

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-13	13:52	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	Because the city is bypassing traditional site-by-site rezonings in favor of mass pre-zoning, I have concerns that many micro-level details regarding infrastructure, lot sizes, and daily livability will be pushed directly to the development permit stage. I have some questions regarding this rezoning process and safeguards that would normally be part of the permitting process: 1. Infrastructure and Servicing Capacity The R3-1 zone allows for a massive jump in density—up to a 2.7 FSR for 6-storey secured rental buildings. Since these developments will happen on quiet, off-arterial residential streets, what is the city’s timeline for upgrading localised electrical grids, water mains, and sewer lines to handle this influx before building permits are issued? 2. Side-Yard Transitions, Privacy, and Shadowing Because the plan eliminates individual public hearings for projects that fit the pre-zoned criteria, what specific design guidelines are in place to protect the privacy, sunlight, and side-yard transitions of existing single-family homeowners when a 4-to-6 storey building is built directly next door? 3. BC Assessment and Property Tax Speculation Since the city is initiating the pre-zoning on these 13,000 lots simultaneously, how is the city working with BC Assessment to ensure that our property taxes do not immediately spike based on the 'highest and best use' (e.g., a 6-storey apartment building) while we continue to live in and maintain our single-family homes? 4. Lot Assemblies and the "Orphaned Lot" Problem To achieve the maximum 2.0 to 2.7 FSR under the R3-1 zone, developers will likely need to assemble multiple lots. What policies or protections exist to prevent a single homeowner from being 'orphaned' (left as the lone single-family house trapped between two multi-family buildings) if their immediate neighbours choose to assemble and sell without them? 5. Lack of West Side Affordability Parity (The R3-1 vs. R3-4 Difference) The Villages Plan outlines strict inclusionary housing and cash-in-lieu requirements for the West Side (R3-4), but waives them for standard strata projects in the Central and East Side (R3-1) areas. Is the city concerned that this asymmetry will disproportionately channel aggressive developer speculation and rapid neighbourhood disruption into Central and East Side communities over the West Side?	Derek Stobbart	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-13	15:03	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	To Mayor and City Council, As a resident of Vancouver, I am very worried about the Villages Plan which will significantly impact a huge part of the city and is being rushed through without meaningful public consultation. The Villages Plan is very complex and requires clear answers to the many concerns which have very been clearly expressed in the following open letter from about 30 well-respected housing experts, builders, architects, academics and urban planners Letter to Vancouver: Why Vancouver Must Re-think the Villages Plan – Housing Reset I have many questions regarding this plan: 1. I live in Mount Pleasant, near 15th Ave and Yukon. Am I inside or outside the nearest village? Please explain. 2. Why do you want to create these new so-called villages when we already have established neighbourhood with their unique character, and replace them with blanket uniform villages that will compete with existing ones ? 3. Why are existing neighbourhood and their current local businesses unsupported, when they are struggling due to construction disruption, tenants' eviction and displacement, and empty new housing ? 4. I am confused and concerned that if this Villages Plan is passed, I will never again have the opportunity to speak to Council about what arises from whichever plan is approved. Please address this concern. I hope you will take the time to provide answers to my questions. Sincerely, Stephen Cassells Vancouver resident	Stephen Cassells	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-13	18:26	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	I would support the rezoning area only limited to the relatively busier streets like W 41st Ave, & Granville St. Leaving the inside street at the original tranquil condition. Building more apartments may help to provide more residential units to ease off the tension of renters and lower down the high rent. But we have enough vacant apartments in other areas like Surrey & Burnaby.	Mimi Tong	South Cambie	
2026-07-13	20:55	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	The few multiplexes that have already been built have been built with little to no respect for aesthetics. They do not fit into the "neighbourhood" that you are so keen on supporting. I live the 16th and MacDonald neighbourhood and oppose your interest in massive densification. It will block sunlight, ruin aesthetics, tax the infrastructure (power, water, sewage, roads, etc...) beyond what it already is and is a danger to wildlife. For those people with non visible disabilities this development can be crippling which you're clearly being insensitive to. I'm supportive of development on all 4 corners of 16th and MacDonald, but not beyond this. It seems that those that have created this plan have no understanding of what it actually means to live in these neighbourhoods. We can walk 5-10 minutes and already have everything you are proposing we need. Could you please please please focus on the areas where SkyTrain is and upzone those areas. For example, why is there not highrise residential at the Renfrew SkyTrain line or any line for that matter. Your planning department is out of control and being unelected, they are not representative of the electorate in those areas. There has been no due process, last minute public meetings, when there has been engagement online through Teams meetings you can ask as question, but can't ask a follow up question and engage in a conversation (they are often wrong). No one has ever once knocked on my door to find our what it's like in my neighbourhood. No one has put on a public discussion at the corner of my neighbourhood. This is being rammed through and it's not democratic.	Colin Scarlett	Kitsilano	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-13	21:00	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	The village plan appears to be a very ambitious project for the City's future. Some may question the locations earmarked for the development when there are existing neighbourhoods that are essentially serving the same functions, while others may worry about the impacts on the current residents, who have been living in the areas for years and built their lives around them. I would like to focus on the two terms being repeated over and over again - "village" and "missing middle". What makes a village a village? The plan has many elements one would expect - a mix of income groups, housing typologies, and land uses. Ultimately, it is the people who make the village a village. A more stable social fabric - groups of residents who would want to live in the neighbourhood for decades, start their families, raise their children, etc., form long-term bonds with their neighbours and the land they live in - that is what makes a village successful Social housing, below-market rentals and condo developments are all great housing options, but should the tenants' economic or familial status change, they will likely need to move out. There appears to be a missed opportunity in re-introducing the kind of missing middle housing that we used to do but have somehow forgotten. Co-ops would be excellent for these village plans in providing stable, affordable, long-term family-oriented housing options, particularly in a time when the federal government appears to be pivoting away from relying on immigration as the main engine for growth. I can only support this plan if the City can mandate a meaningful proportion of co-op housing and partner with the provincial and federal governments to make starting a co-op easier. Without these other measures, we are only building density, not villages.	Boris Chan	Renfrew-Collingwood	

2026-07-13	22:37	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	Hello, I have been a resident in the Marpole area for over 15 years, witnessing many changes and development in this areas, in both good and not good ways. While we have been welcoming more and more people residing in the neighbourhood, we are also experiencing huge increases in traffic related congestion, crowded public transportation, increasing tight public resources and facilities. The proposed village by the Oak & 67th is different from other locations due to its unique geographic location. It is right in the centre and bottleneck of two major transportation bridges and multiple highways in the greater Vancouver area- Oak Bridge and Granville Bridge. Very high volumes of people and motor vehicles pass this area day by day to get to Richmond, YVR, Ferry, Delta, Surrey, US Border, interior, Arbortsford... In this relatively small area, we have public school and day care, senior centre, cultural centre, neighbourhood house, churches, shops, multiple apartments... The lack of proper planning and traffic calming measures make this neighbourhood increasingly becoming a public safety concern. Residents have to go round and round in order to get to home or find a parking, bikes were stolen, cars were scratched, people were hit, ambulance and fire truck couldn't go through, children need special attention to cross the street... Without clear traffic light and no proper signs, a long lineup of cars are waiting on the Hudson street on a daily basis during rush hours to turn left or right on the 70th and then pass through the two bridges. It is a messy and chaotic situation. It greatly bothers local residents and delays people driving or biking through. I sincerely hope the Engineering Department staff of the city come over and observe personally to obtain a good picture of what are happening here. I would request the city, while it is engaging in its village planning, to give some thoughts and considerations in the Marpole 67& Oak village in the following aspects: 1: Reduce local traffic congestion, admitting its location as a transportation hub and already a high density area. 2: Survey and implement public safety and traffic calming measures 3: Increase investment in infrastructure to accommodate a higher density population such as community centre 4: Implement one way traffic in the Hudson Street to reduce potential risk and dangers driving both way in the narrow street. 5: Establish resident parking zone and limit non resident parking on the Hudson & 67th & 70th street. 6: No left turn to the 70th on rush hours. 7: Put on large, clear sign to indicate local traffic only 8: More public consultation and survey in the area to implement policies impacting local residents. Thank you for your attention. I hope my voices be heard by the elected officials.	Ling jiang	Marpole	
2026-07-13	23:17	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	Subject: Inquiry Regarding Infrastructure and Tax Protections for Villages Plan – Nanaimo St. & E 1st Ave.	Germaine Tam		Attachment 1
2026-07-13	23:23	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	July 14, 2026 Mayor and Council City of Vancouver Re: Public Hearing Feedback – Villages Planning Program (ODP Amendments) Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing as a resident living near Garden Park within one of the proposed village areas.	Don Stevenson	Grandview-Woodland	

				I support the City’s objective of increasing housing supply and creating more opportunities for missing-middle housing in established neighbourhoods. However, I am concerned that the current draft of the Villages Planning Program does not include sufficiently clear requirements for transitioning between new six-storey apartment buildings and existing low-density residential properties. General urban planning best practice recognizes that higher-density housing is integrated more successfully when taller buildings are stepped back from lower-scale homes and designed to reduce shadowing, overlook, and privacy impacts. These are standard transition tools used in existing neighbourhood plans and rezonings, and they help new housing fit into existing streets while protecting sunlight access and mature trees. I respectfully request that Council amend the Villages Planning Program to incorporate clear and enforceable transition requirements between new six-storey apartment buildings and existing lower-density homes. These transition measures are widely recognized planning tools that help accommodate growth while protecting sunlight access, privacy, livability, and the urban forest. Specifically, I encourage Council to consider: • Require upper-storey step-backs above three or four storeys where buildings adjoin lower-density residential properties to reduce massing, improve sunlight access, and create a more gradual transition. • Limit streetwalls and side-yard interfaces to four storeys beside existing detached homes, with any additional height stepped back to allow six-storey buildings while softening the scale transition. • Increase setbacks and solar-access protections along rear property lines and residential interfaces to reduce shadowing of neighbouring yards and direct overlook into private outdoor spaces. • Shape building massing to place the greatest height toward primary streets and commercial frontages while reducing it near adjacent residential lot lines; use courtyard and similar forms to improve compatibility. • Strengthen tree-retention and root-zone protection requirements to preserve mature trees wherever feasible and minimize impacts from excavation and underground parkade construction. In a neighbourhood whose identity is tied to its woodland character, protecting the existing canopy is essential to maintaining livability, cooling, and neighbourhood character as growth occurs. The Villages Planning Program presents an important opportunity to add housing in locations close to parks, schools, transit, and local services. However, growth will be more successful and better accepted if it is accompanied by clear requirements for height transitions, sunlight access, privacy protection, and tree retention. I respectfully ask Council to amend the proposed plan to include these measures before adoption. Thank you for your consideration.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	00:18	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	I recognize Vancouver needs more housing, but I am not convinced the proposed Village Plan adequately addresses the realities of the VICTORIA DR & E 61ST AVE neighbourhood. VICTORIA DR & E 61ST AVE already has many of the characteristics of a neighbourhood village, including an established commercial corridor, local businesses, and existing community services. However, the size and shape of the proposed village area appear too broad and may extend beyond the areas that naturally function as a village. Rather than expanding development across a larger area, focus on strengthening and revitalizing the existing commercial corridor and surrounding areas that already support village activity. I am also concerned that the plan assumes infrastructure and community amenities will follow future growth. While some improvements are proposed, residents have been waiting for better improvement for traffic safety, trees, utilities, and public spaces for years. Without clear funding, timelines, and implementation plans, residents are being asked to accept greater density now with the expectation that supporting infrastructure may come much later. Finally, the plan does not clearly address affordability. More housing alone does not guarantee affordability. If new housing is primarily market-priced, many people with ordinary incomes, including those who grew up in the neighbourhood, may still be unable to live here. The plan should better explain how it will create housing that is accessible to a broader range of residents. I support the goal of adding housing, but I am not yet convinced this plan demonstrates that the scale of growth, affordability, and infrastructure investments are appropriately balanced for the VICTORIA DR & E 61ST AVE neighbourhood.	Julie Wong	Victoria-Fraserview	
2026-07-14	10:12	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	I support the upzoning in general, but I am extremely disappointed to see that we will only allow mixed use development on busy streets. Please upzone to allow mixed use developments on all streets in these villages. There is a severe lack of commercial space in Vancouver and it is all concentrated on busy roads that are unpleasant to be on. I live at Nanaimo and Broadway. It is an unpleasant and dangerous intersection. Sitting at outdoors at a cafe, such as Ruka, is not something I'd even consider. However, if we were to allow cafes and other businesses to open on streets such as 8th or 10th or Garden, it would be very attractive to me and others in the neighbourhood. Having visited other cities, such as Montreal and Kyoto, having businesses on traffic calmed streets is very pleasant. I hope that this council can move past historical car-centric zoning practices and make a more livable city.	Mike Gottlieb	Hastings-Sunrise	
2026-07-14	10:57	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	I have attached a letter from the Vancouver BIA Partnership outlining our concerns with the Vancouver Villages Proposal	Patricia Barnes		Attachment 1

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-14	11:58	Villages Planning Program – Villages Plan, City-initiated Rezoning and Vancouver Official Development Plan Amendments	Other	I am overall in support of the Villages Plan. Clearly we need more housing in Vancouver. However, I am uncomfortable letting developers make the decisions about what to build and where. I worry we will not get the new services and businesses that are promised in this plan. Further, I live in the 20th/Commercial St neighborhood - unlike most of the other neighborhoods designated in this plan, we do NOT have transit here. The main intersection used to serve the street car, but now it is just residential streets. Traffic in our neighborhood is already too fast, and it is a walk to transit. Please add more nuance to this plan. We cannot have more density without better access to transit and traffic calming. I would love for my children to be able to bike in our neighborhood, but it is currently not safe to do so. In short, please add stronger language that would require developers to meet their obligations in terms of amenities provided to the neighborhood, manage the addition of new businesses, and coordinate the development with traffic calming and better access to transit.	Jennifer Williams	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	