Good morning members of the Executive Policy Committee.

I want to begin by stressing how important I feel this issue to be. Amending Plan Winnipeg to re-designate the proposed land known as Waverley West from Rural-Policy land to Neighborhood-Policy land will inevitably have a major impact on the physical, ecological, and demographic aspects of Winnipeg for many years to come. I think it is important to notice that re-designating such a large area of land outside of the existing civic boundary, regardless of the scale of any immediate development, facilitates a concentration of residential development at the very fringe of the city, and is thus, a clear indication from city council that your focus is on suburban development.

As life long resident of Winnipeg in my early twenties, I have a love for the city which has raised me as well as a desire to create a life for myself in a vibrant and healthy community. I truly believe that Winnipeg has aspects of, and certainly the possibility to become that vibrant and healthy community. However, I strongly feel that a focus of suburban development -- especially such a large project as Waverly West -- will inevitably prevent Winnipeg from becoming a vibrant and/or healthy place to live.

Science constantly builds further upon truths it has already bagged. Each further discovery starts anew with its own fruitful question. "Fruitful" means that the question must take into account, as far as possible, everything already known about the object, event, or process under scrutiny and, amid this richness of information, must single out a salient mystery or obscurity. This is harder than it sounds, because salient mysteries are apt to be overlooked or taken for granted. Examples from the past could be: "How does water get up into clouds?" and "How does blood from the feet get up to the heart?" Each of these questions, in its own context, was splendidly fruitful. I have mischievously coupled them here to suggest how misleading analogies can be.

After fruitful questions are answered, the answers themselves dispose of false analogies: for instance, what an absurdity to suppose that evaporation does the work of leg veins' valves, or vice versa. Yet as we shall see, slovenly use of analogies is one pitfall of some North American science.

Equipped with a fruitful question, the scientist frames a hypothetical answer, accounting as elegantly and economically as possible—"parsimoniously" is the word favored—for the truth that he or she suspects is hiding behind the question. The question, and the hypothetical answer, together constitute two closely linked stages that require insight, imagination, and courage, qualities possessed by all creative scientists, and in high degree by scientific geniuses.

In the third stage, the hypothesis is tested, by both its creator and others. Ultimately, the real world tests all hypotheses, and usually quickly. When answers from the real world seem to come slowly, it is seldom the evidence itself that is slow to appear; rather, observers are blind to evidence or emotionally

can't bear to credit it. This is why the crashing of the Berlin Wall finally was required as an exclamation point, after unheeded evidence of many decades reported that Marxism was untruthful as an economic theory. An example from medicine is the discovery that peptic ulcers are caused by bacteria, not psychological stress; for years, the evidence assembled by an Australian doctor was ignored by other specialists.

Deliberate tests of a hypothesis can often be contrived experimentally. Tests contrived in the laboratory, like those coming in unsought from life, are useless in the absence of observers alert to evidence, or in the presence of observers who lack respect for evidence. Wishful thinking absolutely does not do. If a hypothesis stands up well to assault by testing, it is eventually accepted as theory or even law, as in "the law of gravity" or "the laws of perspective."

In its fourth and final stage, a successful hypothesis opens up questions previously not even known to exist. For instance, a theory that cholera epidemics spread from contaminated drinking water—a startling finding by John Snow, a nineteenth-century London physician who noticed a correspondence between incidence of cases and a district in the city that was served by a specific well—opened up the sequel question, "How does drinking water become contaminated by cholera as an infectious agent?" The answer, "Sewage," opened up still further questions. Copernicus's stupendous theory that the earth revolves around the sun opened up many other questions, such as "What holds the earth to its course?"

This fourth stage, the question chain, sustains science as a coherent process, erecting continuous, coherent bodies of knowledge. Thus science itself, rather than the will of scientists or the judgments of patrons and grant givers, directs its

There are many reasons why such a specific focus on suburban development will be detrimental to Winnipeg; and on the contrary many reasons why a focus on development within existing neighborhoods and on greenfield land within the existing city limits would be very beneficial for the entire city and would precipitate real growth, not simply growth in the sense of physical size and profits for developers.

I think the most profound effect of such a focus on suburban development will be the continued economic segregation of Winnipeg. Suburbs are typically built to accommodate the upper-middle class. As those with the means to do so move into new suburban neighborhoods, lower-income residents are left in the remaining neighborhoods. Statistics show that it is often the elderly, aboriginal, immigrant, single-parent, disabled and addicted members of society that remain. As these groups are at a disadvantage to participate in the formal economy, entire districts of the city become economically stagnant. This effect can be seen in overwhelming clarity in cities all over North America, and can unfortunately be seen to a certain extent here in Winnipeg. Encouraging more middle-class people and the significant commercial activity they support to move out of existing neighborhoods to the fringe of the city, encourages economic segregation

and contributes to the severe urban decay of specific neighborhoods. Waverley West will obviously contribute to and perpetuate this economic segregation.

Another negative effect of developing Waverley West is that it will put an increased strain on our already burdened transit system. It is widely known among public transportation officials that the most important factor determining the success of public transportation is density. If City Council wants to ensure that Winnipeg has a viable public transportation system in years to come, we need to be thoughtful about how to achieve this. We need to develop new residential neighborhoods in conjunction with effective transit lines, rather than simply running subsidized, low-frequency transit service through suburban neighborhoods.

The residents of Waverley West will inevitably be auto-dependent as they will be isolated from their employment, shopping and entertainment needs; and as the roads surrounding the development are not conducive to walking or cycling. The negative ecological, social and health effects of cars are well documented; and creating grossly auto-dependent neighborhoods is ignorant development, out of sink with progressive city planning underway in other cities.

In addition to the many ills of urban sprawl, Waverley West may very well be completely un-economical. Common sense suggests that extending the cities limits, that is increasing the area the city has to service, will naturally increase the civic budget because of the initial and maintenance costs of infrastructure such as roads, water and sewage and the cost of providing civic services such as: pools, community centers, parks, libraries, police, fire/paramedic, snow removal, and transit.

The Waverley West Financial Analysis released by the city on December 10th concludes that the city stands to make 70 million dollars over the next 80 years through property taxes, permits and development fees. However this report does not appear to be nearly comprehensive enough to make any accurate conclusions. For instance the report does not take basic costs such as snow removal, garbage and recycling collection, transit or the extension of water or sewage systems into account. In addition, the revenues that it does account for assume that Waverley West will accommodate only real population growth rather than a redistribution of the cities current population. Furthermore, the costs that the report does account for do not seem nearly adequate. For instance, the report allots Waverley West merely one million dollars for police service over the next 80 years and just over 20

million to the blanket topic "community services". If this report were the actual budget for Waverley West, I cringe to think of what the development may actually look like; 20 million dollars for community services couldn't possibly add up to more than a simple park and a meager community center; and that's over 80 years.

It seems obvious to me that the Waverley West Financial Analysis is very limited in it's estimate of the potential civic cost of Waverley West; and that the development will inevitably cost tax payers throughout the entire city.

On the other hand however, if city council were to leave Plan Winnipeg as is, and focus development within the existing city limits, we would be able to use the revenues from these properties without necessarily spending so much extra money on new infrastructure and community services. If we were to concentrate development to these areas— that is to the available land outlined in the cities recent Residential Land Supply Study—new development would be closer to existing infrastructure and services and consequently, the city would be able to strengthen the availability and quality of these services with a benefit to the whole city; rather than spreading these services out into brand new suburban developments and compromising the quality of all services at a cost the whole city.

In the last six months we have seen that there is apparently not enough money to improve a failing transit system; that our archaic sewer system is having considerable detrimental environmental impacts on our water systems; and we have come to realize the dilapidated state of our recreation centers and pools. Does it not make sense from both a land-use and an economic perspective to increase the residential density within Winnipeg's existing boundary in order to increase the quality and availability of civic services and infrastructure BEFORE we make an amendment to Plan Winnipeg to increase the physical size of our city?

Amending Plan Winnipeg to allow for Waverley West is essentially opening up a development—which, even according to the Waverley West Financial Analysis will be serviced very poorly—while we cannot even afford to service our existing infrastructure.

The most obvious argument against Waverley West however,—regardless of how un-economical it might be, or how badly urban sprawl will hurt Winnipeg—is that it is simply not needed.

The Residential Land Supply Study released by the city this past October attempts to make the case that Winnipeg is facing a severe housing shortage. It claims (without any justification) that Winnipeg's population will grow by 74, 100 people by 2020 (52,600 people more than Statistics Canada predicts). These population projections from the Conference Board of Canada that the study uses to justify this prediction are out of sink with both historical trends and the predictions of Statistics Canada. The Report also emphasizes that there will be a increased demand for houses as the average household size will fall from 2.4 persons per household to 2.3 persons per household. The report claims that this will be a result of the "echo" generation moving out of their parent's houses into houses of their own. The reality of population growth in Winnipeg however, is that most of the "echo" generation—being in their late twenties—will not be able to afford to buy brand new suburban homes; and their parents, the boom generation—which according to page six of the Residential Land Supply Study is the largest age group of our population—will likely soon be seeking to downsize their homes or move into multi-resident dwellings. Furthermore any increase in Winnipeg's population has most recently come—and will therefore most logically continue to come—from immigrants; and the fastest growing segment of our population are the First Nations. It seems to me then, that

rather than focusing on suburban development as the Residential Land Supply Study suggests; in order to accommodate young people, retires, immigrants and the First Nations—all of whom will most like not be able to afford homes in Waverley West—we need to actively seek housing which is affordable and in close proximity to employment.

Regardless of any optimistic or flawed population projections however, the Residential Land Supply Study still indicates that there is ample land available for residential development within the existing city limits. This is surprising given that the study made use of the available information in a way that surely decreased the potential lots said to be available. Examples of this include: the fact that only land zoned as Neighborhood-Policy land was considered; that only 5% of the population was considered as potential residents in existing mature neighborhoods; that previous industrial sites which are considered conducive to residential development such as the Kapyong Barracks, the Molson Brewery and the Fort Rouge Yards were also not considered; and that the total number of available in-fill lots said to be available was discounted by the total number of single-family home building permits issued since the date of the air photos and not discounted merely by the number of permits issued for in-fill sites.

But regardless of ALL of this, page 18 of the Residential Land Supply Study found that there are currently 22, 628 lots available for residential development. Therefore even if we employ the Conference board of Canada's particularly optimistic population estimates and assume that all of those people are coming to Winnipeg, and we assume that there really are only 22, 600 lots within Winnipeg, we will still not run out of land until 2017.

Clearly then, when we look at available land throughout the entire city, Winnipeg is not facing the severe housing that LADCO and NDlea would have us believe.

To conclude, I want to reiterate Policy 3A-02i of the Plan Winnipeg 20/20 Vision which is; "to promote compact urban form in support of sustainability by approving new residential subdivisions ONLY where there is a reasonable relationship between the supply of land and the projected demand and when a full range of municipal infrastructure can be provided in an environmentally-sound, economical, and timely manner."

I hope that I have made it clear here today that Waverley West is anything but "compact urban form"; that there is not a reasonable relationship at all

between the supply of land and any projected demand; and that Waverley West is neither environmentally sound nor economical.

The only positive effects of Waverley West are for the land owners and property developers. I sincerely hope that when voting on whether to amend Plan Winnipeg to allow for Waverley West, the Executive Policy Committee take the future health and well-being of the entire city and all of it's residents and not just the desires of a specific aspect of the business community.

Thanks again for your time.