

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 25TH, 2008

I, Deirdre Whalen reside at 13631 Blundell Road, Richmond. I have lived in Richmond since 1975.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you again about the Garden City Lands. Thanks also for the questions you posed to me last week at the General Purposes committee. I've had some time to think them over.

I am speaking this evening to encourage the Mayor and Council to re-think the application to remove the Garden City Lands (GCL) from the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). I oppose the application by responding to these questions.

1. What are Richmond's needs? A city bases its needs on the public good. Mayor Brodie put it best when he said "What we're looking for is not a developed area. What we're looking for is an open space, green space, environmental use, for the use and enjoyment of all people in our city and certainly the people of the city centre."

- Keeping the GCL in the ALR ensures all Richmond's needs are covered

2. What are the permitted uses in the ALR? They include test plots, urban agriculture, community gardens, experimental farms for education, walking trails, playing fields, water reservoirs and open space for indigenous plants and animals.

- Securing land for food production, open space and green space is a worthy goal

3. In a compact urban core, what is necessary for livability? I believe planners would agree with me - the preservation of **public green space** is essential to livability. But the problem is, most of the land in our urban core is privately owned.

- GCL is special because it has always been publicly owned
- We would not have to deny a private owner the honest value to amass green space
- This land belongs to the public
- If there is a will, we can find a way to keep it public

4. What are we fearful of? Losing the MOU? In my view the City is acting in haste and the MOU is outdated. It is stuck in the old way of thinking that developing land is always a good thing. The MOU puts the onus on Richmond to develop more land in the urban core than our official community plan (OCP) requires. How is this good for us?

- According to the OCP, the GCL were not used in growth projections
- OCP also says we are short 100's of acres of parkland -- why not use the GCL
- Nothing in the MOU resolves the shortage of park space in the city core
- If the GCL is developed, where do we find more park space? At residential prices - millions of dollars per acre?
- If the GCL is developed, mustn't we buy land for schools? At residential prices?

5. What about the Musqueam? The MOU also makes us fearful that the Musqueam will take all of the land if we don't proceed. But so far, successful land claims have only been on land that is adjacent to reserve land. The GLC is not contiguous with reserve land. So why should we fear we will lose the GCL in this way?

- Musqueam were successful gaining the Musqueam golf course and River Rock which are adjacent to their reserve
- The MOU would give the Musqueam land they could otherwise not lay claim to

I conclusion, I believe there is another way.

- Richmond needs to preserve open space, green space
- The GCL is public land and always has been
- The MOU is not a good thing for Richmond
- There is nothing to fear by canceling the MOU

I would ask you. Must we trade off our children's future? Many of our immigrants came to Richmond to get away from just the kind of city this MOU wants to create. They came here for a better life for their kids. We deserve more green space.

I encourage everyone watching here tonight to write a letter - you can make a difference! And come to the Public Hearing on March 11th - get involved and you will be heard.

Thank you.

De Whalen

H 604.273.6159

C 604.273.6159