Report date range from: 7/14/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 4:00:00 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	12:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Feedback on the Commercial Street Village Plan in particular (though applicable for other villages as well). I am concerned that the proposed Commercial Street Village Plan risks undermining the very qualities that have made this neighbourhood successful and desirable in the first place. Commercial Street already exemplifies many of the objectives that the Village concept is intended to achieve. It is a vibrant, mixed-use neighbourhood where people can live, work, create, shop, and access services within walking distance. Unlike many areas that require significant redevelopment to create a diversity of uses, Commercial Street already has that diversity. One of the neighbourhood's greatest strengths is its unique mix of light industrial, commercial, residential, cultural, and employment spaces. On Commercial Street, a Michelin-recommended restaurant can exist beside an automotive repair shop, down the street from a busy bakery employing dozens of people, alongside artists' studios, galleries, heritage buildings, local businesses, and family-oriented housing. This mixture creates an authentic, economically diverse, and resilient community. The proposed plan appears to place many of these uses at risk. Light industrial spaces, affordable commercial units, arts and cultural venues, and family-oriented townhomes are difficult to replace once lost. Redevelopment pressures tend to favour higher-value residential projects, which may generate increased profits for developers and additional tax revenue for the City, but often at the expense of the employment spaces, cultural infrastructure, and neighbourhood character that made the area attractive in the first place. I am particularly concerned about the potential loss of affordable light industrial, arts and cultural spaces. Creative businesses, galleries, studios, and makerspaces are often displaced by redevelopment and rarely return once land values increase. Light industrial is increasingly pushed out of the city and far from those that work there, and those same people frequent the businesses on this street. These spaces contribute significantly to the identity of Commercial Street and should be protected rather than treated as interim uses awaiting redevelopment. The neighbourhood already contains numerous purpose-built rental buildings, many of which are four storeys in height. While additional housing is an important city-wide objective, growth should be balanced against the capacity of existing infrastructure and community services. Today, the area is already experiencing pressures on: School capacity, with only one local school serving the area; Community amenities, including a community centre that is already heavily utilized; Parking availability and transportation infrastructure; Public and green spaces that support existing residents. The plan does not appear to adequately address how these essential services and amenities will keep pace with significant additional population growth. Most importantly, I believe the proposal fails to recognize that Commercial Street already functions as a successful village. It already contains a mix of housing, employment, culture, retail, services, and walkable amenities. The goal should not be to replace this successful model with a more intensive form of development, but rather to preserve and strengthen the characteristics that have made the neighbourhood distinctive. Growth should be carefully managed to protect employment lands, light industrial uses, cultural spaces, heritage buildings, family-oriented housing, and the eclectic mix of businesses that define Commercial Street. Without stronger protections, there is a real risk that redevelopment will erode the very qualities that residents, workers, artists, and visitors value most about the neighbourhood. In its current form, I do not support the plan and urge the City to revise it to prioritize the protection of existing employment spaces, arts and cultural uses, heritage character, and community infrastructure before pursuing additional density.	Tasha Gallagher	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-14	12:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	PDF attached. See also hxxps://housingreset[.]ca/2026/06/18/letter-to-vancouver-on-villages-planning-program/ *We recommend that City Council not proceed with the public hearing as planned in July, or vote “not supported” if it cannot be cancelled.* We are Metro Vancouver urbanists, planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics with decades of experience—some with development backgrounds—who have come together through HousingReset.ca to seek enduring housing solutions. We write with deep concern about the City of Vancouver “Villages Planning Program” scheduled to go to public hearing on July 14. 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. We recommend that City Council not proceed with the public hearing as planned in July, or vote “not supported” if it cannot be cancelled. We are concerned that most residents are unaware about the magnitude of these proposed zoning bylaws, that would substantially impact neighbourhoods and harm existing neighbourhood commercial areas. However, that is precisely what this proposal will do. 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 — 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.	organization Housing Reset		

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.

Signed:
(In alphabetical order)
Larry Beasley, CM, FCIP, Former Co-chief Planner of Vancouver, author Vancouverism.
Patrick Condon, Professor Emeritus UBC School of Landscape and Architecture, author Broken City. Former head city planner
Frank Ducote, Principal, Frank Ducote Urban Design, former Senior Urban Designer, City of Vancouver
Michael Geller,FCIP, RPP, MLAI, Ret Architect AIBC, urban planner, real estate consultant, developer and Adjunct Professor, SFU
Barbara Gordon, Retired Architect AIBC and retired Director of Capital Planning, UBC
Penny Gurstein, PhD, MCIP (ret.) Professor Emeritus and Former Director, School of Community and Regional Planning, Co-Director, Housing Research Collaborative, UBC
Scot Hein, Retired Architect MAIBC/Former COV and UBC Senior Urban Designer and Development Planner/Adjunct Professor Urban Design UBC/SFU Faculty Continuing Studies/Founding Board Member Urbanarium/Board Member Small Housing BC/Housing Advocate
Norman Hotson, Retired Architect AIBC, FRAIC, RCA, Hon PIBC
Sandy James, former City of Vancouver City Planner, Managing Director Walk Metro Vancouver
David Ley,OC, FRSC, PhD, Urban Geographer, Professor Emeritus UBC, author Housing Booms in Gateway Cities
Mike Mangan, Barrister & Solicitor (Ret.), who worked with the real estate industry for many years, authored The Condominium Manual and taught at UBC for 25 years
Darlene Marzari, first a Social Planner at City of Vancouver, fought the Freeway to save Chinatown/Gastown/waterfront, City of Vancouver Councillor, BC Minister of Municipal

				Affairs, and established the Liveable Region Strategic Plan (1990) Bill McCreery, former registered architect AIBC & AAA, helped create North & South False Creek & thousands of units of developer, public & social housing in BC, Alberta & UK, developed several Vancouver residential projects Sean McEwen, Retired Architect AIBC, FRAIC. Affordable housing advocate Graham McGarva, FRAIC, Retired Architect AIBC, M.A. Elizabeth Murphy, private sector project manager, and senior property development officer, formerly with the City of Vancouver's housing and properties department, BC Housing and BC Buildings Corp Brian Palmquist,Award winning architect and author, AIBC MRAIC BEP CP LEED AP Tom Phipps, Retired Senior Planner City of Vancouver (33 years) Mary Pynenburg MRAIC (Retired) MCIP (Retired) Former Director of Planning City of New Westminster, Former Director of Planning and Development City of Kelowna, former Director of Design / Development CP Hotels Robert Renger, BES, MCP; Consultant City Planner; Former Senior Development Planner and City's lead for UniverCity at SFU, City of Burnaby Mary Beth Rondeau, Ret Architect AIBC Former Urban Designer City of Vancouver Ralph Segal,MAIBC (ret.) Former Chief Urban Designer / Development Planner, City of Vancouver Ray Spaxman, ARIBA (Rtd), MRTPI (Rtd,) FCIP, Hon AIBC, LL.D, Director of Planning, City of Vancouver 1973-1989 Sara Stevens, PhD, Associate Professor UBC School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Chair of Urban Design, Co-founder of Architects Against Housing Alienation Erick Villagomez, Lecturer UBC School of Community and Regional Planning, Principal, Mētis Design | Build, Editor-in-Chief, Spacing Vancouver Arny Wise, B. Comm., M.Sc., RPP, MCIP (ret), urban planner/ retired developer (President, Synergy Develop., VP Development, Goldfan Holdings), Board of Directors Toronto Economic Development Corporation (1990-1999) David Wong, Architect, AIBC; formerly with Engineering & Planning Dept. City of Vancouver Elvin Wyly, Ph.D., Professor of Geography and Urban Studies, UBC			
2026-07-14	12:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It's called "constructive expropriation". I have seen the letter sent by the City to property owners which takes away their building rights. No laneway house, no multiplex, no new house, no duplex. This is outrageous! Who is going to buy their property now? Only a developer and that developer will wait them out- for years- until he gets it cheap. You can't take away building rights that other property owners in the area have and tell these 750 lots that their only option is 4-6 storey with commercial on the bottom!! Every property owner in Vancouver should be alarmed because the creep of this type of zoning restriction is going to continue to happen. I know because I can't build a multiplex even though properties across the lane from me, properties on an arterial even can build a multiplex. I can't because of 2018 pre-zoning to RM8A townhouse. I thought my situation was bad enough (and for the record I again ask for the City to amend RM8A NOW!!!) but this - what Josh White calls "retail expansion" on the backs of Vancouver's property owners is "constructive expropriation" without paying a cent for the property. In fact, the owner gets further fleeced because they have to pay property taxes. All property owners be warned "constructive expropriation" will happen to you next!	Carey Murphy	South Cambie	

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	12:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Writing to provide community feedback regarding the rezoning of the Victoria , Beatrice Street, Alice Street and surrounding neighbourhood from R1-1 to R3-1. I, and other community members, are firmly opposed to the rezoning of this area into apartments. As families that live in this neighbourhood, the existing mix of apartments and houses has created a "village". The shift to more low-rise apartments and mixed use residential buildings will significantly impact the livability of the area, as the increased apartments and residents, will increase and provide reduced access to services. One of the key issues with the rezoning is related to affordability of housing and the downturn within the development market. As most individuals that follow the Vancouver housing market know, there has been a significant downturn in the market, with many developers moving into bankruptcy and apartments remaining empty throughout the city. Affordability is a factor of multiple things - including the volume of housing available and the cost associated with the housing. As we have seen, despite the downturn, this has not led to developers decreasing rental or sale prices for apartments. Without regulatory or other intervention to decrease rental rates and the unwillingness of developers to decrease the sales price, the increase of housing in the market will not actually improve affordability. We have been seeing this trend play out not only in Vancouver, but other metropolitan areas like Toronto. The increase in housing has only led to an increase in empty homes or bankruptcies, rather than providing actual affordable housing. Beyond housing, sufficient and appropriate infrastructure must be in place to enable a neighbourhood to become a "village" and provide services to its residents. With the new developments along Victoria Drive and Commercial Street, no additional infrastructure is being put in place. Although low-rise apartments and mixed use residential buildings have some commercial facilities at street level, none of these provide necessary infrastructure (e.g. grocery stores, community centres, etc.). Without these additions, the businesses and services in the neighbourhood will be woefully overwhelmed with the influx of residents. Other cities, such as North Vancouver, have clear requirements about developments, such as the requirement for community centres / other community buildings to be developed within a specific radius of X volume of residents. The city of Vancouver does not have these same requirements and we are seeing the impacts of an increased volume of residents and limited services throughout the city today. Another factor that must be considered is the volume of people moving to, staying, or leaving the city. With an aging population, immigration restrictions in place, and continued affordability challenges in Vancouver, there continues to be a shift in individuals leaving the city to other areas (e.g. Calgary, the lower mainland). As stated earlier, increasing the volume / availability of housing is not going to improve affordability or livability. These factors, among other issues, such as the economic situation, are creating a perfect storm that is not suitable for the development of additional housing at high prices. Commercial Street and Victoria Drive are well known hubs of community activity in the city - the development of apartments will ruin the existing community here while putting significant pressure on existing services. It is important for cities to grow and develop, however, for cities to attract and retain residents, affordability, livability, and infrastructure are critical to long-term success. If the city is truly interested in the best interests of Vancouverites and developing "villages" across the city, the rezoning is not the right approach to achieve those aims.	Anchita Kaushik	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	12:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the villages rezoning plan	Liz Thomas	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	12:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am vehemently against the Villages Plan set out by the City of Vancouver. I think it is unjust and despicable that the City of Vancouver thinks it is ok to take away homeowners rights. The thought that we cannot increase the size of our homes or build a laneway home for our kids (as the city of Vancouver housing and rental prizes are incredibly out of reach for many) or to retire to. Our only realistic choice will be to live “as is” until we can sell to a developer who will most likely let our home (the home we raised our families in, socialized with neighbours, supported neighbourhood shops) decay until they are ready to redevelop it. Families will never again be able to add to their homes – no renovations that add floor space; no laneways. Our only option will be to live in our homes without additions while developers slowly scoop up pairs or triplets of existing homes. It is disgraceful that City Council can invent zoning wherever they wish, which may restrict homeowners from modestly and incrementally improve their homes. You are taking away homeowners ability to make adjustments to their homes to better provide for their families, such as adding floor space to help out adult children, who even with fair paying jobs are not able to move out independently, or adding space to take care of aging parents and helping provide for their disabled children who will never have the ability to live independently Not only are you taking our rights away as homeowners and tax payers but you are also making it even more impossible to stay living in Vancouver. By not having the option of adding space to our homes or rebuilding on our property as a single home with a suite or a duplex, you have tied our hands. You have taken any and all value of our actual homes, as if we try to sell we are only being based on the lot value – which means we will get less for our property than what the entirety of the lot and house are worth. Homeowners rights and financials aside, the amount of extra people you are trying to bring into small pockets of the city is insane. It is already crazy trying to maneuver through the city. Traffic is at an all time high, bikes and scooter are overtaking not only the roads but sidewalks and the lack of infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, family doctors, etc. is not there for this big surge in the population. The construction at Oakridge alone is too much for the area and yet you want to increase more. I am constantly walking in my neighbourhood and notice that so much retail space is empty because the rent is too high for these mom and pop shops that they only last weeks to months before they have to shut down their business yet you are wanting to add more retail space that no small business will be able to afford. To reiterate- we do not want said villages to be built to make developers richer and homeowners loss their homes and their rights to improve their living space.	Kerrie Corrigan	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	12:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It is disgraceful that City Council can invent zoning wherever they wish, which may restrict homeowners from modestly and incrementally improve their homes. You are taking away homeowners ability to make adjustments to their homes to better provide for their families, such as adding floor space to help out adult children, who even with fair paying jobs are not able to move out independently, or adding space to take care of aging parents and helping provide for their disabled children who will never have the ability to live independently. Homeowners rights and financials aside, the amount of extra people you are trying to bring into small pockets of the city is insane. It is already crazy trying to maneuver through the city. Traffic is at an all time high, bikes and scooter are overtaking not only the roads but sidewalks and the lack of infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, family doctors, etc. is not there for this big surge in the population. The construction at Oakridge alone is too much for the area and yet you want to increase more. I am constantly walking in my neighbourhood and notice that so much retail space is empty because the rent is too high for these mom and pop shops that they only last weeks to months before they have to shut down their business yet you are wanting to add more retail space that no small business will be able to afford. To reiterate- we do not want said villages to be built to make developers richer and homeowners loss their homes and their rights to improve their living space.	Sean Goodwin	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	12:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages plan, particularly the plan for the Fraserhood area, the area I live in. I think this is a hastily put together plan which will not effectively address the housing issue. I would like to see how the city is planning to expand other community services to keep up with the increasing density.	Tracy T	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	12:30	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 Plan as it relates to the Fraser & 33rd and Knight & 33rd villages. The street I live on is in both of these village areas and I am deeply concerned about the scale of the proposed development. The proposed height and density are too high for established residential neighbourhoods and are not necessary to achieve the City's objective of creating walkable communities with local amenities and the missing middle housing. These goals can be met through lower-rise development that is more compatible with the character of surrounding single-family neighbourhoods. Six-storey buildings may be appropriate along major arterial roads, but not on residential streets, including bike routes along Windsor St and East 37th Ave. I am also concerned that this plan will encourage land speculation, driving up property values without meaningfully addressing housing affordability. Increased land values will make it even more difficult to deliver genuinely affordable housing. I urge the City to reconsider and redesign the Villages Plan for the Fraser & 33rd and Knight & 33rd areas through a genuine community planning process that meaningfully involves the residents who live here. Together these two village plans will significantly transform our community. We deserve a neighbourhood plan developed in partnership with the community that will produce better outcomes than a top-down planning approach.	Marlene Wells	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-14	12:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I love the idea of "villages" around Vancouver but it's important to remember what makes Vancouver so special--it's not towers. Lets see more low-rise and mid-rise developments in these areas. Commercial Street is the perfect example. It is the perfect street in Vancouver. Please don't destroy it.	Sam Burkhart	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	12:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It is a problem to rezone in a way that does not allow residential uses to continue. If my house burned down I want to be able to rebuild so we can still stay in our community and my child can still go to his school catchment	Dawn Stenzel	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	12:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I live in the [redacted] with my wife my children and my grandchildren Killarney neighborhood already caters to all our needs for us seniors and for adult children and our young preschoolers and all these facilities are already at walking distance from our beautiful home We definitely are NOT in favour of the new proposed plan for our neighborhood Let’s keep it the way it is as it is very convenient and workable for us residents All facilities are actually very accessible and at walking distance We don’t want to see change Thank you	Shaina D'Souza	Killarney	
2026-07-14	12:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The following correspondence includes the following details and four letters received by the City Clerk's Office: "Dear City Clerk I am unable to attend the Village Plan meeting on Tuesday evening due to illness. Please distribute the attached letters among the Mayor and Council members and then please share the attached letters during the Village Plan Program meeting on Tuesday, July 14, 2026. Many residents have signed the letter titled "Preservation of Greenery on Sasamat Street." Thank you for your consideration and distribution. Sincerely Dr. Hinda Avery [redacted]"	Hinda Avery		Attachment 1 Appendix A Appendix B
2026-07-14	12:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan. I think it is too much and too fast. There is no need to rush something that isn’t fully vetted, that hasn’t provided the public the chance to provide genuine input, and is irreversible. I endorse Larry Beasley’s recommendation.	Vincent Lok	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	12:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	To the Mayor and Members of Vancouver City Council, I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed rezoning of the Kerrisdale 33rd Avenue neighbourhood to permit larger apartment buildings and increased density. I have lived in this neighbourhood since I was a child. For me, Kerrisdale is more than a collection of streets and houses—it is home. It is one of the few places where people still greet their neighbours by name, where children can safely play outside, and where the quiet, tree-lined streets provide a sense of peace that is increasingly rare in a growing city. Some of my happiest childhood memories were made here. I spent countless hours riding my bike, playing with friends in the back lanes, running through the neighbourhood, and enjoying the freedom that comes from living in a safe and close-knit community. Those experiences were possible because of the character of this neighbourhood. It was never just about the buildings—it was about the environment they created.	Eden Lee	Kerrisdale	

				The proposed rezoning threatens to fundamentally change that character. Higher-density development will inevitably bring more traffic, more congestion, greater demand on parking, increased noise, and the removal of mature trees and green spaces that have taken decades to grow. The peaceful atmosphere that residents have carefully preserved will gradually disappear. While each new development may seem insignificant on its own, together they permanently transform the neighbourhood into something entirely different. Once that character is lost, it cannot be recreated. Cities certainly need to plan for growth, and I recognize the importance of addressing housing needs. However, growth should not come at the expense of every established neighbourhood that provides important social, environmental, and cultural value. Not every community should be expected to sacrifice the qualities that make it unique. A healthy city requires diversity—not only in housing types, but also in neighbourhood character. Kerrisdale's mature tree canopy helps improve air quality, reduce urban heat, provide wildlife habitat, and create one of Vancouver's most beautiful residential environments. Replacing family homes and gardens with larger developments inevitably reduces permeable green space and places additional pressure on existing infrastructure, schools, utilities, and roads. This is not simply a debate about zoning. It is about what kind of city we want future generations to inherit. If these rezoning plans move forward, future children may never experience the same carefree childhood that many of us were fortunate to have here. They may never know what it feels like to grow up on quiet streets where neighbours look out for one another, where towering trees define the landscape, and where a genuine sense of community exists. Development can always happen elsewhere. But once the character of Kerrisdale is erased, it is gone forever. I respectfully ask Council to carefully consider not only the projected number of housing units that may result from rezoning, but also the irreplaceable social, environmental, and community value that stands to be lost. Decisions made today will shape this neighbourhood for generations. Please protect the unique character of Kerrisdale and reject the proposed rezoning of the 33rd Avenue area.			
2026-07-14	12:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please abandon the current blanket Villages initiative. Instead, the City adopt a community planning approach to fully realize existing Neighbourhood Centres and to identify potential future village locations through area-targeted intensive public engagement, spread over time, directly with specifically affected local stakeholders.	Cathy Liu	West End	
2026-07-14	12:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	small lot redevelop without proper arrangement of parking slot for small units will led to street parking congestion in neighbourhood area.	XIAO PING FENG	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
2026-07-14	12:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The loss of the tree canopy currently in the homes' front and backyards will be catastrophic. I absolutely do not support this at all and will actively vote for any council members who are approving this. You are taking trees away from future generations that can never grow back to the way these mature trees are, and also not having adequate consultation about the community and the environmental impact.	Sandra Lee	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	12:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Previously we were in a strict design control area at 2100 block Napier recognizing our proximity to Commercial drive. Now it is proposed that we will be in an area where you can build 6 storeys right next to a house or duplex totally shading their yard. But if you want to put up a modest duplex instead, it can only be 2-1/2 storeys not 3 storeys. This makes no sense as allowing the duplex only 2-1/2 storeys rather than 3 storeys (as is allowed for single family in the rest of the proposed village on other side of Nanaimo) often leads developers to build a extremely long duplex to gain the allowed 0.75 FSR. Just take a look at the build currently underway at 2145 Napier which is 2-1/2 stories with very little yard left and totally shading my neighbour's back yard. So 6 storey height for big developer builds and design controls for duplexes that don't promote green space! In addition, the 2-1/2 storey limit on modest developments which promotes longer buildings (compared to 3 storeys) also doesn't make sense since the new plan allows a lane house in addition to the front duplex.	Peter Trainor	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	13:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My neighbours and I oppose the Village Plan in our neighbourhood in Katsulano. This lacks consultation and does not address the housing affordability issue at all, as these properties on the west side of Vancouver will be selling for millions of dollars. This will increase the wealth of developers and destroy our community's fabric and character, as well as the destruction of tens of thousands of mature trees in Vancouver that provide the needed canopy and bulwark against climate change. We will vote in October to get anyone who votes yes on this council out.	Sandra Lee	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	13:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the application. In the area that I live, it is very already very crowded due to too many multiplexes and townhouses. There is no parking - not even in front of my own house. People are getting into car accidents fighting for a parking spot. My husband has been almost hit several times because of this problem. It is very noisy and people are angry. Also, people are parking in the lanes that are already so narrow. So garbage trucks and recycling trucks can't get through and we don't get our garbage picked up! Building more villages will make this the same problem throughout the city. It is not right. New buildings must provide enough parking for all its units and not rely on street parking. The city has made it our problem and it doesn't care!! Before our neighbour was friendly, now it is noisy and angry and people are not happy living there.	Mei-Kui Lee	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	13:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Allowing six-stories on residential streets that are presently comprised of single detached homes will have an enormous and irreversible impact on the community. It would make far more sense to start with allowing six stories on the streets with bus routes or with prexisting commercial spaces (eg, 33rd and Mackenzie, and along Mackenzie where the #2 bus runs)? Start there, and then expand the zoning to the "side" streets if/when the main roads are all developed and there is still more demand or need for further density, rather than going too far too fast.	Amanda Wyne	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	13:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I want to stay in my home until I die. I don't want to change anything.	Irene Mo Tong	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	13:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and City Councillors: As a resident of Vancouver I am very concerned about the Villages proposal because there has not been enough public engagement, the character of these 'villages' will be eroded rather than enhanced, communities will be destabilized in favour of corporate occupants, plus they will force land values up and up making neighbourhoods even more unaffordable. I responded to a survey on the Villages proposal and to me it sounded a lot different from what is now being proposed. I never expected massive multiplexes to be put up along quiet side streets, I thought that they would just be on main streets. Please scrap the current Villages initiative and work with existing neighbourhood centres through community planning with the public and BIAs. And no multiplexes on side streets. So many other municipalities have had major issues with gigantic multiplexes next to single family homes and duplexes. They don't fit with the neighbourhood and lack character and are very block-like. There has been an enormous backlash against multiplexes in Burnaby and elsewhere as the CBC wrote in their October 2025 article, "Public backlash to 'gigantic' multiplex homes in Burnaby, B.C., has council scaling back." And property owners have been shocked to find that under the Villages plan, if it is approved, they will not be allowed to expand or add to their homes or build any other housing type other than four-to-six-storey apartments with ground-floor retail. How is this fair or democratic? Please scrap the Villages proposal. Thank you.	Lisa Penney	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	13:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose to the Villages Plan and th rezonimg in the Victoria drive &E 61 ave	Laura Tsang	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
2026-07-14	13:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My name is Catherine Foo, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the villages planning program. I have lived in Vancouver for the past 40 years , and my property in McKenzie Heights is already zoned for commercial use. Because of my unique position as a long term resident and a local commercial property owner, I can tell you firsthand that the city's top down "village " plan is fundamentally flawed and disconnected from neighborhood reality. The City is using the word "village" to promote high-density, six-to-eight stories concrete buildings. This completely distorts what a true village is. McKenzie Height has maintained its community charm precisely because of its own low-impact, human- scale design. As someone who owns commercially zoned property in this neighborhood, I am deeply concerned about the following impacts: Flooding and Unstable Commercial market: the city's plan to force nearly one million square feet of new retail spaces across Vancouver is reckless. In neighborhood like ours. Independent businesses already struggle with high property taxes, inflation, and shifting demographics. Forcing mass commercial pre-zoning into these areas will cannibalize existing storefronts and lead to a wave of vacant, dead streets capes rather than a thriving "Village " Severe Traffic and Infrastructure Strain: McKenzie Heights does not have the transit infrastructure or road's capacity to handle the sudden, massive influx of density proposed. Forcing multi-stories apartments blocks into our quiet neighborhood will create severe traffic gridlock and overwhelmed our local utilities and schools. The Loss of Democratic Process: Implementing blanket city-wide pre-zoning for 13,000+ lots removes the democratic right of residents to have a say in site-by-site developments. It takes the future of our neighborhoods out of the hands of the community and hands it over to corporate developers to build generic, uniform blocks. Thoughtful housing options are important, but destroying the character of established neighborhoods with generic, unappealing high-density structures is a mistake. As a 40 years resident who understands the local commercial landscape, I urge Council to reject this program and protect the genuine village atmosphere of McKenzie Heights, which I enjoy the slow pace and greenery of the 40 years.	Catherine Foo		

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	13:31	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We have owned our property by the Granville St & West 41st Ave Village for upwards of 40 years, took the time and care for a full renovation instead of a new build in 2018 and have lived in our home since 2019. With school aged children, our plans are long term and we have set our roots to this area. I find it concerning the amount of new building and rezoning that continuously happens around us. The speed at which these new developments are applied for and approved do not fit the demand of the area as it currently stands with many brand new units sitting unoccupied and empty. The rezoning of this area does not make complete sense to me and the supposed public outreach for input has been severely lacking as we have barely heard anything about it until the recent Notice of Public Hearing. Our home sits 1 block shy of the Granville St and W 41st Ave Village and my question is why? Why has such a large area been commandeered to be rezoned into this village and our block is not? What is the plan for our block and the surrounding homes who are our neighbours? Will we be completely engulfed by rezoned highrises in our otherwise quiet community? Will our properly value stay the same while others profit from rises since developers can swoop in and build up? It seems more thought needs to go into these Villages before they can move forward and I call for due diligence and public information to halt the current proceedings.	Melanie Leung	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-14	13:42	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 draft Villages Planning Program as currently proposed for Kensingston Cedar Cottage area. While I support the need for additional housing, the current framework threatens the livability and unique character of our existing neighbourhoods without guaranteeing true affordability. Specifically, I urge you to vote against or refer this proposal back to staff due to the following concerns:Forced and Unnecessary Retail Expansion: The plan mandates ground-floor commercial space in areas where existing neighbourhood shopping streets are already struggling and facing high vacancy rates. Adding nearly one million square feet of new retail space will harm established businesses rather than support them. Property Development Freezes: The current plan freezes properties closest to proposed intersections, preventing existing homeowners from building additions or adapting their homes while we wait for redevelopment. Loss of Participatory Planning: The Villages Plan bypasses the crucial need for neighborhood-specific planning. Blanket, city-wide rezoning overrides local voices and erases the unique context that makes Vancouver’s distinct communities so vibrant. Speculative Pressures: Prezoning grants massive land lift without adequate community benefit or guaranteed non-market, affordable housing. This risks increasing speculative inflation in the housing market rather than solving the affordability crisis. I urge Council to postpone the adoption of this plan and engage in meaningful, transparent consultation with local residents and existing small businesses.	Julie Ng	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

Report date range from: 7/14/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 4:00:00 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	13:50	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Subject: Against the Villages Plan Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing to share my strong opposition to the Villages Plan. I do not agree that we need a Villages plan along with the Official Development Plan and the Broadway Plan. Please stop the rush to development . This is ridiculous. As others have said we just end up with too much oversupply. Never mind the drastic changes to the city, the loss of so many trees and negative impacts to people's neighbourhoods and quality of life. Please stop. Please slow the change and development down. This should NOT be rushed.	Heidi Nucklaus	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-14	13:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a resident of Vancouver for 20 years, I strongly oppose this plan!!	Sydney Porter	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	13:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Having lived in the area of Granville and 41st, which you intend to make into a village area I totally object to this live here a long time all it will do is cause my taxes to increase because you're changing the zoning. No building will be done for at least 10 years as it's 22,000 unsold condos in Vancouver and many new buildings at your building on Granville and Main Street for rent that are empty. Plus you have massive building gonna go on at the old army base fourth Avenue the Towers that are built on Burrard Street or empty as the rent is too high. You'll be ruining a perfectly good area of the City Of Vancouver why try to make it like New York City with no green no grass and just a bunch of terrible buildings	Robert Freedman	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	14:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan and endorse Larry Beasley's recommendation.	So Ying Lok	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	14:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Regarding the entire plan and specifically the Village proposed at West 49th that includes Granville and Oak Street: 1. This is an untested, all-at-once rollout across the entire city. The plan doesn't propose to pilot the "village" concept in an area and evaluate the results. It upzones over 13,000 parcels across 17 separate neighbourhoods simultaneously, with no phasing and no opportunity to test the model before committing the whole city to it. If this concept has merit, Council should be able to demonstrate that with a pilot. Asking residents in 17 different neighbourhoods to accept irreversible zoning change, all at once, on the strength of a theory, is not responsible planning. This is an extraordinarily aggressive rollout. 2. It strips residents and property owners of procedural fairness and individualized review. Because this is a City-initiated rezoning rather than case-by-case applications, the roughly 13,000 affected property owners lose the right to a public hearing specific to their own block. That is a significant loss of procedural fairness in relation to one of the most dramatic rezoning proposals the City has experienced. Many of my neighbours learned about this project last week when receiving notice for this hearing in the mail. 3. The timing directly contradicts the housing market and the government's actions. Weeks ago, Prime Minister Carney announced a plan for government to buy up thousands of unsold, vacant new condo units in Vancouver. We are not short of built housing stock, we have an over-supply, which continue to lie empty. Council is being asked to approve a further wave of upzoning at the very moment our governments are spending public money to bail out an acknowledged surplus. Adding more supply deepens the same oversupply problem taxpayers are now being called on to underwrite. 4. This will not make housing more affordable. Upzoning increases land value, which flows into land cost, not into lower purchase or rent prices. We have direct, current evidence of this in our own city: thousands of newly built condo units are sitting empty because the market has already outpaced demand at those price points. The practical effect of this plan will be higher land values and more speculation - not relief for the people it claims to help. Given the scale of what's being asked, the lack of any pilot or testing, the loss of individualized review for thousands of property owners, and the fact that we are compounding an acknowledged housing surplus rather than addressing it, this plan ought to be rejected.	Anne Cochrane	Oakridge	

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	14:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have reviewed the proposed village plans and I find the one that is planned for my neighborhood, Granville St & W 41sst Ave Village, to be not be implemented. Its existing size should be retained instead of the proposed massive expansion into nearby residential neighborhoods, heavily affecting the quiet streets enjoyed by the residents and visitors. Additionally, we have already commercial districts/centers in all directions: Kerrisdale Village to the West, Marpole Village to the South, South Granville/Broadway to the North, and Oakridge Mall/Oak-41st Community to the East. Adding another node in the middle creates no positive impact on the neighborhood. Our neighborhood around Granville and 41st are famous for its attractive quiet residential streetscape offering pedestrians, pets, and cyclists great walking experiences. I have friends specifically drive out here to walk their pet and take photos the in canopies. Expanding commercial space into this neighborhood would only negatively impact this neighborhood. Please change the proposal to exclude this Village proposal.	Andy Wang	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	14:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	1. On the Loss of Neighborhood Livability & Greenery: Our neighborhood's beauty, mature tree canopy, and quiet character are vital to the health of our community. The proposed R3-4 and C-2E zoning allows for massive building footprints that will result in the clear-cutting of mature trees, the elimination of backyard green spaces, and the loss of natural light for surrounding homes. Replacing our green, livable streetscapes with dense concrete structures will permanently ruin the character and livability of this neighborhood. 2. On Construction Fatigue & Market Saturation: Furthermore, Vancouver is already facing intense construction fatigue. There are countless housing projects currently under construction across the city. We have already approved massive density increases under the Broadway Plan and Multiplex policies. Our local infrastructure, construction labor force, and housing market need time to absorb and digest these existing developments first. Flooding 17 villages with blanket pre-zoning right now will only lead to endless neighborhood disruption, traffic congestion, and half-finished assembly sites without actually delivering occupied housing any faster.	Raymond Chang	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	14:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attachd is a handwritten letter from Suzan Gregg.	Suzan Gregg	Hastings-Sunrise	Appendix C
2026-07-14	14:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Strongly oppose rezoning!!! Rosemont Drive is a quiet, peaceful area. Many of us have been in our homes 30 to 40 years. Forcing residents and seniors from their loving homes is destructive and stressful. It is an unkind act!	Sharlene Hallam	Killarney	
2026-07-14	14:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter from Gillian Chetty addressed to Councillors Fry, Bligh, Maloney and Orr.	Gillian Chetty	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix D

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	14:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	No to apartment buildings on 50’ lots	Rosamund Russell	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	14:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to the Villages Planning Program, mainly due to the amount of rezoning that would take place to 17 areas of the city.	Anne Nickerson	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	14:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter from Gillian Chetty addressed to Councillors Montague, Kirby-Yung, Zhou, Dominato, Meiszner and Mayor Sim.	Gillian Chetty	Dunbar-Southlands	Appendix E
2026-07-14	14:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Hi, I hope all is well, Our opposition comes from the perspective of two hard working professionals in their mid 40s who have only recently been able to purchase an older single family home after saving for 15 years. The general concern is that, despite our intention to raise our 4 year old daughter, we are now suddenly facing a potential re-assessment of the area to the "highest use value" and potentially not being able to absorb further increases to the cost of living despite having no intention of moving. Why rezone the entire area, drive up property taxes (with BC assessments being somewhat grey regarding "best use") before any real development plans or market acceptance been determined. Seems like we are putting the cart before the horse, unlocking the potential of the area and getting the ball rolling on increasing property tax revenue, while anything would take years to plan, if a developer even sees it as a feasible in this market. And in addition, moving is a VERY real expense, with transfer taxes, realtor fees, professional fees being extremely very material in this city. Ultimately, putting pressure on recent purchasers, is very real and even with planning in this high credit society. Thank you for your time.	Sing Ho	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
2026-07-14	14:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am 100 percent against the “villages plan” that has been brought forward by city council. This plan would destroy already established neighbourhood that each have their own character and shape our city. You are allowing Vancouver to be carved up like a steak by developers. Now that large streets such as Oak, Cambie and Granville street have all been built on, now you need to find more land to give these developers. A majority of people who live in Vancouver especially my neighbourhood of Mackenzie and 33rd do not want 6 story apartment buildings. We do not want to live in 500 and 600 sq foot condos and pay 400-500 in strata fees every month. We cannot raise families in these condos. People do not want to live over a pharmacy or a Subway or another Dollarstore. You use the word “village” and “housing” as a way to cover up the real truth of these plans. It’s just a way to tick your box to say you are building more homes. A way to feed hungry developers. A way to build these grey concrete shoe box condos which no one really wants to live in. A condo is not a house and a village is not two or three blocks of apartment buildings with all the trees cut down. You show people having these large bikes and people walking with strollers in the picture. This is impossible in a condo. I know because I have lived it. Building more of this density and destroying neighbourhoods has not made anything more affordable. Townhouses are still over 2 million. Then you are paying almost 1000 if not more in strata fees a month. Then you have to pay 100,000 in gst and 25,000 or more in property transfer tax. The townhouse has no backyard for your kids and you have to live with constant noise from neighbours or neighbours that actually never live in the building because they just bought it as an investment or for a year so their kids could go to school in Vancouver before they move back home overseas. You are just making less and less single family homes. The remaining homes then become more precious and increase in price and are bought by foreign investors or overseas buyers which increases the price even more. People want to buy homes with a back yard to raise their families. Building some small starter homes is actually what is needed. Stop building condos and stop building them where no one wants them. The “missing middle” as presented in the document is not the kind of buildings the middle class want to live in. You just make it easier for developers, and housing investors continue to take over the Vancouver housing market. If you wanted to help people make it more affordable than having policy like getting rid of the property transfer tax and building actual neighbourhoods families want to live. You are just forcing people to leave Vancouver in the thousands for better housing opportunities elsewhere. I believe the New Village plan does not include the neighbourhood where the current mayor lives. If this is such a good plan then why doesn’t the Mayor live in one these so called “villages” with all his children in a condo or a multiplex where you purchase the basement unit for 1.7 million dollars.	Michele McRoberts	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	14:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Totally against the Village Plan = 100% Thanks for continuing to ruin the city.	Rick Gerry	Killarney	

2026-07-14	14:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "RE: Vancouver Villages Plan: Strongly Oppose," containing 41 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix F
2026-07-14	14:38	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 as a property owner in the Nanaimo Street and East Broadway Village regarding the proposed Villages Plan. I support the City's goal of increasing housing supply, including near transit. My concern is not with that goal. It's that residents affected by this rezoning don't yet have enough clarity on what is actually being decided, and the timing of this hearing doesn't help. A single hearing in mid-July falls when many residents are travelling or occupied with the shifting schedules of the school break. This timing doesn't just reduce turnout, it removes the normal back-and-forth between neighbours, comparing notes, checking facts, working out what a proposal like this actually means for their own property, before anyone submits formal input. That matters here especially, because working out what it means for your property is harder than it should be. Here's a specific example from my own situation. My property sits inside both the Villages Plan area and the provincially designated Transit-Oriented Area near Broadway-Commercial Station. The draft plan says TOA sites may redevelop independent of the local development pathway, but it doesn't confirm which sites those are. It points residents to the Transit-Oriented Areas Designation By-law instead, since the map in the draft plan is explicitly marked illustrative only. So a resident can't confirm their own entitlement from the Villages Plan document itself. They have to cross-reference a separate 50-plus megabyte legal by-law to figure out how the two rules apply to their site. If that's what it takes to understand a basic entitlement, it's not reasonable to expect the broader public, most of whom don't work in planning or property, to meaningfully weigh in on a proposal this size on the current timeline. That's not a reason to abandon the plan. It's a reason to give residents more time and clearer, consolidated guidance before Council locks in a decision that will shape development across established neighbourhoods for decades. I'd also ask Council to look at how the Residential Low-rise designation is structured, not just where it applies. The designation extends roughly a five-minute walk from the high street. Within that whole band, the plan sets one flat height and density ceiling, up to 6 storeys, whether a site sits immediately adjacent to the commercial density on the high street or three blocks into a currently quiet residential neighbourhood. There's no step-down as distance from the corridor increases. My own property is three blocks off Nanaimo Street, and under the current draft it's treated exactly the same as a lot immediately adjacent to the commercial density on the high street. If the intent is to concentrate the greatest change along the corridor and taper it into residential streets, the plan as drafted doesn't do that. It applies one ceiling out to a fixed radius, then stops. More generally, and perhaps most critically, Council is collecting a wide range of feedback through this hearing, but the current timeline runs straight from that feedback to a Council vote. There's no stage in between where residents can see what others have raised, or where Council sets out how it weighed and responded to the substantive points before finalizing a decision. Submitting a comment in isolation, with no visibility into the broader record or how it factors into the outcome, isn't the same as a process that actually incorporates public input. I'd ask Council to build in a step between the close of submissions and the final vote, where the feedback received is made available to the public and Council's response to it is documented before adoption.	Derek Sawkins	Grandview-Woodland	

				I'm asking Council to defer adoption until the fall. Use that time for three things: (1) give residents a single, clear reference showing how the Villages Plan and the provincial TOA rules apply together on a given property, (2) have staff look at a graduated approach to height and density that steps down with distance from the high street instead of one flat ceiling applied across the whole walking distance, and critically, (3) publish a response to the feedback collected through this process so residents can see what was raised and how it shaped the plan before a final vote. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Derek Sawkins			
2026-07-14	14:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The “Villages” plan for rezoning 14% of the Ciry of Vancouver is a dazzling abuse of power being wielded by a privileged few to the detriment of most. The lack of needs assessment, economic analysis, multi system impact and the abdication of seeking meaningful citizen and expert engagement is shocking. 1) Who has completed the needs analysis on further densification of the densest housing city in the country? Density does not equal affordability, and the conflated interchangeability of these terms is disingenuous. 2) If development projects are being bailed out by governments because of lack of sales, what is the demand for more product? 3) What are commercial vacancy rates? What types of businesses will afford new rental space? How will this support single proprietor businesses? 4) What plan is IN PLACE for addressing additional water, sewer and electrical grid infrastructure? We already have water restrictions starting in May! What is the plan for the landfill and recycling station capacity? 5) What parking and transit upgrades are scheduled and costed out in the context of population influx? 6) What healthcare and education facilities AND human resource capacities are anticipated and planned for to accommodate this immense densification pseudo-strategy? 7) Parking planning? Gas stations? EV charging? Traffic flow? Accessibility for individuals with compromised mobility? 8) Green space, recreation centres, vegetation canopy? 9) *** A representative from Mr. Rennie’s group*** came to our house a month ago, indicating the anticipation that our home would be expected to sell at lot value (only) in this zoning restructuring. -that threat drops our resale/equity value by 25-30% -higher impact on: -a) those who bought at higher valuations -b) those with escalating interest rate mortgages who can no longer sell because of the INSTANTANEOUS lowering of their property value directly related to rezoning. i) this immediate loss of value could wipe out an individual’s entire equity if they have paid a down payment of 25% 10) Rezoning discourages/inhibits current property upgrades. How do you improve your homestead when you are directly told that your neighbourhood is slated for demolition?	Rhonda Willms	Arbutus Ridge	

				We have seen the boarded up “ghost villages” around Oakridge, where owners are in the waiting place for completion of land assemblies 11) If Vancouver purports to be a “Green City”, how do you justify tearing down usable, more cost efficient homes/rental properties/commercial units in order to waste materials, dispose of them, and rebuild- using new materials (environmental impact of concrete and milling/production of new building materials) in order to create something “new”? This proposed change is: Rushed Cursory in its anticipation of economic, social and environmental impact Uncreative Unrepresentative Unwanted- this is not NIMBY, it’s NIOC (not in our city/community) Esthetically unappealing Financially devastating to home owners/tax payers Under-planned Economically tilted All with the plausible undercurrent of a quid pro quo with political and campaign contributors. This is a plan of economically enforced evictions. Even more so when combined with property tax increases and restructuring (deferral program changes). This plan values displacement over neighbourhood enhancement. YOU, as council, have been hired (voted in) to represent the citizens. Not solely the developers. You should be compelled to fulfill this entrusted duty.			
2026-07-14	14:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "Regarding Vancouver's critical tree canopy in the proposed Villages Plan," containing 32 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix G
2026-07-14	14:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a representative of the younger demographic, I am upset with how the city of Vancouver has handled this development plan. I personally feel as if this plan was sought to be carried out behind the backs of current Vancouver resident as I knew little to nothing about this plan before my parents informed me of what was contained within it. It is through my involvement and education on the plan that I became aware of the drastic consequences this could have on displacing current residents, destroying landscapes and tree canopies in surrounding areas, and opening up peaceful neighborhoods to drastic changes to their structure and vibe. It is because of these set backs that I write to oppose and urge the council to reassess the current plan in order to find better, more sustainable ways to meet goals and take care of our Vancouver residents—especially for future and growing generations.	Elizabeth Marsh	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	14:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "Re: Request to Remove Mackenzie & West 33rd from the Villages Plan," containing 33 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix H

Report date range from: 7/14/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 4:00:00 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	14:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "Re: Proposed Villages Plan, public hearing July 14, 2026," containing 63 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix I
2026-07-14	14:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages Plan should be scrapped. It is going too far way too quickly.	William Dick	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	14:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am against this villages plan and city-initiated rezoning. I have lived in my home in the Victoria-Fraserview for over 27 years and this plan would ruin our beautiful neighbourhood.	John Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	14:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter expressing strong opposition to the proposed Villages Plan, containing 27 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix J
2026-07-14	15:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I have lived in the Victoria-Fraserview neighbourhood with my family for over 27 years and oppose this villages plan.	Eva Wong	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
2026-07-14	15:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to provide community feedback regarding the rezoning of the Alice Street and Beatrice Street neighbourhood from R1-1 to R3-1. I, and other community members, are firmly opposed to the rezoning of this area into apartments. As families that live in this neighbourhood, the existing mix of apartments and houses has created a "village". The shift to more low-rise apartments and mixed use residential buildings will significantly impact the livability of the area, as the increased apartments and residents, will increase and provide reduced access to services. One of the key issues with the rezoning is related to affordability of housing and the downturn within the development market. As most individuals that follow the Vancouver housing market know, there has been a significant downturn in the market, with many developers moving into bankruptcy and apartments remaining empty throughout the city. Affordability is a factor of multiple things - including the volume of housing available and the cost associated with the housing. As we have seen, despite the downturn, this has not led to developers decreasing rental or sale prices for apartments. Without regulatory or other intervention to decrease rental rates and the unwillingness of developers to decrease the sales price, the increase of housing in the market will not actually improve affordability. We have been seeing this trend play out not only in Vancouver, but other metropolitan areas like Toronto. The increase in housing has only led to an increase in empty homes or bankruptcies, rather than providing actual affordable housing. Beyond housing, sufficient and appropriate infrastructure must be in place to enable a neighbourhood to become a "village" and provide services to its residents. With the new developments along Victoria Drive and Commercial Street, no additional infrastructure is being put in place. Although low-rise apartments and mixed use residential buildings have some commercial facilities at street level, none of these provide necessary infrastructure (e.g. grocery stores, community centres, etc.). Without these additions, the businesses and services in the neighbourhood will be woefully overwhelmed with the influx of residents. Other cities, such as North Vancouver, have clear requirements about developments, such as the requirement for community centres / other community buildings to be developed within a specific radius of X volume of residents. The city of Vancouver does not have these same requirements and we are seeing the impacts of an increased volume of residents and limited services throughout the city today. Another factor that must be considered is the volume of people moving to, staying, or leaving the city. With an aging population, immigration restrictions in place, and continued affordability challenges in Vancouver, there continues to be a shift in individuals leaving the city to other areas (e.g. Calgary, the lower mainland). As stated earlier, increasing the volume / availability of housing is not going to improve affordability or livability. These factors, among other issues, such as the economic situation, are creating a perfect storm that is not suitable for the development of additional housing at high prices. Commercial Street and Victoria Drive are well known hubs of community activity in the city - the development of apartments will ruin the existing community here while putting significant pressure on existing services. It is important for cities to grow and develop, however, for cities to attract and retain residents, affordability, livability, and infrastructure are critical to long-term success. If the city is truly interested in the best interests of Vancouverites and developing "villages" across the city, the rezoning is not the right approach to achieve those aims.	Sam Kaushik	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	15:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter titled "Re: Villages Plan - Failure in Process, Consultation & Good Governance," containing 32 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix K

2026-07-14	15:05	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I felt oppose this plan. Please do not vote in favor!	Siobhan O'Meara	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	15:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Do not ruin our neighbourhoods. You will build 6 story monstrosities next to single family homes, without adequate services, zero thoughts on parking AND the units will still cost north of a million dollars. We want Vancouver to be a city people want to live in. There are so many empty condos why would you add more development to this charming neighbourhoods ruining them forever.	Haley M	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	15:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter referencing an open letter "Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan," containing 25 signatures.	Villages Planning Program		Appendix L
2026-07-14	15:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	July 14, 2026 Re Villages Plan My name is Doug Johnstone and I live at [redacted]. Thankfully I am not in one of the village areas set out in the plan. I am a resident, not an “incumbent” as the planning department likes to categorize us- this is insulting and demeaning and Council should insist this term be expunged from all correspondence. I am FERVENTLY OPPOSED TO THIS PLAN. 1) Brian Palmquist estimates that the built-out Villages Plan will accommodate 1.4 million residents on approximately 14% of the city’s lots. How many millions of residents does the built-out ODP and Broadway Plan already accommodate, and why is it necessary to add more density to this. The existing zoned capacity will support population growth to 2050. 2) The population growth estimates used by the city are from the real estate industry, a very obvious conflict of interest. Bob Rennie is not an independent participant in planning and is providing information that benefits him and the development industry. 3) All plans already approved by this council do not recognize any restrictions on population growth, the most obvious being water supply with parkland, schools, hospitals and recreation facilities high on the list. 4) The involvement of residents and the information provided in the process has been haphazard and inconsistent. Processing this far reaching and disruptive plan in summer with a short review period is anti-democratic and anti-resident. 5) The idea that 17 “villages” can be created by decree is unlikely. Villages develop by an organic process over time. How does the city anticipate each village will have strong anchor tenants, such as drug and grocery stores in addition to medical facilities and other amenities people require? Expansion criteria by chain stores are not likely consistent with the design of the Village Plan. How many years will retail space remain vacant until occupied? 6) When eliminating view corridors, Ken Sim said we do not have a view crisis, but that we have a housing crisis. This is not true- we have an unaffordability crisis that will not be resolved by supply side economics without market chaos as is currently the case with +3000 unsold condominiums. The government bailout was announced by Mark Carney who was financially aided by Bob Rennie at his select meet and greet raising $20,000 per participant. A clear conflict of interest. The city of Vancouver has done nothing to mitigate the affordability crisis. It has relaxed the social amenity requirements from developers without regard to the negative social effects on those who were supposed to benefit from development. The Below Market Value misnomer has been continually pushed by the city while the city decreased the percentage- as if 20% of unaffordable housing prices somehow becomes affordable. All to improve profit for the development industry, but not provide affordable housing.	Doug Johnstone	Dunbar-Southlands	

				7) The city and the provincial government have been manipulated by foreign US based advocates who hold that there should be no restrictions on housing supply. The ultra high net worth members of the US based Abundance Network, through their local proxies, Abundant Housing Vancouver/YIMBYS, have been diligently working for over a decade spreading false narratives on the housing malaise and pushing total de-regulation. Local funding comes from the development industry and legitimacy provided by the Urban Development League. City Hall Watch July 13, 2026, expose tells the sordid history. hxxps://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2026/07/13/vancouvers-villages-plan-born-in-the-u-s-a/ 8) This council, aided by the provincial government, has decimated the participatory democracy we used to enjoy. Restricting access to public servants and stonewalling FOI requests and now eliminating public input in how our city grows and evolves has created a vassal population whose only option is voting in the four-year cycle. All council members representing the whole political spectrum have voted lock step with ABC Vancouver's elimination of resident participation. When the Village Plan is incorporated into the ODP, any public involvement on subsequent re-zonings will be prohibited as long as they are consistent with the ODP. Right wing dictators would be impressed. SUMMARY: The move away from any legitimate government oversight on developers creates the perfect environment for those who provide housing. Let the market decide and the developers make their profit! When there is no sign of profit, building stops. Repeat this scenario in the grocery store industry or other critical suppliers and there would be riots. I hope all councillors are proud of their part in eliminating democracy. There is an election this October and the prognosticators are telling of total annihilation of ABC Vancouver, with potential fallout on Cope, Green Party and One City candidates. TEAM for a Livable Vancouver is the only option where residents' concerns will be listened to and acted on. Cancel the Villages Plan- it is unnecessary and doomed to failure and the damage done for this to be proven will be enormous. Doug Johnstone CPA.CA [redacted]			

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	15:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the application. I have lived in this neighborhood for most of my life. This is a quiet neighborhood that should remain such, and the introduction of this Village would negatively impact in many ways. The infrastructure does not support the increase in population, traffic and services available. We don't want the the increase of traffic in this area. Environmentally, we worry about the destroying of the trees. Services to trim the trees took 3 years of complaining to have them trimmed and not removed because they provide much needed shade for residents and wildlife. It interferes with the pathways of the resident coyotes who travel up from the river. The increase in population brings more garbage and more rats, the rats the city does nothing to do to help keep the population down. I don't want more noise, more traffic, more rats, less trees, and additional property tax becauseof a village proposal that doesn't serve us. The sentiment is strong among our neighbors we want to keep our single family houses and quiet neighborhood. It's not downtown, we don't want to be. STRONGLY OPPOSE	Nidine Aldean	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	15:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter from Nancy Alexander.	Nancy Alexander	Kitsilano	Appendix M
2026-07-14	15:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan. Council is being asked to approve one of the largest rezonings in Vancouver's history without sufficient evidence that the plan will achieve its stated objectives. Major questions remain regarding affordability, infrastructure, commercial viability, and implementation. A proposal of this scale should be supported by stronger evidence and more rigorous analysis before approval.	Patricia Lok	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	15:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My name is Sean Byrne and I grew up in Vancouver. I am an architect by profession. This is a crazy proposal. Vancouver is such a beautiful and livable city in part due to careful, considered planning strategies over many decades. This is a reckless concept which will cause nothing but damage. Beautiful neighbourhoods will be ruined by haphazard development, and existing retail hubs, many of which are already suffering, will suffer more. Rather than strategically adding density, this plan will distribute boring and messy density over wide areas. Transit systems will become diluted rather than improved along important corridors. This is highly inefficient, and the city will lose a lot of its carefully crafted beauty and architectural heritage. This is a seriously flawed proposal.	Sean Byrne	West End	
2026-07-14	15:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a handwritten letter from L. Portier.	L. Portier		Appendix N

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	15:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan. I am concerned that the Villages Plan may create more commercial space than many neighbourhoods can realistically support. Existing retail areas in Vancouver are already experiencing vacancies and business challenges. Before approving widespread mixed-use zoning, Council should demonstrate that there is sufficient demand to support the additional commercial space being proposed.	Steve Chang	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	15:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We are opposed to the City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments for the Villages Plan. This rezoning and density will create significant traffic congestion and noise in primarily single family low density neighborhoods and will dramatically alter the character of those livable areas. There is already substantial densification taking place along major arterial roadways with transit and in transit hub areas. As well there is already multi-plex zoning in place.	Robert Lee	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	15:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Others have expressed concern that the prescribed commercial element of increased density in the Villages will adversely affect existing businesses. I share that concern but will focus here on my concern that the lack of commercial diversity in the retail/service components of existing 4-story to 6-story rental and strata buildings across the city will be replicated in new buildings. Dental clinics. Coffee shops/bakeries. Nail salons. Cannabis stores. Pet stores. Mobile phone outlets. Dollar stores. Major pharmacy chains. Fast food chains. With rare exceptions, the small businesses which are displaced by increased density development do not return to their old locations. Produce stores, second-hand stores, tailors, jewellers, butchers, music stores, family-run restaurants If the former mix of businesses become the new standard for new development it will further erode the character and amenities of Vancouver's neighbourhoods.	Kevin Wright	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	15:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a handwritten letter from Frances Leslie.	Frances Leslie		Attachment 1
2026-07-14	15:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strong oppose the Villages Plan. I am concerned that the Villages Plan will accelerate the loss of mature trees and private-property tree canopy, which make up a significant portion of Vancouver's urban forest. The plan lacks sufficient safeguards to ensure that growth can occur while protecting one of the City's most valuable environmental assets. Once mature trees are removed, it can take decades to replace their benefits.	Anne Marie Lee	Arbutus Ridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	15:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a resident of the Kensington Cedar-Cottage Area. I oppose the plan because I find the restrictions on changes and development on certain properties to be arbitrary and draconian. I will not vote for any Council member or slate/organization who supports this plan. My friends and neighbours appear to have had their properties frozen for in perpetuity, with no development or alteration permitted until they sell to developers. It is unclear what the consequences of this plan would be for my property. None of the information sessions or public information provided gave any notice of this. I am also concerned that the planned development appears to be in support of an anticipated population increase of 300% that is speculative, and not matched with commensurate investment for city and provincial services such as water, schools, community centres, and medical services. Vancouver already has vacant units all over the city -- why do we need such a coercive plan at this time?	Vinayak Vatsal	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	15:25	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a resident in this area. I oppose the plans for Villages Planning Program at Mackenzie St/33rd Ave.	Willard Wong	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	15:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I fundamentally oppose the Villages Plan as proposed. The process of top-down mass rezoning without any adequate community engagement will have a significant impact to renters and homeowners living across this city. These impacts include: (1) Limiting other, more livable forms of redevelopment such as multiplexes, townhouses, and laneway houses; due in part to: (2) Changes to the zoning for high density six-story apartment buildings will significantly raise property taxes and limit the real choices available to the people who live there or force them to sell; and (3) the Plan removes opportunities for neighbourhood-specific planning and public review affecting thousands of properties and hundreds of blocks, setting a dangerous precedent. As articulated by Erick Villagomez, "successful communities are not created simply by adding housing. They are built through a combination of homes, services, public spaces, institutions, and the relationships that develop around them". The current Villages Plan is devoid of any meaningful relationships for a successful community.	Chris Monaghan	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
2026-07-14	15:28	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan because it provides no guarantee that the housing created will be affordable to Vancouver residents. The plan contains no requirement for social housing and no assurance that middle-income households will benefit. Increasing development rights alone does not automatically create affordability. In fact, it could create a new problem of even more vacant commercial space and cannibalization of existing Neighbhourhood Centres. Council should not approve a citywide rezoning without clearer affordability outcomes.	Linda Lee	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	15:36	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the Villages Plan and urge Council to reject the proposal. My concerns are not about whether Vancouver should grow. Growth is inevitable and additional housing is needed. My concern is whether this particular plan represents sound, evidence-based planning and responsible governance. First, the business case remains incomplete. Council is being asked to rezone more than 13,000 properties across 17 neighbourhoods despite significant unresolved questions regarding financial feasibility, affordability, commercial viability, infrastructure requirements, and implementation. The plan contains no guarantee of affordability, no requirement for social housing, and no evidence that the resulting homes will be affordable to the households the plan is intended to serve. A proposal of this scale should be supported by stronger evidence before approval. Second, Council should consider the significant governance and risk management implications. This is one of the largest rezonings in Vancouver's history and, once approved, future Councils will face substantial legal, financial, and political barriers to changing course. The practical reality is that this decision is largely irreversible. The City is currently reviewing aspects of the multiplex program because certain impacts only became apparent after implementation. The Villages Plan applies a similar citywide approach on a much larger scale. Given the magnitude of the decision and the absence of a provincial mandate requiring this plan, there is no justification for rushing approval. Third, I am deeply concerned about infrastructure capacity and fiscal sustainability. The City faces a significant infrastructure funding gap associated with maintaining and renewing existing assets. At the same time, the Villages Plan proposes substantial growth that will require additional investments in utilities, transportation infrastructure, public spaces, community amenities, and ongoing operating support. Yet the plan does not provide a comprehensive infrastructure cost estimate, capital funding strategy, operating funding strategy, or phasing plan tied to available funding. Council is effectively being asked to approve the growth first and determine how to pay for it later. I support thoughtful growth, but growth must occur at the right scale, in the right locations, and at a pace that aligns with infrastructure capacity and financial reality. I respectfully urge Council to reject the Villages Plan and direct staff to pursue a more incremental, neighbourhood-based, evidence-led approach that allows growth to occur while preserving public confidence, fiscal responsibility, and sound planning principles.	Vincent Lok	Arbutus Ridge	

2026-07-14	15:44	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly oppose the proposed blanket rezoning of approximately 13,000 parcels under the Villages Plan. The City should first address the many stalled redevelopment sites along Cambie Street, Oak Street, and Granville Street, where rezoning has already occurred but projects remain inactive due to high land and construction costs. Given today's housing economics, new mid-rise developments are unlikely to deliver genuinely affordable housing for local families. Instead, this proposal would permanently alter the character of established West Side neighborhoods by reducing privacy, impacting the mature tree canopy, and placing additional pressure on aging infrastructure. I urge Council to reject this blanket rezoning proposal and focus future growth in areas that have already been designated for higher density.	Tiffany Tan	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	15:45	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This seems to be disastrous scheme which will flood the market with surplus retail and further negatively affect the existing neighborhood areas. How each councillor votes on the Villages Plan will affect my upcoming vote.	Nick Davies	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	15:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The notice for zoning changes and other changes were not clear to me or my neighbor's My understanding is that malty family units and low rise apartment's can be built in the area their other changes in general land use . what does that mean . The city has not been transparent in the changes to the people living in the area . this area already has duplexes with sweets four family's on a small lot and laneway houses with sweets .With all the apartment and condo inventory on the market and hundreds being built these changes are not needed I wonder if any city planers or counselors live in any of the proposed villages.	Wayne Tattersall	Killarney	
2026-07-14	15:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It's a plan that needs some rethinking. Blanket rezoning doesn't consider the citizens' input.	Wah Gee	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-14	15:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It's a plan that needs some rethinking. Blanket rezoning doesn't consider the citizens' input.	Ma Lai Gee	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-14	15:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Killarney is such a nice neighborhood in east Vancouver. Already a village in itself where all facilities and families can walk to. There is already parks, highschools, gas stations, coffee shops, and restaurants available. I am opposed to this development. Lots of families are happy and content with their community and tearing it down will do no good.	Makenna Zizzari	Killarney	
2026-07-14	15:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	CVN to City of Vancouver: Villages Program – OPPOSED Online: hxxps://coalitionvan[.]org/posts/20260714-cvn-to-cov-on-villages-program-opposed/ The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) is opposed to the city-wide rezoning of nearly 14,000 land parcels (about 14% of all in the city) under the Villages Planning Program proposal at this public hearing. We have concerns not only about the process of its formulation, which lacked any meaningful involvement of and even notification to the affected communities, residents, and businesses, but also many details.	Coaltion of Vancouver Neighbourhoods CVN		Attachment 1

We share the concerns in the HousingReset.ca letter from the many urbanists, urban planners, architects and UBC/SFU academics, with decades of experience. They raise many important issues with the Villages rezoning, that also reflect our concerns as follows:

• 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.
hxxps://housingreset[.]ca/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/2026-06-18-final-housing-reset-letter-on-villages-v5b.pdf

In addition, this public hearing includes amendments to existing community plans such as for Grandview Woodlands and Marpole, without any community engagement for these major changes and amendments.

Please do not approve this flawed plan.

Instead, refer this back to staff for a participatory public process to reflect meaningful local neighbourhood-based community planning that meaningfully involves public collaboration that focuses on existing neighbourhood centre shopping areas.

Also, reconsider the Official Development Plan (ODP) and provide for realistic population growth, and strive for: livability in the context of local character; address environmental impacts; include measures to avoid displacement from existing relatively affordable housing; and give adequate consideration to more affordable housing options, including ground-oriented housing for families, co-ops, and other models for both renters and owners, with amenities and adequate infrastructure in each neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs Larry Benge & Dorothy Barkley
CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Arbutus Ridge Community Association
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours
Dunbar Residents Association
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee
Grandview Woodland Area Council
Greater Yaletown Community Association
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association
Kits Point Residents Association
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
Oakridge Langara Area Residents
Residents Association Mount Pleasant
Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group
Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.
Strathcona Residents Association
Upper Kitsilano Residents Association
West End Neighbours Society
West Kitsilano Residents Association
West Point Grey Residents Association

				West Southland Residents Association			
2026-07-14	15:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	1. Blanket pre-zoning heavily inflates land values, triggering speculative real estate trading. Instead of creating genuinely affordable housing, this process runs the risk of driving up overall housing prices and rents, making the neighborhood less accessible. 2. Destruction of Neighborhood Character: Excessive building density and height will destroy the quiet atmosphere, privacy, and visual appeal of existing low-density neighborhoods. 3. Overburdened Public Services: Allowing widespread construction of multi-unit housing (such as townhouses and low-rise apartments) will drastically increase population density. Existing schools, childcare centers, parks, healthcare clinics, and sewage systems cannot handle the sudden surge in residents. 4. The City should develop detailed local area plans for each unique community before changing zoning, rather than rushing a one-size-fits-all approach. The City should prioritize resolving the issues in existing high-density rezoned areas that remain undeveloped, as well as completed projects struggling with low sales. For instance, major land parcels along Oak Street, Granville Street, Cambie Street, and 41st Avenue have already seen development paused due to weak market demand and developer financial constraints. This clearly demonstrates that supply and demand are currently unbalanced. The City should not waste financial resources and manpower on pursuing new high-density residential planning at this time.	Fisher Chen	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	15:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Homeowners should be given more flexibility to the zoning options. More careful planning is definitely required to assess unique situations at different area, and to consider the pace that we can add support infrastructure to the area. Not ideal to have a blanket rezoning for such a broad area.	Andy Sze		

Report date range from: 7/14/2026 12:00:01 PM to: 7/14/2026 4:00:00 PM

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	15:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We would like to give our opinion on the Villages Draft, which would destroy livable, friendly neighbourhoods for no good reason other than profit for developers. We are seeing densification of neighbourhoods but are not seeing the lack of affordability being addressed. Section 2.2.2 Privately-initiated Rezonings seems to benefit the developer rather than the neighbourhood. In our area we have seen single houses currently being replaced by duplexes, each of which are being sold for the cost of the single house they replaced. We have similarly seen four-plexes replace single houses, but are no more affordable than the house they replaced. How will you insure that developers are not the only winners in these planned villages? We keep hearing that we need more housing, yet we also hear that the condominiums that have been built are not selling, and tax payer dollars are needed to be used to bail out the developers. Surely if the free-market was allowed to prevail and the cost of condominiums brought down, the condominiums would sell. Developers would make a little less profit but it would help right the inflated housing market of Vancouver. The philosophy of 'if we build enough it will bring down the prices' does not seem to holding true. We are told that 'villages' need to be built with assorted types of houses. The map shown in the Draft Villages Plan for my area, McKenzie Street and W 33rd, is inaccurate. It correctly states that there is an 'existing small cluster of commercial spaces at the intersection of Mackenzie Street and 33rd Avenue', however the diagram shows the commercial space or 'Village High Street' to be along 33rd rather than along McKenzie, which is where the shops are currently located. McKenzie Street is a wide bus route and is more suited to commercial spaces than the narrow 33rd Avenue. For this reason it is also more suited for 'mixed use low rise'. If increased density must occur in this area, I think it would suit more duplexes and fourplexes rather than 6 storey buildings which will take light and privacy from neighbourhood gardens. If we were to downsize from our current single family dwelling, it would not be to a 6 or 8 storey building. How will you insure that the ground floor commercial spaces in these Village High Streets actually serve the community? I remember when Kerrisdale Village had a wonderful mix of small businesses and restaurants, but as prices increased many of the old businesses left and were replaced by banks and real estate offices. Those that remain often seem to have a high turnover. Similarly, West 10th Avenue west of Alma used to have many shops but when I last visited the area I found many empty store fronts. How will you insure that all these people who are coming to an area have doctors, access to hospitals, and to elementary and secondary schools? I do not see them in the plan. Utility infrastructure is also not in place for such densification. When Olympic Village was built it did not include an elementary school, and still doesn't many years later. All neighbouring schools are over capacity. I believe one is now proposed to be completed in 2029, but that is long after many children have had to be taken out of their neighbourhoods for schooling for their whole elementary school experience. Children should be able to walk to their school and have friends in their neighbourhood. This does not lead to a livable city. We are sure the developers are rubbing their hands with glee, but we do not see that this plan will make Vancouver any more affordable or livable. It is very disappointing to see that money talks. We will be taking our opinion to the ballot box. Shirley and Murray Thomson	Shirley Thomson	Dunbar-Southlands	

I have lived in West Point Grey for 40 years, and I am deeply concerned about the recent wave of development in our neighbourhood. Duplexes, triplexes, and multiplexes are now being built on lots that were once zoned for single-family homes, and the impact on the character of the area has been significant.

These new “plex” developments often occupy most of the lot, requiring the removal of mature trees, shrubs, lawns, and both front and back gardens. As a result, we are steadily losing the green space that has long defined West Point Grey.

In addition, the scale of these buildings is out of proportion with the existing homes. Many extend beyond the footprint of neighbouring houses—jutting forward, backward, and upward. This increased height, width, and depth disrupts the streetscape, blocks sunlight, creates shadow, and diminishes the sense of openness that once made these streets so pleasant. What was once a cohesive and attractive neighbourhood is becoming visually fragmented and increasingly out of character.

The design quality of these developments is also concerning. Many appear to prioritize maximizing floor space over any consideration of aesthetics or architectural harmony. There is little effort to integrate with the surrounding homes or to contribute positively to the neighbourhood. The result is often box-like structures finished with inexpensive materials such as stucco and synthetic trim, along with decorative elements that feel mismatched and poorly executed. Overall, there seems to be little commitment to thoughtful or enduring design.

I understand that the intention behind these changes is to increase housing supply and improve affordability in British Columbia. However, the average cost of these units in West Point Grey is approximately $2.8 million. This does not meet the definition of affordable housing for most residents. Instead, these developments are increasing density without addressing affordability, while simultaneously eroding the qualities that make the neighbourhood desirable.

It is certainly possible to introduce more diverse and attainable housing options in established neighbourhoods. However, this should be done with clear design standards and meaningful input from residents, as well as architects and urban designers. New development should enhance—not diminish—the character and livability of the community.

Finally, many residents feel they are not being adequately consulted about these changes. There is a growing sense that decisions are being made without meaningful community input, leaving residents feeling excluded from the future of their own neighbourhood.

I urge the City and Province to reconsider the current approach, and to prioritize both affordability and thoughtful design, while ensuring that residents have a genuine voice in shaping their community. Dr. Hinda Avery [redacted]

Mayor + Council

July 14, 2026

Appendix B

I have lived in West Point Grey for 40 years, and I am deeply concerned about the recent wave of development in our neighbourhood. Duplexes, triplexes, and multiplexes are now being built on lots that were once zoned for single-family homes, and the impact on the character of the area has been significant.

These new "plex" developments often occupy most of the lot, requiring the removal of mature trees, shrubs, lawns, and both front and back gardens. As a result, we are steadily losing the green space that has long defined West Point Grey.

In addition, the scale of these buildings is out of proportion with the existing homes. Many extend beyond the footprint of neighbouring houses—jutting forward, backward, and upward. This increased height, width, and depth disrupts the streetscape, blocks sunlight, creates shadow, and diminishes the sense of openness that once made these streets so pleasant. What was once a cohesive and attractive neighbourhood is becoming visually fragmented and increasingly out of character.

The design quality of these developments is also concerning. Many appear to prioritize maximizing floor space over any consideration of aesthetics or architectural harmony. There is little effort to integrate with the surrounding homes or to contribute positively to the neighbourhood. The result is often box-like structures finished with inexpensive materials such as stucco and synthetic trim, along with decorative elements that feel mismatched and poorly executed. Overall, there seems to be little commitment to thoughtful or enduring design.

I understand that the intention behind these changes is to increase housing supply and improve affordability in British Columbia. However, the average cost of these units in West Point Grey is approximately $2.8 million. This does not meet the definition of affordable housing for most residents. Instead, these developments are increasing density without addressing affordability, while simultaneously eroding the qualities that make the neighbourhood desirable.

It is certainly possible to introduce more diverse and attainable housing options in established neighbourhoods. However, this should be done with clear design standards and meaningful input from residents, as well as architects and urban designers. New development should enhance—not diminish—the character and livability of the community.

Finally, many residents feel they are not being adequately consulted about these changes. There is a growing sense that decisions are being made without meaningful community input, leaving residents feeling excluded from the future of their own neighbourhood.

I urge the City and Province to reconsider the current approach, and to prioritize both affordability and thoughtful design, while ensuring that residents have a genuine voice in shaping their community.

Dr. Hinda Avery [redacted]

Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver

Re: Preservation of Greenery on Sasamat Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

We, the undersigned residents of West Point Grey, are writing to express our concern about the planned demolition of the homes, lawns, and gardens at the following properties:

- 3123 Sasamat Street
- 3188 Sasamat Street
- 4503 West 16th Avenue

The mature greenery surrounding these properties—including trees, hedges, shrubs, and other established plantings—represents many years of growth and contributes significantly to the beauty, biodiversity, and environmental health of our neighbourhood.

Plans for two- and three-storey duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes on these sites will require the removal of much of this established vegetation. At a time when the City of Vancouver is committed to increasing urban tree canopy and preserving green spaces, we are concerned that so much valuable greenery will be lost.

We respectfully urge the City to require the preservation of as much existing vegetation as possible during redevelopment. While we appreciate that some larger boulevard trees have been protected, we ask that every reasonable effort also be made to retain additional mature trees, hedges, shrubs, and other established landscaping on these properties.

We believe that thoughtful development and the preservation of established greenery can coexist, benefiting both current and future residents.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Name: Dr. Hinda Avery

Address: [redacted]

Phone: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Appendix C

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, JULY 14, 2026

THIS LETTER IS A CONCERN TO THE CHANGES IN ZONING & DEVELOPEMENT PROPOSED TO 17 VILLAGES AREAS.

I LIVE IN THE NANAIMO ST. & 1ST AVE VILLAGE AREA. WHEN THE GRANDVIEW/WOODLAND PLAN WAS DEVELOPED YEARS AGO, IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT DEVELOPEMENT WAS ONLY NEAR SKY TRAIN STN. AREAS & WOULD NOT GO FURTHER INTO NEIGHBOURHOODS TO DISRUPT RESIDENTIAL AREAS. NOW YOU ARE HOLDING A PUBLIC MEETING ON A PLAN THAT WAS MADE WITHOUT ANY INPUT FROM PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS. THIS PLAN ON 17 VILLAGES SHOULD NOT OF BEEN MADE UNTIL THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THESE AREAS HAVE A SAY & NOT AFTER THE FACT. YOU ARE DICTATING WHAT <u>YOU</u> WANT THESE AREAS TO BE - YOU ARE NOT THE ONES WHO HAVE TO LIVE WITH THIS DECISION FOR YEARS TO COME.

I HAVE ALREADY BEEN THROUGH THIS YEARS AGO WITH THE 'ELLA' PROJECT ON NANAIMO & GRANT. CITY HALL PROMISED TO PUT A GROCERY STORE IN THE LOWER MAIN FLOOR PART OF THE BUILDING. THEY SAID IT WOULD BENEFIT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD & ESPECIALLY ELDERLY PEOPLE. THAT IS WHY THIS AREA WAS CHANGED FROM RESIDENTIAL ZONING TO COMMERCIAL ZONING. ONCE THE ZONING WAS CHANGED THEY DECIDED TO PUT IN A FANCY SMALL BAKERY/CAFE FOR PEOPLE TO HANG OUT & SOCIALIZE. PROMISES MADE, PROMISES BROKEN. WHAT WERE LEFT IS NOISE, CAR CONGESTION, TOO MANY PEOPLE COMING & GOING ALL DAY LONG. NOT TO MENTION PROPERTY TAXES GOING

UP BECAUSE OF THE ZONING CHANGES. NOW WE HAVE ANOTHER CONDO COMPLEX ON THE SAME SIDE OF NANAIMO ST. & GRANT ST. WHICH HAS A RESTAURANT/BAR THAT IS OPEN UNTIL 10pm. THERE IS MORE NOISE, MUSIC & CARS COMING & GOING. PEOPLE WHO COME HERE DON'T CARE ABOUT THE NOISE THEY MAKE, OR DROPPING GARBAGE IN FRONT OF PEOPLE'S HOMES - CONTAINERS THAT THEY DON'T WANT TO PUT IN THEIR CARS WHEN THEY LEAVE. WE HAVE A BAD RODENT PROBLEM NOW IN THIS AREA. THIS IS WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO OTHER NEIGHBOURHOODS WHICH YOU ARE PLANNING TO CHANGE. IT DESTROYS THEM.

YOU ARE USING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS AN EXCUSE FOR CHANGE, BUT IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT RENT IS NOT AFFORDABLE FOR PEOPLE THAT NEED HOUSING. ONLY A SMALL PORTION WILL BE RENTALS, THE MAJORITY WILL BE FOR PURCHASE, & TO PEOPLE WHO ARE WELL OFF & NOT PEOPLE THAT NEED HOUSING, NOT AS AN INVESTMENT.

THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS CANNOT SUSTAIN THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE YOU ARE TRYING TO SQUEEZE INTO THESE AREAS. IT DESTROYS THE WHOLE IDEA OF RESIDENTIAL LIVING. I TRULY FEEL YOU ARE MAKING THESE CHANGES TO PUSH PEOPLE OUT WHO OWN HOMES, SO YOUR AGENDA IS TO HAVE CONDOS & STORES IN EVERY SPACE POSSIBLE & DO AWAY WITH NICE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS THAT HAVE BEEN HERE FOR DECADES. REMEMBER, IT'S THE PEOPLE WHO PUT YOU IN OFFICE, TRY LISTENING TO THEM INSTEAD OF DICTATING TO THEM HOW THEY SHOULD LIVE.

YOURS TRULY, SUZAN GREGG

[redacted]

Appendix D

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Fry

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should you vote for it, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best

[redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Bligh

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should you vote for it, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Maloney

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should you vote for it, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Orr

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should you vote for it, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best

[redacted]

Gillian Chetty

Appendix E

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Montague

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Kirby-jung

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

[redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Mr Mayor

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Zhou

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Dominato

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best [redacted]

Gillian Chetty

[redacted]

July 10th 2026

Dear Councillor Meiszner

Re: Village Proposal: Vote July 14 2026

I am completely opposed to this proposal. It will totally transform Vancouver in a way that will change the nature of many of its well loved neighbourhoods and communities that are thriving and working well. For the sake of a 'village' you are going to destroy or weaken 'neighbourhoods'? Makes no sense at all.

Given the scope and breadth of this proposal, there has been insufficient consultation with the neighbourhoods involved which is shameful for an initiative of this size. It should either be cancelled outright or at least put on hold pending further examination and consultation.

Should it pass, you will not have my vote in the next municipal election

Best

[redacted]

Gillian Chetty

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: Janice Kilburn Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Kits

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: Robert Sticklas Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Kitsilano.

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: Erin Hanratty Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Kitsilano

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: P. Johnson Date: July 11

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Nancy NEWMAN Date: July 11 '26

Neighourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Sydney Schaaf Date: July 11 - 26

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: FRANCES ANN LESLIE Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: DUNBAR

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: Janey L. Cole-Morgan Date: July 11/26

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Max Hesse Date: 14 July 2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly Date: July 1/26

Neighourhood: Arbutus Ridge / Mackenzie Heights

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: Olive Yu Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Columbia

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: Kathleen Cheng Date: July 11/26

Neighourhood: Mackenzie St & 33rd 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: Betty Kosel Date: July 11/26

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: S Mamones Date: July 09 2026.

Neighourhood: Mckenzie & 33rd

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: Shari Bender Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Kerrisdale

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: BARBARA HUTCHISON Date: 11 July 2026

Neighbourhood: 33 & Mackenzie

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: ELAINE SOEVENS Date: 11 July 26

Neighourhood: Mackenzie Heights

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: Lorraine Portier Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Marilyn Lemp Date: July 11, 2026

Neighourhood: Mackenzie Heights

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: Rongmei Zhao Date: 2026/07/12

Neighourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Duayne St. Germaine Date: Sat July 11/26

Neighourhood: Kitsilano

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: Yue Zhang Date: 2026/07/12

Neighourhood: Kerrisdale

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: V.L. Williams Date: July 12, 2026

Neighourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Sarah Little Date: July 13, 2016

Neighourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: STUART F LESLIE Date: 2026-07-11

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: CARMEN LEE Date: July 12, 2016

Neighourhood: MARPOLE

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: Benjamin Martin Date: July 13, 2026

Neighourhood: Marpole

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: BRENT MARTIN Date: JULY 13, 2026

Neighourhood: MAIZPOLE

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur Date: 07/13/26

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Simone Leslie Date: 2026/07/12

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Csaba Magyar Date: July 11/26

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Dustin Pirillo Date: July 6th

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: R. Ireland Date: July 6, 2026.

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Destiny Swinford-Turpin Date: July 6, 2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: MURRAY Date: July 6/26

Neighourhood: DUNBAR

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: Myrna J. Bennett Date: July 6/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Susan Coady Date: July 6/2026

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

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: Marlene Lebates Date: 7/11/26

Neighourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Marlene LeGates Date: 7/11/26

Neighourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Gillian Dotte Date: July. 10/2026

Neighourhood: Dunbar

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: Susan Tourigny Date: July 11/26

Neighourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Appendix G

Date: July 11. 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: Sydney Schaaf

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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 ANN LESLIE

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date July 11, 2026

Date: 11 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: Max Hesse

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11/26

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: Janey L. Cole-Morgan

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 1/26

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge/Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 11 - 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: Lisa Osei

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: 11 July 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: ELAINE STEVENS

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

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: Lorraine Portier

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: Jul 11/26

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: MAYANK SINGH

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: July 12, 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:

Name: [redacted]

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: 2026/07/12

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: Simone Leslie

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 07/13/26

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 2026-07-11

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: STUART R LESLIE

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 12, 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] [redacted]

Name: CARMEN LEE

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: July 13, 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: Sarah Little

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11, 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: NANCY NEWMAN

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11 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: P Jonson

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 6/26

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: MARGARET MURRAY

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: July 11/26

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: Albert Dreher

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11/26

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: Albert Dreher

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11 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: FRANCK PRAT MD

Neighbourhood:

Dunbar / Blenheim.

Date: July 11, 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: Destiny Swinford-Turpin

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: Myona J Bennett

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: Susan Coady

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Date: 11 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: Susanna Van Schalkwyk.

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: MARY McINTOSH

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: JULY 11/2026

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: CHRIS HODSON

Neighbourhood: NEW WESTMINSTER

Date: July 11/26

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: Susan Tourigny

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 11, 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: Janice Kilburn

Neighbourhood: Kits

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: MAUREEN KENNEDY

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: July 11, 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: Robert Stickler

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Date: July 11, 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: Erin Hanratty

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Appendix H

Date:

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: Wendy Newman Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11, 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: FRANCES ANN LESLIE Neighbourhood: Dunbar

July 11, 2026

Date: 11. July 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: Max Hesse Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date:

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: Nigel Cole-Morgan Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11/26

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] July 11/26

Name: Janey L. Cole-Morgan Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 1/26

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge/Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 09 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: S Ramones

Neighbourhood: Mckenzie & 33RD

Date: July 11, 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: CINDY NG

Neighbourhood: 16th + Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: Shari Bender Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date:

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: BARRY WEIH

Neighbourhood: 33RD & MACKENZIE

Date: July 11/2026

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: Andrea Maitland Neighbourhood: MacKenzie Heights

Date: July 11, 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: Sascha Westendorp Neighbourhood: McKenzie

Date: 11 July 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: ELAINE STEVENS Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: 11 July 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: ELAINE STEVENS Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date:

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: 

Name: Lorraine Portier Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: July 11, 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: P. JOHNSON Neighbourhood: Dunbar

50

Date: July 12, 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: V.L. Williams Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: 2026-07-11

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: STUART F LESLIE Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 2026/07/12

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: Simone Leslie Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 12, 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: CARMEN LEE Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: July 13, 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: Sarah Little Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: 07/13/26

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: Marlene LeGates Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date:

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: Marlene LeBates

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11, 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: Kathleen Chey

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie St & 33rd Ave.

Date: July 11, 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.

[redacted]

Signature:

Name: Gillian Chetty

Neighbourhood:

Date: July 11, 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: MARY McINTOSH Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date:

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: DARYL MCINTOSH Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: July 11/24

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: Susan Tourigny Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: 11 JUL / 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: L. SHUMEAN

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Kerrisdale

Date: July 11, 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: Robert Stickles Neighbourhood: Kitsilano.

Date: July 11, 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: Erin Hunratty Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Date: July 12/26

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: MARY SIMPSON Neighbourhood: McKenzie + 33rd

Appendix I

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: Nancy Neuman

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Sonia Abrahamsen

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: FRANCES ANN LESLIE

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

July 11, 2026

Date: 11 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: Max Hesse

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: Jul 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: Erin Casey

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Johnathan Yuen

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 1 | 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: Anne Talbot-Kelly

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge / Mackenzie Heights

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: RICK GRIFFITHS

Neighbourhood: KERRIDALE

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: ASTRID SUTTER

Neighbourhood: POINT GREY

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: SACHIT SHAH

Neighbourhood: Point Grey.

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: Derek Fung

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

50

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: Helen Hunt

Neighbourhood: MacKenzie & 33rd

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: Betty Kosel

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 09 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: S. Mamanes

Neighbourhood: McKenzie ST. & 33 Ep.

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: BARRY WEITH

Neighbourhood: 33RD & MACKENZIE

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: Andrea Maitland

Neighbourhood: MacKenzie Heights

Date: SAT. 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: ANDREW I. DAVIS

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR : 22ND. & BLENHEIM.

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: DAVID J. ANTCHESON

Neighbourhood: 37TH & TRAFALGAR

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: Guy H. Stanford

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Brenda Lintz

Neighbourhood: [redacted] Alma St Resident

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: Mehrnaz Sanii

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Sasha Wetterdorp

Neighbourhood: McKenzie

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: PETER ANTHONY

Neighbourhood: ALMA

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: Lorraine Portier

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Deborah Tobert

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: _____

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: Marilyn Lowry

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Height

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: V. L. Williams

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Dongmei Zhao

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Yue Zhang

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: CARMEN LEE

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: 2026-07-11

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: STUART F LESLIE

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 07/13/26

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: JULY 13, 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: BRENT MARTIN

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: 2026/07/12

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: Simone Leslie

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 13, 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: Sarah Little

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 13, 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: Benjamin Martin

Neighbourhood: Marpole

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: Janey L. Cole-Morgan

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: David St Laurent

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Pastori, Marion

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Nigel Cole-Morgan

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: KATHRRINE ARCHIBALD

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: 2026, 7. 11.

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: Christina Chen

Neighbourhood: Dunbar.

Date: July 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: Judith Pike

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: July 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: Myrna J. Bennett

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 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: Susan Coady

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

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: Albert Dreher

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: FRANCK PRAT MD

Neighbourhood: Dunbar.

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: Kathleen Cheng

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie St + 33rd. Ave.

39.

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: Csaba Moffat

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: BRUCE KENNEDY

Neighbourhood: [redacted]

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: DARYL MCINTOSH

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

Date: July 11/2025

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 TURNER

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: CHRIS HODSON

Neighbourhood: NEW WESTMINSTER

Date: 11 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: Susanna Van Schalkwyk.

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: MARY McINTOSH

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

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: Susan Tourigny

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: 11 JUL '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: L. STHELHEAD

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Kitsilano

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: Janice Kilburn

Neighbourhood: Kits.

Date: 11 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: ANDREW L

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

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: Mary O'Connor

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Robert Stickles.

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

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: Erin Hanratty

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Date: July 11th 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: Miya Hayazaki

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11 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: Nancy Newman

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11th, 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 ANN LESLIE

Neighbourhood: DUNBAR

July 11, 2026

Date: 11. 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: Max Hesse

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11/26

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: Janey L. Cole-Morgan

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 1/26

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge / MacKenzie Heights

Date: July 11, 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: BARRY NEIH

Neighbourhood: 33RD & MACKENZIE

Date: 11 July 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: ELANE STEVENS

Neighbourhood: MacKenzie Heights

Date: July 11, 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: Lorraine Portier

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: _____

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: MARILYN YEUNG

Neighbourhood: MacKenzie Height-

Date: July 12, 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: _____

Printed name: V.L. Williams

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: 2026-07-11

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: STUART F LESLIE

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 2026/07/12

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: Simone Leslie

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: 07/13/26

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 13, 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: Benjamin Martin

Neighbourhood: Macpole

Date: July 13, 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: Sarah Little

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 12, 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: CARMEN LEE

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: JULY 13, 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: BRENT MARTIN

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

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: Myrna G. Bennett

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11, 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: Marlene Lebeter

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11, 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: Susan Coady

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Date: 11 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: Susanna Van Schalkwyk

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 11/26

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: Susan Tourigny

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 11/26

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: Susan Tourigny

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 11/26

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: L. 3HUCMAN

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Kildale

Date: July 11, 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 [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Printed name: Janice Kilburn

Neighbourhood: Kits

Date: July 11, 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: Robert Stickles.

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano.

Date: July 11, 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: Erin Hanratty

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Appendix K

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: Nancy Newman Signatur[redacted] Date: July 11 '26

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: FRANCES ANN LESLIE Signature: [redacted] Date: July 11, 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

July 11, 2026

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: Max Hesse Signature: [redacted] Date: 11 July 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Max Hesse Signature: [redacted] Date: 11 July 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Janey L Cole-Morgan Signature [redacted] Date: July 14/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly Signature: [redacted] Date: July 1/26

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge / Mackenzie Heights

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:

Signature: [redacted]

Date: July 9 2026

Neighbourhood:

MacKenzie & 33rd

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: SHARI BENDER Signature: [redacted] Date: July 17/26

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: BARBI WEIH Signature: [redacted] Date: JULY 11, 2026

Neighbourhood: 33RD & MACKENZIE

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: ELAINE STEVENS Signature: [redacted] Date: 11 July 26

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie Heights

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: Marilyn Leung Signature: [redacted] Date: July 11, 2026

Neighbourhood: McKenzie Heights

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: Yue Zhang Signature: [redacted] Date: 2026/07/12

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

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: Dongmei Zhao Signature: [redacted] Date: 2026/07/12

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale.

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur Signature: [redacted] Date: 07/13/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Sarah Little Signature: [redacted] Date: July 13, 2026

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Benjamin Martin Signature: [redacted] Date: July 13, 2026

Neighbourhood: Magpole

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: Simeon Leslie Signature: [redacted] Date: 2026/07/12

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: BRENT MARTIN Signature: [redacted] Date: JULY 13, 2026

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

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: STUART F HESLIP Signature: [redacted] Date: 2026-07-11

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: CARMEN LEE Signature: [redacted] Date: July 29 2026

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

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: Csaba Magyar Signature: [redacted] Date: July 11/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Csaba Mayor Signature: [redacted] Date: July 4/26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: M. LeGates Signature: [redacted] Date: 7/11/26

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Marlene Lebates Signature: [redacted] Date: 7/11/26

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Kathleen Cheng Signature [redacted] Date: July 11/26

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie St & 33rd Ave.

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: FRANCES PRATT Signature: [redacted] Date: July 10 2026

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Blenheim

To Mayor Ken Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council:

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

I am writing to 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.

Gillian Chetty [redacted] July. 11 2026

Name: Signature: Date:

July 5, 2026

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 citywide landuse 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 evidencebased 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, locationspecific 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 neighbourhoodspecific 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.

Mary Day, [redacted]. (33rd & McKenzie area)
[redacted]

90

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: CHRIS HODSON Signature: [redacted] Date: JULY 11 | 2026

Neighbourhood: NEW WESTMINSTER

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: L. Shulman Signature: [redacted] Date: 11 JUL '26

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Kitsilano

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: Rob Stickles. Signature: [redacted] Date: July 11, 2026

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

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: Erin Hanratty Signature [redacted] Date: July 11, 2026

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Appendix L

Date: July 11, 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: Sydney Scharf

Neighbourhood: DVWBtR

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: FRANCES ANN LESLIE

Neighbourhood: JUNBAR

July 11, 2026

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: Hong Yan Yang

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 1/26

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: Anne Talbot-Kelly

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge / Mackenzie Heights

Date: July 11th 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: KEVIN I. O'MALLEY

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Sasha Westendorp

Neighbourhood: McKenzie

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: P.W. Johnson

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 13, 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: V.L. Williams

Neighbourhood: Kerrisdale

Date: July 13, 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: Sarah Little

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: 07/13/26

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: Colette Vadeboncoeur

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: CARMEN LEE

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: 2026-07-11

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: STUART F LESLIE

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: July 13, 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: Benjamin Martin

Neighbourhood: Marpole

Date: 2026/07/12

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: Simone Leslie

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

Date: JULY 13, 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: BRENT MARTIN

Neighbourhood: MARPOLE

Date: July 11/26

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: Albert Dreher

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Marlene Lebates

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

Date: July 11/26

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: Albert Dreher

Neighbourhood: Arbutus Ridge

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: Gillian Chotty

Neighbourhood: Dunbar

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: Gillian Chetty

Neighbourhood: Dunbar.

Date: 11 Jul '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: L. Stellmann

Neighbourhood: Dunbar / Kerrisdale

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: Nigel Cole-Morgan

Neighbourhood: Dunbar.

Date: July 11/26

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: Mary Simpson

Neighbourhood: Mackenzie + 33rd.

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: Robert Stickles.

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

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: Erin Hanratty

Neighbourhood: Kitsilano

Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver BC V5Y 1V4

July 12, 2026

Nancy Alexander
[redacted]

To the City Clerk's office, Mayor and Council

Re: The proposed 'Villages' Plan; July 14 2026 Hearing at City Hall

I oppose this proposal and I request that you cancel it all together. Do not send it back to any "drawing board". Let it go.

The 200+ page report brought to Council at such a late date for blanket rezoning in 17 large areas basically does not even mention Vancouver's many neighbourhoods by name. I believe it acknowledges Kitsilano twice. That is a kind of erasure, as the above proposal only confirms.

The vaunted so-called "Villages" model ignores existing communities and contributions. And, under new City-led rules, their voice is extinguished.

The current City Hall also ignores its individual citizens. Citizen input was once valued and we were not viewed as obstructionists with ideas that had no merit.

As has been written and mapped elsewhere, Vancouver has successfully developed increased density for decades, far surpassing most cities on this continent. This was achieved by thoughtful Vancouver Council and neighbourhood involvement.

I want to see creative and solution-oriented City Council and community collaboration return to City Hall.

Yours truly,

[redacted]

Nancy Alexander

July 11, 2026

Appendix N

To: Vancouver City Council

Re: Creation of "new villages"

I, Lorraine Portier, residing at 36th and Vine Street totally oppose the development of "new villages" when, in fact, there are already many "villages" that could be revitalized and that already have amenities such as libraries, community centres and parks.

L. Portier