TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Note: Petition form letter attachment on file in City Clerk's Office. (1 sample included)
12-8060-20-8683

To Mayor and Council Dec 22, 2010

We have recently become aware that council was **NOT** provided critical information from the planning department regarding our submission in opposition to the Lingyen temple expansion application. Our 595 letters of opposition were submitted to Diana Nikolic in the planning department as part of our brief , our concern is the letters were addressed to Richmond City Council and yet you where not even told about them. We feel that Richmond City Council should have been updated regarding the two Binders of information and those binders should have been made available to council members that wanted to review the information.

PHOTOCOPIED
DEC 24 2010
DISTRIBUTED

Our group is called C.A.L.E. (Committee Against Lingyen Expansion) and we have worked very very hard to collect information regarding the in- accuracies in the submission of the applicant . The examples provided in the binder submitted November 15 th , 2010 detail the problems with the entire process.

The decision by the Planning department to ask the applicant to withdraw the submission for expansion so that the City can conduct a comprehensive review of the No. 5 Road backlands policy is wise. Our concern is that this new development has kept the council in the dark regarding the growing and massive opposition to the expansion plans. Staff should be required to keep the council informed of important information such as the 595 signed comment forms because council needs to be aware so they can make sound decisions as the process continues.

We understand the staff runs the City of Richmond but council is responsible for their actions and council should be updated when large submissions are made by the public. This lack of information is extremely concerning to us because it appears as though the process has major gaps in communication.

We wrote a 19 page brief and submitted 31 pages of exhibits, all these were produced in order to inform Council of the position of the neighborhood. Attached to this letter are a sample of the 595 signed comment forms from adult Richmond residents , we ask that you read them because it is important that you understand the feelings of the residents in this neighborhood. We have attached our brief so council can understand how flawed the public consultation has been.

C.A.L.E. has prepared proposals for a compromise with the Lingyen temple regarding their plans for expansion unfortunately the Temple development team has ignored our invitation to meet and discuss ways to work together in harmony. We feel this next year would be a great opportunity for the two sides to come together and work towards a new plan that could intricate the needs of the temple with the needs of the neighborhood. An excellent example of a process that worked extremely well is the process of community workshops conducted by Townline homes prior to the development plans of the old Fantasy Gardens site. We have attached a proposal for linking of " the Gardens" and the Lingyen proposals. We hope in the future all major projects in Richmond would involve community groups in the process at the inception stage. It seems a waste of resources for the city staff and the developers to create a large scale plan before consulting stakeholders.

The future of the No. 5 ROAD Backlands policy is of critical importance to the residents in this area and the information provided by C.A.L.E. should be considered when moving forward with the

CITY OF RICHMOND
DATE
DEC 23 2010
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

comprehensive review of that policy. The C.A.L.E. brief provided to the City of Richmond is a excellent example of the position of the people of Richmond when it comes to large scale developments on No. 5 ROAD. The City has accepted many applications from multiple faith institutions and allowed exceptions to the existing bylaw (# 5037) this is a testament to the city's tolerance and the multicultural make up of Richmond, but we need common sense when it comes to how large is too large. C.A.L.E. would be very happy to meet with council and staff to present our point of view on maximum size and heights in regards to development guidelines for the revised No. 5 ROAD Backlands policy.

We ask you take the time to understand our strong opposition to Mega developments on No. 5 ROAD and direct staff to come up with guidelines that will avoid this kind of controversy in the future.

Thanks from the Board of directors for the Committee Against Lingyen Expansion

Chairperson C.A.L.E.
Carol Day

Secretary C.A.L.E.
James Day

Treasurer C.A.L.E.
Ralph Radom

Director C.A.L.E.
Stefan Emberson

Director C.A.L.E.
Melia Langevin

Director C.A.L.E.
Mary Friesen

Director C.A.L.E.

Director C.A.L.E.

Attachments * Examples of the 595 comment forms

*Original brief from C.A.L.E. Submitted Nov 15, 2010

* Existing Sitemaps for area and drawing with C.A.L.E. Proposal for Continuation of Lingyen and The Gardens