avenue and Kingsway, where existing businesses, services, and low-rise residential development already provide a stronger foundation for future growth. Building upon these established urban / commercial areas through targeted upgrades and improvements would align growth with locations that already function as neighbourhood activity centers. Furthermore, since these areas already support a mix of businesses and residential uses and may accommodate additional growth more efficiently and cost-effectively than creating new village centers in predominantly low-density residential neighbourhoods.
3. Protect existing purpose-built rental housing and minimize the risk of tenant displacement.

_____

Closing

I appreciate the City's efforts to address housing needs and plan responsibly for future growth. However, successful planning depends on matching development with infrastructure, transportation capacity, community services, and neighbourhood context.

Based on the existing conditions at Victoria Drive & East 61st Avenue and Kerr Street & East 54th Avenue, I believe these locations should be reconsidered as Village sites under the Draft Villages Plan.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

				Sincerely, Jamie Wang			
2026-07-14	11:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver has Villages. Vancouver has neighbourhoods. Each unique neighbourhood has been planned around schools, community centres, libraries and shopping areas. Moving to Vancouver in 2000 I bragged about how great the planning had been offering families and seniors community - within walking distance, and accessibility to a city and an airport. We need density. I have lived in Toronto, Paris and London. There is density. If the COV takes into account the Oak Ridge development, the Jerico Plan, the Broadway initiative, and the Senakw towers, plus the existing empty homes and unsold condo towers, and measures that against our lowering immigration levels, and limits on International students, are we really facing a density issue? And if we want to create housing for families that do not want to live in a condo, are we really creating the right type of housing with 4-6 story apartments and no supporting infrastructure and school build plan? The COV has already cut back on supporting our community services including community centres, pools, libraries and parks. How do you plan to 'build quaint villages' without community? Half of Kerrisdale is for lease due to unaffordable retail rental rates so why create so many additional apartments with retail space that will sit empty. Please put this vote on hold until after the NOVEMBER election. Please invite city planners, community members to be a part of a true densification plan that builds homes so people have 'a front door' - we don't need 54' lots. Town homes with gardens, shared community space built around existing mature tree canopies works for everyone. Stop financially stressing the homeowners who have invested and supported and grown their communities over decades. Listen to your constituents. Cancel the Vancouver Villages Plan and go back to the planning board and work for a livable, green and affordable Vancouver for all.	Deborah Scott	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3
2026-07-14	11:44	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Village rezoning in the Macdonald & 16th is not something I want to support as it will change the character of the neighborhood. Many people in this area do not want to see high rises or anything higher than 3 story buildings. The roads and transit in this area would not be able to accommodate this rezoning density. This neighborhood already has west broadway and west 4th Avenue and Arbutus village all around it. We do not need another village in this area. Please be careful with the rezoning ior out neighborhood and let's not accommodate more developments that that will change the character of our homes. Thank you.	Athena Vulgaris	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	11:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the village plan in its current form for the E1st Ave and Nanaimo area due to the reduction in FSR for single family dwellings with character features. I support allowing more building types in the area but your current villages plan reduces the FSR allowed for single family renovations that is currently allowed in RT-5N and before that in RS-7. RT-5N allows character retention of existing homes with FSR of 0.75. This is now reduced to 0.65 with the R3-1/R1-1 changes. The village plan wants to substantially change the character of the neighbourhood by incentivizing apartments and townhomes and also discouraging additions to single family dwellings by reducing FSR. I propose that you remove the reduction of the FSR to single family dwellings and retain the same ratio as RT-5N. Why is this important? This neighbourhood has developed its character for almost 100 years. The neighbourhood has retained its character through gentle density increases and zoning changes of secondary suites, duplexes, infill and laneway homes. The village plan changes this completely and threatens the character of the neighbourhood where my family has grown for 23 years. Renovations under RT-5N with favourable FSR for character homes have allowed growing families like ours to remain in the neighbourhood. R3-1/R1-1 discourages this with reduced FSR.	Jason Garratt	Grandview-Woodland	

Report date range from: 7/13/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 12:00:00 PM

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
2026-07-14	11:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Villages initiative. While I support the need for more housing, I am concerned that this proposal will further change the character of established neighbourhoods and increase pressure on parks and other shared public spaces. The Arbutus Walk area along West 12th Avenue near Connaught Park already contains many six-storey buildings, and this level of density has significantly increased the use of Connaught Park while reducing the quiet character that residents value. This area has already accommodated substantial growth and should not be expected to absorb even more when there are other locations that could be considered, particularly areas that are not centred around heavily used parks. I am also not convinced that continued upzoning in Kitsilano will improve housing affordability. Despite increased density in recent years, housing in the area remains beyond the reach of many average residents. I question whether adding more density in one of Vancouver's most expensive neighbourhoods will create affordable housing or simply result in more high-priced homes. Rather than implementing such broad changes all at once, I believe a phased pilot approach would be more appropriate. This would allow the City to evaluate the impacts before expanding the program. It would also make sense to begin in areas where additional density would have less impact on established parks and mature detached-home neighbourhoods. The small homes and mature tree canopy surrounding Connaught Park provide important ecological, environmental, and community benefits. Redeveloping these properties would result in the loss of mature trees and further erode the unique character and livability of this well-loved neighbourhood. Growth should be shared fairly across Vancouver rather than placing a disproportionate burden on only a few neighbourhoods. I urge Council to reconsider this proposal and pursue a more balanced approach that protects existing communities while addressing housing needs.	Jane Pulas	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	11:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Hi, I strongly oppose the village plan for Macdonald and 16th Street. In particular, I oppose the change that would allow multiplexes, townhouses and low-rise apartments up to 6 storeys to be built on the side streets in this area. This will completely and permanently ruin the charm and character of this quiet, tree-lined area for no reason. Already many of these properties on the side streets are multi-family, having both basement suites and laneway houses. With current housing prices, this will only increase. With the addition of multiplexes on the main streets, there will be already be far more housing options available in this area than before - more even than what what our services can allow. There is absolutely no reason to allow multiplexes in the residential area of Macdonald and 16th. Please do not make this change!	Larissa Streu	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	11:54	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Our neighbourhood is tree-lined, quiet, and already supports a mix of homeowners and renters that manage just fine with the current housing structure. The amenities that exist are already within walking distance. Please do not ruin something that doesn't need fixing.	JN Yee	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

Appendix A

H F Ker
[redacted]
Vancouver, BC. [redacted]
July 13, 2026

Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Council,

RE: Villages Plan and City-Initiated Rezoning

I am a long-time resident of Vancouver living in the Dunbar area. I recently learned through friends about the City's Village Planning Program. Prior to this, I had no awareness of the initiative other than the concept of Villages in the Vancouver Plan and recently adopted Official Development Plan (ODP). We live within a 5-10- minute walk of three of the Villages West and are closest to the Mackenzie and 33rd Village which we frequent. We have visited most of the villages in the Plan. Our household has experience in development, urban planning, architecture and sustainability. We want the city to be a vibrant and livable place for all to thrive and we embrace positive change.

I have significant concerns about the Villages Plan and City-initiated rezoning. It needs to be coordinated with Neighbourhood Centres planning and requires further work on the details along with more effective public engagement to achieve the intended objectives. My main concerns and recommendations follow:

Village Concept Inconsistent

- The concept of villages as neighbourhood-serving hubs for residents to live and meet daily needs within easy walking or rolling access is a sound aspiration. It is unclear what criteria were used to identify Villages as they are highly variable in scale and context. Given the objective to access daily needs within a 5-minute walk, there are also numerous areas of the city left out, for example Shaughnessy, areas within Hastings Sunrise and South Vancouver.

Lack of Relationship to Neighbourhood Centres

- The Villages Plan makes no reference to how Villages relate to the Neighbourhood Centres identified in the ODP. As Neighbourhood Centres are intended to provide the main services to residents in neighbourhoods (e.g. grocery, pharmacy, library, recreation centre, retail, health services), villages should be scaled to support and augment them and not outcompete them.

- By example, Dunbar Neighbourhood Centre provides 2- full sized grocery stores, a library, recreation centre, park, various retail, medical offices, etc. It is a main "go to" for residents in the area.
    - The proposed increase in commercial space at Mackenzie and 33rd Village is exceeding that on Dunbar St and will only detract from the viability of the Neighbourhood Centre which already has significant vacancies. The housing densities and options proposed for Mackenzie and 33rd exceed those currently available around Dunbar Neighbourhood Centre. This imbalance applies to other villages in relation to neighbourhood centres.
    - Mackenzie and 33rd Village currently functions very well with a small specialty grocery, bakery, café, produce store, florist, art gallery, insurance office, children's clothing consignment store, gym, etc. Proposing an additional block and a half of commercial space along 33rd Ave predominantly on one side of the street is excessive and will not create a desirable pedestrian experience. It will likely displace current tenants. The current 2-sided configuration on Mackenzie St creates vibrancy and connectivity. Loading from the parking lane on Mackenzie St functions effectively.
- Similarly, the proposed substantial increase in commercial space along 41st and Mackenzie (which the associated Urban Systems consulting report recommended against) risks competing with Kerrisdale Neighbourhood Centre and the southern area of Dunbar Neighbourhood Centre which has a full-sized grocery store.
- Many Neighbourhood Centres across the city are currently struggling (e.g. Point Grey, South Granville, Dunbar, Kerrisdale) and have high commercial vacancy rates. The focus should be on planning these with supporting housing and commercial opportunities rather than Villages.

Housing Diversity, Affordability and Equity

- The provisions in the plan to deliver more affordable housing including below-market rental housing and social housing are minimal recognizing the economic challenges of these development proformas. It is highly unlikely this plan will enhance affordability in Villages. In contrast, the currently proposed 3 and 4 storey stacked townhouses or low-rise apartments will enhance housing choice and help address current demands and gaps.
- Enabling 6 storey rental housing up to 3.7 FSR on large lots in villages is out of scale and impactful in the context of many of the villages (for e.g. in locations where this would not already be enabled by the Secured Rental Policy, SRP). There already is

extensive capacity for this (6-storey) form of housing in Neighbourhood Centres, SRP sites, transit corridors and transit-oriented areas in Vancouver.

- Encouraging more 3-4 storey and ground-oriented housing would help address a current shortage in supply of missing middle housing while providing more family-oriented housing. This form can deliver desirable building forms with potential courtyards that fit well in lower density neighbourhoods.
- Of major concern is the proposed change of zoning for residential lots to mixed-use. My concerns include:
    - Redevelopment is required to include commercial floor space in locations with limited market demand. It is hard to imagine any developer willing to invest in such a marginal use.
    - Impact on property owners who have had minimal notification and opportunity to respond.
    - No consideration of severe limitation on resale of current properties affected.
    - Tax implications are unclear but one can only imagine a sharp increase in land value coupled with the negative of hard to sell properties given restrictions on development.

Planning and Engagement Process

- Planning and rezoning all 17 villages at the same time, with the same approach, land-uses and zoning, doesn't adequately recognize the characteristics of each village and how it could be enhanced to best achieve the intended objectives.
    - For example, the Mackenzie and 33rd Village differs significantly from Fraser and 33rd Village. The scale/ hierarchy of the high street in the City's road network, the existing retail, housing and catchment area are all markedly different and require a level of area specificity in planning.
    - Looking at the City's Road Network, the differences between Arterials (e.g. King Edward Ave., 41st Ave) and Secondary Arterials (e.g. Fraser St., MacDonald St) and Collectors (Mackenzie St and 33rd Ave) are indicators of the differences and scales of villages. This is also reflected in land use structure the ODP Generalized Land Use Map but not differentiated in the Villages Plan.
- Residents of the villages and those living close to them were not adequately notified of the planning and rezoning process.
- The draft Villages Plan (the most important stage) was released in mid-May. Several info sessions are noted on the website, but there was no opportunity for residents to

provide feedback to adjust/ refine the draft Plan which was referred to Council in June. This is clearly not good planning process.

Recommended Next Steps

While some good work has been done to date, the City-initiated rezoning of villages across the city is premature and requires further planning work and consultation on the details to achieve the intended objectives. It particularly needs to address the relationship to, and support for, Neighbourhood Centres. This plan is being rushed prior to an election. Residents and interested parties need to be effectively engaged. Their meaningful participation will enhance the outcome.

As elected representatives of all members of the city, I urge Council to listen to feedback, demonstrate leadership and direct staff to undertake further planning and consultation work on villages to address their unique characteristics and relationship to neighbourhood centres in order to develop effective details of the Plan.

Thank-you for your consideration and public service.

H.F. Ker

Appendix B

Date: July 10, 2026

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Request to Remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan

As a long-time resident in Vancouver, I write to urge Council to remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Planning Program, or at minimum defer any decision until further study is completed. **I oppose the Villages Plan for this location because it is a poor fit with the existing neighbourhood, will harm residents' livability, and risks unintended, detrimental impacts on local character and the tree canopy.**

The existing commercial node already functions well for nearby residents and does not demonstrate a clear need for substantial intensification. Providing more commercial space does not mean there will be shops to fill them. The lack of parking along this narrow section of W33rd also cannot accommodate expansion of the commercial space at this location.

The Plan's transit and transportation assumptions also do not reflect current conditions or appreciate the significant road improvement required to allow more activity. Unlike many of the larger Village locations identified in the Plan, Mackenzie & West 33rd is not a transit hub. There is no public transit – no bus route – along W33rd. Many sections of West 33rd are dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians because of the narrow road, lack of proper sidewalks and curbs. The steep grade of W33rd between Arbutus and Larch will make it very difficult for buses to run on it during winter months – perhaps this is why there is no bus route now! Increasing density here without prior and major roadway improvements will be dangerous, worsen parking pressures, strain local streets, and undermine the walkable, modest scale that makes this node successful.

The loss of tree canopy with the building of low-rise residential buildings will be profound in this lush neighbourhood. Most properties have several trees in their yard, and the clear-cutting practice developers are using now will mean over a thousand trees will be lost with the development proposed in the Villages Plan. With the rising, record-breaking temperature in our cities, we need our tree canopy more than ever to protect our residents.

Residents support housing in appropriate locations, but growth must be evidence-based and responsive to local conditions. Approving this Village now risks loss of neighbourhood character, mature trees, and the small-scale businesses that serve the community**. I respectfully request Council remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan or defer inclusion until a stronger, site-specific planning rationale and transportation analysis are provided.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Megan Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar/Southlands

Date: July 9/26

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Request to Remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan

As a long-time resident in Vancouver, I write to urge Council to remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Planning Program, or at minimum defer any decision until further study is completed. **I oppose the Villages Plan for this location because it is a poor fit with the existing neighbourhood, will harm residents' livability, and risks unintended, detrimental impacts on local character and the tree canopy.**

The existing commercial node already functions well for nearby residents and does not demonstrate a clear need for substantial intensification. Providing more commercial space does not mean there will be shops to fill them. The lack of parking along this narrow section of W33rd also cannot accommodate expansion of the commercial space at this location.

The Plan's transit and transportation assumptions also do not reflect current conditions or appreciate the significant road improvement required to allow more activity. Unlike many of the larger Village locations identified in the Plan, Mackenzie & West 33rd is not a transit hub. There is no public transit – no bus route – along W33rd. Many sections of West 33rd are dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians because of the narrow road, lack of proper sidewalks and curbs. The steep grade of W33rd between Arbutus and Larch will make it very difficult for buses to run on it during winter months – perhaps this is why there is no bus route now! Increasing density here without prior and major roadway improvements will be dangerous, worsen parking pressures, strain local streets, and undermine the walkable, modest scale that makes this node successful.

The loss of tree canopy with the building of low-rise residential buildings will be profound in this lush neighbourhood. Most properties have several trees in their yard, and the clear-cutting practice developers are using now will mean over a thousand trees will be lost with the development proposed in the Villages Plan. With the rising, record-breaking temperature in our cities, we need our tree canopy more than ever to protect our residents.

Residents support housing in appropriate locations, but growth must be evidence-based and responsive to local conditions. Approving this Village now risks loss of neighbourhood character, mature trees, and the small-scale businesses that serve the community**. I respectfully request Council remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan or defer inclusion until a stronger, site-specific planning rationale and transportation analysis are provided.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Paula Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar - Southlands

July 9/26

Date: July 10, 2026

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Request to Remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan

As a long-time resident in Vancouver, I write to urge Council to remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Planning Program, or at minimum defer any decision until further study is completed. **I oppose the Villages Plan for this location because it is a poor fit with the existing neighbourhood, will harm residents' livability, and risks unintended, detrimental impacts on local character and the tree canopy.**

The existing commercial node already functions well for nearby residents and does not demonstrate a clear need for substantial intensification. Providing more commercial space does not mean there will be shops to fill them. The lack of parking along this narrow section of W33rd also cannot accommodate expansion of the commercial space at this location.

The Plan's transit and transportation assumptions also do not reflect current conditions or appreciate the significant road improvement required to allow more activity. Unlike many of the larger Village locations identified in the Plan, Mackenzie & West 33rd is not a transit hub. There is no public transit – no bus route – along W33rd. Many sections of West 33rd are dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians because of the narrow road, lack of proper sidewalks and curbs. The steep grade of W33rd between Arbutus and Larch will make it very difficult for buses to run on it during winter months – perhaps this is why there is no bus route now! Increasing density here without prior and major roadway improvements will be dangerous, worsen parking pressures, strain local streets, and undermine the walkable, modest scale that makes this node successful.

The loss of tree canopy with the building of low-rise residential buildings will be profound in this lush neighbourhood. Most properties have several trees in their yard, and the clear-cutting practice developers are using now will mean over a thousand trees will be lost with the development proposed in the Villages Plan. With the rising, record-breaking temperature in our cities, we need our tree canopy more than ever to protect our residents.

Residents support housing in appropriate locations, but growth must be evidence-based and responsive to local conditions. Approving this Village now risks loss of neighbourhood character, mature trees, and the small-scale businesses that serve the community. **I respectfully request Council remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan or defer inclusion until a stronger, site-specific planning rationale and transportation analysis are provided.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Grant Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar/Southlands

Appendix C

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Caroline Day

Neighbourhood: Kensington - Cedar Cottage

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: James McCarthy

Neighbourhood: Kensington-Cedar Cottage.

Date: July 9/26.

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: Kathryn Small

Neighbourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage.

Date: 9 Jul 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: REGINE BARRY

Neighbourhood: Renfrew Heights

Date: 09 07 26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature:

Name: KEVIN V W BARRY

Neighbourhood: RENFREW HEIGHTS

Date: 2026-07-09

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: GREG HACKMAN

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON (33rd & Fraser)

Date: July 8 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: RACHEL DES COTES

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON

Date: July 8 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: RACHEL DESCOTES

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON

Date: July 10, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: M. Mavis

Neighbourhood: Fraser

Date: July 8, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: RODNEY YATES

Neighbourhood: [redacted] E. 39th Avenue

Date: July 11 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Sandra Cmudy.

Neighbourhood: Kensington - Cedar Cottage.

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Tarek Abdelmegid

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: CHANDRA ARYA

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 12/2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: SAVIO TOW

Neighbourhood: Fraserview.

Date: July 12/2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Laura Donahue

Neighbourhood: River District.

Date: July 12th, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Sukhy

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: 12 / Jul / 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Karan Vats

Neighbourhood: Kensington.

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: Avneet Vats

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: HARPREET KAUR

Neighbourhood: Kingsgate

Date: July 12/2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Matt Bond

Neighbourhood: River Districts District

Date: Jul 12/26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Godfrey Jong

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 12 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: THAI THI THU THUY

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Jenny Chan

Neighbourhood: Killarney

Date: July 12/26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Wendy Simpson

Neighbourhood: Kensington.

Date: July 12th, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Bajraj Jugpal

Neighbourhood: Kennisgton

Date: 12/7/26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: KEVIN O' BOYLE

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: SUN JULY 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: HARMAN JUGPAL

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON

Date: July 12/26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Kelly Chen

Neighbourhood: Cedar Cottage

Date: July 12 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Thomas Chen

Neighbourhood: Cedar Cottage

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Hu, DEMI

Neighbourhood: 39th & Argyle Kensington

Traffic, water, road, parking

Nothing Ready!

Think before acting pls!!!

Date: July 12th 26

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you

Signature: [redacted]

Name: JAMES SPICER

Neighbourhood: BEATRICE and 31ST

Date: 12/6/2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: YEN KONG LEUNG

Neighbourhood: 32 AND VICTORIA DR. VAN B.C

Date: July 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: Matthew Hon

Neighbourhood: Oakridge

Date: July 10, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Laura Pasut

Neighbourhood: Kensington.

Date: 9 July 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: Michael Wadden

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 11, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Shelley Freedman

Neighbourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage

Date: July 11/26'

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: J. BATES

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON / CEDAR.

Date: July 11, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: SUNITA ANAND

Neighbourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage (33rd Ave)

Date: July 11, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you

Signature: [redacted]

Name: PAWAN ANAND

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 11, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Stacey Sveistrup

Neighbourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage.

Date: JULY 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: AXIGIE HARLEY

Neighbourhood: FRASER & 33RD AVE.

Date: JULY 12, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council
Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan in its current form. Given the significant concerns raised by residents regarding neighbourhood impacts, affordability, tree protection, infrastructure capacity, design standards, property rights, the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods, and the adequacy of public consultation, I believe the Plan is unacceptable in its current form.

I therefore ask the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. The impact of such an extensive rezoning project is massive for the future of Vancouver and its residents. It requires additional work, including meaningful public consultation, the development of clear design guidelines, comprehensive infrastructure planning, and a full assessment of the Plan's impacts on Vancouver neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: JEFF HALLEY

Neighbourhood: FRASER & 33RD AVE

Appendix D

Date: July 9th, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: SHELLEY STEER

Neighbourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage

Date: Jul 9, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: MICHAEL EREZ

Neighbourhood: HARRIET ST Kensington-Cedar Cottage

Date: July 9, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Sophia Chow

Neighbourhood: Fraser & 33rd Central Village

Date: June 19, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Irene Doolan

Neighbourhood: Victoria + 61st

Date: July 12/2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Dale Westby

Neighbourhood: Little Mountain

Date: July 12th, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Magreta Westby

Neighbourhood: Little Mountain

Date: July 8, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Maureen Hackman

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 8, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: ROZEN EYTAN

Neighbourhood: Mount Pleasant

Date: July 8, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Did chat GPT write the requirements to lead to the most unlivable city? It's CRUEL.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: Laura Rosenthal

Neighbourhood: Harriet St. (Fraser + 30th)

Don't hide behind adding housing — we know there are homes. Who is behind this plan? The same people who took away Little Mountain?

Appendix E

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Villages Plan – Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance

I am a Vancouver resident and urge Council to **NOT approve the draft Villages Plan that is being discussed on July 14, 2026**. Regardless of one's position on housing policy, the process behind this proposal has been rushed, incomplete, and inconsistent with the principles of good planning and good governance.

The Villages Plan proposes one of the most significant city-wide land-use changes in decades, affecting thousands of properties, neighbourhood character, transportation networks, infrastructure capacity, and daily life across Vancouver. A change of this magnitude requires a careful, transparent, and evidence-based process. Instead, Council is being asked to approve broad rezoning **before** critical implementation details have been completed.

Design guidelines are still "coming soon," yet staff are already assisting applicants in preparing development permit submissions ahead of the July public hearing and the potential October implementation date. Council is effectively being asked to approve zoning **before** the rules governing building form, setbacks, privacy, landscaping, shadowing, and neighbourhood fit have been finalized or publicly reviewed. That is backwards. The City should first complete and consult on the detailed rules, and only then seek approval for sweeping zoning changes.

The consultation process has also been inadequate. Many residents were unaware of the full implications of the proposal until very recently, and others who participated do not believe their concerns were reflected in the City's summaries. **Meaningful consultation requires demonstrating how public input shaped the final proposal and acknowledging when a proposed Village location may not be appropriate.**

The City's own Phase 2 engagement summary makes this contradiction clear. For the proposed **MacKenzie & 33rd Village, 66% of respondents disliked the boundaries**. Residents described 33rd Avenue as **narrow, congested, and unsafe**, with dangerous intersections, inadequate sidewalks, limited safe crossings, and lanes too narrow for cycling. Many stated plainly that 33rd Avenue requires major safety, transit, and streetscape improvements before accommodating additional activity, let alone a new Village. What the report doesn't indicate is that there is, in fact, no bus service on W33rd, so there is no 'transit hub' at the MacKenzie intersection.

If the City considers its consultation "adequate" and "representative," then it must also accept — and act on — the clear, location-specific opposition to the MacKenzie & 33rd Village. Ignoring such strong feedback undermines the credibility of the entire engagement process.

The Villages Plan also leaves significant questions unanswered regarding transportation, sewer and drainage capacity, utilities, schools, parks, tree retention, commercial viability, and neighbourhood-specific impacts. These issues should be evaluated **before** rezoning is approved, not afterward.

I respectfully ask Council to reject the draft Village Plan and undertake **genuine, transparent consultation** before bringing a revised proposal forward. I also urge you to remove the MacKenzie and 33rd village from the plan going forward.

Name: Megan Mackay Signature: [redacted] Date: July 9, 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar/Southlands

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Villages Plan – Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance

I am a Vancouver resident and urge Council to **NOT approve the draft Villages Plan that is being discussed on July 14, 2026**. Regardless of one's position on housing policy, the process behind this proposal has been rushed, incomplete, and inconsistent with the principles of good planning and good governance.

The Villages Plan proposes one of the most significant city-wide land-use changes in decades, affecting thousands of properties, neighbourhood character, transportation networks, infrastructure capacity, and daily life across Vancouver. A change of this magnitude requires a careful, transparent, and evidence-based process. Instead, Council is being asked to approve broad rezoning **before** critical implementation details have been completed.

Design guidelines are still "coming soon," yet staff are already assisting applicants in preparing development permit submissions ahead of the July public hearing and the potential October implementation date. Council is effectively being asked to approve zoning **before** the rules governing building form, setbacks, privacy, landscaping, shadowing, and neighbourhood fit have been finalized or publicly reviewed. That is backwards. The City should first complete and consult on the detailed rules, and only then seek approval for sweeping zoning changes.

The consultation process has also been inadequate. Many residents were unaware of the full implications of the proposal until very recently, and others who participated do not believe their concerns were reflected in the City's summaries. **Meaningful consultation requires demonstrating how public input shaped the final proposal and acknowledging when a proposed Village location may not be appropriate.**

The City's own Phase 2 engagement summary makes this contradiction clear. For the proposed **MacKenzie & 33rd Village, 66% of respondents disliked the boundaries**. Residents described 33rd Avenue as **narrow, congested, and unsafe**, with dangerous intersections, inadequate sidewalks, limited safe crossings, and lanes too narrow for cycling. Many stated plainly that 33rd Avenue requires major safety, transit, and streetscape improvements before accommodating additional activity, let alone a new Village. What the report doesn't indicate is that there is, in fact, no bus service on W33rd, so there is no 'transit hub' at the MacKenzie intersection.

If the City considers its consultation "adequate" and "representative," then it must also accept — and act on — the clear, location-specific opposition to the MacKenzie & 33rd Village. Ignoring such strong feedback undermines the credibility of the entire engagement process.

The Villages Plan also leaves significant questions unanswered regarding transportation, sewer and drainage capacity, utilities, schools, parks, tree retention, commercial viability, and neighbourhood-specific impacts. These issues should be evaluated **before** rezoning is approved, not afterward.

I respectfully ask Council to reject the draft Village Plan and undertake **genuine, transparent consultation** before bringing a revised proposal forward. I also urge you to remove the MacKenzie and 33rd village from the plan going forward.

Name: Johnathan Boag Signature: [redacted] Date: 09 July 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Villages Plan – Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance

I am a Vancouver resident and urge Council to **NOT approve the draft Villages Plan that is being discussed on July 14, 2026**. Regardless of one's position on housing policy, the process behind this proposal has been rushed, incomplete, and inconsistent with the principles of good planning and good governance.

The Villages Plan proposes one of the most significant city-wide land-use changes in decades, affecting thousands of properties, neighbourhood character, transportation networks, infrastructure capacity, and daily life across Vancouver. A change of this magnitude requires a careful, transparent, and evidence-based process. Instead, Council is being asked to approve broad rezoning **before** critical implementation details have been completed.

Design guidelines are still "coming soon," yet staff are already assisting applicants in preparing development permit submissions ahead of the July public hearing and the potential October implementation date. Council is effectively being asked to approve zoning **before** the rules governing building form, setbacks, privacy, landscaping, shadowing, and neighbourhood fit have been finalized or publicly reviewed. That is backwards. The City should first complete and consult on the detailed rules, and only then seek approval for sweeping zoning changes.

The consultation process has also been inadequate. Many residents were unaware of the full implications of the proposal until very recently, and others who participated do not believe their concerns were reflected in the City's summaries. **Meaningful consultation requires demonstrating how public input shaped the final proposal and acknowledging when a proposed Village location may not be appropriate.**

The City's own Phase 2 engagement summary makes this contradiction clear. For the proposed **MacKenzie & 33rd Village, 66% of respondents disliked the boundaries**. Residents described 33rd Avenue as **narrow, congested, and unsafe**, with dangerous intersections, inadequate sidewalks, limited safe crossings, and lanes too narrow for cycling. Many stated plainly that 33rd Avenue requires major safety, transit, and streetscape improvements before accommodating additional activity, let alone a new Village. What the report doesn't indicate is that there is, in fact, no bus service on W33rd, so there is no 'transit hub' at the MacKenzie intersection.

If the City considers its consultation "adequate" and "representative," then it must also accept — and act on — the clear, location-specific opposition to the MacKenzie & 33rd Village. Ignoring such strong feedback undermines the credibility of the entire engagement process.

The Villages Plan also leaves significant questions unanswered regarding transportation, sewer and drainage capacity, utilities, schools, parks, tree retention, commercial viability, and neighbourhood-specific impacts. These issues should be evaluated **before** rezoning is approved, not afterward.

I respectfully ask Council to reject the draft Village Plan and undertake **genuine, transparent consultation** before bringing a revised proposal forward. I also urge you to remove the MacKenzie and 33rd village from the plan going forward.

Name: Paula Mackay Signature: [redacted] Date: July 9/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar - Southlands

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

Re: Villages Plan – Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance

I am a Vancouver resident and urge Council to **NOT approve the draft Villages Plan that is being discussed on July 14, 2026**. Regardless of one's position on housing policy, the process behind this proposal has been rushed, incomplete, and inconsistent with the principles of good planning and good governance.

The Villages Plan proposes one of the most significant city-wide land-use changes in decades, affecting thousands of properties, neighbourhood character, transportation networks, infrastructure capacity, and daily life across Vancouver. A change of this magnitude requires a careful, transparent, and evidence-based process. Instead, Council is being asked to approve broad rezoning **before** critical implementation details have been completed.

Design guidelines are still "coming soon," yet staff are already assisting applicants in preparing development permit submissions ahead of the July public hearing and the potential October implementation date. Council is effectively being asked to approve zoning **before** the rules governing building form, setbacks, privacy, landscaping, shadowing, and neighbourhood fit have been finalized or publicly reviewed. That is backwards. The City should first complete and consult on the detailed rules, and only then seek approval for sweeping zoning changes.

The consultation process has also been inadequate. Many residents were unaware of the full implications of the proposal until very recently, and others who participated do not believe their concerns were reflected in the City's summaries. **Meaningful consultation requires demonstrating how public input shaped the final proposal and acknowledging when a proposed Village location may not be appropriate.**

The City's own Phase 2 engagement summary makes this contradiction clear. For the proposed **MacKenzie & 33rd Village, 66% of respondents disliked the boundaries**. Residents described 33rd Avenue as **narrow, congested, and unsafe**, with dangerous intersections, inadequate sidewalks, limited safe crossings, and lanes too narrow for cycling. Many stated plainly that 33rd Avenue requires major safety, transit, and streetscape improvements before accommodating additional activity, let alone a new Village. What the report doesn't indicate is that there is, in fact, no bus service on W33rd, so there is no 'transit hub' at the MacKenzie intersection.

If the City considers its consultation "adequate" and "representative," then it must also accept — and act on — the clear, location-specific opposition to the MacKenzie & 33rd Village. Ignoring such strong feedback undermines the credibility of the entire engagement process.

The Villages Plan also leaves significant questions unanswered regarding transportation, sewer and drainage capacity, utilities, schools, parks, tree retention, commercial viability, and neighbourhood-specific impacts. These issues should be evaluated **before** rezoning is approved, not afterward.

I respectfully ask Council to reject the draft Village Plan and undertake **genuine, transparent consultation** before bringing a revised proposal forward. I also urge you to remove the MacKenzie and 33rd village from the plan going forward.

Name: Grant Mackay Signature: [redacted] Date: July 10, 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

Appendix F

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: MARK TOWNSEND Date: 10 JULY 2026

Neighourhood: FRASER

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: WILSON + ANGELA CHAO Date: 2026 JUL 10

Neighourhood: [redacted] FRASER + 33 AVE

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Arianna Smith Date: June 10 2026

Neighourhood: Fraser and 30th

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Natasja Parlee Date: 10 July 2026

Neighourhood: CEDAR COTTAGE/Kensington

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: ASH LEE Date: July 10, 2026

Neighourhood: Kensington Cedar Cottage

[redacted]

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature [redacted] Name: Treena Goodleff Date: July 10, 2024

Neighourhood: Kensington-Cedar Cottage

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity.** The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Megan Mackay Date: July 9, 2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Johnathan Boay Date: Thurs, 09, July 2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Paula Mackay Date: July 9/26

Neighourhood: Dunbar-Southlands

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Grant Mackay Date: July 10/2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar / South Lands

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability". ← !!!
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: RACHEL OKES COTES Date: July 8 2024

Neighourhood: KENSINGTON

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Ryan Jacken Date: July 8th 2026

Neighbourhood: Kensington

To Mayor Sim and Council:

RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose

I am a Vancouver resident and am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Meaningful Public Engagement.** The Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report states that input was received from 1,970 citizens, less than 1000 of whom live within one of the 17 proposed villages (p.11). There are an estimated 26,000 citizens living within the proposed village boundaries. Public "engagement" therefore involved less than four percent of residents living within the villages. Engagement with the total population of Vancouver was 0.26 percent.
2. **Lack of Affordability.** Based on the past three years of experience with city-wide upzoning allowing the construction of three to six units on a single lot, there is no evidence that increasing density leads to affordability. New construction on the east side and the west side of Vancouver, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes are all currently priced at $1300 to $1600 per sq ft. Developer led housing initiatives will never lead to "affordability".
3. **Loss of Vancouver's Tree Canopy.** The multiplex initiative is having one undeniable impact – the virtual clearcutting of mature trees on building sites. This is in spite of City regulations that previously mandated tree protection. The Village Plan would increase the loss of Vancouver's tree canopy by orders of magnitude.
4. **Lack of Demand for Existing Housing Units.** By all reports there is currently little or no demand for new condominiums, the market for which has been driven by speculation for years. Three thousand or more such units, all priced at $1M or more are currently unsold. Changes to federal immigration policy has completely flattened population growth; in BC the population actually decreased last year. Where is the evidence of unmet demand for housing in Vancouver? (Again, there is a need for **affordable** housing).
5. **Generic Upzoning Ignores History and Diversity**. The top-down imposition of 17 generic Villages ignores the history and character of Vancouver's existing diverse neighbourhoods. Mandating 17 new commercial/retail centres within the proposed villages ignores the unhealthy vacancy rates in the **existing** neighbourhood commercial/retail centres.
6. **Impact on Private Property Owners.** One of the most questionable aspects of the Village Plan is the proposed "sterilization" of between 500 and 750 private properties on the proposed Village High Streets. The owners of those properties received a May 22nd letter from the Community Planning Director informing them that if the Village Plan is passed, the only allowable future use of their properties will be for mid-rise development, specifically street level commercial/retail with five storeys of residential above. The **only** buyers for those properties will be developers, but the Planning Department also acknowledges that the demand for such development may be years away. In the interim, will the City compensate those 500 to 750 owners for their loss of equity?

At the July 14th Public Hearing / Council Meeting I urge that Vancouver City Council puts the Villages Plan on hold until such time as the above concerns are addressed.

Signature: [redacted] Name: Jim Humphry Date: July 8 '26

Neighourhood: Kensington

Appendix G

Date:

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: HELEN LEUNG

Neighbourhood: FRASER ST 28

Date:

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Mike Kilgallin

Neighbourhood:

Kensington Cedar Cottage

Date:

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Shauna Gold + Maureen David

Neighbourhood: Fraser + 33rd

Date: July 9th, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Zsuzsanna Ehn.

Neighbourhood: Fraser & 28th

Date:

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: MORGAN ARD

Neighbourhood: FRASER HOOD / KENSINGTON.

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Megan MacKay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar/Southlands

Date: 09 July 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Jonathan Boey

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

Date: July 9/26

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Paula Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar - Southlands

July 9/26

Date: July 10, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Grant Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

Date: July 8th 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Frances Kelly

Neighbourhood: Kensington Fraser

Date: July 8 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: RACHEL DESCOTES

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON.

Date: 2026.07.08

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed [redacted]

Name: NICK SMOLINSKI

Neighbourhood: FRASER 33RD

Date: July 8 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan

Dear Mayor Sim and Council,

I am a Vancouver resident and I oppose the draft Villages Plan that is being reviewed at the Public Hearing on July 14, 2026. I strongly urge you to consider the multiple problems this plan will bring to our city and, in particular, the harmful consequences to the tree canopy of this city if it is approved in its current form.

Trees are, literally, the lungs of the city and yet in Vancouver mature trees - the vital remnants of a former rain forest - are being cut down at an alarming rate. Every mature tree has at least ten times more positive environmental impact than a new tree. Every mature tree provides more shade and cooling, providing a vital service as we keep breaking high temperature records.

As recently as a few years ago, developers were directed to preserve trees wherever possible. Now developers are allowed to clear cut, removing all greenery. There are no setbacks for future trees or shrubberies, and no preservation of existing healthy trees. Vancouver can no longer pretend to be The Greenest City.

If the proposed Villages Plan is approved in its current form, the tree canopy will be devastated. I do not understand why the City of Vancouver allow clear cutting when we are experiencing accelerating climate change, more wild fires and ever hotter temperatures.

I urge council to put guidelines in place immediately to stop this clear-cutting practice. Further, I urge council to require all developers to replace each and every tree they remove. Trees are required all over the city, and a proper replacement program, overseen by the Parks Board, would be a major, and totally feasible, achievement.

Thank you.

Signed: [redacted]

Name: Anna Kelly

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 9/2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: LILLI WONG

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON- CEDARCOTTAGE

Date: July 9/26

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: SCOTT + SUE ROSS

Neighbourhood: 33rd. & FRASER ST.
(Kensington Cedar Cottage)

Date: July 9. 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Nettie Adams

Neighbourhood: Fraser St + 33rd Ave.

4451 Harriet St.
V5V 4K4
(Kensington Cedar Cottage)

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Printed name: Lindsay Bendickson

Neighbourhood: Harriet St. - Kensington - Cedar Cottage

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Charles Burslem

Neighbourhood: Fraser & 33rd Ave

[redacted]

(Kensington Cedar Cottage)

Date: July 9, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Megan Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Southlands

Date: 09 July 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Johnathan Boag

Neighbourhood: Arbutus/Southlands

Date: July 9/26

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Paula Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar - Southlands

Date: July 6, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Grant Mackay

Neighbourhood: Dunbar/Southlands

Date: July 8, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Printed name: Juan Lum

Neighbourhood: Joyce / Collingwood

Date: July 10 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Megan Marks

Neighbourhood: Fraser

Date: July 5, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: RACHEL DES COTES

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON

Date: July 8, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: T'ai Erasmus

Neighbourhood: Kensington

Date: July 8th 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Frances Kelly

Neighbourhood: Fraser

Date: July 8, 2026

Mayor Sim and Council,
Vancouver City Hall,
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4

To Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan that is being presented at the public hearing on July 14, 2026.

The current Villages Plan is an inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the complex housing crisis in Vancouver. Each village area identified in the Plan has distinguishing characteristics, energy and history that make them unique. Also, the Phase 2 Engagement Summary Report shows vast differences in how residents in each area responded to the Village Plan. Yet, the Plan proposes cookie-cutter expansion for all villages, thus providing clear evidence that the local concerns were, in fact, not carefully considered or addressed.

The Villages Plan also fails to provide tree canopy protection, ensure needed infrastructure such as schools and daycares, address safety, traffic and pollution concerns, and ultimately offer affordable housing. Most of the buildings allowed in the rezoning areas require minimal amount of below market housing and social housing is only included on the westside. The Plan, basically, fails to plan.

I therefore urge the Council to reject the draft Villages Plan application. Further meaningful public consultation is essential before any such changes to our city, with fulsome evaluation of the needs of each distinct village areas and the impact on the existing neighbourhoods.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Diksha Kalra

Neighbourhood: Kensington

[redacted]

I am voting No for a Village Plan. We have lived in our home for 67 years. I realize this council wants to change how Vancouver looks. It will become dark and gloomy and no place for small wild birds.

The new houses have no green area for people to enjoy the out doors.

Edith Lear.

Please excuse my writing - I have arthritis in my hands

Appendix J

Vancouver Villages Plan Comment Colin Oloman

To.

Vancouver City Council

July 08 2026

The City of Vancouver's 2026 Villages Plan is wrong.

By ignorance or design the plan does not confront the inevitable changes in climate being foretold by the 45 °C heat waves in Europe.

https://www.worldweatherattribution.org/fossil-fuel-emissions-have-rapidly-worsened-european-heatwaves-in-just-a-few-decades/

By replacing trees, gardens and grass with walls, concrete and glass the Plan would doom Vancouver's people to *unlivable* outdoor conditions in the decades to come.

This is a plan for a dystopian future.

Wake up Councillors!

Wake up Vancouver!

[redacted]

Colin Oloman

Vancouver

B.C. Canada.

[redacted]

Appendix K

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed East Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) I love Commercial Street and the proposed changes are massive and would change the neighbourly flavor of this street.
(2) We already have a beautiful village here and it doesn't need a renaming or rezoning, without our input.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) There is already sufficient redevelopment in this neighborhood.
(5) More subsidized and affordable housing is needed in this neighborhood.
(6) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(7) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(8) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(9) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(10) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(11) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Diane Kunic

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed East Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) I love Commercial Street and the proposed changes are massive and would change the neighbourly flavor of this street.
(2) We already have a beautiful village here and it doesn't need a renaming or rezoning, without our input.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) There is already sufficient redevelopment in this neighborhood.
(5) More subsidized and affordable housing is needed in this neighborhood.
(6) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(7) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(8) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(9) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(10) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(11) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Patrice Struyk

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed East Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) I love Commercial Street and the proposed changes are massive and would change the neighbourly flavor of this street.
(2) We already have a beautiful village here and it doesn't need a renaming or rezoning, without our input.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) There is already sufficient redevelopment in this neighborhood.
(5) More subsidized and affordable housing is needed in this neighborhood.
(6) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(7) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(8) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(9) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(10) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(11) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

E. Anne Stanley

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed East Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) I love Commercial Street and the proposed changes are massive and would change the neighbourly flavor of this street.
(2) We already have a beautiful village here and it doesn't need a renaming or rezoning, without our input.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) There is already sufficient redevelopment in this neighborhood.
(5) More subsidized and affordable housing is needed in this neighborhood.
(6) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(7) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(8) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(9) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(10) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(11) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Ivan Kunic

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Appendix L

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) Not enough consultation.
(2) This won't solve our affordability housing crisis.
(3) Our population statistics are going down not up.
(4) Asking for this now is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(5) Ask the corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(6) New housing usually means higher rents which is not affordable for average people.
(7) We encourage diversity in housing in a phased approach to meet the needs of all, not some.
(8) We support our local businesses.
(9) The loss of trees would be immense and would only further our climate crisis.

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Ainsley Dong

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) Not enough consultation.
(2) This won't solve our affordability housing crisis.
(3) Our population statistics are going down not up.
(4) Asking for this now is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(5) Ask the corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(6) New housing usually means higher rents which is not affordable for average people.
(7) We encourage diversity in housing in a phased approach to meet the needs of all, not some.
(8) We support our local businesses.
(9) The loss of trees would be immense and would only further our climate crisis.

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Ron Fisher

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) Less than 1% public engagement for such a plan is insufficient.
(2) Renaming or rezoning an area without more subsidized or low income housing won't solve the affordability housing crisis.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(5) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(6) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(7) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(8) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(9) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Leonard

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Lego Blocks x Blocks = IFly
Your mutual addiction
to developer permits
& tax write offs
knows no end.

Dear Mayor and City of Vancouver Councillors

RE: Proposed Villages Plan

I object to this plan going forward for these reasons:

(1) Less than 1% public engagement for such a plan is insufficient.
(2) Renaming or rezoning an area without more subsidized or low income housing won't solve the affordability housing crisis.
(3) Asking for approval in the middle of summer holidays is a ploy to get approval without push back.
(4) If there is a need for more rental units, create a bylaw requiring corporate building owners to rent out their new condos at affordable rents instead.
(5) The economics of replacement housing means higher land value and rents and even less affordability for those who can't afford it.
(6) Both Village targeted areas -- "pink mixed use" and "orange residential" zones promote 6 storey buildings, with an option of privately-initiated rezoning for additional height and density. So in reality, the whole village zone could be upscaled to 6 storey housing when single family homeowners age out of their own housing.
(7) Upscaling primary business streets will make it more difficult for existing businesses to operate and continue.
(8) A phased approach with extensive community consultation is needed before I can agree with the plan.
(9) Why is this being proposed now, when there is a municipal election in October?

Either way, should you vote to approve the Villages Plan, this will affect my voting for you in the upcoming October municipal election.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

LESLEY McLEAN

Full Name

[redacted]

Full Address

Vancouver, BC

[redacted]

Postal Code

Appendix N

July 13, 2026

Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor and Council:

Re: Strong Opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan – Prioritizing Existing Commercial Hubs Over Artificial Expansion

I am writing on behalf of the Dunbar Villages Business Association (the "DVBA") to formally express our strong opposition to the proposed Vancouver Villages Plan. The DVBA questions the need for blanket, mass pre-zoning across roughly 13,000 properties city-wide while many of the City's existing historic neighbourhood commercial districts are in severe crisis. Small businesses are already facing significant challenges, compounded by ongoing financial distress under the highest and best use valuation model and municipal property taxation policies.

Additionally, forcing an immediate oversupply of retail density capacity is at odds with current market conditions. This is especially evident as senior levels of government are actively spending public funds to convert over 2,200 completed Metro Vancouver condo units into affordable housing to absorb a staggering 76% year-over-year increase in unsold new housing inventory. Flooding the market with massive pre-zoned density across 14% of the city's properties—while existing inventory sits stagnant—only benefits land speculators and ignores real economic realities on the ground.

The Dunbar commercial area currently has an alarming vacancy rate of 17+%, up 2 percentage points from last year and worsening after the loss of two additional businesses last week. The City cannot claim to support small businesses while facilitating the slow erosion of our main streets. This structural decay is the direct result of ongoing municipal negligence and predatory development practices that the DVBA has repeatedly raised with staff over the past decade.

Dunbar Village is being systematically hollowed out by the following systemic failures:

- **Speculative Vacancy and Derelict Properties:** Property owners are permitted to leave storefronts vacant and neglected. They face no consequences for turning their street-facing properties into sets for The Walking Dead. Owners post signs in their windows stating they are not interested in leasing and instructing that no one should contact them. Some have rented out their space for others to use as storage. Despite the DVBA Board urging the City to implement an empty storefront tax for many years

and numerous walking tours with the City, no policy action has been taken. This doesn't stop staff from claiming it is one of their highest priorities.

- **Displacement and Monotonous Development:** Many recent mid-block redevelopments have completely wiped out diverse independent retailers in Dunbar. In their place, developers (who consistently refuse to share leasing data with the DVBA) erect uniform façades, replacing literally dozens of independent storefronts with single retail giants, low-risk corporate bank branches, and repetitive services that do not meet Dunbar's organic needs.
- **Increased Uniformity and Sterility:** Mandating rigid, multi-storey block redevelopments under the current framework accelerates architectural uniformity and sterility. Replacing active street fronts with institutional, deep-set corporate spaces destroys the distinct visual character of our communities. But block after block on Dunbar, it continues.
- **The Death of Pedestrian Vibrancy:** This high-rent development model has killed the pedestrian ecosystem on Dunbar. Business owners report that customers no longer walk the street if they are early for an appointment because there is nothing to see, so they wait in their cars.

It is entirely contradictory for the City to focus resources on building new, artificial "villages" when it has failed to preserve the organic, deeply rooted commercial hubs we already have. Artificially forcing retail expansion beyond natural growth zones will dilute municipal resources, divert limited local demand, and inflict further economic damage on community-serving neighbourhoods.

The DVBA Board demands that Council indefinitely delay approval of the Vancouver Villages Plan at tomorrow's public hearing. We ask the City to redirect its planning resources, economic development metrics, and tax mechanisms to work directly with existing BIAs to stabilize our main streets, penalize speculative vacancies, and protect independent retailers.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Lisa Clement
Executive Director, DVBA

July 12, 2026

Appendix O

Dear Vancouver City Mayor & Councillors,

Re: Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) Amendment for Victoria Dr. & E 61st Avenue

We are writing to object the rezoning of Victoria Drive & E 61st Avenue area for the following reasons.

1. **Respect diversity and choice**
   The City of Vancouver is made up of commercial and residential areas. There are areas with high-rises and townhouses and there are areas for single houses. The zoning provides people with choices of different kinds of housing they prefer. For people live in Vancouver Fraserview, they chose to live in a quiet residential area. Rezoning the area forces the residents to give up their choice.

2. **Preserve the environment**
   Rezoning the area for future re-development leads to massive demolition of buildings for a village with densities. It is working against protection of the natural environment.

3. **Protect wildlife and ecology**
   Re-development will damage the natural habitat of wildlife. Vancouver Fraserview is home to many wildlife and various species of birds. Re-development is harmful to the ecology and a threat to the environment for the existing wildlife.

We, as residents of the above-mentioned area, request the City Council to keep the Fraserview area from rezoning. This is an area where young families raise their children and the seniors enjoy their retirement years, an area where they feel safe and quiet. We therefore ask the City to stop disturbing our lives by enforcing any changes for redevelopment.

Yours truly,

Names	Addresses	Signatures
William Chan	[redacted]	
Karen Chan		
Nathan Chan		
Jeremy Chan		
Jennifer Hong		
Hong Tan Le		
Fay Van Hong		

Public Hearing – July 14, 2026: Concerns Regarding Proposed R3-4 Rezoning at 1395 W 50th Ave, Vancouver, B.C., postal code

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing on behalf of the Consulate General of Republic of Indonesia, the owner of the property located at 1395 W 50th Ave, Vancouver, B.C., V6P 1B4 to express our concerns and objections regarding the proposed City initiated rezoning of our neighborhood to the new R3-4 (West Side Villages) district, scheduled for Public Hearing on July 14, 2026.

While we recognize and support the City's efforts to address housing needs, the proposed height and density regulations under the R3-4 district raise concerns about their impact on the livability, infrastructure, parking, and the existing character of our neighbourhood.

We respectfully request that Council consider the following amendments and conditions prior to adopting the report:

1. Excessive Building Height (6 to 8 Storeys)

The proposal allows secured rental buildings up to 6 storeys, and up to 8 storeys in Transit-Oriented Areas. Buildings of this height next to low-density homes would create a sudden and incompatible change. This may lead to increased shadowing, less natural light, and reduced privacy for nearby properties.

Requested Amendment: We respectfully request that the maximum height for secured rental buildings on standard lots be reduced to 4 storeys, aligning with the strata apartment forms, to better match the existing scale of the neighbourhood.

2. Parking Impacts from Increased Density

Higher density will increase demand for parking. Our area already has limited on-street parking and narrow laneways. Without enough on-site parking, this may cause congestion and make access more difficult for residents, visitors, and emergency vehicles.

Requested Amendment: We request that adequate on-site parking be required for new developments, along with a parking impact assessment to ensure the area can handle the increased demand.

3. Infrastructure and Laneway Capacity

The existing infrastructure on our block, including sewer, water, and electrical system, was designed to support single family homes, not higher density multi family buildings. The narrow laneways may also not be suitable for increased traffic and service vehicles.

Requested Amendment: We request a detailed, block-by-block infrastructure assessment before any development permits are issued under the R3-4 zoning, to confirm that the area can safely support the additional demand.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Pinardi Priambodo [redacted]
Head of Chancery

On behalf of the Consulate General of the Republic of Indonesia

1395 W 50th Ave, Vancouver, B.C., V6P 1B4

Email address: [redacted]

Appendix Q

Dear Vancouver City Council Members,

I am in opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan.

The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input.

The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Below I will give examples of the negative impact this Villages Plan would have on existing residents, without offering a substantive benefit to new residents.

The Plan cites the "missing middle"; however, it allows for rezoning residential streets to 6-story apartment buildings. These apartment buildings do nothing to address the "missing middle" and will make it unlivable for existing residents living in 2-3 story homes. Many homes in my neighborhood (the proposed 33rd and Fraser Village) are on smaller 80-ft deep lots. Per the plan, our short lots cannot be rezoned by themselves (without land assembly) and we could be faced with 6-storey buildings in our backyards. This is unlivable.

Existing residents in my neighborhood have already created density and have created ways to living here more affordable. We have built community, both within our homes and on our streets. For example, two families co-own our small 1200 sq ft home. Our neighbors have 3 families living in their home. Many neighbors have multiple generations in one home, thereby allowing adult children to support aging parents and aging parents to provide care for grandchildren. And many homes have already been redeveloped per existing zoning to allow 4 separate homes on one lot. Redeveloping our neighborhood will force us out, make it unaffordable to find something similar, and break up our existing community. This is being done with no benefit for future residents. The Plan has no guarantees for making housing that is built affordable for middle-income residents. The is also very little to address low-income residents. There are already vacancies and homes that are not selling in my neighborhood and throughout the city because they are unaffordable. The Government has already planned to buy out more than 2500 homes that have not sold to support people in a rent-to-own scheme. The Villages Plan would exacerbate this problem and force out all but the wealthy and elite in the City.

The Plan talks about residents being within a 5 minute walk from services and shops; however, the Plan does very little to address keeping and making streets safe for walking or for those biking or those using mobility aids. Increasing shopping in neighborhood streets

will increase car traffic. Specifically in my neighborhood, there are no plans for traffic calming, such as what is in place in other pedestrian friendly areas like West 10th Ave or the Commercial Drive neighborhood or Hastings-Sunrise. We already need to make Prince Albert and East 28th Ave streets that you cannot drive straight through. These both intersect with bike routes and drivers routinely run stop signs. Stop signs and roundabouts are inadequate for traffic calming. “No thru” except bikes and pedestrians are required. Additionally, maximum speed limits of 30 km/hr need to be implemented and enforced on all non-major streets in the Villages and across the City. The only proposed improvement for the proposed 33rd and Fraser/Knight Villages is a crossing at 31st and Knight. This is inadequate for current state let alone future state. We already see the blocks around Fraser and 30th/29th busy with car traffic.

Adding shops to these Villages will compete with existing businesses, especially locally owned businesses who are already struggling with high rents. We have lost great busy Community minded businesses along Fraser St due to unaffordability (e.g., Ubuntu, Cozy Café). We already have vacancies along Fraser St. The Plan makes no mention of how the City will make it affordable for local businesses and encourage businesses that residents actually need –grocery stores, produce markets, meat markets that are not owned by Loblaws or Jim Pattison; hardware stores; local gathering places – not more cannabis stores, vape shops, beauty shops etc.

Additionally, the Villages Plan would destroy the existing character of the neighborhoods. Homes that are over 100 years old and in good livable condition will be destroyed. The environmental impact alone of destroying and building new is shameful on the City of Vancouver. Old trees that provide much needed shade and cooling will be destroyed. The East side is already 1-2 degrees Celsius warmer than the West side due to having fewer trees and green space. We need more trees not more buildings. I see no plan for increasing access to community centres, libraries, parks, or recreation in my neighborhood. Gray’s park is thriving and busy at all times. Adding thousands of residents will necessitate additional parks and gathering spaces for community.

I call upon this Council to vote against rezoning our neighborhoods without our consent and consultation.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kendrick

[redacted]

Appendix R

[redacted]

Appendix S

Date: July-10-2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: TRAN / AMY

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: 11/7/26

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: LAI CHAN YEE

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: 11/7/26

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: VINCENT KEUNG

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: July 10, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Richard Chu Sam

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: ~~30/06/26~~ 10/07/2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Shen Yi Gi

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: 10 July 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

[redacted]

Signature: _____

Name: KIM MAN WONG

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: 10 July 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: STEPHEN ETHO

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: July 10, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Nora G. Dukes

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: July 12, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Anne Lam

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON-CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: July 11 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: DARLENE BAILEY

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: July 10/2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: STEPHEN ROY

Neighbourhood: Mountain View / Kensington

[redacted]

Date: July 10 / 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: Jessica Roy

Neighbourhood: Mountainview / Kensington

Date: July 11, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature [redacted]

Name: MICHAEL WONG.

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: JULY 10 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: LENA LEE

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Date: JULY 10, 2026

I am a resident of Vancouver and strongly oppose the proposed Villages Plan. I respectfully request that the Vancouver City Council not approve the proposed Villages Plan at the public hearing scheduled on July 14, 2026.

As outlined in the open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan" (June 18, 2026 HousingReset.ca) sent to the Mayor and Council from 30 prominent Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and academics, there are many reasons why the City should not adopt the proposed Villages Plan.

Instead, I believe the Council should take the following corrective actions:

- Postpone or cancel the July public hearing and refrain from approving the current proposal on the existing rushed timeline.
- Rework the program so climate mitigation, tree retention, and livability protections are addressed before any broad rezoning is approved.
- Strengthen existing neighbourhood centres rather than creating competing new commercial areas on smaller village nodes.
- Publish enforceable neighbourhood-specific design controls dealing with setbacks, upper-storey massing, overlook, shadow, privacy, and landscape buffering before Council considers any village upzoning.
- Provide location-specific analysis of transit access, traffic impacts, sewer and drainage capacity, tree-canopy retention, local business displacement, and public-benefit delivery before any rezoning proceeds.
- Conduct meaningful consultation that begins with genuine alternatives, including the option of not designating certain locations as Villages at all.

Vancouver can plan for growth without sacrificing health, shade, privacy, neighbourhood stability, or the vitality of established centres. A responsible plan would protect the urban forest, respect local conditions, value existing communities, and direct change to places that are actually equipped to absorb it.

Thank you.

Signature: [redacted]

Name: LENA LEE

Neighbourhood: KENSINGTON - CEDAR COTTAGE

Dear Vancouver City Council Members,

I am in opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan.

The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input.

The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Below I will give examples of the negative impact this Villages Plan would have on existing residents, without offering a substantive benefit to new residents.

The Plan cites the "missing middle"; however, it allows for rezoning residential streets to 6-story apartment buildings. These apartment buildings do nothing to address the "missing middle" and will make it unlivable for existing residents living in 2-3 story homes. Many homes in my neighborhood (the proposed 33rd and Fraser Village) are on smaller 80-ft deep lots. Per the plan, our short lots cannot be rezoned by themselves (without land assembly) and we could be faced with 6-storey buildings in our backyards. This is unlivable.

Existing residents in my neighborhood have already created density and have created ways to living here more affordable. We have built community, both within our homes and on our streets. For example, two families co-own our small 1200 sq ft home. Our neighbors have 3 families living in their home. Many neighbors have multiple generations in one home, thereby allowing adult children to support aging parents and aging parents to provide care for grandchildren. And many homes have already been redeveloped per existing zoning to allow 4 separate homes on one lot. Redeveloping our neighborhood will force us out, make it unaffordable to find something similar, and break up our existing community. This is being done with no benefit for future residents. The Plan has no guarantees for making housing that is built affordable for middle-income residents. The is also very little to address low-income residents. There are already vacancies and homes that are not selling in my neighborhood and throughout the city because they are unaffordable. The Government has already planned to buy out more than 2500 homes that have not sold to support people in a rent-to-own scheme. The Villages Plan would exacerbate this problem and force out all but the wealthy and elite in the City.

The Plan talks about residents being within a 5 minute walk from services and shops; however, the Plan does very little to address keeping and making streets safe for walking or for those biking or those using mobility aids. Increasing shopping in neighborhood streets

will increase car traffic. Specifically in my neighborhood, there are no plans for traffic calming, such as what is in place in other pedestrian friendly areas like West 10th Ave or the Commercial Drive neighborhood or Hastings-Sunrise. We already need to make Prince Albert and East 28th Ave streets that you cannot drive straight through. These both intersect with bike routes and drivers routinely run stop signs. Stop signs and roundabouts are inadequate for traffic calming. "No thru" except bikes and pedestrians are required. Additionally, maximum speed limits of 30 km/hr need to be implemented and enforced on all non-major streets in the Villages and across the City. The only proposed improvement for the proposed 33rd and Fraser/Knight Villages is a crossing at 31st and Knight. This is inadequate for current state let alone future state. We already see the blocks around Fraser and 30th/29th busy with car traffic.

Adding shops to these Villages will compete with existing businesses, especially locally owned businesses who are already struggling with high rents. We have lost great busy Community minded businesses along Fraser St due to unaffordability (e.g., Ubuntu, Cozy Café). We already have vacancies along Fraser St. The Plan makes no mention of how the City will make it affordable for local businesses and encourage businesses that residents actually need –grocery stores, produce markets, meat markets that are not owned by Loblaws or Jim Pattison; hardware stores; local gathering places – not more cannabis stores, vape shops, beauty shops etc.

Additionally, the Villages Plan would destroy the existing character of the neighborhoods. Homes that are over 100 years old and in good livable condition will be destroyed. The environmental impact alone of destroying and building new is shameful on the City of Vancouver. Old trees that provide much needed shade and cooling will be destroyed. The East side is already 1-2 degrees Celsius warmer than the West side due to having fewer trees and green space. We need more trees not more buildings. I see no plan for increasing access to community centres, libraries, parks, or recreation in my neighborhood. Gray's park is thriving and busy at all times. Adding thousands of residents will necessitate additional parks and gathering spaces for community.

I call upon this Council to vote against rezoning our neighborhoods <u>without our consent and consultation</u>.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kendrick

[redacted]

Appendix U

[redacted]

Dear Vancouver City Council,

Re Vancouver Villages Plan

I ask Vancouver Council members to vote against the Vancouver Villages scheme. A new city plan needs to emerge from neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood consultation, with accompanying plans for funded infrastructure, and an adaptive management mindset.

Remember the Freeways?

Sixty years ago, Vancouver rejected the idea of freeways dissecting our city, feeling that quality of life was worth more. Citizens vetoed the idea of bulldozing historic neighbourhoods and destroying vibrant communities. I ask City Council to find the same moral fibre and realize that it is repeating many of the mistakes of the Freeway plan, writ large.

I understand that the Freeway Plan and the Villages Plan have different origins and intentions, but there are notable similarities in process and irreversibility.

The approach on the Villages scheme amounts to external judgment pre-empting consultation on residents' wishes. Sixty years ago, city planners decreed that Strathcona was a slum, a blighted neighbourhood that needed renewal. Now we get city declarations that underused single family zones need to be transformed into Villages.

Today's Village plans will have the same effect as the Freeway Plan of carving up our city and wrecking established neighbourhoods, in ways that will later be deeply regretted... and cannot be reversed. Remember that City Council is still undoing the ills arising from the false start on the Freeway Plan: remaking Granville Street Bridge and planning to remove the unsightly and divisive Georgia / Dunsmuir viaduct. Such remedial action will not even be possible under the Villages plan as our neighbourhoods, once razed (even incrementally), cannot be recreated.

Vancouver is famous for the citizen revolt that killed the freeways yet now you ask us to trust a similar top-down redesign?

This plan causes upheaval and fear, to what end?

I live in the area designated as the West 16th and MacDonald so-called Village. We are currently a set of neighbours that have a supermarket and a scattering of other shops that serve us as well and support community spirit. Now, with a wave of a hand, said Council is planning to encourage surgical removal of our community, to be replaced by notional commercial-retail-

residential high rises. This makes no sense. We have no idea if such commercial space will even work in an area that has had low pedestrian circulation. Allow the neighbourhood to evolve organically, at its own pace.

Already the vultures are circling and contacting my immediate neighbours across the street to create Land Assemblies. The offers are couched in warm and sympathetic terms but are clearly aimed at unsettled people. Fear has entered our city blocks, with each household wondering who will start the dominoes falling.

Support neighbourhoods, without destroying them

Villages and other communities emerge through organic growth; they aren't mandated. All these neighbourhoods where new Villages are proposed have a life and a heartbeat of their own that will be snuffed out by externally dictated pronouncements.

I wonder why City Council would decide to establish new so-called Villages rather than strengthening and enhancing existing community hubs. When I travel to UBC, I see the dampened strip of Point Grey shops along West 10th, where the anchor shop Safeway has gone. That would be a great area to apply effort and thought. Upward growth there would be natural and logical… and mesh well with the new Jericho Lands development.

Jumping in with both feet is bad planning

It is very worrying that the city would embark on remaking 300 blocks at once, rather than tackling things slowly and learning from experience. I am a research biologist and I know it is plain dangerous to change everything at once. We should always take big steps in a spirit of adaptive management, including affected people, launching pilot studies, learning along the way, and modifying our plans based on those discoveries.

I hear no plans to address the capacity of schools, roads, parking, sewer and water services, childcare, community centres or other services. The Villages plan proposes massive rezoning for six storey buildings and retail development but has no plan in place for funded infrastructure. Instead, we get pie-in-the-sky wishful thinking with pretty artists' renderings of Utopian future. It all feels very Brave New World, and very unattractive.

Where is the demand?

I'm not understanding the burning need for this remaking of our city. About 40% more purpose-built rental homes were registered in 2025 than in 2024. The immediate forecast is for a supply surplus, many large housing developments are already underway in Vancouver, and Canada's population is declining. As a consequence, it seems that developers are pulling back.

It is telling that a proposed five story residential building at West 16th and Macdonald has been reshaped into a proposal for a hotel, a hotel that is both out of character and out of place in this neighborhood, one block from an elementary school.

Vancouver's consultation is neither meaningful nor democratic

I am dismayed that City Council has rushed the process of village planning and consultation. Citizens have hardly even woken up to the threat, and yet the final decisions are being discussed. Most people have not even heard about a plan that will permanently reshape our street and community. For a change of this scale, Council needs to consult neighbourhood by neighbourhood with proper open houses and genuine local discussions, not just administer one survey for the whole city.

In conclusion

I ask City Councillors to set aside this Vancouver Villages scheme in favour of a more measured plan that takes change slowly, consults residents carefully, anticipates infrastructure challenges, and learns from experience.

The freeway plan was to create modernization, a world class city. The Villages plan is sold as complete 15-minute neighbourhoods. Surely the narrow escape from the freeways plan should breed humility?

Thank you for your service to our city.

Yours truly,

[redacted]

Amanda Vincent, PhD