

2025 Vancouver By-Election Candidate Questions

Green Party of Vancouver - Annette Reilly Responses

Question #1 - Future of the Elected Park Board

The City has had an elected Park board for over 130 years, but this Council has voted to ask the Province to amend the Vancouver Charter to eliminate the elected Park Board mid-term.

Do you support an independent elected Park Board? (Yes/No)

Do you support the City requesting the province to amend the Vancouver Charter to eliminate the elected Park Board? (Y/N)

And what would you do on this issue if elected?

Yes, I support an independent elected Park Board. In fact, I support the Park Board having their own operating budget so requests no longer have to go through city council.

No, I do not support the City requesting the province to eliminate the elected Park Board. Vancouver's greenspace and parks are essential to our city's culture. I believe the elected Park Board is essential to the health and wellbeing of these spaces. Keeping the Park Board is a matter of democratic representation. They have been elected to serve for 4 years and it would be an affront to the people of Vancouver to have this board dissolved.

There isn't much that can be done on a municipal level at this point other than rallying the voices of the people of Vancouver to speak out against this at the provincial level. The decision lies with the province at the moment. We may get lucky and have our next civic election prior to the decision being made. It will be in our city's best interest in 2026 to elect a new council full of people who want to protect the Park Board so we can reverse the decision at a municipal level at that time.

Question #2 - Infrastructure & BC Zoning Bills

The BC zoning bills 44, 46 & 47 passed by the province last year, proposed massive increases for development while reducing the City's ability to raise the needed resources for related infrastructure demand. This is everything from utilities to parks and recreation facilities.

Do you agree with the City being complicit with implementing the BC zoning bills? (Y/N)

How do you plan to provide the required infrastructure for this growth and/or what would you do differently if elected?

The municipal government operates at the whim and assent of the provincial government. The province legislates our local government's ability to exist, to write by-laws and to collect taxes, they have the statutory authority to impose upon the municipality as they see fit. I believe it is in our best interest to figure out ways to comply with the provincial mandates while also maintaining or improving the well-being of the people of Vancouver. This challenge can only be solved with cooperation and creative problem solving. We need to maintain and enrich our communities with parks, services, and infrastructure, building a healthy, more livable Vancouver. We can only do that if we work together.

Question #3 - Jericho Lands

The Jericho Lands are 90 acres in West Point Grey with proposed development to potentially over triple the population of the existing neighbourhood, with towers of up to 50 storeys.

Do you support this scale of development for this site? (Y/N)

Would you consider alternatives that are more ground oriented and sustainable such as suggested by the Jericho Coalition <https://jerichocoalition.org/> ? (Y/N)

And what would you do differently, if anything, if elected?

The ODP for the Jericho land gives a wealth of information regarding the 4 phase development of this land over the next 30 years. My understanding on this project is that the MST has taken over primary decision making on how the land will be developed. In the spirit of reconciliation, I do support what they feel is the best use of the land. I will be asking questions regarding the infrastructure available for the increase of population. We will need to make sure that there are services (schools, grocery stores, clinics, childcare, etc...) available as the population increases. Fortunately, because the construction is set over such a lengthy time period, we will have the ability to solve these issues as it moves forward.

Question #4 - Broadway Plan

The Broadway Plan is resulting in massive land speculation, demoviction of tenants from older more affordable rentals, and tower blockbusting on side streets without local context. If the UBCx is approved, it would do the same to Kits and WPG.

Do you agree with the Broadway Plan? (Y/N)
Would you consider a pause to the Broadway Plan? (Y/N)
And what would you do differently, if anything, if elected?

I agree that Vancouver needs better transit and, being that the 99 is the busiest bus route in all of Canada, it makes sense that we put a train on that route. There are tens of thousands of people who commute to UBC every day. A train will decrease the amount of traffic and increase reliability and frequency of transit on that busy route.

A pause to the Broadway Plan is not possible at this point because of provincial housing targets and transit oriented legislation. What IS possible, and what I plan on fighting for, is better protections for those who are being displaced. I am interested in revisiting the Pace of Change policy that was shot down by ABC, which is designed to manage the rate at which older rental housing is redeveloped, ensuring a balanced approach to growth and tenant protection.

If elected, I would also be fighting to retain as many older buildings as possible, while also fighting for more affordable housing in new constructions. The towers along the Broadway corridor are being mandated by the province. I live near Broadway in East Vancouver. I'm a renter. It is people like me who are at risk of being displaced. I understand the very real anxiety of this situation. It's terrifying. I look at the new constructions in my area and not only can I not afford to buy them, they are all too small for my family of 4. There is no space to raise a family in these tiny units. I personally love older buildings and want to see as many of those upgraded and retrofitted to be greener and equipped with both heat and a/c to protect our residents from the climate emergency.

Question #5 - Vancouver Plan ODP

The Vancouver Plan has been approved by the current and previous Council. It is currently being turned into the Official Development Plan (ODP) to be approved as required by the Province in June 2026. This growth of towers across the city is being justified by the idea that there is a lack of housing development and that more density would create more affordability.

Since the 1970's the City has tripled the number of housing units, more than any other centre city in North America, yet we have the most expensive housing, not the least.

Do you agree with the Vancouver Plan? (Y/N)
Would you continue to implement it? (Y/N)
And if not, what would you do differently to provide growth and affordability?

I think we all know by now that the affordable housing crisis in Vancouver goes way beyond supply and demand. You have to look back more than 30 years to see the beginning of this crisis. All three levels of government have let down the people of Vancouver for decades.

The Vancouver Plan is about healthy communities. It's about a livable Vancouver. It talks of having pockets of communities that have active transport access to services. Who doesn't want to have a grocery store within walking distance? Who doesn't want schools and childcare a bike ride away?

The changes that ABC made to the Vancouver Plan was to reduce view cones and add height. This was actively opposed by Adriane Carr and Pete Fry in council. In my opinion, view cones and solar access, along with thoughtful community engaged visioning that includes village high streets, walkable communities, good public serving amenities and access to nature are all essential to the functional aspect of the Vancouver Plan to help protect the livability of our city.

Question #6 - Tower Corridors Citywide

The City is currently proposing wide corridors of 20 storey social housing projects across the city in every neighbourhood, without public hearings.

Do you agree with this proposal? (Y/N)

Why or why not?

What would you do differently, if anything?

The proposal I believe you are referring to is the social housing initiative. This initiative permits non-profit and government organizations to build social housing buildings from 6 to 18 storeys, depending on neighbourhood type. New buildings will have the opportunity to include local serving retail and childcare alongside social housing. These proposed changes would allow social housing projects to be built faster with less cost, giving priority to providing homes for people who need them most and working toward maintaining diversity in the city.