



But will it work?

In the lead up to this year's civic election, The REVUE is investigating a few of the policies that political parties, incumbents and aspiring, have put out there as solutions to some of the city's chronic problems.

What we've been looking for is not a list of issues the city faces, we all have an opinion of what they are, but rather new and specific ideas to address them. Not generalizations, not the same solution (that failed) framed differently, not political naïveté and (especially) not hubristic delusion usually expressed as "I am for the people and will do things differently."

The way it worked was The REVUE posed questions and gave the parties an opportunity to respond. Some did and their responses were included in the published article, some didn't.

Here are the previously published results for you to consider before you vote.



TEAM's solution for a liveable Vancouver - repeal blanket zoning and replace it with "neighbourhood-based plans"

This story was first published on April 8, 2026 in The REVUE's Breaking News Blog

In a recent promotional video, Colleen Hardwick, former Vancouver City Councillor (2018-2022) and member of Team for a Livable Vancouver, described how "Calgary applied blanket zoning allowing multiplexes all over their city" and how the new Calgary City Council "is taking the first steps toward repealing it." Then she stated, "We can do the same in Vancouver."

Assuming TEAM is elected with a majority, or at least enough like-minded councillors in October's civic election, what impact might the repeal of "blanket zoning" have on property values, investor confidence, projects set to go or already underway, and the availability of housing in the near future?

According to a spokesperson for TEAM for a Livable Vancouver, the party would indeed repeal the Vancouver Official Development Plan, pause the Broadway Plan, reconsider multiplexes, and make spot rental rezoning the exception rather than the rule.

As to what the impact these sweeping changes might have, the question was sidestepped with the following response:

"Rezoning needs to be carefully balanced between the need for growth with more housing options, while avoiding land value inflation that undermines affordability efforts. It is essential that City approval processes are efficient, transparent and predictable for both investor and public confidence. TEAM would introduce a suite of policies to get approved projects to completion faster. The City's Official Development Plan (ODP) confirms that there already is enough approved development in the pipeline to serve projected population growth to 2050, so there is time to plan this properly."

Just what that means to a developer who has purchased land under the previous zoning and programs is unclear. What happens to land values if property that has been assembled and purchased under one set of zoning principles, say for a spot rental apartment tower, is suddenly repealed? What about the homeowner who wants to cash in on the enhanced value of their property to facilitate such a development?

Making the approval processes "efficient, transparent and predictable", something every council in recent history has said they would do, and have, with some success, does not address this issue. Neither does the City's ODP report confirming "that there already is

enough approved development in the pipeline to serve projected population growth to 2050", if that pipeline is disrupted.

But as far as TEAM is concerned the overriding issue is that all these policies and programs as presented in the Vancouver Plan "are flawed" because they lack "meaningful public involvement."

However, according to the City of Vancouver, during the creation of the Vancouver Plan between November 2019 and April 2022, 52,480 in-person and online contact points with community members were made that included more than 25,000 survey responses from 12 online surveys available in at least six languages, 100 youth workshops, 29 neighbourhood workshops and more than 100 meetings with stakeholder organizations and community groups.

(<https://www.shapethecity.ca/vancouver-plan>)

Despite these consultations, TEAM still sees the need to address this top-down approach to city planning, by initiating "a neighbourhood-based participatory planning process to provide the growth we need for an affordable and livable future."

Take the issues of multiplexes. TEAM "would reconsider how multiplexes are implemented through a neighbourhood-based planning process that considers a range of options for each neighbourhood through a public participatory process."

The term "neighbourhood-based planning" appears in almost every TEAM communication. For example, on their website entitled "Planning for Livability and Affordability", the section under Participatory Planning for All Neighbourhoods, reads:

"Ensure that every new development is planned in consultation with local residents and businesses, within the scale and context of each neighbourhood, and with the needed infrastructure and amenities."

This is not a new idea. In the 1970s and 1980s Local Area Plans were undertaken that resulted in plans being developed for Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodland. The lack of citizen participation in other neighbourhoods ultimately led to the program being abandoned. It reemerged in the 1990s through 2010 as CityPlan and Community Visions and saw over 100,000 residents get involved in "bottom-up" planning at a local level.

How would the participatory planning process TEAM envisions work differently, beginning with a proposal from a developer to the approving of a development permit?

Apparently, that question puts the cart before the horse.

As the spokesperson explained; "The whole idea of participatory planning is that neighbourhood-based planning for growth is done with extensive public involvement in advance, with the public having a meaningful role in the outcome of that plan and how it is reflected in zoning. Then the development permit stage should be straight forward and be consistent with the zoning through a publicly transparent process."

Does that mean development would be paused until a neighbourhood-based plan "with extensive public involvement" can be completed? How many residents would have to participate in the "extensive public involvement" for it to be representative of the neighbourhood?

Could these "neighbourhood-based planning" committees just be replacing one special interest group with another?

The REVUE submitted these follow-up questions but TEAM for a Livable Vancouver declined the opportunity to comment.



Will ABC's promise of another 0% property tax increase mean less services and higher fees?

This story was first published on June 11, 2026 in The REVUE's Breaking News Blog

To launch their campaign for the Vancouver Civic election this October, the ABC Party led by Mayor Ken Sim have promised (if elected) a second year of 0% property tax increase.

The City of Vancouver's 2026 budget of \$2.39 billion which also froze property taxes was achieved by identifying \$120 million in savings and new revenue.

That included a 12% reduction in funding for arts, culture, and community services, a 14% cut in planning, urban design, and sustainability, and about 400 potential layoffs of unionized and non-union staff in general administration. Additionally, the Vancouver Park Board was required to find approximately \$11 million in budget savings and revenue increases which has resulted in increased user fees and charging for parking at community centres.

Mayor Ken Sim has stated, "We will not use global economic challenges as an excuse to reach further into people's pockets." He claims that the second 0% budget is necessary to "stay focused on delivering the core services that Vancouverites expect from City Hall – investing in public safety, road maintenance, garbage pickup, and community centres."

With inflation around 2% per year, holding taxes flat for two years reduces the city's purchasing power by roughly 4% in real terms—on the order of tens of millions of dollars.

Even if costs only rise at the level of inflation but revenue doesn't increase, the question becomes how will this campaign promise effect the city's ability to deliver services people rely on every day like libraries, community centres, and parks? Should citizens expect another round of fee increases or be prepared for service cuts?

The REVUE made several requests to ABC for comment, however, at press time it had received no response.