

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
2026-07-20	15:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, We are writing to express our serious concerns and opposition regarding the proposed Villages Plan and to request that Council pause its adoption until there has been meaningful public consultation and a more comprehensive assessment of its impacts. We are long-time Vancouver residents (Grandview Woodland) and already live within walking distance of many of the amenities that the proposed Villages Plan seeks to create, including shops, services, parks, and transit. We appreciate the value of complete, walkable neighbourhoods because we already experience those benefits every day. However, this is precisely why we question whether a one-size-fits-all approach is appropriate. Neighbourhoods have different characteristics, different levels of existing amenities, and different needs. Planning policies should recognize these differences rather than applying broad rezoning measures without sufficient consideration of local context or meaningful input from the communities they will affect. We recognize and support the City's objective of increasing housing options and creating complete, walkable neighbourhoods. Vancouver needs thoughtful growth, diverse housing choices, and policies that respond to the needs of current and future residents. However, we do not believe the proposed Villages Plan, in its current form, adequately achieves these objectives. Our primary concern is the apparent lack of meaningful engagement with the residents who will be most affected by these changes. A plan that has the potential to fundamentally reshape established neighbourhoods should be developed through transparent and robust public consultation. Many residents were unaware of the proposal until it was already well advanced. Consultation should not simply inform the public of decisions that have effectively been made; it should genuinely incorporate community knowledge, identify unintended consequences, and allow residents to help shape better outcomes. Beyond the consultation process, there are several aspects of the proposal that appear insufficiently considered. First, the requirement or expectation for ground-floor commercial or retail uses raises significant questions. Across Vancouver there are already numerous vacant retail and commercial spaces that remain unleased for extended periods. Before creating additional commercially zoned space, the City should demonstrate that there is sufficient market demand to support it. Otherwise, we risk creating more vacant storefronts rather than vibrant neighbourhood centres. Economic realities should be reflected in planning policy. In addition, there appears to be a disconnect between the proposed level of redevelopment and current housing market conditions. Across Vancouver, there are reports of newly completed condominium units that remain unsold or unoccupied, while other projects have been delayed or cancelled due to challenging economic conditions. Before introducing widespread new zoning that encourages additional redevelopment, the City should explain how it has assessed existing housing inventory, current absorption rates, and market demand. If the market is already struggling to absorb recently completed housing, it is reasonable to question whether this proposal is appropriately timed or whether it may create uncertainty without delivering the intended housing outcomes. Second, the proposal appears to limit flexibility for existing homeowners. If properties are being rezoned to encourage greater density, why are long-term residents not being given	Elizabeth and Mesal Casalang	Grandview-Woodland	

			more opportunities to adapt their own properties? Many families would welcome the ability to build a laneway house, add a secondary dwelling, or renovate their homes to accommodate adult children, aging parents, or multigenerational living. These types of incremental, family-oriented forms of density are often more affordable, less disruptive, and better integrated into established neighbourhoods than large redevelopment projects. Third, there appears to be insufficient analysis of the financial impacts on existing residents. Rezoning frequently affects property values, assessments, and ultimately property taxes. Many long-time homeowners, including seniors and families on fixed or moderate incomes, are already struggling with Vancouver's rising cost of living. Council should clearly communicate how the Villages Plan could affect property taxation and what measures, if any, will be implemented to protect residents from unintended financial hardship. The proposal also seems disconnected from current market conditions. Vancouver's development sector has slowed considerably due to high construction costs, financing challenges, and uncertain market conditions. If the economics do not support redevelopment, much of the proposed zoning may simply remain unused while creating uncertainty for residents and property owners. Planning should be based not only on long-term aspirations but also on realistic assessments of market feasibility. In addition, we are concerned that the Plan does not appear to sufficiently address the infrastructure necessary to support increased density. Housing cannot be considered in isolation. Growth should be accompanied by careful planning for transportation, parking, schools, childcare, parks, community facilities, utilities, and healthcare services. Without corresponding investment, increased density risks reducing the quality of life for both existing and future residents. Good planning requires more than ambitious housing targets. It requires thoughtful implementation, sound economic analysis, infrastructure planning, transparency, and public trust. At present, we are not convinced that the Villages Plan demonstrates these qualities. We respectfully ask Council to: 1. Delay approval of the Villages Plan until meaningful neighbourhood consultation has been completed. 2. Publish a comprehensive analysis of the economic assumptions supporting new commercial zoning and the anticipated demand for additional retail space. 3. Provide greater flexibility for existing homeowners to create family-oriented housing options such as laneway houses, secondary dwellings, and renovations that support multigenerational living. 4. Conduct and publicly release an assessment of the potential impacts on property taxes and housing affordability for existing residents. 5. Demonstrate how supporting infrastructure and public services will be expanded alongside increased density. 6. Ensure that future planning is supported by transparent evidence regarding housing demand, existing unsold housing inventory, commercial vacancy rates, development feasibility, and current market conditions so that policy decisions are grounded in realistic expectations rather than assumptions. Vancouver deserves thoughtful, evidence-based planning that balances growth with livability and respects the voices of the communities that call these neighbourhoods home. We urge Council to reconsider the current proposal, undertake meaningful public engagement, and develop a more balanced plan that addresses these significant concerns before moving forward. Thank you for considering our comments.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				Sincerely, Mesal and Elizabeth Casaclang			
2026-07-20	15:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Once again, I register my opposition to this proposal. No meaningful in-person consultation has been conducted with neighbourhood residents. The boundaries of the proposed area to be rezoned in Cedar Cottage have been drawn oddly, excluding areas (such as along Stainsbury Avenue, Knight Street, Victoria Drive, Kingsway, and Commercial Drive) that have seen densification in recent years. Further, if there is a concern about a lack of access to grocery stores in the area, there are numerous such stores within reasonable walking distance, and ample access to public transit. Many houses in the area have gardens growing not just decorative flowers but also edible fruit and vegetables; adding high-rise construction to the neighbourhood would make such projects nonviable by denying them the necessary sunlight. Further, even with the densification that has occurred near the proposed area, the units are far from fully occupied, and Council would be better served focusing on how to get families needing a place to live into those units than building more in an area whose character has long been that of detached single-family homes. Neighbourhood residents, especially those who have lived here for decades and risk being forcibly displaced by redevelopment, uprooted from the community and connections they've built, have not been consulted in any meaningful way about this proposal. We have not had any case made to us for why this plan will ultimately be to our benefit. I am not opposed to densification, but I am opposed to densification imposed on current residents rather than being done in cooperative collaboration with them, particularly when the densification that has already occurred in the area has not even seen full occupancy. Council would be better served working to persuade residents of the benefits of the plan, mitigating its drawbacks, and acknowledging what has already been done, than drawing boundaries around an area that excludes existing densification efforts and longstanding local businesses serving the community and claiming without evidence that something needs to be done. I am open to being persuaded that this plan will be to my benefit, and to the benefit of everyone in the neighbourhood. But as of now no such case has been made to me, and what I can see for myself is that it will be to the detriment of current residents. I am therefore opposed to this proposal and I hope that Council can return to it in future with a more well-developed plan that takes into account what is actually needed and what has already been done.	Daniel Pareja	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-20	16:04	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please stop this plan. Since higher-density development was introduced, parking in our neighbourhood has become increasingly limited, and there is much more vehicle traffic than there was ten years ago. At the same time, our property taxes continue to rise. We do not need or want a high-density community.	andy liao	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-20	16:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We ask that this proposal be reconsidered. Since higher-density development began, parking in our neighbourhood has become increasingly scarce, and traffic levels are significantly higher than they were a decade ago. Meanwhile, our property taxes continue to increase. We do not feel that a high-density community is necessary or desirable for our area.	mei yang	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-20	19:53	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We oppose the Vancouver Villages proposal for several reasons. First, the very title “Villages” is a misnomer. Villages are places where families live, children grow up, and households have room to expand. What is being proposed here is not a village, but a collection of many units packed closely together. Simply calling it a village does not make it one. A true village supports families of different sizes, including larger families. This proposal appears to favor smaller households and does not reflect the way real villages function. Removing parking and car lanes and replacing them with bicycles does not create a village; it simply makes the area less suitable for families. Second, many commercial storefronts across the city are already sitting vacant. I have lived in the same house for 17 years, and on MacDonald Street, where you propose these villages, many storefronts remain empty. What makes you believe that we can absorb more storefronts over the next 17 years when existing commercial spaces are already unoccupied? Third, if these neighbourhoods are rezoned, will homeowners face higher property taxes because of increased land values? Many long-time residents may not be able to afford significant tax increases. We have also now entered a period of declining immigration, fewer international students, and slowing growth rates. At the same time, there are nearly 24,000 housing units currently entering the market. How will the city absorb this additional supply, and what evidence supports the need for even more development at this time?	Meirav David	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-20	21:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mayor and Council, I am a young Vancouver resident who hopes to build my future in this city. I support increasing housing supply, and I support very thoughtful densification. However, I cannot support the Villages proposal because I do not believe it represents equitable, evidence-based planning. This discussion should not be framed as being for or against housing. It should be about whether this is good planning. My first concern is fairness. If Vancouver is facing a housing crisis, then every neighbourhood should contribute to the solution. Yet this proposal asks some communities to absorb significant change while leaving others, including Shaughnessy and much of Point Grey, largely exempt. If we believe increased density is necessary, why should the responsibility not be shared across the entire city? My second concern is the public process. Decisions that will fundamentally reshape established neighbourhoods deserve broad public awareness and meaningful consultation. Yet many residents were unaware of the proposal until it was well underway. The City's own engagement represented only a very small fraction of Vancouver's population. For a policy with consequences that will last for generations, that level of engagement does not inspire confidence that residents were adequately informed or heard. Public trust depends on meaningful participation, not simply meeting the minimum requirements for consultation. Third, affordability has been treated as an assumption rather than a demonstrated outcome. Building more housing is important, but simply allowing more market-rate development does not automatically create affordable homes. We only need to look at many of Vancouver's recent developments to see that newly built housing is often priced well beyond the reach of young professionals, families, students, and essential workers. If affordability is the objective, Council should be asking what evidence demonstrates that this proposal will achieve it.	Lauren Caswell	Kitsilano	

				I am also concerned about the environmental and financial impacts. Vancouver has spent years emphasizing the importance of preserving its urban tree canopy because mature trees reduce heat, improve air quality, manage stormwater, and make neighbourhoods more livable. Yet redevelopment often requires removing mature trees, with removal itself costing thousands of dollars and replacement trees adding further expense, while taking decades to provide the same environmental benefits. We should carefully consider whether these costs have been fully accounted for before approving widespread redevelopment. Finally, Vancouver's neighbourhoods are not static. Many have already evolved through laneway homes, secondary suites, duplexes, multiplexes, and incremental redevelopment. Change has been happening organically. Rather than imposing sweeping city-initiated rezoning across selected neighbourhoods, Council should ask whether a more balanced, incremental, and city-wide approach would better achieve the goals of increasing housing while preserving the qualities that make these communities desirable places to live. I want Vancouver to grow. I want more people my age to be able to stay here. But good intentions are not enough. Good planning must be fair, transparent, financially responsible, environmentally conscious, and supported by evidence that it will actually achieve its stated objectives. I urge Council to reconsider this proposal and develop a more equitable, city-wide plan that distributes growth fairly, genuinely engages residents, and demonstrates how it will deliver meaningful improvements in housing affordability, not simply more market-rate housing. Thank you.			
2026-07-20	21:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	:I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Villages Plan and the associated city-initiated rezoning [Villages Planning Program].While I support the need for responsible growth and increased housing supply in Vancouver, this specific proposal is fundamentally flawed and rushed. I urge Council to vote against the plan for the following critical reasons: 1)Lack of Infrastructure Planning: The plan proposes massive density increases without a credible strategy to support the resulting population with vital infrastructure, such as schools, transit, parks, and utility upgrades. 2)No Guarantee of Affordability: There is no guarantee that the new developments will deliver the deeply affordable or below market housing our city desperately needs. Instead, the plan risks creating speculative conditions that will drive up property taxes and threaten existing, naturally affordable homes 3)Mandatory Commercial Zoning: Forcing mandatory retail and commercial spaces on the ground level of hundreds of single family and side street properties is impractical. It burdens homeowners and fails to account for the actual market viability of scattered retail hubs.4) Rushed Public Process: Pushing through a city-wide rezoning that affects roughly 14% of the city’s properties without adequate neighborhood-level consultation is undemocratic Residents deserve the time to review how these 17 proposed village hubs will impact the unique character and livability of their specific communities.5) Growth in Vancouver should be thoughtfully planned, community-driven, and properly funded. The Villages Plan currently asks Vancouverites to accept massive zoning changes on a wish list rather than a solid, comprehensive strategy 6) This is unfair to the property owners that have a functional expropriation of their land. I urge you to vote NOT SUPPORTED on the Villages Plan Thank you	Sherri Caswell	Kitsilano	
2026-07-20	22:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Subject: Opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan – Granville & West 41st Dear Mayor and Members of Vancouver City Council, I am a resident of the Granville and West 41st Avenue area, and I am writing to express my opposition to the current Vancouver Villages Plan and the proposed changes that would significantly increase development intensity in our neighbourhood.	Wen Xiao	Kerrisdale	

			I want to make clear that my opposition is not based on a belief that Vancouver should never grow or that no additional housing should be built. I support responsible housing development and reasonable opportunities for homeowners to renovate, expand, or rebuild their properties. However, I am concerned that the current Villages Plan goes too far, too quickly, without sufficient evidence that the proposed increase in apartments and retail space is economically viable or that the resulting development will actually create the vibrant, sustainable neighbourhood the City envisions. My concerns are particularly serious for the Granville & West 41st area. 1. The economic feasibility of additional apartments and retail space has not been adequately demonstrated. The City's vision for Villages assumes that increasing residential density and adding retail space will create vibrant, walkable neighbourhood centres. However, I believe the City needs to demonstrate that this assumption is supported by current market conditions. In and around our broader neighbourhood, there are already examples of newly developed residential and commercial space that has experienced difficulty achieving full occupancy. The presence of vacant or underutilized apartments and retail premises should raise an important question: before the City creates substantial additional development capacity, has it adequately assessed whether the existing market can absorb the additional housing and commercial space? The City's own retail analysis for Granville & West 41st projects substantial future demand for additional retail floor area. However, projections of future demand should not be treated as proof of economic feasibility. The City should also examine current vacancy rates, actual leasing activity, absorption rates, construction costs, financing costs, commercial rents, and the economic viability of existing retail businesses. I am particularly concerned that the Villages Plan could result in the construction of large amounts of new commercial space that is difficult to lease or sustain. Empty storefronts do not create vibrant villages. They can instead make existing neighbourhood commercial areas less attractive and less viable. Before approving significant additional density, I ask Council to require a transparent and independent feasibility analysis that addresses: Current apartment vacancy and absorption rates; Current and historical retail vacancy rates; The actual demand for additional retail space; The financial feasibility of constructing and operating new retail premises; The impact of construction costs and interest rates on development feasibility; Whether the projected new housing is likely to be affordable to Vancouver residents; Whether the proposed retail space can realistically support small and independent local businesses. The City should not assume that rezoning land for more apartments and retail automatically creates housing affordability or vibrant commercial villages. 2. Existing homeowners should retain reasonable opportunities to renovate, expand, and rebuild. I am concerned that the Villages Plan may unintentionally reduce the flexibility available to existing property owners who simply want to improve or replace their homes.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			Many existing homeowners have invested significantly in their properties and have chosen to live in these neighbourhoods for many years. They should not be placed in a position where the only economically viable future for their property is to participate in a large-scale redevelopment or land assembly. A homeowner should be able to reasonably renovate an existing home, add living space for family members, rebuild when necessary, or replace an aging house without being disadvantaged by a planning system designed primarily around large-scale redevelopment. I therefore ask Council to ensure that the Villages Plan protects a meaningful range of options for existing property owners. The City should clearly demonstrate that homeowners will continue to have practical and economically reasonable pathways to: Renovate existing homes; Add appropriate living space; Rebuild or replace aging homes; Create housing for extended family members; Maintain and improve existing properties without being pressured toward redevelopment. The City's housing strategy should not treat existing homeowners merely as future redevelopment sites. 3. The proposed redevelopment risks destroying the green character and identity of our neighbourhood. The Granville & West 41st area is not simply an underdeveloped collection of properties waiting to be intensified. It is an established neighbourhood with mature trees, gardens, landscaped yards, setbacks, and a distinctive residential character. The green character of the neighbourhood is an important part of its environmental and social value. Mature trees and established landscaping cannot simply be replaced by newly planted trees after redevelopment. Once mature trees, gardens, and established green spaces are removed, it can take decades to recreate the same environmental benefits and sense of place. I am concerned that the cumulative effect of the Villages Plan could be the gradual loss of these characteristics through: Larger building footprints; Reduced setbacks; Removal of mature trees; Loss of private green space; Increased hard surfaces; More construction activity and land assembly; A transition from individually designed homes to increasingly uniform multi-unit developments. The City should not define "neighbourhood character" merely by building height or architectural appearance. The character of Granville & West 41st is also created by its trees, gardens, open spaces, mature landscaping, and the relationship between homes and streets. If the City wishes to increase density in this area, it should do so in a way that preserves these qualities rather than treating them as obstacles to redevelopment. 4. I ask Council to reconsider the scale and approach of the Villages Plan.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				I believe Vancouver can pursue additional housing without fundamentally transforming every neighbourhood into a high-density redevelopment zone. Instead of relying primarily on broad upzoning and assuming that market forces will produce the desired outcome, I encourage Council to adopt a more measured and evidence-based approach. Specifically, I ask Council to: Conduct and publish independent economic feasibility studies for the proposed residential and retail development capacity. Publish current vacancy, absorption, and leasing data for apartments and commercial premises in the Granville & West 41st area and surrounding neighbourhoods. Reassess the projected demand for new retail space against actual market conditions and the performance of existing commercial areas. Protect existing homeowners' reasonable ability to renovate, expand, and rebuild their properties without being forced into large-scale redevelopment as the only practical option. Establish meaningful protections for mature trees, landscaped yards, setbacks, and green space. Conduct a neighbourhood-specific assessment of the cumulative impact of redevelopment rather than applying a broad, standardized approach across Vancouver. Consider a phased approach to additional density, allowing the City to evaluate actual housing demand, retail absorption, infrastructure capacity, and neighbourhood impacts before approving further increases. I support a Vancouver that provides more housing and opportunities for future generations. However, I do not believe that more density, by itself, guarantees affordability, economic vitality, or better neighbourhoods. The City should be careful not to replace an existing, functioning neighbourhood with a speculative vision of what it might become. Before making fundamental and potentially irreversible changes to Granville & West 41st, Council should demonstrate that the proposed development is economically viable, that existing property owners are treated fairly, and that the neighbourhood's mature green character can genuinely be preserved. I respectfully ask Council to reject the Villages Plan in its current form, or at minimum defer its implementation in the Granville & West 41st area until these concerns have been properly studied and addressed. Thank you for considering my concerns. Sincerely, Victoria, Wen Xiao Resident of the Granville & West 41st Avenue Area			
2026-07-20	22:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	To the Mayor and City Council Members My name is Gillian Rudge. I am a long-time Vancouver resident. I have lived over 30 years in my current home. I am vehemently opposed to the Villages planning program. When my neighbours and I learned about this hearing on July 8 we were all deeply troubled by the proposed changes as outlined by Vancouver City Council. As community members, we are not opposed to thoughtful housing development in all areas of the city but we are genuinely concerned that the current scale, placement and density of	Gillian Rudge	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

			the Villages Planning Proposal all fail to account for, among other issues, local neighbourhood infrastructure constraints, quality of life considerations, environmental impacts, and congestion and accessibility in our streets and laneways. The rush to approve this plan before the upcoming election later this year is disingenuous and fails to respect democratic principles that underpin good, sound, and reasonable governance. The timing of the hearing when many residents are not currently in the city, the inadequacy of the information provided in earlier communications about the Villages Plan, and the choice by the Mayor and Council to deliver information cards about the July 14th hearing only 8 days prior to the meeting are all incredibly disappointing from a City Council that claims to have the interest of Vancouver residents at heart. One of our primary concerns with the Villages Planning program is the proposed bylaw amendment that would accompany this plan. This amendment would enable developers to begin construction without the opportunity for local public input. This means Vancouver residents would no longer have an opportunity to express concerns about development in both their immediate and surrounding neighbourhoods. At last week’s hearing we learned that owners of residences in the proposed mixed-use areas would lose the right to improve or build on their own lots. This is de facto expropriation. This lack of transparency and the loss of opportunity for thoughtful reflection and meaningful local input is completely unacceptable. I would like to highlight three off the many issues we have with the plan. #1 A "One-Size-Fits-All" Approach The blanket upzoning of 17 different villages across hundreds of blocks all at once fails to respect the unique architectural, historical, and infrastructure realities of individual neighborhoods like ours. If your priority is vibrant, livable communities then a one-size-fits-all approach to town planning is a step backwards for Vancouver. An example of difference that has been ignored by the Village Plan is the variation in lot sizes within each area. Lot depths in our area vary greatly, from approximately 130 ft (40 m) to approximately 96 ft (29 m). Clearly lot size differences impact the type of structure that could be built, especially considering appropriate set back from the street and access to parking. As 30-year residents in our area, we have supported density changes such as property conversions that provide main floor, basement, and laneway homes enabling double and triple occupancy and duplex development with secondary suites that provide quadruple occupancy. These types of housing all currently exist on our street. In fact, they represent approximately 90% of the 32 lots. #2 Loss of Natural Habitat Associated with the Villages Plan Our area is well known for its many tree-lined streets and homes that have mature trees. These trees and the gardens that the Vancouver community highly values provide a natural habitat for many insects, birds and animals. When homes like ours are knocked down and the gardens and trees are removed to build out to the lot lines on all sides, these habitats disappear as does the wildlife. Vancouver might have to rethink how it markets itself in the future. #3 Neighbourhood Impact The main road in our neighbourhood has a single lane of traffic in each direction and is a busy bus route, the #33. Intensifying density along this bus route without expanding sidewalk widths, layout, or utility infrastructure, presents a safety hazard for all road users		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				(e.g., vehicle, bike, and scooter) and a pedestrian hazard for all who use this route. In addition, this street is lined with many tall, mature trees that would not likely survive the construction of 4-6 storey buildings, especially if it is left up to developers to determine whether they should be removed. Parking in our neighbourhood is already at a premium and the streets are narrow and already highly congested. We argue that multi-story residences and the associated vehicle traffic will further choke residential streets and laneways in an effort to create retail services we do not need; our neighbourhood is currently a 7-minute walk or roll to shops and services. Conclusion We support increasing housing supply, but blanket upzoning across the hundreds of blocks in the Villages Plan treats fundamentally different neighborhoods as though they are the same in every way. In these hearings you have heard, repeatedly, about the dissatisfaction within three particular areas – East 33rd, West 33rd, and Dunbar – where residents note that critical aspects of their neighbourhoods have been ignored. Good planning in all areas should be context-sensitive, reflecting each area's needs. A phased, evidence-based approach would better balance housing objectives with thoughtful neighborhood planning. Finally, would you buy clothing in a One-Size-Fits-All shop? Would you send your children to a One-Size-Fits-All school? Would you seek medical treatment at a One-Size-Fits-All hospital? Not likely. But it appears you are prepared to impose a One-Size-Fits-All neighbourhood plan on the thousands of residents who live on over 13,000 city lots. We urge the Mayor and Council to reject this proposal in its current form and make the necessary changes to plan so that it incorporates thoughtful planning and allows for local input. Thank you for considering the feedback of Vancouver residents who want to ensure that Vancouver remains one of the most respected and liveable cities in the world. Gillian Rudge			
2026-07-20	22:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I want to make clear that my opposition is not based on a belief that Vancouver should never grow or that no additional housing should be built. I support responsible housing development and reasonable opportunities for homeowners to renovate, expand, or rebuild their properties. However, I am concerned that the current Villages Plan goes too far, too quickly, without sufficient evidence that the proposed increase in apartments and retail space is economically viable or that the resulting development will actually create the vibrant, sustainable neighbourhood the City envisions. My concerns are particularly serious for the Granville & West 41st area. 1. The economic feasibility of additional apartments and retail space has not been adequately demonstrated. The City's vision for Villages assumes that increasing residential density and adding retail space will create vibrant, walkable neighbourhood centres. However, I believe the City needs to demonstrate that this assumption is supported by current market conditions. In and around our broader neighbourhood, there are already examples of newly developed residential and commercial space that has experienced difficulty achieving full occupancy. The presence of vacant or underutilized apartments and retail premises should raise an	Kai li	Oakridge	

			important question: before the City creates substantial additional development capacity, has it adequately assessed whether the existing market can absorb the additional housing and commercial space? The City's own retail analysis for Granville & West 41st projects substantial future demand for additional retail floor area. However, projections of future demand should not be treated as proof of economic feasibility. The City should also examine current vacancy rates, actual leasing activity, absorption rates, construction costs, financing costs, commercial rents, and the economic viability of existing retail businesses. I am particularly concerned that the Villages Plan could result in the construction of large amounts of new commercial space that is difficult to lease or sustain. Empty storefronts do not create vibrant villages. They can instead make existing neighbourhood commercial areas less attractive and less viable. Before approving significant additional density, I ask Council to require a transparent and independent feasibility analysis that addresses: Current apartment vacancy and absorption rates; Current and historical retail vacancy rates; The actual demand for additional retail space; The financial feasibility of constructing and operating new retail premises; The impact of construction costs and interest rates on development feasibility; Whether the projected new housing is likely to be affordable to Vancouver residents; Whether the proposed retail space can realistically support small and independent local businesses. The City should not assume that rezoning land for more apartments and retail automatically creates housing affordability or vibrant commercial villages. 2. Existing homeowners should retain reasonable opportunities to renovate, expand, and rebuild. I am concerned that the Villages Plan may unintentionally reduce the flexibility available to existing property owners who simply want to improve or replace their homes. Many existing homeowners have invested significantly in their properties and have chosen to live in these neighbourhoods for many years. They should not be placed in a position where the only economically viable future for their property is to participate in a large-scale redevelopment or land assembly. A homeowner should be able to reasonably renovate an existing home, add living space for family members, rebuild when necessary, or replace an aging house without being disadvantaged by a planning system designed primarily around large-scale redevelopment. I therefore ask Council to ensure that the Villages Plan protects a meaningful range of options for existing property owners. The City should clearly demonstrate that homeowners will continue to have practical and economically reasonable pathways to: Renovate existing homes; Add appropriate living space; Rebuild or replace aging homes; Create housing for extended family members; Maintain and improve existing properties without being pressured toward redevelopment. The City's housing strategy should not treat existing homeowners merely as future		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			redevelopment sites. 3. The proposed redevelopment risks destroying the green character and identity of our neighbourhood. The Granville & West 41st area is not simply an underdeveloped collection of properties waiting to be intensified. It is an established neighbourhood with mature trees, gardens, landscaped yards, setbacks, and a distinctive residential character. The green character of the neighbourhood is an important part of its environmental and social value. Mature trees and established landscaping cannot simply be replaced by newly planted trees after redevelopment. Once mature trees, gardens, and established green spaces are removed, it can take decades to recreate the same environmental benefits and sense of place. I am concerned that the cumulative effect of the Villages Plan could be the gradual loss of these characteristics through: Larger building footprints; Reduced setbacks; Removal of mature trees; Loss of private green space; Increased hard surfaces; More construction activity and land assembly; A transition from individually designed homes to increasingly uniform multi-unit developments. The City should not define "neighbourhood character" merely by building height or architectural appearance. The character of Granville & West 41st is also created by its trees, gardens, open spaces, mature landscaping, and the relationship between homes and streets. If the City wishes to increase density in this area, it should do so in a way that preserves these qualities rather than treating them as obstacles to redevelopment. 4. I ask Council to reconsider the scale and approach of the Villages Plan. I believe Vancouver can pursue additional housing without fundamentally transforming every neighbourhood into a high-density redevelopment zone. Instead of relying primarily on broad upzoning and assuming that market forces will produce the desired outcome, I encourage Council to adopt a more measured and evidence-based approach. Specifically, I ask Council to: Conduct and publish independent economic feasibility studies for the proposed residential and retail development capacity. Publish current vacancy, absorption, and leasing data for apartments and commercial premises in the Granville & West 41st area and surrounding neighbourhoods. Reassess the projected demand for new retail space against actual market conditions and the performance of existing commercial areas. Protect existing homeowners' reasonable ability to renovate, expand, and rebuild their properties without being forced into large-scale redevelopment as the only practical option. Establish meaningful protections for mature trees, landscaped yards, setbacks, and green space. Conduct a neighbourhood-specific assessment of the cumulative impact of redevelopment			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				rather than applying a broad, standardized approach across Vancouver. Consider a phased approach to additional density, allowing the City to evaluate actual housing demand, retail absorption, infrastructure capacity, and neighbourhood impacts before approving further increases. I support a Vancouver that provides more housing and opportunities for future generations. However, I do not believe that more density, by itself, guarantees affordability, economic vitality, or better neighbourhoods. The City should be careful not to replace an existing, functioning neighbourhood with a speculative vision of what it might become. Before making fundamental and potentially irreversible changes to Granville & West 41st, Council should demonstrate that the proposed development is economically viable, that existing property owners are treated fairly, and that the neighbourhood's mature green character can genuinely be preserved. I respectfully ask Council to reject the Villages Plan in its current form, or at minimum defer its implementation in the Granville & West 41st area until these concerns have been properly studied and addressed. Thank you for considering my concerns.			
2026-07-20	22:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to express my opposition to the current Vancouver Villages Plan and the proposed changes that would significantly increase development intensity in our neighbourhood. 1. The economic feasibility of additional apartments and retail space has not been adequately demonstrated. 2. Existing homeowners should retain reasonable opportunities to renovate, expand, and rebuild. 3. The proposed redevelopment risks destroying the green character and identity of our neighbourhood.	YUNJIE WU	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-20	23:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The planning department stated that no infrastructure upgrades would be needed for The Villages Plan besides some water upgrades. I have calculated the sanitary flow for my catchment at Sherbrooke Street & 33rd Avenue on the attached spreadsheet. I calculate the sewer to be at 115% of full with the proposed zoning. Sewer pipes are not typically designed to flow full. I would like to see their proof that no infrastructure upgrades are necessary because there are many combined sewers and pipes installed more than 50 years ago. These pipes were not designed for the large increase in density, the increased runoff coefficients, and climate change.	Aaron Berghoffer	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Attachment 1 Attachment 2

2026-07-21	00:42	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I just now learned of the Housing Accelerator Fund and how it relates to the “villages” plan. I am very concerned by the issues/questions raised here: https://cityhallwatch.wordpress.com/2026/07/20/housing-accelerator-fund-cad30m-dark-horse-villages-mass-upzoning/#more-117560 Why has the City not made all this crucial information clear and readily available to Vancouverites? The fact that thousands of participants in this public hearing have expressed such strong, impassioned and well reasoned objections to the “villages” plan indicates that no amount of potential funding from HAF is any justification for supporting this plan. Please vote NO.	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey	
2026-07-21	07:32	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This would drastically change the character of the neighborhood.	Michael Galbraith	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-21	08:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	To: Mayor Sim and Councillors Subject: Villages Planning Program, Public Hearing, July 14, 2026 I Support well-planned housing growth and affordability. I Oppose the proposed Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments (the Villages Plan) in its current form because it lacks sufficient community planning, infrastructure commitments, and meaningful consultation. Many of the residents of the Mackenzie Street and 41st Avenue area who will be impacted by the Village Plan are unaware of such a plan. This was evidenced at a recent informal gathering of the neighbourhood residents to discuss the proposed plan. Many residents remain unaware of the full implications of the proposed changes for their own properties and neighbourhood. I Request that Council defer approval until village-specific planning is completed. The request is not intended to oppose planning for additional housing and promoting communities. Rather it is based on concerns that Council has not yet provided residents with sufficient information, neighbourhood-specific analysis, or meaningful opportunity to understand and comment on the significant policy changes being proposed. The village planning program represents one of the most consequential city-wide planning initiatives in recent decades. It proposes amendments to the Vancouver Official Development Plan, city-initiated rezonings, and amendments to several municipal by-laws that will shape land use, redevelopment potential, neighbourhood character, and public infrastructure for generations. Such decisions require a planning process that is transparent, evidence-based, and founded on informed public participation. MAJOR CONCERNS Lack of Meaningful Community Consultation • Homeowners, renters, seniors, local businesses and other affected community members have not been adequately involved in shaping the future of their neighbourhood. • Consultation focused on broad concepts rather than meaningful co-design. Insufficient transparency • Community feedback has not been transparently reflected in the final proposal.	Ric Arboit	Arbutus Ridge	

			• Expected development timelines • Anticipated building forms and heights • Density levels proposed for neighborhood • Redevelopment sequences • Impacts on existing homes and businesses • Financial impacts for taxpayers • Implementation strategy/priorities One-Size-Fits-All Planning • Each village has unique history, character, businesses, transportation patterns, and infrastructure. • Applying similar planning assumptions across all 17 villages ignores local conditions. • Village-specific planning should precede zoning and development changes. Infrastructure Not Keeping Pace Current infrastructure is already under pressure. Examples include: • Schools • Childcare • Parks • Community centres • Libraries • Utilities • Sewers • Water systems • Roads • Public transit • Emergency services Questions that remain unanswered: • Who pays? • When will upgrades occur? • What guarantees exist before redevelopment proceeds? Traffic and Parking Impacts • Increased density will significantly increase local traffic. • Existing neighbourhood streets already experience congestion. • Visitor and customer parking is limited. • Construction impacts on traffic, parking and walking is very disruptive to residents and businesses and may continue for years. Threat to Local Businesses • Small independent businesses face displacement. • Higher land values and redevelopment pressure increase commercial rents. • Construction disruption may permanently close long-standing businesses. • Village character depends on diverse local businesses, not just new buildings with some retail space allocation. Loss of Neighbourhood Character Residents value: • Heritage buildings • Mature trees • Walkable streets • Human-scale development • Public gathering spaces • Safety			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			• Local; businesses • Housing diversity that reflects neighborhood needs Rapid redevelopment risks replacing these qualities with generic development. Tree Canopy and Environmental Impacts • Mature trees may be removed. • Increased hard surfaces reduce climate resilience. • Urban heat island effects may increase. • Green infrastructure commitments remain unclear. Affordable Housing Questions Support additional housing, but ask: • How much will actually be affordable? • Affordable to whom? • What percentage is below market? • How many family-sized units? • How many rental units are guaranteed long term? Without binding affordability requirements, increased density may simply produce more expensive housing as we currently witness. Development Speculation • Property speculation may accelerate. • Rising land values create pressure on existing homeowners and renters. • Existing affordable rental housing may disappear through redevelopment. Heritage Protection • Many villages contain historically significant buildings. • Redevelopment incentives may encourage demolition rather than preservation. • Heritage protection should occur before increased development rights. Public Facilities Growth should be accompanied by commitments to: • New parks • Schools • Childcare • Recreation facilities • Public plazas • Community gathering spaces These commitments should be secured before significant redevelopment begins. REQUESTS TO COUNCIL Defer approval of the Villages Plan. Good planning depends on public confidence. Planning decisions are more durable when the residents believe the process has been fair, transparent, and evidence-based. • Complete village-specific planning for each community. • Conduct meaningful consultation with residents, businesses, and community organizations. • Prepare infrastructure funding plans before approving additional density. • Establish measurable affordability targets. • Strengthen heritage protections. • Protect existing local businesses. • Increase tree protection requirements. • Publish transportation and infrastructure impact studies.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				• Phase growth according to infrastructure capacity. • CLOSING STATEMENT • I support thoughtful growth. • I support more housing. • I support complete, livable communities. • I do not support planning that outpaces infrastructure, lacks village-specific analysis, or fails to reflect meaningful community input. • Council should pause the current Villages Plan, address these deficiencies, and return with a plan that balances housing needs with the long-term health, identity, and livability of each proposed village Sincerely, Ric Arboit Homeowner			
2026-07-21	09:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the requirement for retail space in densification plan as an unnecessary competition to already established (and struggling, in some cases) organic neighbour high streets. I would consider supporting a plan that removed that requirement, as I support more low-rise densification. I fundamentally object to high-rise densification as community destroying.	Marie Cocking	Fairview	
2026-07-21	10:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Members of Vancouver City Council, I am writing to express my concern about the proposed rezoning changes in our neighbourhood. While I understand the need for more housing, increasing density on this scale could create several serious problems, including: Increased traffic and congestion on local streets Less street parking for residents and visitors Greater pressure on schools, parks, sewer systems, water services, and emergency services Loss of privacy, natural light, green space, and mature trees More noise, dust, road closures, and long-term construction disruption Higher property taxes, insurance costs, and other expenses for existing homeowners Increased pressure on longtime residents to sell to developers Loss of the neighbourhood’s character and sense of community More flooding or drainage issues from increased building coverage New housing being added faster than the surrounding infrastructure can support I respectfully ask Council to slow down the process, carefully study the impact on each neighbourhood, and ensure that proper infrastructure and protections are in place before approving widespread rezoning. Thank you for considering the concerns of local residents. Sincerely, [David M] [REDACTED]	David MacKenzie		

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
2026-07-21	10:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I vehemently oppose this plan. The City Manager, Planning Department and Council should be ashamed about bringing such a MISGUIDED proposal forward WITH LITTLE TO NO CONSULTATION. THE NOTICE OF ANY PAST OPEN HOUSES, ETC WAS INEFFECTUAL AT BEST. HOW ABOUT NEXT TIME INFORMING RESIDENTS ON THE FRONT OF THE POSTCARD THAT 6 STOREY APARTMENT BUILDINGS WILL BE BUILT BESIDE YOUR SINGLE FAMILY / DUPLEX, ETC DWELLING, NOT BY 2050 BUT BEGINNING IN 2026. IT'S CLEAR THE CITY DIDN'T WANT RESIDENCES TO KNOW.	kevin SHARP	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-21	10:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As someone who has recently purchased a home in the Fraserview area, I am concerned with the scale and impact these pre-zonings will have. If we had know such a change was being proposed in this neighbourhood we may have reconsidered purchasing here. Me and my partner feel blindsided by the change and the attempt for council to push this through before the election. We love the Fraserhood area and support further densifying this neighbourhood but, a blanket pre-zoning is not the solution. I think more careful attention needs to be given to each of the neighbourhoods proposed for the villages plan.	Adam Poole	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-21	10:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please pass on my opposition the Villages Plan as it currently stands ; the destruction of mature trees is absolutely unacceptable at this dire stage of climate change . The lack of even basic urban planning and considered design features is beyond comprehension ; what happened to our excellent planning staff, working to create liveable communities ? Please alter the proposal to reflect our citizens desires for green space , intelligent design and sustainability .	Suzette Meyers		
2026-07-21	10:48	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Do not want my house to become a six story development and my neighborhood to become a development dream	Louise Haut	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-21	12:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	: As a resident of the area of the proposed village at Fraser and 33rd I write to express my opposition to the village plan as it is currently outlined. ☹️This plan will cause hardship to many residents including myself and my family. Changing our zoning will prevent us from continuing to enjoy and upgrade our home (where we have lived since 2010). The taxes associated with a rezoning are unaffordable to us. ☹️I worry that significant densification without a plan for also developing services and public spaces including transit, parks, schools, community centres etc will prevent access to and enjoyment of the current spaces and amenities by existing residents. ☹️What you are proposing will negatively change the neighbourhood we love and the one in which we have chosen to raise our family. It is already a village. I know my neighbours, participate in community gatherings and events, and can walk to many stores. ☹️Please do not make these changes as currently proposed. It only benefits developers and will ruin the place we call home.	Jonathan Stacey	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

2026-07-21	12:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	: As a resident of the area of the proposed village at Fraser and 33rd I write to express my opposition to the village plan as it is currently outlined. ☹️This plan will cause hardship to many residents including myself and my family. Changing our zoning will prevent us from continuing to enjoy and upgrade our home (where we have lived since 2010). The taxes associated with a rezoning are unaffordable to us. ☹️I worry that significant densification without a plan for also developing services and public spaces including transit, parks, schools, community centres etc will prevent access to and enjoyment of the current spaces and amenities by existing residents. ☹️What you are proposing will negatively change the neighbourhood we love and the one in which we have chosen to raise our family. It is already a village. I know my neighbours, participate in community gatherings and events, and can walk to many stores. ☹️Please do not make these changes as currently proposed. It only benefits developers and will ruin the place we call home.	Jonathan Stacey	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-21	12:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing as a homeowner living in one of the 17 neighbourhoods directly affected by the proposed Villages Plan. Increasing Vancouver's housing supply in an affordable manner is needed for the city to grow. However, growth should be guided by sound planning principles, and not simply just increasing allowable density, and by taking advantage of initiatives that have been successful and expanding upon them rather than just tearing down to start from scratch. The issue is how to grow this in a thoughtful, quality manner that respects existing neighbourhoods while maintaining environmental green space, and investment in infrastructure. I do not believe the Villages Plan, as currently proposed, reflects these principles. My concerns include: 1. A one-size-fits-all approach that does not adequately recognize the unique character, infrastructure capacity, and needs of individual neighbourhoods. For example, from some of the speakers at your council meeting, high street plans in some neighbourhoods do not follow current existing high streets which have the potential to create empty storefronts. Many neighbourhoods have duplexes and laneway houses which add density but maintain individual character and green space. 2. Loss of neighbourhood character. Good planning should ensure that new development complements rather than overwhelms established residential areas. Having a mixture of homes, laneway homes, duplexes, and multiplexes allows for character, and greenery. 3. Inadequate protection of mature trees and green space. Trees and green space are essential for the city's air quality, climate resilience, and livability. It is part of the reason why our city is rated as highly liveable. The proposed plan has no safeguards to protect existing mature trees which are mostly located on private property. 4. Insufficient infrastructure planning. Growth should be supported by schools, parks, childcare, community centres, transportation, utilities, and emergency services before significant increases in density occur. The proposed plan has no safeguards on how to build or upgrade infrastructure. Creating a plaza along a high street does not equate a park which would maintain environmental green space lost, and a plaza does not create a park for children to play in, and for people plus animals to walk through. In my neighbourhood, there are no parks with the nearest park being a leash free dog park on the other side of Oak street, and the nearby public schools are at capacity (Sir William Osler) or over capacity (Ecole Rose des Vents has trailers and borrowed space from the church across the street, Edith Cavell & Jamieson schools have trailers and a lottery system for enrollment). With increased density, there is a need for parking spaces beyond filling the streets which in my neighbourhood are full with traffic during VanDusen Garden Events. Parents have children who are involved in activities and sports which will require a car to shuttle them. 5. More density does not necessarily create affordability. The proposed plan does not show how it will produce homes that are genuinely affordable for middle income families and first time buyers. There is nothing in this plan that provides low income housing where it is really needed. 6. Preventing homeowners from making changes to their property when the street is earmarked for commercial and residential use will open the city to lawsuits which it can ill	holly fong	Oakridge	

			afford. Previous land expropriation has traditionally been for infrastructure upgrades such as schools, roads, and transit. 7. Neighbourhood specific planning should precede major zoning changes because meaningful public consultation is essential and has not occurred. Residents deserve a meaningful opportunity to help shape the future of their communities. They should not find out about proposed changes for through a post card sent in the mail about a council vote on a highly impactful plan without any input or documentation. Planning decisions of this magnitude should be developed collaboratively with residents, not simply presented for comment after key policy directions have been established. For example, community input improved proposed plans for Olympic Village and maximized community by in. 8. Changing 17 neighbourhoods all at once does not ensure success. Each neighbourhood is different with unique identities and needs. It proposes to change 17 neighbourhoods simultaneously without clear evidence of what works, what is sustainable, and without safeguards to maintain existing neighbourhood character, greenspaces, and how to build or upgrade infrastructure. The city already has plenty of expensive, empty condos that do not meet residents needs, and empty storefronts. 9. The proposed plan is up for a council vote towards the end of this council’s mandate which removes accountability and opens the plan to be discarded by a potential new administration. This plan is not an overnight plan. The proposed changes are immense, occurring over a decade or more, impacting a majority of residents. As such citizens should be able to vote on these changes in an election. As it happens, such an election is happening shortly, and this is the right forum for a plebiscite on this plan. By delaying approval of this plan until after the upcoming Civic election will give all Vancouverites the right to express their opinion of this plan, a right that is essential in a true democracy. I respectfully ask Council to reject the Villages Plan in its current form and direct staff to prepare a revised approach that emphasizes neighbourhood specific planning, infrastructure first investment, protection of our urban forest, and context sensitive, well designed housing that enhances rather than diminishes our communities. Thank you for your consideration, Holly Fong ██████████		
--	--	--	---	--	--

2026-07-21	12:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing as I heard only through a member of the public that is located within the MacDonald Street area. Ironically I have immediate family that live two houses away from the proposed rezoning area in Mackenzie/33rd and were not aware of the plan. I oppose the plan as it is proposed and my comments are as follows: - Foremost, the City did not provide adequate consultation and notification to home owners (inside and outside of the proposed village). - The village proposed at Mackenzie/33rd is not appropriate. Nearby locations such as Dunbar, Kerrisdale and Macdonald where significant retail development currently exists is more appropriate for 6 story buildings with retail. - Council should lower the number of stories permitted. 6 stories is way too tall for most of these residential locations, causing shading and alterations to neighbours microclimate. - Council could consider a gradation of zoning heights or reduce the village size to 2 block radius from the proposed main streets. - Council should allow those homeowners within the core area /street (as well as the others) still to be able to build laneway homes, renovate, etc as per the current SFR zoning. Otherwise the City should compensate these homeowners. - Provincial "school" tax is going up 50% in 2027, which if these properties are now worth more, could force long time residents to have to sell. - Council should consider a "trial" village(s) and then later apply those learnings to future villages. - Why were all the villages proposed at approximately a 4 block radius from the main intersection? The City needs to retain neighbourhoods character through creative rezoning. - The zoning should come with bylaw requirements for developers to designate significant spaces to allow for green canopies of trees (not just small columnar ones) and a significant contribution retaining green space (not just indoor recreational facilities). Thank you for your consideration.	Lauren Cherkezoff	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-21	13:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am strongly against this Villages plan. Like so many others that have been approved by this and previous councils this only supports developers and land speculators and will do nothing to make housing more affordable while destroying communities and putting even further pressure on already stressed resources and things like health care, schools etc. Send this back this does not need to be rushed thru and maybe some much better ideas will emerge during the fall election.	Don Gardner	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-21	13:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I want to be clear from the outset: I believe in development and growth for our city, and I am not writing as someone opposed to change. But I have serious concerns with the Villages Plan as currently proposed, and I do not believe it will fix the affordability and housing challenges we actually face. I understand this Public Hearing, first opened on July 14, resumes today, and I ask that you weigh the following before voting. The scale of this rezoning is overreach. Roughly 13,260 parcels – about 14 per cent of all land in the city – would be rezoned for four- to six-storey buildings, with heights up to eight storeys in some locations, and about 96 per cent of properties within the designated areas would be pre-zoned so that individual projects no longer come back to Council or the public. My home on West 13th Avenue in Kitsilano sits just a few blocks from the Macdonald Street and West 16th Avenue Village, one of the areas directly named in this rezoning. This is not incremental change to complement 17 neighbourhoods; it is a wholesale transformation of the low-density character that defines them. The overreach goes further than the 17 Villages themselves. The same bylaw package before you also amends the Cambie Corridor Plan, the Cambie Corridor Public Realm Plan, the Marpole Community Plan, the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan and Public Realm Plan, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, and the Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan – each adopted after its own, separate, multi-year community planning process. Folding all of these into a single hearing is not proportionate engagement; it reopens commitments	Mark LEDENBACH	Kitsilano	

			made to several different communities at once, under one vote. That points to the deeper problem: this has not amounted to meaningful engagement with the residents actually affected. An 18-month planning process run at the citywide level, now being used to also amend several older, separately-negotiated community plans, is not the same as genuine, block-by-block engagement with the people whose homes and streets are being rezoned. Many residents are only learning the specifics of what happens on their own block through this hearing itself. These neighbourhoods have a distinct scale, streetscape, and community feel that residents value and that took decades to establish. Replacing detached homes and small local shops with blocks of mid-rise, mixed-use buildings will not enhance that character – it will erase it. The Plan is being sold as a path to affordability through sheer volume of new supply, but the City’s own figures do not support that. As of late 2025, the City reported roughly 47,400 housing units sitting in its development pipeline, against only about 4,850 homes actually completed that year. On the Broadway Plan – the City’s own template for this style of upzoning – 146 projects have entered the pipeline, 68 remain stuck at the rezoning-application stage, and only a single project has reached occupancy. Rezoning and redevelopment applications are not the same as built, occupied homes. Zoom out from the Villages Plan alone and the numbers are more striking still. Combined with the recently approved Official Development Plan and the Broadway Plan, the City has now granted private owners of roughly 80,000 parcels the right to build about 700,000 new housing units – enough capacity for an extra 1.4 million people, more than double Vancouver’s current population of 670,000. At the city’s own roughly 1 per cent annual population growth rate, that is over a century of housing supply authorized in one stretch, on top of an existing approvals pipeline of about 78,000 units that alone would cover roughly 30 years of trend growth. UBC Professor Emeritus Patrick Condon has raised this same point independently in his own submission to this hearing, and I share his concern. The bylaw details before you today undercut the affordability framing further. The new C-2D mixed-use district is explicitly exempted from the rental replacement requirements of the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan, and unlike the R3-4 and C-2E districts, it carries no inclusionary affordable housing requirement at all. The Plan also raises the floor space ratio in all R-3 districts from 1.45 to 1.6 for sites over 460 square metres, layered on top of rezoning existing low-density R1-1, duplex, and multiplex parcels into these higher-density districts. A meaningful share of the added capacity under this Plan can proceed without replacing a single existing rental unit or contributing to affordable housing. This entitlement is also being given away for free. Contrary to the City’s own long-standing practice on density approvals, no land value capture or payment is being asked of landowners in exchange for rights that Professor Condon estimates are worth billions of dollars. A properly designed land-lift charge – the model that helped finance Vancouver’s own False Creek South and Yaletown – captures a share of that windfall for public benefit, including non-market housing, without increasing the price a buyer ultimately pays. The Villages Plan moves in the opposite direction, effectively ruling out that tool just as the case for using it is strongest. Where is the risk analysis on land speculation? Recommendation M in the staff report states plainly that approval at this hearing “creates no legal rights for any person, or obligation on the part of the City,” does not obligate the City to actually enact the rezoning by-laws, and leaves City officials, including the Approving Officer, unconstrained in how and when they exercise discretion. The City is asking to permanently change land use designations and density limits across 13,260 parcels while explicitly disclaiming any obligation to deliver on them – exactly the kind of low-accountability change that invites landbanking and speculative price inflation rather than the near-term construction the Plan is being sold on. The Plan’s growth assumptions also deserve scrutiny, measured against current, real migration data rather than long-range projections. Canada’s population fell nationally in the third quarter of 2025 for the first time in decades, driven by a net outflow of non-permanent residents, and B.C. recorded a net loss of over 25,000 people from international migration in the fourth quarter of 2025 – a reversal from a net gain the year before. Metro Vancouver’s own regional planners have since cut their long-term growth forecast. A rezoning of this		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				magnitude should be justified against who is actually moving into and out of Vancouver right now, not against outdated growth targets. If the goal is truly to strengthen these 17 areas, the City should focus on improving the existing village cores – better transit connections, streetscapes, and support for local businesses – rather than up-zoning hundreds of surrounding blocks of established housing and displacing the residents who live there now. Many of us made a deliberate, long-term decision to settle in these neighbourhoods, in part because of their scale and character. Had we wanted higher-density, transit-oriented living, we would have chosen a different neighbourhood, or a different city altogether. Changing the rules so fundamentally for those who already made that commitment is neither fair nor good governance. I urge you to pause and revise this Plan: commission a proper risk and land-speculation analysis, pursue land value capture rather than giving this entitlement away for free, close the rental-replacement and affordable-housing gaps in the C-2D district, and undertake real, neighbourhood-level engagement with affected residents before proceeding further. Yours truly, Mark Ledenbach			
2026-07-21	13:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I want to be clear from the outset: I believe in development and growth for our city, and I am not writing as someone opposed to change. But I have serious concerns with the Villages Plan as currently proposed, and I do not believe it will fix the affordability and housing challenges we actually face. I understand this Public Hearing, first opened on July 14, resumes today, and I ask that you weigh the following before voting. Before anything else, I need to flag a transparency concern that should be resolved before this vote. In November 2023, the City signed a four-year, roughly \$119-million funding agreement with the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the federal Housing Accelerator Fund, paid out in tranches, with the final instalment of roughly \$29 to \$30 million contingent on the City completing its commitments under that agreement. The City’s own referral report for this hearing confirms that delivering the Villages Plan is a named component of those commitments, yet the specific contract terms and metrics have not been made public, and it is unclear whether every Council member has even seen the full text. If this decision is genuinely being weighed against the risk of losing tens of millions of dollars in federal funding, Council and the public deserve to see the actual contract language before voting, not after. Vancouver has previously seen an undisclosed agreement found by the courts to have improperly predetermined a rezoning decision at a public hearing, and I would ask you not to risk repeating that here. Set that funding question aside, and the scale of this rezoning is overreach on its own terms. Roughly 13,260 parcels – about 14 per cent of all land in the city – would be rezoned for four- to six-storey buildings, with heights up to eight storeys in some locations, and about 96 per cent of properties within the designated areas would be pre-zoned so that individual projects no longer come back to Council or the public. The same bylaw package also reaches beyond the 17 Villages themselves to amend the Cambie Corridor Plan, the Marpole Community Plan, the Norquay Village plans, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, and the Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan – each the product of its own, separate, multi-year community process. This is not incremental change; it reopens commitments made to several different communities at once, under one vote. This has not amounted to meaningful engagement with the residents actually affected. An 18-month citywide planning process, now stretched to also amend several older, separately-negotiated community plans, is not the same as genuine, block-by-block engagement with the people whose homes and streets are being rezoned. Many residents are only learning what happens on their own block through this hearing itself. These neighbourhoods have a distinct scale, streetscape, and community feel that took decades to establish. Replacing detached homes and small local shops with blocks of mid-rise, mixed-use buildings will not enhance that character – it will erase it. The Plan is being sold as a path to affordability through sheer volume of new supply, but the	Jason Dolker	Kitsilano	Attachment 1

				numbers do not support that. The City reported roughly 47,400 units in its development pipeline against only about 4,850 homes actually completed in 2025; on the Broadway Plan, the City’s own template for this style of upzoning, 146 projects have entered the pipeline and only one has reached occupancy. Zoom out further: combined with the recently approved Official Development Plan and Broadway Plan, the City has now granted private owners of roughly 80,000 parcels the right to build about 700,000 new units, enough capacity for 1.4 million more people – more than a century of supply at the city’s own growth rate. UBC Professor Emeritus Patrick Condon has raised this same point independently in his own submission to this hearing, and I share his concern. The bylaw details compound the problem. The new C-2D district is exempt from rental replacement requirements and carries no inclusionary affordable housing requirement at all, unlike R3-4 and C-2E, while the floor space ratio in all R-3 districts rises from 1.45 to 1.6. And this entitlement is being given away for free: no land value capture or payment is being asked of landowners for rights worth billions of dollars, breaking with the City’s own past practice of funding non-market housing this way, as it did at Yaletown and False Creek South. Where is the risk analysis on land speculation? Recommendation M in the staff report states plainly that approval at this hearing creates no legal rights or obligation on the City, does not obligate the City to actually enact the rezoning by-laws, and leaves City officials, including the Approving Officer, unconstrained in how and when they exercise discretion. Permanently changing land use designations across 13,260 parcels while disclaiming any obligation to deliver on them is exactly the kind of low-accountability change that invites landbanking and speculative price inflation rather than near-term construction. The Plan’s growth assumptions also deserve scrutiny against current migration data, not long-range projections. Canada’s population fell nationally in the third quarter of 2025 for the first time in decades, and B.C. recorded a net loss of over 25,000 people from international migration in the fourth quarter of 2025 – a reversal from a net gain the year before. Metro Vancouver’s own regional planners have since cut their long-term growth forecast. If the goal is truly to strengthen these 17 areas, the City should focus on improving the existing village cores rather than up-zoning hundreds of surrounding blocks of established housing and displacing the residents who live there now. Many of us made a deliberate, long-term decision to settle in these neighbourhoods, in part because of their scale and character. Had we wanted higher-density, transit-oriented living, we would have chosen a different neighbourhood, or a different city altogether. Changing the rules so fundamentally for those who already made that commitment is neither fair nor good governance. I urge you to disclose the full HAF contract terms to Council and the public before voting, pause and revise this Plan, commission a proper risk and land-speculation analysis, pursue land value capture rather than giving this entitlement away for free, close the rental-replacement and affordable-housing gaps in the C-2D district, and undertake real, neighbourhood-level engagement with affected residents before proceeding further. Thank you for your time, Jason Dolker Kitsilano neighbourhood, Vancouver, BC			
2026-07-21	14:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Please see the attached letter.	Nick M		Attachment 1

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
2026-07-21	15:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not agree with the village concept at w16 & MacDonald nor any of the other 16 village sites as we do not have the proper infrastructure to support these locations. Besides, many of the concepts are not viable as many younger adults would not be able to afford any of the suites and there are already thousands of unoccupied brand new suites already build and unaffordable. Many small businesses are closed due to the high cost of property tax and government taxes etc	Steve Chang	Kitsilano	
2026-07-21	16:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I object to these plans as they are not warranted	Kenneth Chang		
2026-07-21	16:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not agree with this motion as this offers no assistance to the younger generation as these new suite will still not be affordable. Work on creating more social housing which is more under your control	Steve Chang		
2026-07-21	16:06	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages plan in its entirety including the amendments proposed to now be heard July 22.	Shaun Ramdin	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-21	16:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I object to this potential program as it takes away from the Vancouver I know. This works best in a very large city like Toronto not Vancouver. I should know as I have lived and worked over 60 years in Vancouver and worked/lived 5 years in Vancouver. Our city doesn’t have the infrastructure to support this project.	Steve Chang	Kitsilano	
2026-07-21	16:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I object to this potential program as it takes away from the Vancouver I know. This works best in a very large city like Toronto, Paris or London, England as Vancouver is a small city in comparison	Patricia Lok		
2026-07-21	16:21	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I object and is totally unacceptable	Patricia Lok	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
2026-07-21	16:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Vancouver's proposed Villages Planning Program should not proceed in its current form because it risks causing significant unintended harm to neighbourhoods without addressing the city's core housing challenges. My main concerns are: 1. Neighbourhood instability: A city-wide blanket rezoning would encourage scattered speculation and piecemeal redevelopment rather than cohesive new communities, resulting in uneven property values, displacement, retail disruption, and uncertainty. 2. Undermining existing neighbourhood centres: Rather than strengthening Vancouver's established commercial and community hubs, the proposed Villages could divert investment and demand away from them, weakening their long-term vitality. 3. Poor fit with existing communities: The proposed building heights and densities are too standardized and could overwhelm surrounding neighbourhoods through overshadowing, loss of privacy, tree removal, and increased crowding. 4. One-size-fits-all planning: Applying the same development rules everywhere ignores the unique character and needs of different neighbourhoods, leading to homogenized communities without sufficient supporting amenities. 5. Lack of affordability strategy: The proposal does not adequately secure affordable or non-market housing, meaning it is unlikely to solve the city's housing affordability crisis. 6. Premature and overly centralized approach: there is already enough zoned housing capacity for decades of growth, making a city-wide rezoning unnecessary. Planning should occur through detailed, neighbourhood-specific engagement rather than a top-down city-wide initiative. Please: Abandon the blanket Villages rezoning. Focus on strengthening existing Neighbourhood Centres through targeted community planning. Identify potential future Village locations one at a time based on demonstrated need and extensive local consultation. Develop each Village through customized planning that reflects local character, appropriate scale, affordability, and supporting community services. Implement Villages gradually over many years, matching development to actual demand and continually refining the approach.	Dianne Fang	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-21	16:47	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am not in favor of the Village Plan. I do not want any more 6 to 8 story buildings going up in any more areas. We already have nice “village” areas and they should not be changed. I do not believe this will benefit any of the neighborhoods in Vancouver nor will it bring more affordable housing. All it will do is wreck even more of our beautiful city.	Janice Ketcham	Shaughnessy	

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
2026-07-21	18:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am absolutely opposed to the Vancouver villages plan for the following reasons: Dunbar and West 10th avenue in Point Grey used to be thriving ‘villages’ and are now struggling and have an increasing number of empty stores. It makes no sense to create many more stores nearby which will just exacerbate the problem. These areas grew incrementally over time and with community input; they were not just imposed on the residents. I am absolutely opposed to any plan which provides blanket rezoning to large areas of the city without any realistic consultation. It is unconscionable to remove the rights of hundreds of homeowners to choose how to change their homes. The villages plan will mean that hundreds of mature trees will be cut down, reducing the green canopy of our ‘greenest city’, reducing the amount of carbon absorbed, and lowering cooling and the air quality which the mature trees provide. New plantings will take many decades to replace them. The new six storey buildings will shade many houses whose owners may have spent thousands of dollars on solar panels. In the next election I will not be voting for anyone who has voted for this appalling plan. Penelope Balakshin	Penelope Balakshin	Kitsilano	
2026-07-21	19:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dense development changes a neighbourhood. Larger buildings bring more traffic, parking pressure, sidewalk noise, and general crowding. With more people, there’s also a higher chance of disruptive behaviour. A quiet street becomes busy, and the character of the area shifts. It is no longer a quiet street to live on. There used to be an expectation that younger residents built equity gradually—starting outside Vancouver, buying or renting modestly, then moving inward as finances improved. Today, some seem to expect immediate access to Vancouver housing and view any opposition as unfair. Many people spend heavily on non- essential lifestyle costs—premium phones, frequent dining out, rideshares, clubbing, convenience services. Greater frugality could help them save toward housing goals. Wanting a certain type of home requires personal financial responsibility, not expecting society to provide it.	Denise S	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-21	21:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan. Gentle densification is what I grew up with in Cedar Cottage: a simple two storey house with a half basement. My great-grandma, parents, siblings and I shared the main floor; my grandparents lived in the basement suite. The half basement held the laundry and my dad’s workshop. Summer evenings were spent together in the backyard. That kind of multi- generational living is normal around the world — so why does Vancouver’s Villages Plan push isolating 6, 8, and 20 storey towers with tiny units? We’re of Scottish–French heritage. If you don’t have a large extended family, you can still create a shared home bought together with trusted relatives or friends. Living this way lets people save for a future down payment and eventually buy the home they want — without relying on government handouts, which ultimately come from neighbours and the broader community. The government handout I’m referring to is driving major rezoning changes that disrupt neighbourhoods and increase property taxes.	Denise S	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
2026-07-21	22:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We have a quiet beautiful neighborhood in the Killarney area with plenty of small businesses and grocery stores already. We do not want changes that will increase the population density and shrink our living spaces in our neighborhood.	Steve Chen	Killarney	
2026-07-21	22:38	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages plan.	Catherine Barr	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-21	22:40	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the village plan. I am a long time resident of this area and have young children. We want to keep our neighbourhood a quiet and safe residential area. Our children should have to the rights to feel safe walking to school and play in backyards. There are already stores and services within walking distance. We do not want to make this area busy and dense, otherwise we would be scared to let our children play outdoors with large buildings and businesses surrounding us. We want to continue living the way have been and have a sense of belonging and feeling safe in our neighbourhood.	Linda Chen	Killarney	
2026-07-22	06:19	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We live in a vibrant, multigenerational area with tons of basement suites. There is just enough infrastructure to accommodate the population. There are no more green spaces added in this proposal . Why not look at low density areas like Dunbar? I think we all know why....	Thomas Yardley	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	