

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	16:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Attached is a letter from Val Bjarnason.	Val Bjarnason		Appendix A
2026-07-14	16:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to oppose the village plans in the arbutus area. I am a resident of this area. I do not agree with the changes proposed (re-zoning) to include low rise and commercial use for various reasons: 1) this area had an elementary school (Trafalgar elementary). The proposed change to include commercial use will likely result in a significant increase of traffic/cars and people in the area. This may negatively impact the safety of the children attending the school as young children walk to/from school. There are lots of cars that go in and out of this area particularly during school drop off, pick up and also at school events. Parking may become an issue for families attending the school and residents living on these blocks. There could be increased in car accidents. 2) The school and surrounding area/playground is not fenced, and this may increase risks to children during recesses or outdoor time. 3) The large grass area beside the school is regularly used by the community for sports and activities, and we hope to continue to have access to this space for recreational use. 4) increased population and traffic in the area may result in increased crime and loitering , again in a space close to an elementary school. In conclusion, I strongly oppose the changes in rezoning to this arbutus area, particularly the block around Trafalgar elementary. I hope that the safety of our children can be taken into consideration, and at minimum hope that the block/streets and space around the school can be excluded from this rezoning. (And to limit the rezoning to tue main roads eg west of Mcdonald street which is at least some distance away from the school). Thank you	Annie Chan	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	16:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose it	Farisha Aldean	Victoria-Fraserview	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	16:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The worst part of the Villages zoning plan is what effectively amounts to expropriation of land (without paying for that expropriation) of approximately 750 properties on or near arterial streets. If you are a property owner of one of these lots you will be banned from being able to renovate your home by adding an addition to your house, or from being able to build a new single family house or from adding a lane home to your property, you will also be banned from building a duplex or a MultiPlex which are all things that most properties in Vancouver are allowed to do right now. Who's property is it? Property owners rights are being trampled on. Your choices eradicated. If the city pushes this through for these 750 properties what will stop them from doing the same thing to another 5% of lots in the city a few months from now then another 5% a few months later, and so on, and so on until most property owners have no choice about what they are allowed to build on THEIR property. In the case of our property, we had choices taken away from us when a city initiated rezoning was thrust upon us to RM-8A (townhouses). We didn't ask for it, it was done to help developers bypass the costly and time consuming rezoning process (and now townhouses are no longer a viable option in our area). We were told not to worry, that nothing would change for us, that we could do anything we would have been able to do if we weren't rezoned. NOT true. We would have been R1-1 and would have been able to do a MultiPlex. But we have been told we can't do that (to City planners - please fix this and add MultiPlex to RM-8A). Pre zoning is not a gold mine for existing owners, not a get rich situation, it is control by the city to get what they or developers want. If you own one of these properties you will become just a tax paying place holder for the eventual developer who will be your only choice to sell to, and only if you can manage to assemble with enough of your neighbours to make a parcel of land that would entice a developer to want to buy. If the city wants to take away the rights of current property owners they should pay to expropriate these 750 lots. While I think that 4-6 storey small scale (1-2 lot) apartment buildings like the older ones in kits and in the Cambie village area would be fine as a way to solve the housing crisis. I even like the idea of more ground floor retail to bring shopping and restaurants closer to each neighbourhood but it's the rights and choices being stripped away from current property owners in this plan that is atrocious. If you bought the house as a single family property you should retain the ability to do anything you could at the time you bought it, as well as new choices. Not be suddenly told you only have one choice. This Villages plan needs a major revamp including more consultation with existing owners and renters in the affected areas.	Clive and Carey Bottomley	South Cambie	

2026-07-14	16:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the villages motion. I am very concerned about areas of the city which could use funding to assist local businesses and add vibrancy to already existing neighborhoods. I ask city council to amend the motion for the villages project and give more consideration to support our neighbourhoods and communities. Thank you.	Lorraine Savidan	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-07-14	16:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Oppose this plan and send for reconsideration. Seems to be max development by design. Unaffordable tax increases. Will evict seniors and other longtime residents. Need legacy plan to maintain the average citizens. 1. Scale and “gentle” branding Calling this “gentle” density minimizes what Council is actually doing: blanket-rezoning approximately 13,000 parcels while amending the ODP and existing community plans. The buildings may be low-rise, but the legal and geographic intervention is enormous. 2. Loss of future rezoning scrutiny Council is using one enormous hearing to settle the rezoning question for thousands of properties at once. After pre-zoning, many conforming projects may proceed without another site-specific rezoning hearing, even though residents do not yet know which sites will be assembled or what will actually be built. Those in support appear to be connected to developed and their network to show "support" when it's not in area residents with their lives uprooted. These are abundant housing activists pushing their version but what about those displaced? This plan needs to be moderated to include new residents in a gradual manner. Please oppose this. 3. ODP sequencing Council recently adopted the ODP and is already being asked to amend it for a program that was already underway. A long-range plan should provide stability and coherence, not require major foreseeable amendments almost immediately after adoption. 4. Engagement statistics Social-media impressions, estimated reach and website visits are publicity statistics, not public input. The City should disclose whether survey responses were unique, how many came from affected residents, how they were distributed among the Villages, and whether the respondent pool was representative. 5. Neutrality presented as support The City combines respondents who “liked” proposed boundaries with respondents who were “neutral” and presents the combined figure favourably. Neutrality is not support. Council should receive separate figures for approval, neutrality, opposition and uncertainty. 6. Correspondence classification and duplicates The published correspondence contains irrelevant material classified as support, an entry labelled “support” whose text calls the proposal a disaster, and duplicated opposition language. Before citing raw totals, Council should require a transparent classification and deduplication audit applying the same standards to both sides. 7. Affordability loopholes	Guvi Singh	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

			More development capacity does not automatically produce affordable housing. Most apartment and townhouse options will not face inclusionary requirements, some developers may pay cash instead of providing homes on site, and rents ten percent below a city-wide market average may remain unaffordable. Council should publish the number and income depth of affordable units this plan is actually expected to deliver. 8. Land assembly and large consolidators The useful development densities may depend on assembling several lots, particularly where standard 33-foot parcels are involved. That structure may favour well-capitalized land consolidators over ordinary owners and small builders. Council should disclose how many parcels are independently developable and how many require multi-lot assemblies. 9. Tenant protection and enforcement Tenant protections are only meaningful if they are enforceable. Council should require a compliance budget, audits, penalties, a tenant registry, an accessible complaint process, and public reporting on displacement and successful returns. The City should also provide a comprehensive count of renters currently living in affected properties. 10. Transit and utilities Proposed transit improvements are unfunded, while water, sewer, stormwater and other utility requirements will largely be assessed later through individual applications. Council should not grant city-wide-scale zoning capacity before receiving Village-by-Village infrastructure assessments, funding responsibilities and delivery schedules. 11. Schools, childcare, parks and public space Schools, childcare, parks, recreation and public spaces remain dependent on future budgets and competing priorities, while the new development rights would take effect immediately. Council should require measurable service-capacity thresholds and a mechanism to pause approvals when infrastructure falls behind growth. 12. Pilot the program instead Council does not have to choose between blanket approval and building nothing. Begin with three varied pilot Villages, establish infrastructure, affordability, tenant-return and project-delivery benchmarks, publish the results, and return to a public Council decision before rezoning the remaining areas. 13. Political and lobbying transparency Council members should disclose relevant lobbying meetings, hospitality, gifts, campaign			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				support and employment discussions involving organizations that may materially benefit from this rezoning. The public should be able to distinguish policy judgment from outside influence or future personal opportunity.			
2026-07-14	16:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Villages Plan as proposed. I am against the proposal for the village around Knight and 33rd. The proposal will remove the public views of the North Shore, Howe Sound, and Downtown forever. Comments have been shared with the City via the Villages planning process in prior phases, explaining that due to steep slopes from 33rd to 31st Avenues, a negligible height reduction on 33rd would easily facilitate the retention of these public views. An immaterial impact on housing delivery with a material tradeoff to community and quality of life for this neighbourhood. East Vancouver deserves protected public views too, not just the West Side.	Victor B	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	16:49	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I respectfully oppose the current 17 Villages Plan in its present form. While I support increasing housing supply and creating more affordable housing, I am concerned that the proposed R3-4 zoning may have unintended consequences for existing neighbourhoods. In particular, I am concerned about increased pressure for land assembly, the potential loss of mature tree canopy, increased redevelopment of established single-family lots, and the impact on neighbourhood character. I would like the City to consider a more gradual approach that balances new housing with preservation of existing green space, infrastructure capacity, and the interests of current homeowners. I encourage Council to revise the proposal before moving forward.	Michael Wang	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	16:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the Vancouver Village Plan because I believe it will significantly change the character of established neighbourhoods without adequately addressing the infrastructure and services needed to support increased density. While I recognize the importance of creating more housing and improving affordability, I do not believe the current plan strikes the right balance between growth and livability. Increased density should be accompanied by investments in schools, childcare, parks, community centres, healthcare services, utilities, and transportation. Without these improvements, existing residents and new residents alike may experience increased congestion, pressure on public services, and a reduced quality of life. I am also concerned about the potential loss of mature trees, green space, and neighbourhood character that make Vancouver’s communities attractive and livable. These environmental and community assets should be protected as growth occurs. Meaningful consultation with residents is also essential. Many community members feel their concerns have not been adequately considered in the planning process. A successful long-term plan should reflect collaboration between the City and the people who live in these neighbourhoods. I support thoughtful, well-planned growth that provides diverse housing options while preserving the qualities that make Vancouver’s neighbourhoods unique. I encourage the City to revise the Village Plan to better address infrastructure, environmental protection, and meaningful community engagement before moving forward.	Irazu Derby		
2026-07-14	16:56	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Hello, We are completely opposed to this application. You're planning to build under the guise of affordable rentals, yet the reality is that all these newly built rental buildings are vastly unaffordable for the average Vancouverite making their living in this city. You'll only push out locals, living in these neighbourhoods, by building these expensive rental units. Best to go back to the drawing board on this.	Peter Kletas	Oakridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	16:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am a long-term resident of Grandview Woodlands and my kids and grandkids live here as well. I have neighbours who are friends who have lived here since they were born and some have sadly passed on. We have a sense of belonging in our neighborhood that is deep, and discovering that we have been suddenly removed from our Grandview Woodlands home to be part of a six-storey "Village" with arbitrary boundaries is truly disturbing. This seems to be contrary to all good planning principles and what makes Vancouver a livable place and a home. At my age I understand change happens, but it does not have to be imposed without meaningful consultation or consideration for how it impacts our community. As Councillors, if these appeals for a just process are not convincing, please also ask why the "Villages" are being placed in areas with acknowledged scarcity of park amenity - it is quite noticeable on the Village Plan map (page 136) where future park is outside all of the "Villages". If these are attempts to help provide housing, by now it is well known that increasing supply has not increased affordability for most people. Instead, we risk destabilizing our community with familiar block-busting techniques - note that it would take just two standard lots to more than make the minimum lot size for a 75 ft tall six-storey apartment to be developed next to a house. Surely, City Council and planners are more clever than this in introducing change? Please reconsider cutting us out of our life-long and generational belonging in our neighbourhood at Grandview Woodlands. There is already a plan that has been through proper consultation and is still in effect. Thank you, Emily Chu	Emily Chu		
2026-07-14	16:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am strongly opposed the CoV Villages Plan as currently proposed. Notably, while the associated staff report refers to "consolidating feedback and technical work into a comprehensive draft Villages Plan as well as identifying areas for City-initiated rezoning", there is no indication that the thousands of local residents who stand to be directly affected by proposed rezoning were appropriately notified or consulted. Frankly, in view of broad and growing public opposition to Vancouver's prior Multiplex rezoning, that has arguably failed by lacking reasonable design guidelines, tree-protection and provision for adequate servicing infrastructure -- let alone affordability -- (https://www.change.org/p/stop-vancouver-s-multiplex-expansion), my sense is that there is every reason to anticipate that the subject plan would only amplify these unsustainable impacts. Consequently, I encourage Mayor and Council to pause subject planning and expand related public consultation, beginning with direct notification and consultation with current residents of proposed Village areas. Respectfully, Guy Cross Vancouver	Guy Cross	West Point Grey	
2026-07-14	17:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the so-called "Villages" plan. We are a wonderful City of Neighbourhoods already. Please do not refer back to planning, simply cancel the entire proposal. Thank you.	Jan V. Alexander	Dunbar-Southlands	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The increase in property taxes for recent purchasers of homes in the proposed "village plan areas" is unjust and puts significant strain on young families and hard-working professionals. As a family comprised of what's considered "high" income professionals, it still took 10 years in order for us to save towards a downpayment for our current home in Vancouver. The zoning changes that come with the village plan will SUBSTANTIALLY increase property taxes for anyone who purchased in the last 10 years. Your mitigation plan does NOT allow anyone in our situation to adjust in a meaningful way, as income is mostly stagnant. It only provides time to push us out. Please reconsider your decision by the following ways: 1) Adjust your Section 19(8) of your Assessment Act to be inclusive of property owners within this year. (Not only those who have resided for >10 yrs.) 2) Only implement the increase in property taxes when larger building plans have actually come to fruition. Why should everyday families be fronting the cost of building your proposed villages that the developers and the city will be ultimately profiting from?	Annie Pang	Marpole	
2026-07-14	17:01	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I vehemently oppose the proposed rezoning and villages Plan for 41st and Granville ave ‘village’ area which is up for discussion at the public hearing on July 14,2026. I have been a homeowner and resident on west 40th avenue for 35 years and prior to that was a homeowner on Churchill street just north of 41st avenue for 6 years, also within the area you are proposing for a zoning change and development bylaw. The idea that Granville and 41st could possibly become a “village” is absurd and I am certain there are very few, if any, current residents who are in agreement with such a zoning change to our neighbourhood. I could go on with many reasons for my opposition but I imagine many of them will be brought up during the public hearing tonight. I want to register my firm opposition to this rezoning proposal. Kathleen Winton 1668 west 40th avenue Vancouver B.C.	Kathleen Winton	Shaughnessy	
2026-07-14	17:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Opposing the application	Smita Singh Kaliray	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	17:15	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	First of all, the city is the home of existing residents. Therefore: Before major changes,Priority should be given to respecting the quality of life of residents Second, The population growth hypothesis that supported the previous policy may not be as valid as it was at the beginning. From Becky	Becky Ng	Kerrisdale	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose this plan! While the concept may have some merit, the scale is far too aggressive!! To impose six-storey buildings at a the outer edges of village boundaries in established residential communities is much too harsh. MAYBE three storeys at the outer edges would be ok, and soften the transition. But unless these potential new builds include co-ops or larger rental housing for families, the effort will cause more problems than it purports to solve. The proposed building are too tall for all but busy arterial streets, they will make traffic and parking impossible, and the decimated mature tree cover and loss of greenery and permeable surfaces will impact us all. (having developers plant a couple of saplings at the front corners of solidly concreted over new builds is nowhere near good enough!) This is not a selfish NIMBY comment: I wouldn’t want this for anyone’s back yard. Allowing this plan in its current form would cause much more harm than good. Please take it back to the drawing board and scale it down!	Fiona Beaty	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-14	17:16	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Pushing the “Villages” plan through at this time is unpardonable. You have heard and will hear again on July 14, many of the reasons that this plan is flawed, as well as how the process is poor, if not downright deceitful. Keep working on city planning and bring forward smaller scale solutions that work for the people of Vancouver AFTER the October election.	Amarea Wardrop	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	17:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	stripping away public hearings for 14,000 lots is not “legalizing housing”—it is illegalizing local democracy. It silences the very community members who live in these neighbourhoods, removing their right to shape local infrastructure, school capacities, and environmental protections true neighbourhood preservation requires localized design, tree canopy protections, and community input—not sweeping, blanket upzonings that treat 17 distinct communities as a single, homogenized, machine-readable asset class for investment platforms both domestic and global. This is literally the financialization of housingif a developer wants to fundamentally transform a local block, they must be legally forced to bring that specific project before the neighbourhood in a transparent, accountable public hearing.	Leona Rothney	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-14	17:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	1. this area has already over population with town houses and apartments, elementary and high schools not able to support the new coming people 2. not enough water, draining issue (this draining system not even upgraded) 3. Too much traffics with pollution 4. People live here for a long time, if this area is rebuild, so where do they go. this is really un-fare. why break our houses to build apartments. city should build new apartments far away from our neighbor hood. build apartments in the areas that no existing housing 5, should plant more trees to protection our enviroment instead of over build the apartments. Please respect our living enviroment. thanks for consideration	kenyan tu	Killarney	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:24	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Letter to be attached re reasons for opposing the proposed the Villages Plan on the agenda for July 14, 2026	Joan Bunn	Kitsilano	
2026-07-14	17:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing as a local resident to formally register my strong objection to the proposed 6-storey building at Victoria Drive and East 61st Avenue. While I understand the City's broader housing goals under the Vancouver Villages Plan, the specific physical geography of this corridor makes a high-density development structurally unsafe and highly impractical. The City must reject this proposal based on the following critical material planning and public safety grounds: 1. Severe Road Constraints and Traffic Gridlock Victoria Drive at this location (from 54th till Marine Drive) is exceptionally narrow, leaving zero margin for error when unusual traffic events occur. Just recently, a single broken-down bus on Upland Drive forced two transit buses to entirely cross over the median line onto the oncoming side of Victoria Drive just to pass. (In addition, there is 10 cars right behind the bus that intend to cross over the median line) Our local roads simply do not have the physical width or capacity to absorb the massive influx of construction vehicles, moving trucks, delivery vans, and resident vehicles that a 6-storey complex brings. 2. Compromised Emergency and First Responder Access The narrowness of Victoria Drive (including intersection of Stirling and 54th , Nainamo and 54th) means that any minor traffic disruption causes immediate clustering and gridlock. If a 6-storey building is approved here, the resulting vehicle congestion will make it physically impossible for fire trucks, ambulances, and police first responders to navigate the streets efficiently. This poses a direct, life-threatening risk to the entire, established Fraserview neighborhood when every second counts during an emergency. 3. Incompatible Density and Scale Placing a 6-storey mid-rise on an already choked, narrow secondary arterial is poor urban planning. The density proposed is entirely disproportionate to the surrounding road infrastructure, which was built for a quiet, lower-density residential community and cannot be physically widened to accommodate this scale. For these reasons, I request that the City reject this application and protect the safety and accessibility of the Fraserview community. Thank you for your time and consideration.	E Leo	Victoria-Fraserview	

2026-07-14	17:29	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to oppose the village plan and rezoning to the Arbutus (king edward/mcdonald) area. I am a resident and a homeowner residing in this pocket. Our family chose to live in this beautiful, quiet, peaceful, safe and family oriented neighborhood just a few years ago from downtown because we were specifically wanting to avoid high traffic, commercial and high density areas. I believe most people who live in this neighborhood feel the same. By adding commercial and low rise buildings to residential streets will undoubtedly affect the character of this area, and truthfully, no one wants their home to be next or, or worse, between these bigger and taller buildings! Not only this, it does not make sense to increase density around the school area which further worsens existing parking issues and congestion during school days, and possibly increase risks of accidents with young children playing in the area. Finally, there are already many existing empty units that the province plans to buy to "bail out" the developers. Do we really need more apartments built right now, and in locations that will negatively impact existing neighborhoods, at the expense of the people currently residing in these areas. And what will happen to our property taxes? Further increase due to tue rezoning? All in all, I oppose this plan and hope the city council can reconsider this proposal.	Dave Lin	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	17:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	We strongly oppose this application. Why demolish existing housing stock to make way for unaffordable rental housing? The newer rental developments along West 41st Avenue appear to have a significant number of vacant units. Replacing existing homes with unaffordable rental housing does little to address affordability concerns, while generating unnecessary environmental waste through demolition and construction.	Lourdes Kletas	Oakridge	
2026-07-14	17:35	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the application of rezoning my current residential area into a village. The existing infrastructure has not kept pace with the growth in our region and is inadequate to support the significant increase in population density that this proposal would introduce. This type of change will change the character of established family-friendly neighbourhoods, which have been valued for their sense of community and that change will potentially make it a less desirable place for young families to live and raise children.	Anisha Johal	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	17:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	First I am learning about a plan that drastically impacts residents. Quality of life would be substantially degraded if this ill considered plan were implemented. Strongly oppose the plan and am shocked the Council is even considering.	Thomas Madden	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	17:41	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am opposed to this proposal. My concerns are already reflected in the many previous comments in opposition.	Tina Hildebrandt	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-14	17:43	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The rezoning of our neighborhoods is being rushed through without our consent. There has been inadequate notice about the proposal, with residents only receiving a mailer less than 2 weeks before the council meeting. Additionally, signage required for other rezoning applications is completely absent in our neighborhoods. Many residents will be on vacation and unavailable to provide input. The Villages Plan is a plan for Density and not Community. Density is at the expense of Community with this Plan. Below I will give examples of the negative impact this Villages Plan would have on existing residents, without offering a substantive benefit to new residents. The Plan cites the “missing middle”; however, it allows for rezoning residential streets to 6-story apartment buildings. These apartment buildings do nothing to address the “missing middle” and will make it unlivable for existing residents living in 2-3 story homes. Many homes in my neighborhood (the proposed 33rd and Fraser Village) are on smaller 80-ft deep lots. Per the plan, our short lots cannot be rezoned by themselves (without land assembly) and we could be faced with 6-storey buildings in our backyards. This is unlivable.	Jennifer Kendrick	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

			Existing residents in my neighborhood have already created density and have created ways to living here more affordable. We have built community, both within our homes and on our streets. For example, two families co-own our small 1200 sq ft home. Our neighbors have 3 families living in their home. Many neighbors have multiple generations in one home, thereby allowing adult children to support aging parents and aging parents to provide care for grandchildren. And many homes have already been redeveloped per existing zoning to allow 4 separate homes on one lot. Redeveloping our neighborhood will force us out, make it unaffordable to find something similar, and break up our existing community. This is being done with no benefit for future residents. The Plan has no guarantees for making housing that is built affordable for middle-income residents. The is also very little to address low-income residents. There are already vacancies and homes that are not selling in my neighborhood and throughout the city because they are unaffordable. The Government has already planned to buy out more than 2500 homes that have not sold to support people in a rent-to-own scheme. The Villages Plan would exacerbate this problem and force out all but the wealthy and elite in the City. The Plan talks about residents being within a 5 minute walk from services and shops; however, the Plan does very little to address keeping and making streets safe for walking or for those biking or those using mobility aids. Increasing shopping in neighborhood streets will increase car traffic. Specifically in my neighborhood, there are no plans for traffic calming, such as what is in place in other pedestrian friendly areas like West 10th Ave or the Commercial Drive neighborhood or Hastings-Sunrise. We already need to make Prince Albert and East 28th Ave streets that you cannot drive straight through. These both intersect with bike routes and drivers routinely run stop signs. Stop signs and roundabouts are inadequate for traffic calming. "No thru" except bikes and pedestrians are required. Additionally, maximum speed limits of 30 km/hr need to be implemented and enforced on all non-major streets in the Villages and across the City. The only proposed improvement for the proposed 33rd and Fraser/Knight Villages is a crossing at 31st and Knight. This is inadequate for current state let alone future state. We already see the blocks around Fraser and 30th/29th busy with car traffic. Adding shops to these Villages will compete with existing businesses, especially locally owned businesses who are already struggling with high rents. We have lost great busy Community minded businesses along Fraser St due to unaffordability (e.g., Ubuntu, Cozy Café). We already have vacancies along Fraser St. The Plan makes no mention of how the City will make it affordable for local businesses and encourage businesses that residents actually need –grocery stores, produce markets, meat markets that are not owned by Loblaws or Jim Pattison; hardware stores; local gathering places – not more cannabis stores, vape shops, beauty shops etc. Additionally, the Villages Plan would destroy the existing character of the neighborhoods. Homes that are over 100 years old and in good livable condition will be destroyed. The environmental impact alone of destroying and building new is shameful on the City of Vancouver. Old trees that provide much needed shade and cooling will be destroyed. The East side is already 1-2 degrees Celsius warmer than the West side due to having fewer trees and green space. We need more trees not more buildings. I see no plan for increasing access to community centres, libraries, parks, or recreation in my neighborhood. Gray's park is thriving and busy at all times. Adding thousands of residents will necessitate additional parks and gathering spaces for community. I call upon this Council to vote against rezoning our neighborhoods without our consent and consultation.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages plan has a number of issues and as a long time resident of Vancouver, a hard working home owner, and a citizen of Canada, I urge the city to stop this initiative as there are many negative impacts including (1) Loss of trees, bushes, and green space. This impacts not only oxygen production which is critical, but it also impacts global warming. (2) The VSB, Ministry of Health, and Translink do not have infrastructure in place as the reduction of VSB school sites, insufficient bus service/coverage, and insufficient hospital capacity are not in line with these villages they plan to dot throughout existing residential neighborhoods. (3) Little villages which will also include some commercial/retail inside residential areas don't look great impacting the overall feel of Vancouver residential areas and also detract from/negatively impact commercial/retail areas that are struggling to stay afloat (Eg. Dunbar street, Arbutus street, just to name a few). Furthermore, these 'villages' will not even solve the affordable housing problem it is allegedly supposed to address. We've already seen one of these developments put into the Kerrisdale area on 39th and Elm and they are not priced to be affordable nor are they designated as affordable rentals. The initiative brings a lot of negatives around the tree destruction, environmental damage, infrastructure burden, impacts to big street commercial/retail areas nearby, and neighborhood look/feel but also bring no benefits. please think of our city, our province, and our planet and put a stop to this initiative and others like it.	Ken Su	Kerrisdale	
2026-07-14	17:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I OPPOSE the application to rezone the Naniamo Street and East 1st Avenue 'Village'. We need to preserve our heritage homes and protect our neighbourhoods for future generations! There are many areas of South Vancouver, Burnaby, and Coquitlam that are poorly developed with no parks, no walkable streets, gigantic homes with 2 car garages and homes with no consideration for design and quality. Why is our neighbourhood being rezoned??? We don't need any more density. The Naniamo St and East 1st Ave. area IS FULL OF BEAUTIFUL HERITAGE HOMES, including mine, that NEED TO BE PRESERVED and PROTECTED!!!	Monica Feldman	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	17:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Need appropriate infrastructure before increased density in these areas. Need better public transportation, infrastructure for density to serve the community such as upgraded community centers, available swimming pools, available ice rinks, etc. I have seen density increases already without the necessary infrastructure. Families in cambie corridor struggle with worsening traffic, inability to find swimming lessons for kids, etc. The ones who benefited from increased density in Cambie corridor are those who sold to developers when their fsr went up and with it their property value.	Jeff Lau	Arbutus Ridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	As a nearby resident and a homeowner, I have serious concerns about the scale and pace of the proposed changes and how they may significantly alter the character and livability of our existing neighbourhoods. I chose to live in this community because of its unique balance of accessibility, greenery, open space, and a quieter residential environment. Since moving here just over a year ago, I have already experienced ongoing construction activity in the surrounding area, with continuous noise and disruptions having a significant impact on my daily life. The prospect of further large-scale development raises concerns about the cumulative impact on current residents. I am particularly concerned about how increased building heights and density may affect privacy, views, sunlight, traffic, and the overall neighbourhood character. While I support creating more housing, development should be carefully planned with appropriate transitions between new projects and existing communities. Finally, I understand the needs for more homes in Vancouver, but I only support a thoughtful growth. Therefore, I respectfully encourage the City to consider a more balanced approach that supports housing growth while protecting the quality of life of existing residents. Meaningful consultation with the communities directly affected should be an essential part of any major planning changes.	Vaniee Liu	South Cambie	
2026-07-14	17:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The plan will bring a lot of negative effects to the neighborhoods, such as safety and traffic. It will also destroy the community's environment.	Zhengang Liu	Oakridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	17:59	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I appreciate the City’s efforts to address growth and recognize the need to plan for Vancouver’s future. However, I do not believe the proposed Vancouver Village Plan is the right approach for my neighbourhood. Our community has evolved organically over many decades. The shops, services, and gathering places that define our neighbourhood were not imposed through centralized planning—they emerged in response to the needs and character of the people who live here. Within a short walk of my home are a French bakery, a Chinese bakery, a Jamaican patty shop, a sushi restaurant, local dog grooming services, and many other long-standing businesses that reflect the remarkable cultural and ethnic diversity of our community. These businesses deserve policies that help them thrive, not planning that risks undermining what has developed naturally. Our neighbourhood has already established its own commercial nodes and rhythms along Macdonald Street, West 16th Avenue, Arbutus Street, and King Edward Avenue. These have grown in ways that are responsive to residents and have created a vibrant, walkable community. The proposed Village Plan instead imposes artificial boundaries and a standardized model that does not reflect the lived reality of our neighbourhood. It feels like a plan designed by people who do not live here, rather than one shaped by those who know the community best. I am concerned that it will accelerate gentrification, weaken the unique character of existing neighbourhoods, and replace locally grounded development with a one-size-fits-all vision. Planning should support and strengthen what already works. It should build on the organic character of neighbourhoods rather than overwrite it. I urge the City to reconsider this approach and engage more meaningfully with residents to develop plans that reflect the unique history, diversity, and identity of each community	June Francis	Arbutus Ridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I appreciate the City’s efforts to address growth and recognize the need to plan for Vancouver’s future. However, I do not believe the proposed Vancouver Village Plan is the right approach for my neighbourhood. Our community has evolved organically over many decades. The shops, services, and gathering places that define our neighbourhood were not imposed through centralized planning—they emerged in response to the needs and character of the people who live here. Within a short walk of my home are a French bakery, a Chinese bakery, a Jamaican patty shop, a sushi restaurant, local dog grooming services, and many other long-standing businesses that reflect the remarkable cultural and ethnic diversity of our community. These businesses deserve policies that help them thrive, not planning that risks undermining what has developed naturally. Our neighbourhood has already established its own commercial nodes and rhythms along Macdonald Street, West 16th Avenue, Arbutus Street, and King Edward Avenue. These have grown in ways that are responsive to residents and have created a vibrant, walkable community. The proposed Village Plan instead imposes artificial boundaries and a standardized model that does not reflect the lived reality of our neighbourhood. It feels like a plan designed by people who do not live here, rather than one shaped by those who know the community best. I am concerned that it will accelerate gentrification, weaken the unique character of existing neighbourhoods, and replace locally grounded development with a one-size-fits-all vision. Planning should support and strengthen what already works. It should build on the organic character of neighbourhoods rather than overwrite it. I urge the City to reconsider this approach and engage more meaningfully with residents to develop plans that reflect the unique history, diversity, and identity of each community	June Francis		
2026-07-14	18:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Mayor and Council, I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Angus Dr. & W 57th Ave. Village. As a resident living immediately adjacent to this proposed boundary, I believe this blanket, city-initiated upzoning is fundamentally unfair to local homeowners both inside and outside the zone, and threatens to destabilize our community for several reasons: Unfair Tax Penalties on "Incumbent" Residents: By pre-zoning these quiet residential blocks for up to six storeys, BC Assessment will immediately revalue these properties based on their "highest and best use" as multi-family development sites. Long-time homeowners within the zone—who have no intention of selling or redeveloping—will face massive property tax spikes simply for staying in their homes. Negative Spillover for Bordering Homes: Those of us living just outside the arbitrary boundaries will bear the brunt of the localized infrastructure strain, traffic, and construction disruptions, while simultaneously facing speculative pressure that will artificially drive up our own property assessments. Erosion of Democratic Input: Implementing sweeping, city-initiated rezoning strips community members of their democratic right to shape the future of their own blocks. It pre-approves massive density without a clear plan for how local schools, parks, and utility infrastructure will cope with the rapid influx of residents. I urge Council to reject this top-down rezoning proposal and instead focus on protecting local homeowners, preserving neighborhood character, and pursuing collaborative, gradual housing growth that does not penalize existing residents.	Mavis Chan	Marpole	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:02	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Oppose	Kary he	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:07	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed rezoning because I believe the City is moving too quickly without adequate planning or meaningful public consultation. Before increasing density, the City should ensure that local infrastructure—including roads, transit, schools, childcare, parks, and utilities—can support future growth. I am also concerned about increased traffic, parking shortages, and the long-term impact on established neighbourhoods. I respectfully ask Council to delay the proposal until further studies and broader community consultation have been completed. Key reasons: Insufficient infrastructure to support higher density. Increased traffic and parking pressure. Lack of meaningful public consultation and awareness. Significant neighbourhood changes without enough evidence or planning. Request to delay approval until impacts are fully assessed and residents are better consulted.	Hong Shen He	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:08	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose	David Robertson	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-07-14	18:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed rezoning because I believe it is being implemented without sufficient planning or community engagement. The City should first ensure that infrastructure can support additional density and fully evaluate the impacts on traffic, parking, and neighbourhood livability. I also believe residents should have been given more time and better opportunities to participate in the decision-making process. I respectfully ask Council to delay the proposal until these issues are addressed.	Yanmei Liang	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:11	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I oppose the proposed rezoning because I believe the City is moving too quickly without sufficient planning or meaningful public consultation. As a resident directly affected by this proposal, I had never heard about it until a neighbour mentioned it to me just before the Public Hearing. If residents are unaware of such a significant change, it raises concerns about whether the consultation process has been effective. I am also concerned that increased density will lead to more traffic, greater parking demand, and increased safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and children in our neighbourhood. I respectfully ask Council to delay the proposal until these concerns have been properly addressed.	Jiaying He	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	It is wrong to “impose” villages within a city, this will detract from existing “natural “ villages, existing businesses will suffer, residents will be forcibly rezoned. There are already numerous vacant street front business properties, does it make sense to add more?? Let’s concentrate on improving what we have, encouraging growth and new business in existing village zones. Improve bike/scooter lanes between villages. Create more sitting out cafes and restaurants. Please don’t add to the endless “rebuilding” of the city, these new villages will be very disruptive.	Peter Saunderson	Kitsilano	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Oppose the application. Please leave our area as residential single family dwellings.	KAMALJIT REEL	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:22	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I support increasing housing supply, but I don't believe this proposal adequately addresses the impacts on existing neighbourhoods. Infrastructure such as roads, transit, schools, childcare, parks, utilities, and parking should be expanded alongside increased density. I am also concerned that many residents, including myself, were not aware of this proposal until very recently, which suggests the public consultation process did not effectively reach everyone affected.	Jiayi He	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	18:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	So far density in our city is only supporting developers . This is historical fact. More density has not brought us affordable housing. We could use the existing density plans to bring affordable housing to the people? Downgrade developers for profit housing plans to Density in exchange for mixed affordable rents, a la Patrick Condon’s research & reports. We need transit plans in place for any more density considerations. Many of our essential service personnel have long commutes. What happens in an emergency when bridges may be out ?	Amelia Gubana	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	18:34	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	My name is Spencer and I live in the Kensington neighbourhood near the Knight St and 33rd Ave intersection. I am opposed to the proposed rezoning plan as proposed. While I do not disagree with the proposed rezoning of residential low rise on individual properties to enable densification of 2-3 multifamily housing; I strongly opposed the establishment of a high street on 33rd including the Knight St neighbourhood. 33rd is already used as a thoroughfare nearing maximum capacity. Adding the quantity of residential units proposed in the mixed use redevelopments as well as commercial traffic to this already congested street will compound this problem. Parking will likely be established with access through the adjacent alleys which face onto the low density family homes which will further increase traffic adjacent to our properties. My family is already within walking distance to high street commercial locations on Kingsway, Victoria St and Fraser St. The proposed high street calls for structures up to six stories built along a ridgeline. Homes on the north side of the high street will have an exasperated obstruction looming over their homes. This is an inappropriate application of stepped density. The new structures will encroach much closer to the property lines in order to accomplish the floor space ratios being proposed. The homes along the alleys will have an ediface as a neighbour with an underground parade entrance. This is a harsh departure from the current neighbourhood. To reiterate, I strongly oppose the high street as proposed in the Kensington village and am indifferent on the broad rezoning of low density residential as this may be desirable to some of my neighbours. Removing the high street rezoning is a reasonable compromise in my opinion.	Spencer Lyons	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:39	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I do not think that the neighborhood at 16th and MacDonald can support a significant increase in population and have the following concerns about the proposed village: - the loss of character and green space in the neighborhood - that the local businesses currently in existence will be displaced and that only larger businesses will be able to afford the rent (eg Shoppers Drug Mart at 4th and MacDonald) - that the streets off of the arterials are narrow and cannot support condominiums that are more than three stories (ie higher than the current homes) - that there will be a loss of canopy that has taken decades to grow and is currently not being replaced. I choose to walk in this neighborhood in the summer because of the shade it provides. - that family homes will be replaced with condos that are studio or one bedroom, which cannot accommodate families. There are not enough 2 bedroom or 3 bedroom condos available. - that increased traffic makes it less safe for my children to walk or bike in the neighborhood - that there are already several large developments in the city and that we do not have the electrical grid nor water supply for the city over the next 30+ years	Lisa Cornish	Kitsilano	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:45	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 as a resident who lives within the proposed Village area between Fraser Street and Windsor Street, and I want to express my strong opposition to the Vancouver Villages Plan. While I understand the City's desire to address housing needs, I am deeply concerned that the proposed density increases are being advanced without adequate consideration for the infrastructure that already struggles to meet current demand in our neighbourhood. First and foremost, transportation infrastructure in this area is already under significant strain. East 33rd Avenue is frequently congested, particularly during peak commuting hours. Adding substantial residential density without corresponding transportation improvements will only worsen traffic congestion, increase delays for residents, and create additional safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike. I am equally concerned about the capacity of community amenities. Both Hillcrest Community Centre and Kensington Community Centre already operate at or near full capacity. Residents routinely face challenges registering for programs and accessing services. Before approving thousands of additional residents in these proposed Villages, the City should clearly demonstrate how recreation facilities, libraries, parks, and other public amenities will be expanded to accommodate future demand. Parking is another significant concern. The City's policy of requiring minimal parking in many new developments may work in theory, but the reality in our neighbourhood is different. Many households continue to rely on vehicles for work, family responsibilities, and daily activities. Insufficient parking requirements will inevitably push more cars onto already crowded residential streets, creating challenges for current and future residents alike. Beyond infrastructure concerns, I have serious questions about the impact this plan will have on my property and family. My home is not simply an investment; it is where three generations of my family live. Like many Vancouver families, we have built our lives around maintaining and adapting our property to meet our family's evolving needs. I am concerned about how the Villages Plan may affect property values, assessments, and property taxes. Vancouver residents already face some of the highest housing-related costs in the country. Will property assessments increase based on speculative redevelopment potential created by this plan? Will homeowners be forced into higher tax burdens because of zoning changes they neither requested nor support? I am also seeking clarity regarding future renovations and modifications to my property. As my parents age, we may need to make accessibility and mobility-related improvements to help them remain safely in their home. Will the City's new planning framework make it easier or more difficult for families like mine to adapt existing homes to meet changing needs? Residents deserve clear answers before such sweeping changes are implemented. In summary, I am strongly opposed to the Vancouver Villages Plan and urge Council to reconsider this proposal. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Megan Cruz Fraser Hood Vancouver, BC	Megan Cruz	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	18:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	There hasn't been adequate consultation for the proposed Villages rezoning. The first notice I received from the city that the proposed changes would impact my property was 2 weeks ago.	Elizabeth Araujo	Grandview-Woodland	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	18:46	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am completely opposed to this plan.	Eddie Cruz	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	18:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	While I do support the notion of increasing the availability of missing middle housing, I think this is too sweeping and possibly too blunt. There are areas identified as Villages that I can see could definitely use a high street and some housing variety, but there are also areas, such as Commercial St & E 20th, or Nanaimo & E 1st, that have existing thriving retail areas and ongoing construction of density. Blanket rezoning those areas will no doubt displace exiting businesses, some of which have been around for decades and are beloved by the community. I'm concerned that in some Villages, such as the one I live beside, this plan will bulldoze what you're trying to create in other areas. I can't support this without more protection for existing neighbourhood staples, and for the beautiful old homes, of which many should really have heritage protection, such as between Knight St and Commercial St. That area is one of the nicest neighbourhoods in East Van, and levelling blocks of homes, as well as hundreds of old trees, will not make a better Village. Also, I have yet to see new development that actually improves affordability. More housing is unhelpful if it's all more expensive than what it's replacing. You can rent a basement suite or older apartment unit in these Village sites for less than you'll be able to rent a unit in a new apartment block. The Commercial St area has already done more than its fair share when it comes to accepting additional density, please leave it be and don't allow it to be bulldozed further.	Garret McTavish	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	19:09	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim, Councillors, and city planners, I've tried to follow Vancouver City policies and have contributed as a citizen/voter/property owner/taxpayer since I was age 19 in 1970. I've appeared occasionally before City Council, and greatly value the opportunity to be heard. I have registered to speak on July 14th against the proposed Villages Plan. But at age 75 I may not have the same stamina as you civic representatives and officials to last through a prolonged hearing. So I'll send this brief message in case I don't last on Tuesday. As pointed out by Housing Reset, the plan seems almost calculated to harm existing residential and small business commercial communities, and adversely affect the property rights of many current homeowners. It seems ill-advised, unnecessary, and premature just before a civic election. I am in favour of more housing for people who live and work in Vancouver, but do not favour progressive destruction of the qualities of livability and environmental quality that so many Vancouverites treasure. I urge you to put this plan aside. If it seems appropriate after a new Council assumes office, at least then the new Council might have a mandate to approve such dramatic change. I can assure you that I have similar concerns about how our Provincial Government has imposed drastic changes on BC cities including Vancouver, seemingly with little appreciation of their implications and even less concern for how many voters feel about their actions. Thank you for considering my views, which are broadly shared by my wife - also a voter. Tom Perry [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Tom Perry		
2026-07-14	19:13	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am signed up to speak but may not be able to wait long enough given the large number of speakers. So see the attachment showing what I plan to say.	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey	Attachment 1
2026-07-14	19:14	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Villages Plan. The plan fails the test of equity. Shaughnessy remains Vancouver's most glaring example of inefficient land use and historical preservation of wealth. Despite our city's housing crisis, Shaughnessy has remained virtually frozen in time while lower-income, more vulnerable neighborhoods are repeatedly targeted for major upzoning. By concentrating these 'Villages' in areas where residents lack the discretionary income and time to organize campaigns against City Hall, the City is exacerbating urban inequality. True planning equity means densifying our wealthiest, lowest-density neighborhoods first.	Vlad Alexander	Arbutus Ridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	19:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	to record my objections to the Villages Plan and process for implementation, reasons as follows. (primarily relating to the Commercial St/20th Street proposal, but could apply to all areas) 1. Insufficient public input for such a wide-sweeping changes in the official Plan and mass rezoning. Public Meetings scheduled during busy holiday season and in summer when residents are often away. Online meetings not truly interactive, presentation style limited to 1 hr and barely any of the questions submitted during the time were addressed by the city staff. (Many expressed opposition to the mass rezoning and the total densities proposed, and the scale—6 stories too tall, yet none of these objections appear in the city’s summary reports.) 2. I am opposed to mass city-council initiated rezoning. Increases land speculation, land values and therefore taxes for residents in the proposed villages. (Rezoning works best on a response to need basis, and can maintain pace with necessary infrastructure changes). 3. Scale: 6-story buildings (and greater if permitted), will overwhelm the neighbourhoods in the proposed village designated zones (standard should be 4 stories with some 6 stories in appropriate locations). The density projections are immense and scale totally unrealistic if fully built out. 4. Lack of design input for residents to retain heritage, historical and distinctive features unique to their “village”. 5. Oddly shaped and seemingly random boundaries to the proposed village. Background: I have owned a business in the existing Commercial Street “high street.” Over the past 12years I have seen that this street has organically grown to serve the neighbourhood (which self-identifies as Cedar Cottage/Trout Lake) It has naturally developed its own unique village, centred around its unique historical, diverse, artisan-focused and tightly-knit community, with a vibrant “Jane Jacobs” neighbourhood flavour. Please don't destroy what its residents and businesses have so lovingly built. Elizabeth McKitrick Business Owner Second Nature Home Boutique [REDACTED] @2ndNatureHome	Elizabeth Mcketrick Second Nature Home Boutique	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-07-14	19:20	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning and the inclusion of a new "village" designation at Mackenzie Street and West 41st Avenue. Our local area is already exceptionally well-served by existing commercial hubs, making a new village entirely redundant: Kerrisdale Village: This vibrant, established hub spans West 41st Avenue (from Larch Street to Maple Street) and West Boulevard (from West 37th to West 39th Avenue).Dunbar Street Commercial Area: A thriving corridor around west Dunbar and 41st.Both of these existing commercial districts are within easy walking distance of our neighborhood. Furthermore, Kerrisdale Village currently has a number of vacant, boarded-up commercial units. Introducing more commercial space when our existing storefronts are struggling to remain occupied is economically counterproductive and threatens the viability of our current local businesses. Finally, I am deeply concerned about the lack of communication surrounding this project. Many of my neighbours remain completely unaware of this proposal. We do not need another village.	Sui Chow	Kerrisdale	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	19:30	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	The Villages Plan as written takes renovation rights away from homeowners whose lots cannot be redeveloped, and Council should not approve it until that is fixed. We live within the Nanaimo St and E 1st Ave Village area. We support density, we support more building types in our neighbourhood, and we want this plan to pass. The problem is specific and correctable: the plan reduces the character retention renovation FSR for existing single family homes from 0.75, currently allowed under RT-5N and previously under RS-7, to 0.65 under the proposed R1-1 framework. That reduction assumes every lot in the Village is a viable redevelopment candidate, so a lower renovation FSR simply nudges owners to sell to a developer. This is wrong. Lot dimensions, topography, servicing, and position within the Village boundary mean many lots will never pencil for multiplex or apartment development. No developer wants them at any price the plan enables. Owners of those lots get penalized twice. They cannot participate in the density the plan creates, and they lose renovation capacity they hold today. When a family grows, when aging parents move in, when a household becomes multi generational, these owners will have less ability to adapt their homes than they had before Council acted. A plan built to expand housing flexibility should not strip it from the residents least able to benefit. The fix costs the plan nothing. Amend it so owners retaining an existing character home may renovate to 0.75 FSR, matching the current RT-5N entitlement. This reduces density nowhere a project is viable. It only protects people the market will not touch. We ask Council to approve the Villages Plan with this amendment, not as written. A rezoning covering thousands of parcels on a compressed timeline is exactly where nuances like this get steamrolled. Do not let that happen here.	Devrim Birlik	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-14	19:33	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	Many experts, more knowledgeable than me about the city and who love our city are supposed to this plan, including architects for planners, etc. We need to listen to them. Our city is changing to rapidly and we are not being thoughtful about it development. We are going to end up with a city that has no soul and no personality.	Paula Littledale		
2026-07-14	19:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	This type of rezoning is disruptive to how our city functions. Our residential neighborhoods, tree lined streets are part of what makes this city the 9th most livable city in the world. Let’s not ruin that with disorganized expansion in density when so many other viable alternatives exist. Additionally, the infrastructure in some of these targeted neighborhoods are no where near where they need to be to support such a huge expansion in density.	Mojib Javadi	Arbutus Ridge	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	19:51	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Oppose	I worked very hard and save money by not buying nor spending in order to move into my neighborhood which is more low density and quiet and paid a high mortgage for my property. I feel the city just want to spread all the lower income housing throughout the city and actually decrease the value the properties the hard working people actually worked and paid for. I also have a feeling there will also be social housing and the reason I moved away from my previous neighborhood was because after social housing was built near my street the break in and vandalism incidents increased drastically. Very miserable since hearing about these villages. I also paid the premium for a 3 bedroom condo and from the public hearing today they will build more 2-3 bedrooms that are lower value. That means the people that are paying mortgages for 3 bedrooms would see a decrease in their property values. My property is also within a unique site and it’s in a pink rezoning initiative on shapeyourcity. There is no clear direction on what that means. If the city force below market rent in our strata corporation that would decrease our strata unit value and also increase the crime rate, which is the most worrisome!	May Chan	Killarney	

Appendix A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Hinda Avery



**Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver**

Re: Preservation of Greenery on Sasamat Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Name:

Val Bjarnason

July 10/26

Address:

Phone:

Email:

**Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver**

Re: Preservation of Greenery on Sasamat Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Name: Dr. Hinda Avery

Address: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]