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Abstract

False Creek is a distinctive neighbourhood in the centre of Vancouver where you would expect to see high density, perhaps high rise development; instead you can see a low and medium rise and low density development with large public open space. It contrasts to the nearby Fairview Slopes and the West End. This thesis tries to investigate and explain what made this land development so different from others.

In the 1960s, liberal ideology emerged in Canada. Its influence was felt here in Vancouver. It was embraced by the upcoming new "class" of professional, technical and administrative workers. This new liberal ideology gave new meanings to the ideas of "growth" and "progress". It promoted social equity and livability in urban development; its priority was placed on people not property. Vancouver was transforming from an industrial city to a service oriented postindustrial city.

A political party founded at this time, The Elector's Action Movement (TEAM), was liberal oriented and won the municipal election in 1972. Its election coincided with the False Creek south development. TEAM innovatively administered the development. It broke away from the former administration, the NPA, and innovatively implemented measures to secure a livable and socially mixed community. The implementation of False Creek south in the first two phases was achieved with the commitment of the TEAM City Council and with the blessings from the federal and provincial government. The result is an innovatively designed and socially mixed neighbourhood in downtown Vancouver. What we can see today in False Creek south shore phase I and II is a legacy of what this party achieved in urban development.

With the deterioration of economic situation and the return of a conservative movement in the late 70s and early 80s, TEAM faded away from the municipal politics. Conservative NPA was back to the municipal administration. Urban development was left to the private sector to manipulate. The later two phases became profit driven development with very little concern of social issues. To provide a socially mixed community was not an objective in the later phases in False Creek south.
The result is high density, high rise development of the later two phases.

This thesis investigates the False Creek south shore development in and after TEAM administration; compares the policies of the two administrations, and the perception of the role of the administration during and after TEAM control; examines the demographic and physical design differences in the same development between different phases. This helps to reveal the inter-relationship between urban development and civic politics and provides a valuable insight into the effects of policy and ideology on the nature of urban development.
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INTRODUCTION

Vancouver was a city heavily reliant on the forest industry and the Canadian Pacific Railway from its foundation in 1886. It was basically an industrial and merchant city. The city-scape was manipulated by the market place.

From the 1960s, the world at large began to experience a revolution in conventional concepts. People began to question the old value system which had prevailed in society since the Industrial Revolution. A more liberal ideology was born and spread in the society. This ideology was accepted more widely and went beyond the intellectual circle; the ideas of "growth" and "progress" were given new meanings; the pursuit of physical growth and numerical increase of industries were replaced by the pursuit of "livability" in human settlement --- the city. Environmental issues became a popular, rather than just an academic concern. Service industries boomed in large cities and the direction of urban development moved from the industrial to the executive centre. The time came in the 1960s for the people to bring their attention from the new god they created for themselves --- "the industry" --- back to man himself. This was the coming of post-industrial society, a return to humane ideology.

Vancouver, one of the biggest cities in Canada was inevitably influenced by this international movement. False Creek development was initiated and carried on in such an atmosphere.

In the late 1960s, shortly before False Creek development became a daily issue in City Council, a new political force was formed in Vancouver. It was called The Elector's Action Movement, or TEAM. Compared with the existing ruling political force, the Non-Partisan Association (NPA), this new party seemed to be less industry-growth bound and their policies were more people-oriented. TEAM was more like a reformer than a successor of NPA. The
appearance of TEAM in many ways answered the summons of the era. It was not a surprise that in the 1972 municipal election TEAM swept the City Council, and their mayoralty candidate, Art Phillips was also elected.

False Creek development coincided with the ideological changes of the 1960s and 1970s. The presence of this reformist municipal government gave this inner city development some features that would have been different if NPA were in power. This was proved later when NPA resumed power in the late 1970s and developed its False Creek development policies.

False Creek development received considerable attention during TEAM’s administration, it was considered as one of the testing grounds for its new ideology. False Creek basin once became one of the most talked-about area in Vancouver. TEAM integrated their socially conscious liberal ideology into the development policy and created a microcosm in False Creek. The pursuit of livability and the aesthetic style of life, the innovative way of administration and the support from provincial and federal government all helped to turn False Creek basin into one of the most desirable places to live in Vancouver.

Just like other political forces, TEAM had its limitations. Some of its ideologies were too idealistic to solve problems in reality; in the course of TEAM’s pursuit of livability it helped, unintentionally, the phasing out of lower income groups from or adjacent to the development. The differences between the conservative and the reform forces within the party were exposed and intensified as the economic situation got worse in the late 70s. Four years after TEAM took power in the municipal government, before False Creek south development was completed, it lost its majority place in City Council in the 1976 election and was eclipsed from the political stage of Vancouver. NPA resumed power.

False Creek development went on, but the development policy changed. Some fundamental issues introduced by TEAM in False Creek development were questioned, some of them were discarded without further note. The successive government put more attention into mega projects that may better reflect the physical growth of the city. This resulted in the realization
of projects like Canada Place and B.C. Place Stadium. The change of government and its political ideology, the change of pertinent policies, and the shifting of priorities all contributed to the change of physical appearance to the later phases of False Creek development.

In the course of False Creek development, the TEAM administration imposed some policies as a result of their ideological pursuits. These included the requirement of a certain percentage of social housing for the under-privileged people so that the development may reflect the composition of the society and at the same time provide housing for the under-privileged in the downtown area. It was also intended to achieve a mixture of people from every walk of life known as social mix. This was also intended to eliminate the gaps among different social groups. In the process of the development, the first Design Guidelines were introduced so that the development was under an overall control. To be more effective in controlling the development, the City did not cut the property into small parcels and sell them to different private developers, on the contrary the City kept the whole property and developed it as a whole. The City also applied some innovative methods in design process. Among them are the setting up of a drop-in office for collecting public opinion; the formation of a citizen representatives committee to sit in City Council meeting to monitor the municipal decision making on False Creek; the public participation program in the process of planning etc. In physical design, as a result of TEAM's pursuit of livability, the architectural response was low-rise medium density as opposed to the high rise high density approach of the previous government. The brief control of the TEAM administration set the tone of Vancouver's urban development for the following decade as low to medium rise, medium density approach. The present urban scape in False Creek is one of the legacies of the liberal ideology and the TEAM administration. Within the developments there was also the concern of the arrangement of family housing, taking into account that the children should have easy access to the ground level. It was thus regulated that family housing should be placed at grade.

All these make False Creek an unique place in Downtown Vancouver. By comparing the
TEAM and NPA administration, and the differences in policies, and the change of physical appearance under different city governments, the case of the False Creek development provides a valuable insight into the effects of policy and ideology on the nature of urban development.
Chapter 1. Historical Review

I-1. False Creek, The Industrial Basin

Vancouver was a milltown in its early years. The forest industry and railway were the backbone of this west-coast city. This was the character of Vancouver since it was founded in 1886. False Creek, the small inlet immediately adjacent to the downtown peninsula had been considered and used as a major industrial area and a secondary harbour ever since.

As an important industry in B.C., the forest industry used False Creek as a port and storage place for lumber. Sawmills were built around the creek before CP Rail chose this seaside milltown as its western-most terminus. In 1884, CP Rail announced that the railway would be extended twelve miles westward from its statutory terminus at Port Moody to the coast. At that time, Vancouver's downtown area was around Hastings Street, False Creek seemed to be well away on the outskirts of the city. So the roundhouse and railyards were constructed on its northern banks. Between 1886 and 1888 the railways started False Creek's development as a transportation and industrial area utilizing the water and rail facilities. Besides its use as a terminus, it was also used as a secondary port as one part of CP Rail's initial goal of generating traffic for its trans-continental railway by establishing a trans-Pacific trade.\(^1\) Some foundry workshops and other industries could also be found in this area.

Between 1886 and 1890 several new sawmills were established on False Creek. The completion of the CP Rail to Vancouver in 1886 expanded the lumber markets to the wood-scarce prairies, and encouraged the expansion of lumber processing industry in Vancouver. By 1890, there were four sawmills on the north side of the Creek and one on the south side.
Fig. 1-1: False Creek Location Map
During the period of 1905-1913, Vancouver saw the immigration of 100,000 people (see Table I and II on p. 14). This brought a big economic boom to the city. The city itself became the largest market for the growing sawmill output owing to this. Between 1900 and 1920, the whole shoreline of False Creek from Kitsilano trestle bridge to Main Street was gradually filled with industries, most of them sawmills. As described in a report prepared by the City Planning Department in 1963,

False Creek, up to 1940, was primarily a sawmill area with booming grounds. It was an ideal site for this industry providing a sheltered harbour for log storage, circumferential rail trackage and a large unskilled labour pool close by. In 1920, there were 20 sawmills in operation...

Some of the industries, notably the sawmills and shipyards, required waterways for purposes like storage and shipping; others like warehouses were located there because of rail facilities which had been extended to the south side in 1902.

the warehousing activities were localized along the CPR lines on the water-front, ... similar warehouse facilities were built on the False Creek side of town, an area also served by CPR lines.

This was the heyday of False Creek as an industrial site.

Owing to the rapid expansion of population and the bad economic situation after the World War I, in 1929 Vancouver amalgamated with its two southern neighbours, Point Grey and South Vancouver. As the city expanded, so did the Central Business District located across the creek to the north. In the 1960s, the so called quaternary industry[5] started to prevail over primary, secondary and tertiary industry. One of the characteristics of quaternary industry is, as identified in W. Hardwick's *Vancouver*, "(that) their locations are not tied directly to the constraints of material production, nor are they tied to the constraints of distance."[6]

Downtown was regarded as the proper location to show prestige. Thus the existing Central Business District of Vancouver became a favourite location for quaternary industry. Owing to
this, the CBD area expanded. It shifted west and south from Hastings to Granville, Burrard Street and Georgia Street area.

False Creek basin at this time, being a piece of industrially used land separating downtown from residential area to the south, had become a rundown place labelled as a "filthy ditch that stank".

The tide of industry in False Creek began to recede in the 1930s. At first it was by accident: two of the largest sawmills burned down and were not rebuilt. New sawmills started to appear in Fraser River Valley. They were more competitive in size and productivity. Slowly other industries in False Creek basin also became obsolete and uneconomic.

Since most of the industries in this area operated on land leased from CP Rail, with relatively short-term leases, businessmen would not invest heavily in new plants. On the other hand, with the land costing a fraction of its real value, they were in no rush to leave.

Although the Burrard Inlet/False Creek mills were the centre of the largest numbers of mills in the 1920s, their relative importance declined during the depression years, while the sawmills along the Fraser River boomed in number and in size. But False Creek mills still persisted. The most important reason for their staying was that these mill sites were on leased land, owned or administered by the CP Rail, and the rent was amazingly low, many mill paid only a few cents per square foot for land.\(^7\)

The site deteriorated as time went by because a considerable number of the industries used the waterway for the discharge of effluent. For many years, city sewers emptied into the creek; house-boats without sanitary facilities were an intermittent feature. The resulting stench became a civic embarrassment. As described in a report on the rehabilitation of False Creek prepared by the City Planning Department in October 1963,

To most industries, False Creek is thought of as a "bad address". It is an old and declining industrial district, ... The physical conditions of False Creek are unattractive ...\(^8\)
Up to the late 60s, the city government managed to keep False Creek basin an industrial area although it was becoming more and more inefficient. Several motions were moved in Council meetings since as early as 1927 to improve the physical condition of this area. The last attempt to upgrade this area as industrial use was in 1967. Nothing was done due to the complicated ownership of the land.

I-2. The Ownership Of Land

As early as 1886, when the City of Vancouver was just founded, officials of CP Rail secretly negotiated with the premier of British Columbia for an enormous grant of land as an inducement to extend the railway line to Vancouver. As a result of the negotiation, CP Rail was granted most of the central business section of the city, a wide right-of-way on the north side of False creek, a strip of land along its south shore and an additional 6,000 acres that included most of the present Fairview, Shaughnessey Heights and neighbouring districts to the south. This made CP Rail the biggest land owner in False Creek area.

While CP Rail owned much of the shore, the province still owned the land beneath the water. Neither had full authority to deal with the creek. There were also other owners, including the Federal Government, the City and a few private owners.

The land-water dispute between the CP Rail and the Provincial Government was finally settled in 1967 by giving the CP Rail control of both shore and underwater land on the north side of the creek, while the Province took control of the south shore. In 1968, the provincial government entered into negotiation to trade its south shore property for 200 acres of city owned land on Burnaby Mountain. By 1968 when the consolidation and trade of land was finally completed, the CP Rail controlled most of the north shore, the City owned most of the
land ownership

The ownership arrangement for all of Area 6 is illustrated on the plan. There has been some misunderstanding in the past regarding the amount of land owned by the City. For the purposes of this report, Area 6 is assumed bounded by Connaught Bridge, 6th Avenue, the Granville Bridge, Granville Island and the water's edge.

The acreages by ownership are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>71.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Terminals</td>
<td>16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.R.</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Development Ltd.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigurdson</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantam Holdings</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
south shore; the Federal Government (the National Harbours Board) owned Granville Island, B.C. Hydro and private owners were in control of the rest. This is the basic pattern of ownership in False Creek area when False Creek development started.

1-3. Time Of Change

It was probably because of the inertia of previous perceptions of this area that the City Council still regarded False Creek as an industrial area in the 60s regardless of the substantial changes that happened to the CBD area and the City as a whole. The lower blocks of the Fairview slopes were re-zoned for light industry to match with the nature of land use of False Creek.

The last serious consideration of solely industrial use in False Creek area was in October 1967. Several aldermen, fearing that public opinion was already drifting away from retaining the industrial uses, introduced a resolution on behalf of the industrial users, stating that it was city's policy that False Creek remain industrial,

"That whereas the city has been advised of the concern of certain industries located on land leased in the False Creek industrial area as the continuance of their leases; Therefore be it resolved that it is council's policy at this time that the land abutting False Creek be retained as an industrial area."

This does not mean that the City was not bothered by the condition of False Creek basin. It had been a long standing desire to upgrade this area from industrial slum to a modern industrial park. The major problem in False Creek development before the 1968 land consolidation and transfer was that the ownership of this piece of land was scattered among different owners. The administrative and jurisdictional dispute made it almost impossible to do anything about it. The five major land owners, namely the Federal Government, the Provincial
Government, the City of Vancouver, CPR Company and B.C. Hydro were not eager to do anything because it was of a small interest to any of them:

for the CPR Company it is the end of the line; for the Province of B.C., it is only several hundred out of several million acres in the public domain; for the National Harbours Board, it is but few of the hundred miles of Vancouver harbour; the Carrall Street Yards are almost a relic of the past in the complex operations of the B.C. Hydro; for the city of Vancouver, it is but one of the forty-four square miles in the city.\[10\]

The solution to this problem, thought to be a joint management authority representing all the owners, was recommended by the "Cousin's Report" in 1955, and again by the "False Creek Rehabilitation Report" in 1963. But these proposals were never realized.

The CP Rail's land lease of 1928 was for 40 years. In the late 1960s when the land leases were about to expire the owners decided to give redevelopment another try. The result of that effort was the 1968 land consolidation and transfer. This made changes possible.

Five months after City Council's October meeting ensuring the industrial use of False Creek land, in March 1968 the Planning Department recommended that City Council reconsider its industrial policy on False Creek land because there were too many practical difficulties in maintaining and expanding industry. In addition, the maintenance of industry was deemed to prohibit future redevelopment. Ornamental parks, office towers and residential uses were first suggested for the future redevelopment of False Creek.

The reconsideration of land use policy in False Creek area was not solely the result of simpler ownership of land. A number of other factors also worked to bring about this intention of policy change. For example, the growing public pressure for removal of the creek's industries, the more attractive economics of residential development, and the development of the Roberts Bank super-port which obviated the need for a secondary city harbour.\[11\]

A decisive push to the City was the CP Rail's plan for a $185 million residential redevelopment project for their 190 acres of land on the north shore of False Creek in 1968.
Source: Marathon's Proposal for the North Shore of False Creek.
This project was later expanded to a $250 million project in 1969. It proposed to build 11,000 high-rise apartment units to house some 20,000 people. Moreover, Marathon Realty, the real estate arm of CP Rail, proposed swapping its Shaughnessey Golf Course land for the City's recently acquired 85.5 acres on the south shore and proposed a residential complex on both sides of the Creek.

Being in the stage of rapid urban growth, it was clear that False Creek area would eventually be woven into the downtown area. The importance of the location was obvious. The city government was not happy with the idea of giving up this opportunity of showing its administrative control of this city, the rising consciousness of liberal ideas also prohibited the city government from giving in to big businesses. The municipal government decided to develop its own plan.

I-4. Land-Use Debate --- Industrial Or Non-Industrial

In December 1968, City Council asked the Planning Department to prepare a report on goals and policies for False Creek development in conjunction with the downtown plan. At the same time a public planning program was launched. The Vancouver Planning Department invited citizens and community groups to participate in the planning process. This was the first time the general public was invited to participate in the decision making of the future use of the land. In November 1969 the City Planning Department released a proposal prepared by local architecture firm Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners (TBP&P) with five alternatives for False Creek future development. The five options were:

Concept No. 1: **Full industrial development.**
Redevelopment of False Creek and the adjacent Fairview Slopes area to the south for light industrial uses.

Concept No. 2: **Residential and recreational development.**
A predominantly residential area with a full range of multiple dwelling types and with all ancillary public and commercial facilities.

Concept No. 3: Residential and industrial development.
Allow continued industrial usage of part of False Creek; provide for additional inner city apartment development; provide some solution to the demand for public and commercial marinas.

Concept No. 4: Residential-commercial and recreational development.
A residential and recreational area, including commercial developments compatible with multiple dwelling areas.

Concept No. 5: Recreational and residential-commercial development.
Create a major park and recreational facility in False Creek to meet expanding city-wide open space needs; in addition, redevelop remaining False Creek lands and the Fairview Slopes for a combination of high density residential and commercial uses.¹²

A pamphlet explaining each and every option was published and distributed to the public to gather public comments. A lot of responses were received soon. Almost all of them urged the phasing out of industrial use in the creek area and the introduction of residential and recreational uses. In a report prepared by the Planning Department the city planners gave their own assessment to the five concepts:

Concept No. 1: Accompanies a plan consciously restricting the growth potential of the downtown. By continuing a policy of industrial development demands of the inner city must be met in other areas.

Concept No. 2: Would encourage a single high density commercial core on the downtown peninsula. An expanded housing stock would reinforce employee preference for working in downtown. The availability of employees would encourage potential office staff employers to locate downtown. Vancouver could become the "executive city" of the Canadian west.

Concept No. 3: The False Creek area would partially meet the housing demands of downtown for the near future. Greater numbers of employees
FALSE CREEK CONCEPTS RELATED TO DOWNTOWN PLANNING

Concept #1:- Accompanies a plan consciously restricting the growth potential of the downtown. By continuing a policy of industrial development in False Creek, housing and employment demands of the inner city must be met in other areas.

Concept #2:- Would encourage a single high density commercial core on the downtown peninsula. An expanded housing stock would reinforce employee preference for working in downtown. The availability of employees would encourage potential office staff employers to locate downtown. Vancouver could become the "executive city" of the Canadian west.

Concept #3:- The False Creek area would partially meet the housing demands of downtown for the near future. Greater numbers of employees would have to travel to the downtown from outlying parts of the metropolitan region.

Concept #4:- Development of an "executive city" would be encouraged as in Concept #2. The metropolitan region's offices, entertainment, cultural and administrative headquarters would be dispersed throughout the downtown peninsula and around False Creek. Meshed with it would be residential development creating an exciting urbane environment.

Concept #5:- The relationship to the downtown would be similar to Concept #4 excepting that the potential of tourism would be very greatly enhanced. This concept has the added advantage of providing for the open space requirements for many future inner city residents.

Fig. 1-4: The Five False Creek Development Options: Their Potential Impact on the Future of Downtown Vancouver

Source: City of Vancouver Planning Department (1970) False Creek Development Concepts, January, p.22
would have to travel to the downtown from outlying parts of the metropolitan region.

**Concept No. 4:** Development of an "executive city" would be encouraged as in Concept No. 2. The metropolitan region's offices, entertainment, cultural and administrative headquarters would be dispersed throughout the downtown peninsula and around False Creek. Meshed with it would be residential development creating an exciting urbane environment.

**Concept No. 5:** The relationship to the downtown would be similar to Concept No. 4 excepting that the potential of tourism would be very greatly enhanced. This concept has the added advantage of providing for the open space requirements for many future inner city residents.\[13\]

It is not difficult to see that the Planning Department was in favour of the residential and recreational development in False Creek area.

In August 1970 after careful study, the City finally gave up the idea of keeping False Creek an industrial area and decided to develop it along the line of Concept No. 2, 4 and 5—residential and recreational uses. This cast a new light to the future of False Creek.

---

**I-5. Need For Housing In Inner-Urban Area**

Since the formation of municipality in Vancouver, one of the major trends has been the rapid growth of population. (Table-I) This growth was mainly achieved by immigration. (Table-II)
TABLE-I

Population Growth at the Interval of Every Thirty Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE-II

Migration to Greater Vancouver Regional District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Net</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>% of population increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951-1956</td>
<td>57,608</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1961</td>
<td>72,025</td>
<td>56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1966</td>
<td>63,054</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1971</td>
<td>103,592</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This growing population constituted an urgent demand in housing development in the urban area.

The 1960s saw the rapid growth of service industry. With it came the office boom in downtown Vancouver; increasing number of white collar workers crammed into the downtown area.

it is certain that within the city of Vancouver all white collar employment categories increased both absolutely and relatively from 1951 to 1971 ... with the office boom adding three thousand jobs a year downtown alone between 1968 and 1975 ... Between 1976 and 1977 downtown office space doubled to
fourteen million square feet. Eight thousand new jobs year were added in Vancouver from 1971 to 1975 and seventy-five percent of these were generated by new office construction.¹⁴

This rapid growth of office buildings brought a lot more people working downtown. There was a tendency and need for easing commuting traffic to and from work by providing housing close to work. All these factors propelled the need for housing downtown.

There was also demand for housing from another group of people in downtown area. The structure of the city was formed as the city grew. It was enhanced by Harland Bartholomew's plan of 1930s. The general distribution of different "classes" of people was formed as early as the first boom period from 1905 to 1913, with "the elite to the south, the middle-class to the west, worker to the east, while ethnic groups crammed into the margins of the core."¹⁵ This pattern has been kept until now. At the time when False Creek was still a centre of sawmills and industries, it drew a large amount of unskilled labour from adjacent areas. This also left a problem that there were a lot of people in the lower-income groups living in this area who were neglected. To accommodate this segment of people in the downtown area was also a crying need at that time.

I-6. Preparation For The Redevelopment

Having decided the direction of False Creek development, the City Council appointed TBP&P again in January of 1971 to prepare a development plan for the city-owned land while at the same time looking in general terms at development policies for all the lands surrounding the Creek. The "False Creek Study Group" which was composed of TBP&P and city officials was also set up to prepare the development plans.
On Nov. 26, 1971, TBP&P released a report stating that in False Creek there was an unparalleled opportunity to create a better place for people to live. The report strongly urged citizen-participation in the decision making process on the future of False Creek. As it was said in the report:

People are becoming increasingly aware of urban problems. Projects that could simply materialize a few years ago as a fait accompli, are now often stalled or blocked by citizen reaction as soon as they leave the drawing board ... People want to be consulted before the fact ... citizens are asking for a real say in the future of their cities.\[16\]

In the late 60s and the 70s, the public was eager to participate in every thing that might influence their lives. They regarded themselves as the host of the city and tried to participate in the administration of the city. In 1971, in Vancouver City there were over 3,000 citizen groups monitoring the administration of the municipal and senior governments. False Creek, as one of the biggest urban redevelopment programs in Vancouver, was naturally under close attention.


\[3\]. Vancouver Sun, February 21, 1978.

As described in W. Hardwick's *Vancouver*, "Greater proportions of our national wealth are being created outside the traditional fields of primary, secondary, and tertiary industry...more and more people have been engaged in activities which are related, but are not tied in directly, with production, distribution, and consumption of goods. These include the 'extra-economic' activities that act as catalysts to the production economy plus those activities which provide experiences to a rapidly expanding number of men and women....For some quaternary industries, the products are the ideas, reports, displays, techniques, thought-models, and techniques that bring about acceleration in technological change, create demand, and provide for social advance. These include such diverse fields as research and development, advertising, public relations, higher education, investment counselling, medicine, and labour negotiating. All of these activities are related to production, but they are not an integral part of it nor are they essential to the geographic analysis of location of production at any particular time. These activities are people-dependent and are not tied to traditional industrial locations...for shipping their end-products, (they) depend on modes of transportation such as telecommunications and the post office,..."


Chapter 2. Time of Change — Social and Political Atmosphere in Vancouver in the Late 1960s and Early 1970s

In the late 1960s, the world saw a change in the long prevailing conventional ideology of Industrialism which favoured industrial growth and boosterism. This emerging new ideology centred more on the notion of man himself and his relationship with the environment rather than the physical growth of it. Politically this new ideology proposed to politicize the public and give the people more chance to express themselves and to participate more actively in national and civic politics. In Vancouver this was the beginning of an era when new political forces took shape and later took control of the municipal administration.

II-1. Brief History Of The Formation Of NPA And Its Administration

The City of Vancouver had been administrated by executives of big corporations or people representing them since the beginning of the municipality. Before NPA was formed and took control of the municipality in 1937, the ward system was used in municipal administration. The City Council was then composed of representatives elected from each ward, these representatives voted in City Council for the people who elected them.

With the economic boom and rapid growth of population, the city boundary extended outward. This caused the formation of a new municipality South Vancouver in 1892. The development of South Vancouver occurred mostly on the east side by people of the working class, while the west side was settled by the more prosperous citizens. Thus a pattern of
demographic distribution based on economic and social status was formed. This pattern was 
enhanced in 1908 when the CP RAIL developed the west side of South Vancouver for the new 
elite of Vancouver and set up a new municipality --- Point Grey.

During and after the First World War years, South Vancouver suffered from financial 
hardship. Later, together with Point Grey, the two cities decided to join Vancouver City. In 
1929 the Province agreed to amalgamate the two cities with Vancouver. Accordingly the City 
Council was then composed of representatives from each of the three previous individual cities. 
The ward system was extended to the two cities.

After the amalgamation, proponents of different points of view for civic government from 
each of the three cities were put into one council. Political leaders still had considerable 
influence in their ward’s affairs and in the expenditures of local funds. Conflict arose about 
the expenditure of public funds, particularly between representatives of business and 
professional classes and east side and south side workers. In part, conflict centred upon 
questions of priorities, in terms of services to property or people.

There was another conflict after the amalgamation. The newly amalgamated cities 
intended to change the old ward system which had served the city for a long time. The 
newcomers were concerned about being in a less favoured position in civic affairs compared 
with the old wards. The pressure of change came mainly from Point Grey where a large 
percentage of the residents were intellectuals, professionals and businessmen. They regarded 
themselves as the backbone of society and wanted to be in close contact with civic politics.

In 1935, on instructions from the provincial government, a plebiscite was held. It did away 
with the ward system and brought about an at-large system of government.

A new era in civic politics was inaugurated in 1936 with the first at-large election. With 
heavy east-side working class support, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), a 
left-of-centre political party, did very well in the city council election. Business leaders became 
concerned. Since the amalgamation of the three cities, there had been conflicts between the
central and west side business and professional classes and east side and south side workers. With the first success of this working class oriented party, the business leaders felt the threat to their interests. They held discussions during 1937. This resulted in the formation of the Non-Partisan Association (NPA). It was followed by the formation of the non-partisan form of government in 1937 and started thirty-six years of NPA administration in Vancouver. In the name of 'keeping the socialist out of the city council', the business leaders formed the NPA in fact to keep their own interests intact.

The foundation of the non-partisan / technocrat government established the model of a government charged with pursuing policies of economy and efficiency --- an answer to the call for the establishment of social order in the emerging industrial society. One of the first goals of this reform movement was to take partisan politics out of city hall. Partisanship, the reformers believed, lay at the root of patronage and bossism in city government. But as analyzed by Lupsha,

First, by removing the party label, this reform often took away one clue a voter had to a candidate's policy orientation. Second, by removing in an overt way the political party's role in city politics, this reform took away the best mobilizing force for informing and involving the electorate. Third, in placing the responsibility of discovering a candidate's merits squarely on the individual citizen, it greatly raised the time and information costs of participation.

The catalyst of this change was the presence of CCF in city politics with its first concern placed on the public. This threatened the business section. Once a candidate's association with a specific party was obscured in the election procedure, it became very hard for the general public to keep track of his agenda and merit. Only those who could afford an expensive election campaign or who were sponsored by big businesses could get enough publicity to get elected. For those poorly financed parties or individuals it was almost impossible to get into the election although it was said to be an "at-large" election system. The
non-partisan, at-large election de-politicized the city. The public was alienated from city politics.

As a new and upcoming class, the businessmen / manager took the place of the aristocracy in civic politics. With the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, industrialism was gradually accepted by the society. There was an urge to change the autonomous folk society to a well administrated new mass society, and to establish new social order to this mass society came with the Industrial Revolution. This order must be maintained by the emerging class. The main purpose of establishing this order was to get rid of the autonomous and relaxed administration of the folk society, and to achieve high economy and efficiency of the mass society and its government. As an rational ideology, it pursued a universal rationality in society and projected this idea to architecture and planning as revealed in the modern movement. Political forces carrying this ideology always saw themselves as establishers and keepers of this new social order, they ruled the society in a very proud way and posed as the great saviours of the mass. Leaders of these parties were usually top officials of big enterprises and basically believed in physical growth and boosterism. They believed whole heartedly that the benefit of business is the benefit of society. At the municipal level they pursued a centralized model of management. "Inevitably the appropriate model for urban administration was perceived to be the rational private corporation, to be imitated in an attempt to introduce into city government the standardization and scientific management already found in industry." [3] The municipality was suppose to provide services, and the first priority was to serve the property, not the people.

As a political force equipped with this ideology, NPA politicians saw themselves as acting in the best interest of the public, as trustees of public wealth. They did not try to be "representatives". The bureaucrats joined the politicians in striving for economy, government efficiency, and a civic plan derived by the experts. In government, as in the public corporations described by Galbraith, control shifted from the owners (voters) to the "management team"
whose goals were the maintenance of the bureaucracy and the setting of priorities that served the ends of the bureaucratic system first and other community needs second.\textsuperscript{[4]}

In the process, urban politics moved from a concern with citizenship to a concern with consumership. Urban governments, viewed through the lenses of the marketplace, became simply a provider of goods and services; and with power in the bureaucracy, an elite with its own visions, jargon, and information became the directors of urban change.

The NPA leaders were drawn from Vancouver's social and business elite. They were owners and managers of large and small corporations, developers and executives of big corporations. From the time when it was founded in 1937, NPA controlled the municipality and based their policies on big businesses and gave first priority to providing service to property instead of people.

Over the past thirty-odd years (1937-1972) they (the NPA) have done their best to serve the interests of big businesses...because the NPA is big business and they have been serving themselves. The main power people in the NPA sit on the boards of various major corporations that stand to benefit from control of City Hall...the (NPA) executive included many powerful figures in the business world, tied together with common directorships in various enterprises.\textsuperscript{[5]}

With strong financial support and at-large election, NPA controlled the city government for more than thirty years before other political forces finally challenged the mayoralty and the City Council. NPA's administration did not encourage public participation. On the contrary it was quite elitist in its administration and alienated the public from civic politics. The public became apathetic to local politics. As was shown by the voting of municipal election in Vancouver:

In Vancouver there was a gradual but definite decline in the vote on the east side, inhabited mainly by working-class residents. After 1945 turnout was 10 to 20 per cent lower than the west-side middle-class voters. Further, westsiders tended to vote NPA state (almost exclusively of west-side residents), while eastsiders voted more randomly. Both
factors ensured that the west side --- especially the old municipality of Point Grey --- controlled council.[8]

Also, in early 20th century, the world was still in the shadow of the Industrial Revolution. Ideologies derived from Industrial Revolution were still widely believed as the principle for the development of the society. Thus NPA's position as a ruling party in city administration was kept intact until the 1960s when this ideology began to be challenged.

II-2. The Coming Of Post-Industrial Ideology

In the 1960s the majority of people within big cities were no longer engaged in the production and distribution of material processed goods --- the predominant occupation of the industrial phase. More and more people were engaged in the provision of services. A British psychologist Eric Trist observed the change and farsightedly predicted its possible outcome:

The advantage of this metaphor ... is that we shall not assume that the present social order will continue in the future; rather we prepare ourselves to assist the emergence of a society radically different from the industrial societies which have evolved in the past hundred years.[7]

Trist juxtaposed facts and words used in the 1930s and the 1960s to reveal the changes. For example, in 1935 blue collar workers were predominant in society; in 1965, it was the white collar workers who were predominant because more people received higher education; in the thirties, people were trained for a single life-long job, while in 1965 serial jobs were more common. Furthermore, he saw shifts in values from achievement to self-actualization; from self-control to self-expression; from independence to interdependence; from endurance of distress to a capacity for joy. In the public sector he uses the operative words---"responsive to crisis" for the 1930's compared to "anticipative of crises" in the 1960's; "requiring public
consent" as compared with "public participation"; and shifts from "detailed" to "generalized" central control. These ideas existed before the 1960s, but mainly at academic level. What made it possible to influence the society was that in the 1960s a larger proportion of the population became aware of these ideas and accepted them. These new ideas changed the existing value system and way of life. This change eventually resulted in the change in the political system.

As this more liberal post-industrial ideology spread into the society, people were not satisfied being one anonymous part of a giant social-machine. They wanted to be freed from the orders established and kept by the previous generations; they wanted more chances to express themselves. Inevitably the public began to require a bigger say in national and civic politics. Nationally the liberal ideology became widely accepted. In 1968 liberal party leader Pierre Trudeau was elected Prime Minister.

In 1968 a new liberalism was enunciated in Canada. It was endorsed at the national level in Pierre Trudeau's dramatic election as Liberal Prime Minister. The spring fever of Trudeau-mania had much to do with style, as Trudeau presented himself as an unconventional politician, a middle-aged professional and intellectual who was in touch with the 1960s youth culture and sympathetic to the aesthetic lifestyle. His promises of greater participation and more open government, of ethnic and lifestyle pluralism, were conveyed with the air of one who understood the need for a break with the past.

In Vancouver, for nearly forty years the NPA controlled the city government. This system, under NPA, encouraged a dependence on and high regard for expert and technical assistance from a bureaucratic establishment. As mentioned before, the NPA government officials saw themselves as trustees of the public wealth, they acted in what they believed to be the best interests of the community. In reality such a government could not represent the interests of the majority of the society but that of the few.

Needless to say, a system of government in which the elected people do
not see themselves in a representative role and in which a bureaucracy exercising considerable power only indirectly feels the pulse of the public at large is liable to lose touch with the interests of significant sectors of the community. It may supply services efficiently and it may have had broad public support when material economy was high on the priorities of the electorate ...[10]

In the late 1960s the material economy gave way to a more service and information oriented economy. Ideas originated in the nineteenth century no longer fit the changed circumstances of the 1960s.

II-3. The 1967 Freeway Debate --- The Awakening Of The Sense Of Public Participation In Civic Administration

The sense of alienation from civic affairs was increasingly and repeatedly felt by community groups in Vancouver as was the increasing conflict between industrial and post industrial society. It was demonstrated in stormy public meetings throughout the 1960s. Among all the events the most critical one was the 1967 freeway debate. It alarmed the public what they might lose under the non-partisan / expert government, and also, what they may gain by fighting for their own rights.

The decision of developing a radial freeway system in Vancouver was made around 1960 as part of a strategy to strengthen downtown. In the NPA government, the whole issue was discussed as technical issue and was always presented as a technical not a political question. In 1967 City Council decided to build a replacement for the Georgia Viaduct. The idea of replacing the viaduct was appealing to voters, but it was never discussed in any overall
freeway strategy. However, the bureaucracy knew that the viaduct had to be designed for the eventual freeway system. With this in mind, the City Council hired a firm to design an interchange into which the Georgia Viaduct could eventually fit. The design of the interchange was adopted by Council without any discussion about the desirability or alignment of the freeway system. The freeway system was designed to cut through Strathcona. To the NPA council Strathcona was an urban blight in need of change. Since there was no neighbourhood there, they could shove the freeway through it and get urban renewal in the bargain.

Strathcona residents thought otherwise.

The public realized now that the interchange design could be adopted without consulting their opinions. Cumulatively the whole freeway could be built as one without any public input. This was a clear case of non-partisan / technocrat authoritarianism in civic administration. With its unilateral prioritization of property before people, the public became alarmed. Public meetings were held. They made briefs objecting to the government process which would bring about decisions that would affect hundreds of citizens without any consultation. They reacted against economic-efficiency models and cost/benefit analyses, neither of which included any social or aesthetic benefits. They reacted against a government which did not see itself in a representative role, and a socially unconscious technostructure that dwelt in professional isolation.

Under immense public pressure the City Council reconsidered and abandoned the interchange proposal. The whole public transportation system was placed in the public forum for discussion and review.

This public involvement was a shock to the political and administrative establishment. With the growing awareness and acceptance of a more liberal ideology in the public the views of the NPA administration seemed to gradually move out of phase with the significant subsets within the population. The non-partisan at-large system of government, with its dependence upon expert advice for decision making, had no built-in provision for the input of substantial
changes in attitude from various subsections of the community.

From 1968 onward, the NPA Council tried to adjust their policies to catch up with the changes. They did a good job in the first thirty years of administration adjusting to changes. But this time it was not that easy. In the past the changes were within the same ideological framework --- the industrial ideology. This time the NPA had to deal with an ideology which in many ways contradicted its original belief. It was not long after the freeway debate that NPA was swept out of the political stage by the newly emerged political force --- The Electors' Action Movement.

II-4. The Answer To Change

In the 1960s the majority of employees in Vancouver had shifted from blue collar workers to white collar workers. An urban economy based on manufacturing had changed to one based on services. There was also an increasing awareness of an ideology strictly different from Industrialism. The need of transition became apparent.

In the world liberalism prevailed, especially in the field of culture and politics. Nationally the election of the liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau marked the political success of liberal ideology. This international and national cognition of liberal ideology encouraged many local political responses throughout Canada. In Vancouver, it characterized by the formation of The Electors' Action Movement as a municipal reform party and the Committee of Progressive Electors (COPE), a more left inclined party in 1968.

This transition from industrial to post-industrial society was accelerated by the emergence of a new socially conscious professional, technical, and administrative elite "class". A study of TEAM's leadership in 1968 showed the same profile of this ascending class: predominantly
youthful, highly educated, middle and upper middle income, and heavily professional in occupation. The similarity of the composition of TEAM and the emerging new class seemed to demonstrate that the emergence of TEAM was in some way a response to the social development. It represented a new political force, with more concern for people than NPA.

As a new civic political power, TEAM stood for the new awareness of the need to break the rationalism and to establish a people oriented, more romantic and expressive way of life. People were the centre of the concern; industrial growth and boosterism no longer had first priority in this new ideology. For the first time in Vancouver's brief history, "Growth boosterism, the hallmark of Vancouver politics since the town's inception in 1886, was to be replaced by the liberal notion of the 'livable city', a landscape in harmony with human sensibility."

The central idea of TEAM was social equity; the emphasis was placed on the improvement of people's life, a respect for individuality and plurality, and a promotion of the aesthetic style of life --- a livable city.

The NPA could not adjust to this new ideology, they still tried to enhance the policy of growth and the city efficiency --- a policy which strongly favoured business interests. As late as 1971, the last NPA mayor hoped to develop Vancouver into the largest city in Canada. This was surely not acceptable in a society where the attribute of size and number had been taken out from the issues of urban development.

TEAM took another approach to urban development. What was proposed in TEAM's election campaign was "the livable city," "people before property," and "the quality of life." It announced in its 1970 party election literature that "What unites us is a common concern for the quality of life in our city." These issues were just what the public was concerned about. It was not surprising that in the 1972 municipal election TEAM took a firm control of the city. Eight out of ten council memberships were taken by TEAM members and TEAM mayoral candidate Art Phillips was elected mayor of Vancouver.
The ideology embraced by TEAM municipality had its influence on housing and landscape control policies. It gave this city a new city-scape different from what the NPA delivered and from what we are now getting in Vancouver. As a declaration of their social belief TEAM, after attaining power in 1972, conducted the redevelopment of the False Creek South residential/commercial area. "It is a product of the ideology of liberal reform, emerging from the social innovation of the 1960s and reacting against the rationalism of an earlier generation of municipal politicians, planners and designers." [12]

The adaptation to the liberal ideology was not unique to Vancouver, it was an international movement. What was unique was the extent this party influenced the political history and the physical image of this city. In many cities, liberalism in life style and attitudes was not accompanied by such active politicization, much less by political success in civic election. By studying specifically the influence of this reformist administration in Vancouver and its influence to the implementation of the False Creek development, we can reveal the inter-relationship of the urban development and civic politics. We can then read the urban landscape in a clearer way. We can also have some idea of the kind of urban development that is welcomed by the public; and what our responsibility is as architects when dealing with urban development. A deeper understanding of where we have been can help us to have a clearer idea where we are going.


Chapter 3. False Creek Residential Development During TEAM Administration
1972 — 1978

As shown earlier, in the late 60s and early 70s, in Vancouver there appeared an ascending class of liberal minded, white-collar service and professional workforce and a commitment to a leisure and consumption oriented lifestyle; Vancouver was shifting from an industrial city to a post-industrial city. Like other ideologies, the liberal ideology was not mute politically. The emergence of TEAM politicized this newly appearing class and made it possible to address its post-industrial ideas more assertively.

When TEAM entered onto the political stage in Vancouver in 1968, the role of the real estate industry and the strategy for urban development were perceived by the electorate as major campaign issues. Consequently the shape of TEAM policy towards urban development became one of the most significant elements of its platform.

TEAM developed a critique of the urban strategy directed by a centralized administration sympathetic to business interests and the city efficient --- the categories of the "engineering mind." This was to counter the practical results of this excessively rationalist ideology and re-establish the primacy of people and a "livable city". [1]

In 1972 TEAM members took a majority number of seats in the City Council. TEAM mayoralty candidate Art Phillips was elected. False Creek development was at a stage when the final decision of land use had been made to terminate industrial use and to develop it as a residential / recreational area. Being the largest inner urban development in Vancouver and in North America at that time, TEAM inevitably gave serious consideration to the implementation
of this redevelopment. The newly elected TEAM council saw an opportunity of making False Creek a physical interpretation of their ideology and an example for future inner city residential development elsewhere.

The change of land-use policy to residential and recreational use was made by the NPA council before TEAM took office. It appears that False Creek redevelopment had been under way before TEAM took control of the municipality. Then did it make any difference to the False Creek redevelopment whether TEAM took the place of NPA or not? The answer is: Yes. The difference is what kind of development was envisaged for this inner city land. Should it be developed in such a way as to cut the whole area into small pieces and sell it to the private developers to develop, or should the city take the developer's role and develop this area as a whole? Should it be developed as another West End with high rise and high density to make full use of this inner city site on a revenue basis, or should it be developed as a medium density residential neighbourhood with a careful concern to providing livability for the future residents of the basin? Should it be developed as a homogeneous area for the rich, or should it be developed as an area where people from all walks of life may have the choice of living there?

III-1. False Creek Development Before TEAM Administration

Reform is a process. Like any process in history it does not happen overnight. In Vancouver this ideological reform had already been going on since the late sixties when NPA was still in power. The NPA government attempted to adjust itself to this new attitude, but the adjustment was not carried out thoroughly. It was also impossible for the NPA to do so because this new ideology was in contrast in many ways with that of the NPA. There is a process of change in this redevelopment and there is a continuity along this line of change.
As the city entered the late 60s and early 70s, its nature was changing from an industrial centre to an executive centre, the idea of keeping False Creek as an industrial site had been gone for some time. Considering the future use of False Creek basin, some basic objectives emerged: socially mixed housing; the rejection of high rise buildings; the protection of views; the recreational use of the water; a restriction on automobile usage within the site; an emphasis on quality design and sensitive environmental considerations. But these concerns were not shared by the majority of NPA council members.

Liberal minded council members had a growing voice in the process of decision making in the NPA council. They were extremely vocal in issues about False Creek:

In a January 1972 City Council meeting, the use of the site for subsidized housing was put forward. Alderman Art Phillips, who would be elected mayor in the fall 1972 election, presented a motion stating that "if and when the City's land on False Creek is developed for residential purposes, provision be made ... for the inclusion of a significant amount of low cost, public, private and senior citizens housing." [2]

This motion later evolved into a by-law which regulated that any residential development on city-owned lands include a required amount of social housing.

In August 1970, the NPA Council formally resolved to eliminate industrial uses from consideration. The False Creek Policy Plan which the City Planning Department prepared, recommended that on both shores of False Creek basin "residences will comprise a significant portion of new development ... Population of this planned area at full development is estimated at 45,000 people living in approximately 28,000 dwellings." [3]

Both TEAM and NPA found that residential development was the appropriate solution for the False Creek basin. But their point of departure was not the same. For NPA the redevelopment should provide decent revenue for the city in the first place regardless who can be accommodated. They had no problem accepting high-rise, high-density approach. This led to the West End style solution. For TEAM the primary notion was to provide a livable
environment for people and to fulfil the need for housing in inner city, and to provide accessibility to this beautiful setting to people from all segments of the society. TEAM projected a 30,000 people community with physical design guidelines for buildings and requirement of social mix, as oppose to NPA's 45,000 people community.

III-2. Land-Use Debate --- Parkland Or Residential Land

Once the False Creek land use policy was established in 1970, there began a debate over the percentage of residential and recreational use. In early 1972, the NPA council promoted high density residential development for False Creek land. This appeared not likely to be accepted by the public. In the late 1972 municipal election, NPA lost control to TEAM. TEAM promoted a lower density development with socially mixed housing. Being uneasy with the idea of accommodating low-income residents in this area, the NPA strong hold --- the Parks Board and the business associations began to emphasize recreational use for the site with only a minimum of housing, but not necessarily social housing.

Major opponents to TEAM's residential approach were the corporate business community and citizens' groups favouring recreational use of the site. The more vocal opponents of the use as socially mixed housing on the south shore were: the Greater Vancouver Real Estate Board, the Board of Trade, the Downtown Business Association, the Vancouver Planning Commission, the civic Non-Partisan Association (NPA), the Junior League, the Save Our Parkland Association and the Citizens' Council on Civic Development.

The Real Estate Board claimed that: "The False Creek flats are not a suitable location for a supply of family or low income housing with the necessary schools and other facilities". The Board of Trade favoured a recreational and cultural use of the site to enhance the city's "executive image". According to the Board of Trade the site was too valuable for use as
housing for the poor. As in an article in *Vancouver Sun* on April 3, 1974, the Board of Trade claimed that "a high amenity area such as envisaged for False Creek is not a suitable site for subsidized low-cost housing." That is to say, these business oriented groups thought that housing for the poor does not deserve the high amenity of this piece of land.

For citizens' groups that were against residential development, they were concerned with the availability of such a piece of land in central urban area in the future. They saw the city owned False Creek south shore land as the last chance to set aside park land in the central area. This in a sense showed their lack of confidence in getting the preferred development from private developers.

Those who supported housing development were mostly groups with a clear public orientation. Among the supporters were groups such as the Citizens Advisory Committee on False Creek, the Committee of Progressive Electors (COPE), the Greater Vancouver Housing Coalition, the United Housing Foundation and, most importantly, the TEAM Council members. It seems likely that had it not been for the election of the TEAM majority council in 1972, the socially mixed residential land use option for the south shore would not have been implemented.

In November 1973 the process of choosing a design alternative for the south shore was concluded with the publication of *Area Six: The Development Opportunity* by the Planning Department. Previous plans were for the whole False Creek area while this plan was more specific for the city owned Area Six. It included four alternative schemes derived from the five *False Creek Development Concepts* prepared by the City Planning Department in late 1969. (For details of the four schemes and the process of choosing them, see III-4-a-1 *Design and Planning Measures*). These schemes ranged from predominately housing to predominately parkland approach.

The recommendations generally follow the lines pushed by Hardwick in the past. They lie between the call for extensive housing by such aldermen as Harry Rankin and Mike Harcourt and the demand for a strong emphasis
on parks by the planning commission, the Board of Trade and others. [4]

On Nov. 20 1973 the City Council chose the compromised Scheme 2 --- half housing and a large destination park. The city rejected the un-livable high density scheme to avoid constructing another West End. It denied the all-park scheme because they felt the need to solve housing shortage in inner city.

The use of False Creek land for housing reflected TEAM's belief that municipal resources should be used to deal with current social needs, in this case housing.

But this was by no means the end of the debate. It lasted well after TEAM took office and implemented phase one of the redevelopment project.

III-3. TEAM's Objectives --- Social Mix And Livability

After TEAM took control of the city council, attempts were made to avoid the social policy and physical design mistakes of the NPA administration in urban development. In the case of the south shore, where the City of Vancouver was in the position of being owner of most of the site, the decision-making authority for zoning and planning approvals and, the developer of the entire site, the City was able to quickly and efficiently devise a development plan, and obtain the necessary approvals to implement the plans.

TEAM was very clear about what kind of development they want on city owned land. When city council hired design teams to develop detailed designs for Area 6 it challenged the design teams to create a community:

...that would be innovative in terms of "urban livability" by providing:
1). a quality residential/commercial/open space environment; and
2). a socially viable mix of all incomes and lifestyles while maintaining a concern
for economics and the practical marketability of the project. [5]

...To accomplish the desired income (and social) mix, we wish to include a range of dwellings such as cooperative, senior citizens housing, condominiums, low and medium density apartments and garden apartments, and to take advantage of federal and provincial assistance programs... There are many possibilities, such as some dwelling units for the physically handicapped, newer lifestyles such as floating homes, and the physical integration of facilities... A challenge to the terms will be to integrate incomes and lifestyle of the resident population by means of site planning, suite mixes, support facilities, the government assistance programs, etc. into a viable community. [6]

The social and tenure mix objective stem from TEAM's ideology of social equity which argued that residential areas, especially those being designed from scratch, should reflect, within themselves the variety and mix of the wider physical and social world. The livable city objective came from the pursuit of quality life.

TEAM had included in its election platform the promise that they would begin building socially mixed housing within two years. Once they gained the total control of the City Council they began to implement the design process in False Creek.

III-4. TEAM's Approach To The False Creek Development

Although the debate over the use of land as park or as residential never stopped after TEAM took power, the TEAM council went ahead with the partly residential and partly recreational land use approach. City Council accepted the patterns developed by False Creek Study Group. Unlike the traditional land use control process which gives a general control over the kind of use allowed on the affected property, these patterns dealt with those factors
which contribute to the micro quality of the environment. This is one of the unique characters of the False Creek development under the TEAM government.

In dealing with detailed architectural design, Design Guidelines were used for the first time. This contributed a lot to the physical character of the first two phases of the False Creek redevelopment. These patterns and design guidelines were later included as part of the Official Development Plan By-law for the False Creek basin.

III-4-a. Area Development Plan For Area 6 Phase I

In November 1973, the City Council accepted the Area Six: The Development Opportunity prepared by the Planning Department (see Figure 3-1 --- 3-6). It presented four conceptual development plans. They were:

1). intensive family residential development;
2). family residential development with a significant open space;
3). open space with compact high density residential areas;
4). civic developments in a major open space.

The report recommended the formal adoption of alternative number two known as Scheme Two: the medium density family residential option with a large public park.

The Planning Department's report recommended that Council:
1). adopt as the guide for implementation the concept described and illustrated as Scheme 2 for city-owned lands in Area 6;
2). approve the first phase of development at the eastern end of city lands in Area 6 to include a quality development of mixed uses including marina, residential, related commercial and open space; and
3). approve the principle that city-owned land in Area 6 remain in the public domain. [7]
development alternatives 1

THE FIRST SCHEME - intensive family residential - is in principle the same as the Thompson Berwick Pratt & Partners' proposal. (It should be noted that the consultants recommended against a family component.) The priority for Area 6 is clearly stated as a residential environment. Its success depends upon the quality of the urban environment appropriate to the False Creek setting.

Scheme 1 provides the greatest amount of housing:
- estimated population: 3,150
- total housing units: 1,900
- estimated family households: 500 - 750

With Scheme 1 there will be sufficient family content to justify adequate related facilities including schools, community facilities, etc. Furthermore, the emphasis on residential development will provide significant incentive for compatible developments in the Fairview Slopes, in Area 10 including the B.C.C.C.U. proposals and elsewhere in the Basin.

While the developments on Granville Island are not compatible with this form of use at present, adoption of this scheme would provide a maximum incentive to change. The Federal Government has demonstrated its willingness to cooperate with the City on its development program.

Scheme 1 has no major identifiable open space. This has three implications. First, it means that in order to maintain the balance of open space to development, throughout the False Creek Basin, large open spaces must be found in other sub areas. Secondly, it will make the City lands and the water's edge seem less accessible to the public than can be justified by the amenity that they represent. Thirdly, there is some conflict with the family life style arising from the lack of a significant open space.
THE SECOND SCHEME - family residential with a significant open space - is a modification of the first which attempts to overcome its shortcomings. The opportunity for family housing is retained. It will however, be recognized that the total number of housing units etc. will be reduced as a result of giving over some of the limited acreage to open space.

- estimated population 2,650
- total housing units 1,450
- estimated family households 350

With Scheme 2 the existence of the major open space tends to make all of the lesser open spaces, in and around the housing enclaves more meaningful. It provides a focus to the whole neighbourhood. This focus is related to the other important events of the plan such as the marina and the school.

The implications to the other surrounding areas arising from Scheme 2 are essentially the same as for the first scheme. However, there is an added advantage that development opportunities in the Fairview Slopes are improved. The open space provides a broad view corridor to the water. The Fairview Slopes essentially become a part of the False Creek Basin through this means.

There remains the need in Scheme 2 for a physical connection to the Fairview Slopes. The need for costly treatment of 6th Avenue may be reduced by virtue of the careful placement of housing areas and by design controls.

Scheme 2 still contains a sufficient number of family households to justify the inclusion of related facilities. This will be the more so, to the extent that families are accommodated in the Fairview Slopes and in Area 10.

Two important factors must be recognized.
First, development will demand careful attention to detail and to quality standards. Second, the scheme is still subject to financial and other tests.
development alternatives 3

The third scheme - open space with compact high density residential areas - is a further modification of the basic development plan as proposed by the Consultants. It shows the effect of increasing the open space to the point where it becomes the development priority. The total number of housing units and the population can remain approximately the same as in scheme 2, but because of the higher density, the character of that population changes.

- estimated population 2,400
- total housing units 1,360
- estimated family households 100 - 150

The family content of this third alternative is based upon the assumption that a certain percentage of families will live in any residential area. The family content in Vancouver's West End is approximately 10% of all households. However, 100 - 150 family households is well below the threshold of viability for schools and the related facilities. This disadvantage might be overcome if significant family households are established in Area 10 and in the Fairview Slopes. If so, a school site can be found.

Scheme 3 is less dependent upon stringent adherence to the development quality controls inherent in the first two. This does not, of course, mean that anything is good enough. Far from it, the exciting challenge of the False Creek opportunity will remain. However, specific requirements for a family environment which were described earlier are not demanded.

Scheme 3, more than meets its open space allocation when measured on a False Creek Basin wide scale. The major open space will be large enough to attract developments which cater to a city wide population. It is difficult to anticipate what they will be.

There are different implications to some surrounding areas. Notably the Fairview Slopes, which, by virtue of the larger open space, could be subject to pressure for higher densities and more commercial use. Redevelopment of Johnston Terminals lands might be better facilitated because of the higher densities.
The Fourth Scheme - Civic Developments in a major open space - represents a complete break from City Council's intent as described earlier in this report. Nevertheless, it cannot be ignored for many of the briefs and submissions received suggest that it is desirable.

The fact that the priority for the City owned lands is illustrated as green space with Civic Developments does not deny the possibility for some housing. However, housing content would not be significant to the overall concept.

It would be wrong to view Scheme 4 as a "do nothing" alternative. The marina is virtually committed and other developments would soon follow. A second marina is in fact a major possibility with this alternative. The full development of Scheme 4 would however, probably take longer than the three residential schemes to complete, although the achievement of a public open space could be quickly obtained.

There are a number of advantages which should be recognized. Waterfront land elsewhere in the city is recognized for the high amenity value that it has. Most of Vancouver's available waterfront lands are publicly held as parkland. If citizens place a high priority on open space needs, then False Creek's south shore is well located in relation to Vancouver's dense population areas. Furthermore, taking the long term view the City will have more difficulties, over the next 20 years, maintaining its open space quota than it will have providing sites for housing.

Scheme 4 will, if pursued, provide less incentive for the other proposed residential developments, elsewhere in False Creek, to proceed. Will Granville Island become a "public place" without housing in Area 67? Will Area 10 housing be too isolated without complementary developments in Area 67? These and other questions arise. The Fairview Slopes might also be subjected to increased pressure for higher density zoning and more commercial content.

There is a question of cost with Scheme 4. Funds are not now available for the development of up to 70 acres of parkland, or for appropriate other Civic uses. It must be assumed that these would be forthcoming.

Assuming that one recognizes the opportunity of False Creek, both as a place to be in and a place to live in, then something will be lost if there are no houses.

Fig. 8.4: Development Alternatives No. 4.
Source: City of Vancouver Planning Department, 1979.
Area Six: The Development Opportunity, November
the four alternatives - analysis

Any one of the four alternative schemes could be adopted for implementation. They achieve different public goals. The pertinent points from each are illustrated on the following page.

The choice between the alternatives depends upon how 'you' answer the two questions stated at the front of this report.

1 How much residential use should there be and to what extent should a family life style be encouraged?

2 How much open space should there be and what purpose should it fulfill?

The four schemes are not black and white alternatives. Some shift is possible between Schemes 2 and 3 for instance, to increase the open space and modify the development density accordingly. The details of soil conditions or the restraints of financial feasibility will dictate variations. In any case the schemes themselves are not sufficiently precise at this stage.

Each of the four alternative schemes have disadvantages as well as advantages. Taken together however, Scheme 2 appears to come closest to the overall aspirations of the City. The reasons for this choice are as follows:

1 Of greatest importance is the effect that a residential development on City lands will have on other development areas in False Creek. Marathon Realty is well advanced in its planning program for the construction of housing and other facilities on their lands. Similarly the B.C.C.C.U. is well advanced in their plans for a residential development in Area 10. In addition, the first few proposals have been made for new residential developments on the Fairview Slopes.

The opportunity exists for three developments to proceed together in the False Creek Basin -- one on City lands, one in Area 10, and one on Marathon lands. Without the City's immediate involvement in an implementation phase, the process of change will be less meaningful.

2 There is today an urgent need for housing and particularly close to the centre of the city. Preliminary market analyses prepared for the City, the B.C.C.C.U. and Marathon Realty indicate that this need runs through the full social and economic spectrum. At the same time there is a strong demand for waterfront park and for additional open space in the False Creek area. This fact also runs through the briefs and submissions and earlier resolutions of City Council.

Both demands can be met. Schemes 2 and 3 demonstrate variations of emphasis on these apparently competing needs. The best interests of the City and its citizens can be served through the adoption of a balanced scheme providing both housing and open space.

Only preliminary financial projections have so far been undertaken. As stated earlier they indicate that all schemes are viable but the funding arrangements and financing methods etc. will be different. The need for specific quality controls on the environment for livability will have an important bearing on the financial picture. There are sources of funds both from the private sector and from senior governments for experimental innovation, subsidized and market housing. Financial constraints do not indicate a preference for one scheme over another. The whole question of financing is under investigation by Mr. E. D. Sutcliffe, Development Consultant and the Finance Department.
### Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Average Density &amp; Range of Residential Enclave</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Other Land Uses</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 1</td>
<td>City wide Neighbourhood 8 acres</td>
<td>500-750 units</td>
<td>Average 60 du/ac</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>Public marina and local commercial only.</td>
<td>Depends upon Johnston Terminals.</td>
<td>This scheme provides for family life style. This scheme is essentially the same as the Consultant's proposal submitted to City in 1972.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 2</td>
<td>15.5 acres</td>
<td>1,150-1,400 units</td>
<td>Average 60 du/ac</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>Public marina and local commercial.</td>
<td>Depends upon Johnston Terminals.</td>
<td>This scheme provides for family life style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 3</td>
<td>28 acres</td>
<td>100-150 units</td>
<td>Average 85 du/ac</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Public marina and local commercial with some appropriate Civic uses.</td>
<td>Depends upon Johnston Terminals.</td>
<td>100-150 family units are shown because it is expected 10% of the units in any area will be family occupied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 4</td>
<td>± 70 acres</td>
<td>1,200-1,260 units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>One or more marinas together with appropriate Civic uses.</td>
<td>Depends upon Johnston Terminals.</td>
<td>Specific development for this scheme has not been defined. This scheme could be developed over a longer time span.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Vancouver Planning Department, (1979), Area 6: The Development Opportunity, November.
Although this alternative did not satisfy either those council members like Harry Rankin and Mike Harcourt who were for intensive housing development, or those in the Park Board who were for major park land development, this approach was reasonable enough to face the problems of that time. It was carried on by the City Council despite opposition from various sources.

City council's unanimous approval of the False Creek plan is a triumph for both public participation and professional planning in a development that ultimately should be one of the unique attractions among North American big cities.

In its choice from four possible alternative schemes, the council has captured the public mood and translated it into a realistic compromise between the more extreme approaches that have been advocated for the area.

The North and South shores of the "creek" will be neither a sea of low-cost housing nor one of parks and green space. There will be plenty of both. [8]

III-4-a-1. Design And Planning Measures

Once the conceptual plan was chosen, the city needed a more detailed area development plan to form the basis to rezone this land from light industrial to mixed used area. An international competition was considered, but it would take a long time and the TEAM council was about to meet their promise of building social housing within two years. At that point, it was already the second year of their first term of office. If the City Council just took a pick from design teams at large, it would potentially leave City Council a bit more vulnerable to political attack over the wisdom of its False Creek decisions. Thus a competition limited to three local design teams was organized in early 1974.

On February 5, the City Council approved the appointment of three local design teams from
approximately thirty applications and named them as team 'a', 'b' and 'c'. Each team was composed of architects, landscape architects, facility and environmental programmers, structural engineers and social scientists.

The three design teams were formally appointed on February 11, and were required to complete the design on April 22. That is to say, each team was given less than ten weeks to prepare a design. To make sure that the design on the city owned land would be what the public preferred, the City Council arranged to have a public review of all three proposals before the Council made a final decision. After April 22 deadline, the plans and models would be put on display from April 25 to May 13 at various locations in the city for public consideration. At the same time the City appointed a Review and Recommendation Committee composed of the Director of Planning, a development consultant and representatives from architecture, development and housing interests. The committee met seven times from May 21 to June 3, and presented its report to Council on June 4.

The Three Design Proposals for False Creek Development

The three design proposals were finished before the required April 22 deadline. On April 19th City Council met in special session to receive design proposals for the south shore of False Creek from three teams of consultants hired in February.

The proposal presented by team 'a' considered to create "a looking glass into a future in which citizens will be seen to be ordering their own lives the way they want them to be, collectively making decisions that affect their community and learning to be good neighbours to those who do not live there." Also there was the notion of "giving preference to family housing" and "separation of the car and the pedestrian."
team 'a'

The idea of a true community is linked to the Settlement. It is not just a place to live but a place to visit. A true community is a place where people can relax in all weathers and seasons. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place to live.

A place to visit

false creek settlement

a place to live

The heart of a community is the Settlement. It is not just a place to live but a place to visit. A true community is a place where people can relax in all weathers and seasons. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place to live.

A place to visit

false creek settlement

a place to live

The heart of a community is the Settlement. It is not just a place to live but a place to visit. A true community is a place where people can relax in all weathers and seasons. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place to live.

A place to visit

false creek settlement

a place to live

The heart of a community is the Settlement. It is not just a place to live but a place to visit. A true community is a place where people can relax in all weathers and seasons. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place to live.

A place to visit

false creek settlement

a place to live

The heart of a community is the Settlement. It is not just a place to live but a place to visit. A true community is a place where people can relax in all weathers and seasons. It will be a place where all of these things will happen. It will be a place to live.
One major feature of this proposal is the arrangement of a "Community Commons" proposed at the junction of Area Six and Fairview. The "Commons" would function as "a special place to meet, shop, play and learn". This "commons" would actually be a shopping mall. The destination park was more of a linear character, and helped to create a waterfront oriented public open space. On the other hand, the linear character of this park pushed the residential buildings back from the waterfront. The marina was relatively smaller than it was in the other two proposals. The general site layout was still quite conventional, it did not go as far as creating enclaves. They were designed as a modified version of row houses along the street.

But, in this proposal there was a very good shopping system which covered this area with corner stores and bigger commercial facilities. This made it a convenient place to live.

The second proposal by team 'b' is a local version of Christopher Alexander's "Pattern Language". The legends beneath the site plan were the patterns developed by team 'b'; they were the theoretical basis of this proposal. Because of its theoretical orientation, this second proposal was in many cases very idealistic.

The general layout of the site plan was generated by the soil condition of the site as shown in pattern 1.

As in "Pattern Language", this proposal gave considerable amount of emphasis on the notion of public participation. Detailed strategies were provided to help encouraging participation in the implementation process. For example:

Pattern 22: provide wood frame construction to allow "do-it-yourself" alterations.

Pattern 23: allow the opportunity for people to help design their own new home.

Pattern 26: allow small development groups to participate.

There were some other ideas which would be good for the project but were unfeasible economically. For example:
Fairview Town

Team 'b'

View of swimming basin, Heather Park

View down Oak Street showing creek, car line and floating over shops

Seawall park and picnic point

Shop and community facilities at Oak Square

Market deck, floating commercial and ferry dock

Section through Oak Street looking west, showing land dock over 6th Avenue and Oak Square

Fig. 3-8: Design Concept for Area 1 from team 'b'.

Pattern 7: provide substantial noise abatement for the community

Pattern 27: provide an opportunity for development on the south side of Sixth Avenue to complete the community in harmony;

Both patterns encouraged arranging the traffic artery Sixth Avenue underground.

Another important feature of this proposal was the extension of Oak Street down to the water edge, cutting the site into two parts, the street would be ended by commercial and recreational facilities at waterfront. This would make Oak street one of the most exciting streets in Vancouver. But this move might have brought too much commercial and other urban activities into this residential development. In the end this was not intended as a commercial development.

In this proposal, public open space was arranged to the east side of the site, the west side was relatively dense with residential enclaves. Thus the west side of the site would be less inviting compared with the east side; The Oak street extension would be the splitting point of the public (east side) and private (west side) space on this site. This division went against the pursuit of providing continuous water front accessible to the public.

Team 'c' went closest to the city's requirement. It is not surprising because the leading firm of team 'c' was TBP&P which had been city's consultant on the development of False Creek since 1969.

The way team 'c' understood this project was based on the understanding of public open space:

At the water's edge, the pedestrian should have supremacy over other modes of movement. Pedestrian paths should be lined with activity and they should offer a variety of experiences and be laid out in continuous expanding loops.\(^{(9)}\)

In their approach, team 'c' proposed two clusters of residential enclaves. The one to the west of the site was named Spruce Neighbourhood; the one to the east, Heather
Fig. 3-9: Design Concept for Area 6 From Team 'c'
development economics  May 1, 1974.

The City of Vancouver has invested large amounts of public funds in land, services and improvements in Area 6. The design teams were advised that there was $4,000,000 of City investment attributable to the residential/commercial development (excluding the marina) of Phase 1.

The teams were asked to comment upon the feasibility of such a figure and the impact of the poor soil conditions upon it. Each team has assured the City that the figure is practical but too many unknowns involved, including the attitudes of the private property owners.

The teams were also asked to comment upon the practicality of the figures that the City has budgeted for the 6th Avenue treatment, noise abatement, rail relocation and park development as applied to their design concepts.

Each team has assured us that these figures are appropriate for their concepts with the exception of Team A who has not provided an economic analysis of the decking of 6th Avenue as they explain that there are too many unknowns involved, including the attitudes of the private property owners, to provide a reliable analysis at this time.

Team C has suggested that the land cost attributable to housing, net after the commercial component, be traded off between high and low income incomes. Thus, the low income households would pay what they could afford and the high income households would pick up the difference.

Under this arrangement, a family earning $10,000 would support a land cost of $3,100 and a household earning over $15,000 would support a land value of approximately $9,200.

It is the opinion of Team C that if this method were combined with their suggested management procedures and if the high income units were marketed as condominiums that the difference in land value could be supported by the current large gap between cost and sale price in the condominium market.

The result would mean that a one bedroom cooperative unit would require an income of $8,500 while a three bedroom cooperative would require an income of $13,300.

### Comparative statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>'a'</th>
<th>'b'</th>
<th>'c'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Acreages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Park</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking over 6th Avenue and rail right-of-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck (subtract)</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1 bed 288</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2/3 bed 308</td>
<td>suite size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3/4 bed 193</td>
<td>1,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedroom</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>740 - 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in square feet</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>62,750</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public berths</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>False Creek Development Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>1101 W. 6th Avenue</td>
<td>736-3474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighbourhood; the land in between the two neighbourhoods was the destination park: Charleston Park.

One of the characteristics of team 'c' project was to establish separated pedestrian and vehicular circulation system. The residential area was designed as "car-free" zone, it may however be used by service and emergency vehicles.

Another character was the design of "pedestrian activity focuses". This walking street system connected by activity "squares" was a modern interpretation of the street system of medieval towns.

In this proposal, the residential development followed the enclave approach. There are three enclaves in the west side and five others in the east side. In the west side, with three low rise, low density enclaves, the neighbourhood looks like a suburban resort instead of a downtown residential neighbourhood. The enclaves in the east side composed of some high rises and the density is also higher. The carefully designed details of the buildings gave this cluster an European flavour especially the treatment of the water front and Leg-in-Boot Square.

On June 4 the Review Committee presented its report to Council and recommended the proposal by team 'c', led by TBP&P, as the one to be implemented on the False Creek south shore land. This recommendation was approved by the City Council on June 11.

In less than five months, the city Council held a design competition, a review of public opinions, set up a review committee and chose a plan for construction. All these showed that the Council was eager to start construction of this project as soon as possible.

Also, by the end of 1974, it would be time for municipal election, the TEAM Council wanted to have something done on the False Creek city owned land to honour their promise of building socially mixed housing within two years before coming into power in 1972. So, although the Review and Recommendation Committee was not totally satisfied with any of the three projects, the TEAM council chose the one which was deemed the best of the three designs that
Source: City of Vancouver, False Creek Development Group.
FALSE CREEK AREA 6, PHASE 1

Overall Statistics

1. Total Land Area
   APPROXIMATELY 52.4 ACRES.
2. Development Area
   APPROXIMATELY 20.28 ACRES (INCLUDING ALL RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL AREAS).
3. Public Areas
   a. Neighbourhood Park
   b. School
   c. Circulation
   d. Destination Park
   9.11 ACRES
   2.0 ACRES
   0.51 ACRES
   19.5 ACRES
4. Total Number of Residential Units
   NOT TO EXCEED 900 UNITS.
5. Non-Residential Space
   NOT TO EXCEED 70,000 SQUARE FEET.
6. Average Net Density (Units per development acres - as in 2. above)
   17.72 ACRES
   9.92 ACRES
   2.44 ACRES
7. Population
   APPROXIMATELY 1,600.

Whereas the above statistics are an overall maximum for the entire Phase 1, there will be a 10% latitude (10% - +10%) in the allocation of these amounts among the following two neighbourhoods.

Area 6 Neighbourhoods - Phase 1

Spruce

Land Use
The Spruce neighbourhood is planned as a predominantly family residential area. Non-Residential uses are planned to include the school, community facilities, and some commercial facilities.

1. Neighbourhood Area
2. Development Area
3. Public Areas
   a. Neighbourhood Park
   b. School
   c. Circulation
   3.96 ACRES
   2.0 ACRES
   2.44 ACRES
4. Number of Residential Units
   NOT TO EXCEED 330 UNITS.
5. Non-Residential Space
   NOT TO EXCEED 70,000 square feet. Total non-residential space may be located in either Spruce or Heather neighbourhoods, or partially in each.
6. Average Net Density (Units per development acre as defined in 2. above)
   3.96 ACRES
   2.0 ACRES
   2.44 ACRES
7. Number of buildings above three storeys
   THREE BUILDINGS AT TEN STOREYS OR LESS.
8. Site Coverage in Development Areas (Landscaped decks at lower levels to be considered open space)
   7%
9. Site coverage in Development Areas above three storey height
   NOT APPLICABLE.

Heather

Land Use
The Heather neighbourhood is planned as a mixed lifestyle residential area. Non-Residential uses are planned to include a marina, community facilities, and some commercial facilities.

1. Neighbourhood Area
2. Development Area
3. Public Areas
   a. Neighbourhood Park
   b. School
   c. Circulation
   5.15 ACRES
   3.07 ACRES
4. Number of Residential Units
   NOT TO EXCEED 650 UNITS.
5. Non-Residential Space
   NOT TO EXCEED 70,000 square feet. Total non-residential space may be located in either Spruce or Heather neighbourhoods, or partially in each.
6. Average Net Density (Units per development acre as defined in 2. above)
   6.07 ACRES
   3.07 ACRES
7. Number of buildings above three storeys
   NOT TO EXCEED 60 UNITS PER ACRE.
8. Site Coverage in Development Areas (Landscaped decks at lower levels to be considered open space)
   7%
9. Site coverage in Development Areas above three storey height
   NOT APPLICABLE.
"comes closest to satisfying the requirement of the City". Although the end result of False Creek development under TEAM administration good, the rationale for selecting this scheme was poor. In a sense the TEAM Council jeopardized the quality of the design of False Creek for their political gain.

III-4-a-2. Design Guidelines.

After scheme 'c' of Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partner was selected as the Area Development Plan, the City started to hire architects for detailed design for Phase I Area 6. To make sure that the whole site was going to be developed in a controlled manner, TBP&P was again commissioned to compose 'patterns' to be used on city owned site. These were the first Design Guidelines. ( see Appendix )

As an elaboration of the essence of TBP&P's Area 6 proposal these Guidelines were issued to participating architects to guide them through the process of this development and make sure that the physical characters of this development enhance the policy of this development. The Design Guidelines were composed from the result of the study of a large social and behavioral literature in the area of residential housing design.

The Design Guidelines were more of a generative character. They composed of four parts: Building Concepts; Street Functions; Parking Policies and Enclave Design. These Guidelines were composed in a form almost the same as "The Pattern Language" and many of the concepts of this guideline were drawn directly from this book.

The most important characters of this guideline are: the pursuit of "enclave-shape" housing clusters instead of the conventional row house type development and a pedestrian street system with limited access to and accommodation for cars.
The enclave concept was developed in response to five design principles:

1) the physical identifiability of a street address.
2) direct ground access of all dwellings
3) a "through" unit with back and front entrances.
4) a "dough-nut" shape which enclosed the semi-private open space to be shared by the households within the enclave, and
5) a zero building set-back which concentrated households' private and semi-private open space within the enclave, and made the rest of the open space public.

The semi-private open space is the core of the enclave concept. It shapes social intercourse in each enclave. It could set an interesting precedent for medium density residential design in western Canada. [10]

Another innovation of these Guidelines was the pursuit of a pedestrian street system and restricted vehicular access to the site. The intention was for False Creek residents to be able to walk to all their amenities, including shopping, and for visitors to False Creek to enjoy the street life.

Besides all the above requirements, the Design Guidelines also recommended the way the dwelling units were to be designed.

Design Guidelines for dwelling units recommended:
1) some variety in facade
2) the use of natural materials.
3) families with children are housed at grade
4) the main rooms be sunny and attractive
5) transition zones between public and private access be provided at entrances to the unit
6) in apartment buildings corridors be kept short.
7) roof forms and colour be considered in a general sense
8) every house should be designed with a clear "front" and "back"
9) unblocked view from every suite window. [11]
4.4 Enclave Open Space

"Enclave Gateway: all points of entry to an enclave should clearly differentiate between public and neighbourhood territory". It is necessary to give a sense of territoriality to the enclave open space; to make it belong to the residents. This is not necessarily a "gate", but a series of clues such as paving changes, archways, steps, trellises, etc., that indicate a change of territory.

Continuous Open Space

As described by the Building Envelope, the open space in an enclave is continuous, not divided by buildings. In other words, all the enclave's residents share one open space... it may have major and minor parts to it.

In some designated areas (see Building Envelope Plan) up to 10% of the Open Space requirements of the enclave may be placed on the street or exterior of the enclave if there is an adjacent complementary function. But there must be a direct connection to the enclave interior.
Fig. 3-14: Housing Enclave in Phase I.

Fig. 3-15: Housing Enclave in Phase I.
Fig. 3-16: Public open space in Phase I --- Charleston Park.

Fig. 3-17: Public open space in Phase I --- Spruce Square.
Fig. 3-18: Pedestrian overpass in Phase I.

Fig. 3-19: Pedestrian street in Phase I.
The Guidelines determined that False Creek be developed along the line of low-rise, medium density, with a lot of open spaces and a careful concern of the built form. Therefore the design of the physical environment in False Creek was of greater public concern than was usual in urban development efforts. This resulted in the creation of an urban oasis in the downtown concrete jungle.

III-4-a-3. Social Mix

One of the very distinct characteristics of TEAM was its emphasis on social equity. To provide equity in housing development was one of the major issues in the implementation of this project.

The idea of creating socially heterogeneous neighbourhoods began as early as the 1940s. The model of a socially successful community was then, and to some extent remains, the small rural village whose social and kinship networks reinforced the primary group structure which effected social control, generated basic community mores, and was a source of satisfaction and pride to the individual.[12]

The objectives of social mix in general terms are social diversity and social equity. The objective that was most pertinent to the decision of planners and policy-makers in False Creek was probably that which concerns the desirability of social diversity (which is in essence the social equity issue). Other priorities in terms of the goals for False Creek were the promotion of aesthetic enrichment and diversity, the provision of freedom of choice in housing to all socio-economic levels; equality of opportunity, and the maintenance of a stable residential area.

To promote social equity and quality of life (aesthetic way of life) the TEAM council was determined to make a microcosm in False Creek where they had general control as the owner
and policy authority.

To ensure that social mix would be carried out in this development, TEAM council made it a policy concerning the percentage of people living on False Creek city owned land. (see Table III. Residents Composition Target in Chapter 5.)

III-4-a-4. Administrative Measures

When detailed planning was completed, City Council needed to rezone False Creek area from industrial to a mixed use category. They noted the negative aspect of zoning by-laws, suggesting that "they are good at specifying what ought not to happen on a site. In specifying a particular land use, they exclude related options which might be in the spirit of the plan." [13] The City Council decided to break the conventional approach by using Development Plan section of the Vancouver Charter:

Rather than using the zoning by-law section of the Vancouver Charter, the decision was made to use the development plans section. British Columbia has no separate planning act which applies to Vancouver. The planning authority is located in the Vancouver Charter. The development plans sections of the Charter had never been used before. A decision was made to use it because an official development plan can include policies and general criteria rather than just the zoning regulations, permitting a more flexible, incentive oriented approach." [13]

On June 27, 1974, the City Council voted to rezone the False Creek lands west of the Cambie Bridge as False Creek Comprehensive Development District (FCCDD) and to adopt the False Creek Official Development Plan By-law (see Appendix). In this way the City Council used all of its administrative power to ensure that False Creek redevelopment would carried on
This official development plan was another innovation in planning in the city. This was the first one applied to such a large scale project. The format of this plan was also unique because of the detailed criteria it contained. For each major category sets of "mandatory requirements," "interpretive requirements" and "guidelines" were specified so as to allow flexibility while still enforcing TEAM's design and land use mix philosophy. Also this official development plan left enough space for future possibilities. In this way it was quite open ended.

Another contribution of this official development plan was that it established a two stage procedure for the approval of development of any portion within the rezoned district.

This Official Development Plan By-law provides the framework for the preparation of development plans in two stages as follows:

1. "Area Development Plans" will be prepared for all or parts of the area zoned FCCDD based upon the policies and regulations set out in this By-law. These area development plans will be submitted to the Director of Planning in the form of appropriate drawings and other information. The Director of Planning shall forward acceptable plans, together with recommendations from the Technical Planning Board and the Vancouver City Planning Commission to City Council for consideration at a Public Hearing.

2. "Development Permit Applications" will be made, in accordance with normal procedures as set out in the Zoning and Development By-law No. 3575, to the Department of Permits and Licences. Consideration of any development permit application will be based upon both the policies and regulations of the official Development Plan By-law, and upon such additional information as is included in the approved Area Development Plan for the area within which the application is made.¹⁴

Once the area was rezoned and the False Creek development plan adopted in June 1974, the City started preparing for the Area Development Plan for each of the three phases of city owned land.
With the support of TEAM council the Area Development Plan for phase I was approved smoothly on November 12, 1974, about one week before the municipal election of November 20.

TEAM won the majority of City Council again. TEAM's mayoral candidate, Art Phillips, was re-elected. This guaranteed the continuous endeavour of creating a livable urban development in False Creek basin.

Another contribution in terms of administrative innovation was the founding of the False Creek Development Group.

Before TEAM took office the NPA government realized the scale and the importance of False Creek development. They started setting up special groups which worked on specific tasks for the False Creek development. When TEAM took power the new government inherited this organizational structure. Between 1971 and 1974 when the basic planning and designing decisions were under discussion, a total of six groups or teams were established. They were:

The False Creek Study Group, 1971-1972
A group comprised of the Assistant Director of the Planning Department responsible for False Creek and a variety of consultants including TBP&P, whose responsibilities included the preparation of a development plan.

Special Committee on False Creek, 1972-1973
A committee of aldermen responsible for reviewing False Creek Policies, proposals and development guidelines. Upon dissolution, matters pertaining to False Creek were directed to the Standing Council Committee on Planning and Development.

False Creek Planning Team, 1973
A team of Planning Department staff responsible for reviewing the False Creek Study Group's work in order to develop workable policies.

Under the aegis of the Vancouver City Planning Commission and comprised of appointed citizen resource persons, the two panels were formed to review housing mix and open space recommendations for Phase 1, Area 6.

Citizen's Advisory Panel, 1974.

Under the aegis of the Vancouver City Planning Commission, this panel was made up of 20 volunteers representing housing, park, school and other interests, and was responsible for providing advice to the Phase 1 Design Teams, as well as conducting an evaluation of the three design submissions.


A five person committee (the Director of Planning, a development consultant and representatives from architecture, development and housing interests) responsible for reviewing all comments received regarding the Phase 1 design competition and recommending to Council a design concept for the site.

There were different ideas about how to implement the False Creek development. The NPA argued for an "in-house" approach, that is, to have this project handled by a division of the planning department; while some TEAM members preferred a separate development corporation. These differences were settled with the 1972 municipal election when TEAM won the majority in City Council.

In early 1973 shortly after the TEAM got control of the City Council, Doug Sutcliff, a local commercial developer, was hired as project manager and development consultant to direct and coordinate all aspects of the project. In the mean time, opinions about the desirability of a separate development corporation began to shift when ... aldermen recognized that such an agency would not necessarily be responsive to policies established by Council, (thus) would dilute Council's power and authority, and basically be an unnecessary and possibly self-perpetuating agency. The decision not to have a development corporation meant, with regard to the non-city lands in False Creek, that the City was prepared to depend on land use controls plus the influence it was able to exert on other land owners.
For its own development, the City would probably have to raise money for front end costs through more traditional channels as well as ... (play) some type of management role. [16]

Thus instead of having a development corporation the City Council established the False Creek Development Group headed by city consultant Doug Sutcliff. The FCDG functioned as a distinct civic department in the city hall, but "had a greater discretionary authority over expenditures than any other department and it reported directly to the City Council rather than through the City Manager's office." [17] The activities of the FCDG include the following:

--initiate the planning process for each phase and to review the details relating to each of the housing sites;
--negotiate land acquisition and site consolidation;
--hire coordinating architects for each of the three phases of the project;
--guide the project through the plans approval process;
--handle negotiations with the Engineering Department regarding the servicing of the site;
--preparation and control of capital budgets for financing the infrastructure;
--prepare and issue proposal calls;
--recommend sponsor groups for development of each development site;
--negotiate the land lease for each site;
--negotiate the design of the housing projects;
--expedite the development permit process; and
--assist in the negotiations with CMHC and the province to obtain financing for the non-market units. [16]

The formation of FCDG changed the style of the city's overall management of the project. It acted as a developer leading the project through the various stages of the development process.
III-4-a-5. Public Participation Issues

The start of False Creek development coincided with the coming of a more liberal ideology. A very important indication was the waking up of the sense of public participation in civic politics. It contributed a lot to the ousting of NPA and to the arrival of TEAM. In the late 1960s the public played an important role in the abandonment of a proposed free way in the city. It is easy to imagine that the public had a big say in the False Creek development as well. Although the public opinion received increased attention in the NPA administration before it was ousted, its attitude towards this issue was different from that of the TEAM's. The TEAM Council was more positive. They intentionally installed the mechanism of public input into the municipal bureaucracy; while the NPA government was more passive in dealing with this issue.

As early as 1971 TBP&P urged citizen participation in the decision making process on the future of False Creek in a report to the NPA City Council. As mentioned in the first chapter, in 1971 there were over 3,000 citizen groups in Vancouver monitoring the administration of the municipal and senior government.

After TEAM took power in late 1972, the City Council encouraged the process of public participation and set in gear the installation of public input mechanism in City Hall.

In this period, there was a great deal of public reaction to each move the city made to the False Creek development. This showed a growing interest in participating in urban development. Instead of concentrating on what should not happen the public's reaction became more positive. Now they wanted to voice what they wanted to happen. This showed a change to a more positive attitude in the public realm.

In May of 1973, residents close to False Creek area and those interested in moving in later formed the False Creek Citizen Coalition. They wanted a voice in the planning and development of the region. The coalition requested that "any plan for development should
include 40% low-rental housing, preservation of some existing housing, land use for all income and social levels and elimination of proposed high rise apartments.\textsuperscript{[18]} They also demanded an opportunity to design and manage the housing unit and to meet with Council members on a day to day basis. Although the request was turned down by W. Hardwick for overlooking the position of City Council and the False Creek committee, it showed the spirit of the public of the early 1970s.

The City Council was also active in providing the possibility to encourage public participation in the course of the development. One important way was to keep the public more informed about what was going on in City Council. They opened the council meetings to the public. To make it easier for the general public to have a chance to attend council meetings, the city council changed the timing of council meetings from day time sessions to evening sessions. In addition, in the case of False Creek development, a booth was set up in the lobby of City Hall and made it easily accessible for people interested in this development. Also City Council provided flyers of schedule of council meetings and also council meeting minutes to keep the public aware of what was going on. The public really experienced having greater control over their own destiny.

Besides organizations set up by the public themselves, the City Council invited representatives from the public to monitor and to provide recommendations to the city council, and to participate in the council decision making process.

Other professionals and academics went further in their concern for the process of providing public opinions to the False Creek development. In June 1973, architect Stan King, together with some students from UBC staged a "design-in" program. They conducted a survey called The False Creek Image Survey. The redevelopment of False Creek was the thrust of the survey, but its main motivation was to provide a different kind of input into urban planning which would be significant to urban development somewhere else later. Stan King gave reports to the City Council on their findings and in a way helped to form and confirm the kind of
development people preferred on False Creek land.

The activities of public organizations were quite visible in the month of February in 1974, shortly after the City Council approved the recommendation of the False Creek development. Because of the changes in the perception of the quality of life and the promotion of the environmental concern and aesthetic style of life, when the City Council decided to develop along the line of residential and recreational use on the city-owned land, it was under serious attack from some public organizations. Together with the downtown business community and the NPA strong-hold --- the Parka Board, and the Citizens' Council on Civic Development favoured the park land and public open space approach on city owned land. They charged the False Creek committee headed by Walter Hardwick with ignoring the park land approach recommendations from this citizens' advisory panel. Some citizen groups were quite keen on using city owned land purely as park space. They also saw False Creek south as the last chance for the city to get a piece of park land free from structures in the centre of the city. They tried every way possible to halt the development and tried to tell the government what they thought right. When citizen groups started to see an issue from a narrow view point, it may appear quite arrogant and over-demanding. It became another form of dictatorship.

As municipal leaders, TEAM had to consider the whole picture. They found that the need for housing in downtown area was urgent. They believed that the municipal resources should serve the urgent social need of the time; in this case it was housing. Also they felt it necessary to set up an example for the future residential development elsewhere. Although the TEAM City Council and the False Creek committee was under pressure of keeping the city owned land as park space, mayor Art Phillips stood firm on the decision of the residential and recreational approach and backed Hardwick's committee. At the same time the TEAM council showed their interest in listening to the public opinion on detailed planning which would be due in April 1974.
On April 23, City Council met in special session to receive design proposals for the south shore of False Creek from three teams of consultants. This selection process was also designed to allow public opinions to make sure that the public would have their voice in the procedure. City and consultant staff will man special displays (of the three projects) in various public libraries from April 25 to June 10. Council will make no decision until it reviews the public's reaction and hears from a special-appointed 20-member citizens' advisory panel. Once a specific design is selected, public hearings will also be needed before the area is rezoned to comprehensive development district from its present industrial classification.[19]

At this time the public participation mechanism became fully functional in municipal administration.

III-4-a-6. The Role Of Senior Governments

At the early stage of False Creek development, the economy was buoyant. The federal government was in the hands of Liberal party. The provincial government was controlled by the more sympathetic NDP. The federal government was interested in finding a new model for Canadian urban development; and the provincial government was willing to help the City especially in subsidized housing development. Without the financial and administrative help from the senior governments TEAM's idea of a livable neighbourhood with social and tenure mix would have been hard to achieve.

What was important for False Creek development was that the entire south shore area be developed as a whole so as to keep the consistency of this development. The City Council, however, was faced with the problem of how to finance the social housing section of the...
development.

The federal government was very supportive financially in helping the False Creek redevelopment. Of course, to help Vancouver finish at least part of the project for the May 1976 United Nations Habitat Conference to be held in Vancouver was another reason for federal assistance. The federal government was also thinking of using Vancouver as an example for future urban development in other parts of Canada.

In December 1973, shortly after City Council approved in principle the residential and recreational use of the city owned land, a request for a $10 million loan from the federal government was sent to CMHC "under Section 42 of the National Housing Act to help finance the front end expenses associated with Phases 1 and 2." [20] In less than three weeks the approval of the long term low interest loan was announced by federal Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford. Even the City Council was surprised at the speedy approval from the federal government. In an article of December 31 1973 in Vancouver Sun, Alderman Walter Hardwick expressed City Council's gratitude:

After city council approved the plans for the False Creek area in late November we applied for the grant. We're very gratified the government was able to process our application so rapidly ... The importance of the money to the city really centres around the fact that we will probably be able to develop the majority of land between Cambie and Granville bridges in one period of time. If we had to use conventional sources of civic financing, the development probably would have stretched over five to eight years. I know Mr. Basford feels as I do that we should be able to demonstrate to the people throughout the world imaginative ways of using marginal inner city land and creating a new urban environment.[21]

Before the loan was approved, in January 1973, the federal government granted the City $2.25 million from its Winter Works grant program to help preparing the site for the redevelopment. This money was used in the construction of a $3.52 million seawall running the length of the city's south shore property.
The federal government made it clear that the support to the False Creek redevelopment was for lower-income and family subsidized housing. Not only did the federal government have its preference of the organizational form of subsidy --- co-operatives, also it was prepared to provide more help if needed to accomplish the redevelopment, especially for the goal of providing subsidized housing.

Federal Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford has suggested the city encourage co-operative projects in the False Creek area to provide low-income homes. In a letter to Mayor Art Phillips released Monday, Basford said co-operatives would allow for "deeper subsidies" to assist low-income families. Basford also suggested the city investigate other low-income housing assistance programs available from the federal government.

If these are not enough, the government would also be prepared, with provincial concurrence, to make operating subsidies available to subsidize rent on a 50-50 sharing basis.1221

As a result of the encouraging economic situation nation-wide in the late 60s and early 70s, the liberal ideology embraced by the government had an important influence to the decision making at federal level. In September 1974, the federal government announced another program for rental housing which could be shared by the City of Vancouver. Mayor Art Phillips planned to use it in subsidized rental housing:

Urban Affairs Minister Barnett Danson's announcement Friday that Vancouver would share in the $50 million federal program to assist in rental housing construction was welcomed Monday by Mayor Art Phillips. Phillips told reporters he believes Vancouver's share of the funds --- still to be decided --- could be best used in the construction of rental housing in the False Creek area. Phillips said the federal assistance program could make it possible to build housing in False Creek which would meet both the senior governments' and the city's objectives.1231
One year later when the first phase of False Creek development was under way, the City got its share in the form of seven loans totalling $18.2 million. (see *Province* Sept. 29, 1975) The seven loans went to seven sponsors of housing program. The financial support from the federal government made it possible for the City to lease its land at a lower price so as to help developing subsidized housing.

At the provincial level, the government was also helpful in the housing development on city owned land. Instead of selling the land to private developers the City planned to lease all of its development land. To get maximum economic return from the market section of the development the City planned to build condominiums. But provincial law (the Strata Titles Act) did not allow condominiums to be built on leased land. The City negotiated with the provincial government and convinced the government to bend its law and to compose a new Condominiums Act to fit the policy decisions of City Council.

III-4-b. Area Development Plan For Phase II

Preparation of Area Development Plan for Phase II started soon after construction of Phase I started in 1976. On April 6 two local architecture firms Downs Archambault and Davidson Johnston were hired by the City to prepare two design concepts for phase II, one a predominately residential option by Downs Archambault, the other a park and civic building option by Davidson Johnston.

In about six weeks, a report regarding the two options was submitted to the City. The report recommended residential option instead of park and civic building option. On October 6 the Area Development Plan for Phase II was adopted by City Council.

The Phase II site was very different from Phase I. It was long and narrow with elevated
bridge ramp to part of the southern edge and all of the western edge of the site. The basic planning and design principles of Phase I were adopted, eg. the pursuit of livability and social mix, new guidelines were also introduced to face new problems of this site, eg. acoustic control from the bridge ramp. These new guidelines were also used to correct some problems revealed from Phase I after residents started to move in, eg. the lack of parking space.

Phase II was developed as a mixed community as Phase I, the arrangement of different family types were carefully considered.

The nature of the housing development must be a direct response to the particular needs of each user group both in built form and in their private and shared open spaces ... The distribution of user groups is directly related to social needs. Thus family units are located close to existing family units in Phase I and an adjacent park; couples are located next to families; elderly are situated next to mature couples and close to major community services, and at the extreme western end of the site singles and independent couples are located near to shared recreation facilities. [24]

In Phase II the projected mix was equal percentages of low, middle, and high income groups. Among them 20% families, 32% couples, 36% singles, 12% elderly, and an ownership (private market housing) / rental (social housing) ratio of 48% / 50%. It was later found out that one proposed commercial development for Phase II was not feasible it was therefore replaced with the 104 unit Creekview Co-operative. This boosted up the percentage of non-profit social housing in Phase II to 75%.

With the help of both provincial and federal government, the first two phases of False Creek redevelopment went smoothly and created a neighbourhood which is one of the most desirable places to live in Vancouver.
Fig. 3-20: False Creek Area 6, Phase II Location Map.
Source: City of Vancouver (1976), Area Development Plan for Area 6 Phase 2, False Creek.
Fig. 3-21: False Creek Area 6, Phase II Site Plan.
Source: City of Vancouver, False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 6, Phase II.

Fig. 3-22: False Creek Area 6 Phase II Development
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Chapter 4. False Creek Residential Development After Team Administration  
1978 — 1986

The TEAM majority council was in power for only four years. The party lost its general control in City Council in the 1976 municipality election. TEAM was reduced to a minority position in the 1977-1978 council. There was a split within the party itself which caused the final collapse of the party. The dispersal of the party was so obvious that its mayoral candidate of 1976 Jack Volrich quit TEAM just before the 1978 election and ran for mayor with the support from NPA. He won the election. NPA once again became the majority party in City Council. TEAM got only one seat in that election and lost all its positions on the school and parks board.

Once the NPA regained control, it went quickly back to its late 60s strategy, emphasizing physical development and reducing services to people. The conservative movement was fuelled by the return of the Social Credit Party at the provincial level in 1975, the fading away of the Liberal Party at federal level, and the deteriorating economic situation of the nation at that time. All these contributed to the later phases of the False Creek redevelopment.

IV-1. The Fall of TEAM

As time went by, ideology advocated by TEAM revealed its weakness. It turned out that this ideology brought with it some side effects that were not perceived before. For example, the
Fig. 4-1: Fairview Slopes Development: off-limit profit-driven developer type development gentrified this once working class neighbourhood.

Fig. 4-2: Fairview Slopes Development.
development on False Creek south brought up the property value of the close-by Fairview Slops. The private sector turned it into a yuppie neighbourhood soon after the City started False Creek development. The City became impotent in areas beyond it control. The pursuit of "quality of life" and "livability" helped the phasing out of the "working class" residents who once worked in this industrial area. (see Figure 4-1, 4-2.)

Also the split within TEAM made its administration unstable. From the day when TEAM was formed its composition was divided into conservative and liberal factions. It was formed as a "coalition of reformers and more conservative business interests." [1] The split between the two sides became more obvious after the first victory of municipal election. The NPA gradually regained their influence:

The precariousness of TEAM's grip on power was obvious in 1974. Three incumbents did not run, and their seats were captured by a rejuvenated NPA. During 1975 and 1976 TEAM drifted further to the right, losing interest in issues such as the ward system and public housing. This caused TEAM's most left-wing alderman, Darlene Marzari, to resign and sit out her term as an independent. ... the (1976) TEAM mayoral nomination was won by conservative alderman Jack Volrich (a Liberal-Social Creditor). [2]

Another TEAM - NDP council member Mike Harcourt also quit TEAM in protest of the right turning policies of TEAM after losing the mayorship nomination to Jack Volrich in 1976. He remained a New Democrat and later campaigned and won the mayoral election as an independent with obvious inclinations towards the NDP.

Starting from the second term of Art Phillips' office in 1974, TEAM's majority position was challenged by the recovering NPA. Comparing the number of TEAM members in the City Council, in the 1973-74 council eight out of ten of the council aldermen were TEAM members; in the 1975-76 council only five out of ten, with the other four from NPA and one from COPE. In False Creek issues, COPE alderman Harry Rankin always sided to the line of TEAM, thus helping to get a majority in voting. This secured the first two phases of the False Creek
development to be carried out along the pre-proposed line. Starting from the 1977-78 City Council, TEAM became a minority party, although mayor Jack Volrich was still a TEAM member. TEAM never recovered. After the 1978 party convention, with the breaking away of two chief members, it gradually faded from the scene of civic politics in Vancouver although it captured two seats in the City Council in 1980 election when Mike Harcourt won the mayorship.

IV-1-a. Economic Situations In The Late 70s

After the economic boom of the late 60s and early 70s, the economy began to show signs of recession by the mid-70s. It deteriorated towards the end of 70s and early 80s. The economic situation directly affected urban development, especially large projects like False Creek with large amount of subsidized housing. As a result of the unpromising economy, fiscal conservatism came to daily administration of the city. The municipal government had to be very careful in its spending. In the case of subsidized housing, the federal government was helpful in the first two phases of the redevelopment. But its policies changed as conservatism came back with the economic recession. The city government had to find some way to finance this section of housing and implement their policy of providing housing to the under privileged groups.

The tough economic situation was felt at the beginning of Art Phillips' second term of office. In his inaugural address to the Council, Art Phillips made it clear that "hard work and careful spending will be this council's trademark." The economy was so tough that in the process of implementing phase one of False Creek redevelopment, when council proposed to hire an American firm to construct the Heather Street Marina, much attention was aroused in the
public and the media. Council was attacked for its lack of concern to the local unemployment situation. This proposal had to be withdrawn.

Businessmen have the reputation of managing money, therefore in times of economic hardship, the public tend to become more conservative and count on business oriented parties to help the city survive.

IV-1-b. Political Atmosphere Of The Late 70s

In the 70s, the liberal ideology was around long enough for the public to evaluate it according to what it achieved. TEAM's pursuit for a livable city achieved great success in many cases. But this also brought with it some unforeseen side effects; some of its pursuits proved to be too idealistic to be accomplished in reality.

During TEAM administration, the pursuit of livability and quality of life helped the significant growth of the price of property. This contributed to the phasing out of the lower income groups either within or adjacent to the developed area. For example, along Granville street, where TEAM council conducted a "beautification of the street" movement, the result of this movement was that several small retailers were forced out because of the dramatically increased leasing price. In the case of False Creek, the City redeveloped this one-time "eyesore" of the city and made it a highly desirable place to live. The City could reinforce the idea of creating a socially mixed neighbourhood on the city owned land but could not help with the gentrification and phasing out of the lower income people in adjacent areas, like Fairview Slopes south of False Creek. Fairview Slopes used to be a residential neighbourhood for workers who worked in industries on the Creek site down below. It was redeveloped by private
developers as a site for luxurious condominiums shortly after the city began to redevelop False Creek site. In these cases, TEAM council's major concern was placed purely upon the livability of one specific site. It failed to use its influence to protect the close-by areas; they did not realize how impotent the City could be when dealing with the private sector. The utopian character of this ideology faced trouble in reality:

where its (the city's) control was more limited and constraints were greater, livable city planning was far less successful, this was particularly the case in the private housing market. The promotion of the culture of consumption, the quality of urban life, had unfortunate side-effects. In an era when amenity is a significant factor not only of personal migration but also of industrial and office location, TEAM's livable city strategy helped to inflate housing demand pressures in centre city while at the same time its development policies and those of the provincial and federal governments contributed to limit housing supply. Property owners and developers capitalized on this bottleneck and land prices sky-rocketed; from 1972 to 1974 during the tenure of the first TEAM majority council, Vancouver house prices doubled. In contesting the city efficient TEAM had not inaugurated the age of urban equity; indeed in the private land market liberal ideology promoted a new if unintended elitism. ... In each instance an action stemming from liberal ideology has disfavoured a vulnerable income group and favoured the more privileged. [3]

TEAM was not favoured by the business groups because of its active intervention in urban development issues, particularly for its slighting of business lobbying. In land use conflicts, TEAM kept standing on the opposite side of the business community. According to a statistic cited by David Ley, between 1973 and 1975 TEAM was against businessmen in land use conflicts in 88 cases out of 98. However, the statistic also showed that TEAM's policies did not favour parties like COPE either. These parties claimed that insufficient attention was paid to housing and welfare problems. TEAM at times turned out to be quite elitist in these issues. From the same statistic, it showed that TEAM was more keen on solving problems for the westside residents --- its electoral source of strength and neglectful of the needs of the eastside
TEAM party itself split in the late 70s. TEAM was a compromise at the time of its foundation. It was a coalition of the reformists like Mike Harcourt and the conservatives like Jack Volrich. The separation between the reformists and the conservatives within the party became overt after the first two terms of office. Their differences were amplified by the economic hardship of the late 70s. The ground for the existence of the coalition was gone. They could not stay in the coalition together any longer. The conservatives left TEAM and joined in other parties which best suited their pursuit. :

the threat of recession made fiscal conservatism, free enterprise, and limits to government control important issues in both city and national elections, so that political platforms endorsed in 1968 had lost their historical momentum a decade later ... Just as a surge of reform sentiment had endorsed TEAM's vision of the livable city in the early 1970s, so a popular conservative movement in 1978 contributed to its downfall. [4]

By the end of the 70s, the first phase of False Creek development was finished. Some design defects were revealed as residents moved into phase I. The design principles were an interpretation of TEAM's ideology, especially in phase I. But not all of these principles were feasible. For example, besides the pursuit for plurality and aesthetic life style, TEAM tried to create an ecologically superior community: one family, one car; encouragement of the use of bus or bicycle or your own feet. The design concept was to integrate False Creek south into the transit system, providing only one parking space for each family, in hopes that this design feature would reduce the use of private cars so as to contribute to the improvement of the environment. Thus in the whole Phase I area, the parking space provided is only 2/3 of normal standard. This feature turned out to be an idea that worked only on paper. As soon as Phase I was completed, complaints came from residents about the inconvenience of this lack of parking space. The circulation system within this development was designed to fit with pedestrians' use only. The streets are too narrow to provide for road-side parking, still
Fig. 4-3: Lack of parking space in Phase I of False Creek south development is an everlasting problem.
residents and visitors park their cars on the road anyway. The parking problem in Phase I was so serious that it made newspaper headlines. The False Creek Cooperative Housing Association board of directors even considered a legal solution. "There is no doubt that (TEAM) City Council's futuristic vision has severe growing pains." [9] 

IV.2. NPA's Approach To The False Creek Redevelopment

After the NPA regained majority in City Council, especially after Jack Volrich campaigned for mayorship as NPA's choice and won in 1978, they quickly resumed the policies of the 1960s --- pro development and limited services to the people. This was shown very clearly in Jack Volrich's second term of office in 1978. (City Council) promoted a curious blend of fiscal conservatism and lavish spending on mega-projects: a provincially sponsored trade and convention centre on the waterfront and a 60,000 seat football-baseball stadium; and in 1980 it gave unflagging support for another major provincial initiative, a 200-acre redevelopment on the north side of False Creek. [8]

The political atmosphere became more conservative when the Social Credit party resumed power at provincial level. At federal level, the liberal leader Pierre Trudeau was replaced by the Progressive Conservative Party leader Joe Clark in 1978. A conservative atmosphere was in the air at national, provincial and municipal level. The provincial and federal governments changed their attitudes towards housing policies. They became less enthusiastic about supporting subsidized housing projects. Instead, they were more keen on giant projects that could mark the physical growth.

The municipal government was becoming apathetic to the idea of providing social housing and the whole notion of social equity. The goal of providing housing for the under privileged
group on the city owned land was not pursued with vigour, the viability of this pursuit was questioned; and the pursuit of creating a socially mixed neighbourhood was never mentioned again. In the later development of Area 10B of False Creek in 1981, Ald. May Brown showed her discontent with subsidized housing issue:

Ald. May Brown was concerned about how much affordable housing would be constructed and how much the city would have to pay for that housing. "for us to put $1 million (the cost of the city's write-down on land lease price) to assisting 43 families seems to be a disappointing effort" she said, "We are really achieving very little in helping people with housing."

False Creek south, the project proposed to be one that would provide an example to the future urban development was now removed from cities priority position. The whole process of the development was slowed down.

IV-3. The Implementation of False Creek Under NPA Administration

When NPA captured the majority of the City Council in 1978, the second phase of False Creek redevelopment was already under way. The NPA council coincided with the decision making process of Phase III and Area 10B of the redevelopment. Jack Volrich, who represented TEAM and gave the go-ahead to the second phase which provided 75% of social housing, now followed a somewhat different school of thought in implementing the third phase of this redevelopment.
IV-3-a. Design And Planning Measures

The beginning of the design and planning of Phase III and Area 10B of the redevelopment was in the "grey area" of City administration. On the one hand, the NPA majority council had to carry on the development policies already approved by the previous TEAM council, on the other hand, they tried to impose their policies on the remaining phases of the redevelopment.

In the first two phases, the False Creek Development Group was in charge of selecting architectural firms to develop design concepts and prepare for Area Development Plans, with the City appointing several developers for the implementation of each phase. However, the City Council of 1977-78 decided to hire a single developer and develop the remaining two sites as single project. This single private developer would be responsible for developing design concepts using architects hired by himself. The concept would then form the basis for the Area Development Plan. The False Creek Development Group would function merely as the reviewing and approving party in the whole process. By doing this, the City lost its control of False Creek development. This coincided with NPA council's approach in the direction of less government intervention and reliance on free enterprise and dependence on market manipulation. All these led to the developer type development in Area 10B and phase III.

IV-3-a-1. Area 10B Implementation

In January 1977, City Council approved the appointment of the Daon Development Corporation and Architects, Rhone & Iredale to develop a design concept for Area 10B at city expense. The design concept was based on the luxurious Mediterranean resort Port Grimaud, located in the French Riviera. The goal of social and tenure mix objectives of previous councils
Fig. 4-4: Area 10B Development Proposal.
Source: Rhone & Iredale Architects, *Concept for the Development of Area 10B*
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Fig. 4-5: Area 10B Development Location Map.
Source: City of Vancouver, False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B
Fig. 4-6: Luxurious Area 10B Development.

Fig. 4-7: Luxurious Area 10B Development.
was not carried on Area 10B, because the city felt that the site which is in between of two bridges was not appropriate for family housing development:

the City, therefore, decided to seek maximum financial return from the lease of the building sites with the major social objective being an accessible and attractive waterfront. This led to an essentially luxury housing concept based on immediate access of most units to personal boat moorage, such as one finds in Port Grimaud. [8]

The Area Development Plan based on this concept was approved in October 1978. However the construction of this phase did not happen until 1982. The first developer Daon Development Corporation withdrew from the project and their idea of providing moorage proved problematic because of engineering difficulties. Another developer Narod Developments took over the job and redesigned the intended moorage area into a decorative fresh water lagoon. The luxurious orientation of this project remained unchanged. Because of this "luxury" orientation, livability and aesthetic way of life was achieved for people who could afford it. The goal of creating social mix became an objective hard to achieve. (see figure 4-4 --- 4-7.)

IV-3-a-2. Phase III Implementation

The site of phase III was right next to the Heather community, to the east of phase I. It was originally the site of Johnston Terminals. This site was not within the city acquired land. It was owned by 221914 British Columbia Ltd. --- a subsidiary of Imperial Ventures Ltd. This was the first development on False Creek south which was not on city owned land.

When TEAM was majority in City Council, they hoped to use its influence to keep the
Fig. 4-8: Phase III Development Location Map.
Source: Vancouver City Planning Department, (1982) False Creek Area Development Plan, Area 6, Phase III, May
Fig. 4-9: High Density Phase III Development.

Fig. 4-10: High Density Phase III Development.
development on this privately owned land along the line of the first two phases. However by the time phase III development started TEAM was long gone. NPA council was not interested in the idea of interfering with private sector development.

Like Area 10B development, City Council did not intervene. It was developed by one private investor. By the time the Phase III was under discussion in 1981, Mike Harcourt won the mayoralship in late 1980 as an individual candidate with a clear inclination to the NDP. COPE made a breakthrough into the municipal government by winning three seats in the city council with TEAM getting two. At the provincial level, the NDP seriously challenged the leading position of Social Credit party. Therefore, in the 1979 election, the general atmosphere was not as dominated by conservatives as the previous one. Still, at municipal level, the decision-making process was very much in the hands of the NPA's, and the recession kept an conservative atmosphere in City Hall.

Although there were five NPA members out of ten, the other five were divided between COPE ( three ) and TEAM ( two ). " TEAM's conservative roots showed through as one or both of the TEAM aldermen frequently sided with the NPA "[9]. Therefore NPA's policy was still the mainstream in city development.

On Sept. 17, 1981, Mike Harcourt's City Council approved the proposal submitted by Imperial Ventures Group regardless of objections from the residents groups. This proposal was to provide 700 units of housing, among them 25% would be social housing, as well as some park space, a marina, recreational facilities, warehouse space and parking. ( see figure 4-8 ... 4-10 )

The neighbourhood delegation was against this proposal for many reasons:

The main complaint was that phase three, located on the Johnston Terminals site between Moberly Road and the Cambie bridge, will have more housing and less open space than the rest of the False Creek development and that a planned widening of Moberly would encourage more traffic and cause parking problems. [10]
The resident of the False Creek neighbourhood saw the possibility of phase III becoming a new high density neighbourhood. They spelled out specifically that they did not want it to become another West End. They found that this proposal for Phase III was a very real departure from the rest of the area.

The City Council aldermen did not see it that way. They argued that the high density had been compensated for by the proposition to build 25% percent social housing. As Ald. Marguerite Ford put it: "it is denser than the rest of False Creek but we are requiring 25-per cent non-market housing so it is justified." So it seemed that the City Council was doing the residents a big favour by allowing 25% percent social housing so that the residents should be quiet about the high density imposed on Phase III. This attitude was nothing like that in the first two phases where TEAM’s Council fought for the interests of the public.

On the other hand, the City Council was also in an awkward situation at this time. They had to carry on the False Creek south redevelopment project, while at the same time, real estate was soaring day by day; City Council could not afford to wait for a better design. As Ald. Harry Rankin said:

It is not a perfect development but it meets the general guidelines we have laid down. To think you can build 25 per cent non-market (social) housing without an increase in density is an illusion ... I am convinced we have to get it going ahead because every week that goes by the cost of housing goes up.

The dominance of NPA policy and the tough economic situation assured the approval of this high density approach on south shore False Creek with dramatically different physical appearance from adjacent two phases.
IV-3-b. Administrative Measures

After the TEAM majority council was ousted in the 1976 election, the rejuvenated NPA resumed its 1960s policies. When TEAM was in power, its way of administration was not favoured by the business community because of its active intervention in the urban development. In the 1977-78 City Council with a NPA majority, the municipality started to withdraw from this active role and left it to the private sector. Administratively, the 77-78 council stripped the power of the False Creek Development Group and gave it to the private developers, with the FCDG just in the position of monitoring the development. This indicated that the new city council believed that urban development should be left in the hands of private developers. It was left to the market to dictate the type of development to be built. Inevitably the whole notion of revenue return was again the first priority of the development. The objective of providing housing for lower income groups and families was no longer the primary concern, even though the development was on land owned by the city. The city withdrew from its active role in urban development. This indicated the return of NPA's ideology.

Although city administration became more and more conservative, some of the policies developed by TEAM were still kept by the NPA City Council. Policies like the two stage procedure for the approval of urban development; public hearings on major projects etc.. These policies proved to be effective ways of monitoring urban development. The requirement that in every housing development 20 to 25 percent should be developed as social housing was retained, although it sometimes became a goal that could not be achieved. Because the resources from senior government dried up; and private sector was not willing to mark down land price or use any other way to subsidize social housing.

Because of the changed role of City Council in urban development, it became less enthusiastic to False Creek development. The apathy to this development could be seen
through the speed of the development and the amount of publicity it received, in comparison to previous phases.

On the other hand, Jack Volrich’s council and the later Mike Harcourt’s council was more keen on development close to downtown core --- where the Trade and Convention Centre and B.C Place Stadium were to be built. These projects, marking the physical growth of the city, were well suited to the prevailing ideology.

IV-3-c. Public Participation Issues

With the recession of the late 70s and the conservative atmosphere, the public was far less active compared with the late 60s and early 70s. This can be perceived in the number of articles appearing in local newspapers and the number of public hearings on Area 10B and phase III development. It is true that the policies of developing this piece of City owned land had already been decided in the early 70s, thus there was not much left for the public to debate; but it seems that there was much less reporting on this development especially after the NPA regained power. News about the development could seldom be seen in major newspapers like Vancouver Sun or Province in the late 70s. Pertinent news could be found in some community papers like West Ender and Courier. The public was not that vocal even upon the decision of building luxurious condominiums in Area 10B and the phase III development.

City Council was also becoming more neglectful in their regard for public participation. In 1977, city council wanted to accept a proposal by Frank Stanzle, the appointed private developer for the market housing section of phase I. This proposal, known as Ceasar's Bridge, proposed to close off two parts of seawall in order to provide approximately 3,500 square feet of commercial space and 5,500 square feet of residential space. The motivation of city council and
the contractor were the same: "The city and the contractor want to proceed with the
development to earn some financial return on the property." [13]

This proposed development would not only block the seawall at two places which curbed the
access to the water front, it would also block the view of fifty families residing in
condominiums built by the University Non-Profit Building Society. Although this proposal was
much opposed by the residents, city went ahead approving this proposal all the same:

In spite of objections by the local residents and a protest petition signed in a
short time by more than 1200 members of the Vancouver public, a motion was
passed by the standing committee on planning and development on April 21. It
opens the possibility that privately-owned residences would be erected on the
water's edge and extend over the water of False Creek ... These high-priced and
likely hot-selling town houses would probably be profitable to the developer.
They may provide some revenue for the city through the lease of the land. [14]

The article called for public debate about this issue and claimed that it was highly
controversial and political.

In spite of objections from the public, city council carried on with the approval procedure.
In May 1977, the proposal was sent to the permit board for development permit application.
The public was quite upset with the City Council, as reported in an article in Province:

False Creek residents who have been battling a development there that will
see them cut off from the water front in two locations have all but given up
their year long fight.

City hall is to announce its decision Monday, but "I feel that we lost," said
Dr. Josef Skala on Friday. "It's mainly through inexperience we just didn't
know how to do it."

Skala said city officials have their own idea of how False Creek should be
developed, "and I don't believe they meant the community would build in a
participatory way at all ... this isn't the way to start a new community." [15]

City's development permit board decided on July 12, 1977 to approve this development in
spite of public opposition. Although this development was finally given up, it came dangerously
close to realization. Upon cancellation of this project, the residents were required to pay for the "loss of revenue" on this development to the city. This was a far cry from the early council's approach of providing livability to the general public.

Art Phillips' TEAM majority council also had rejected a proposition by public groups about creating major park land on the city owned land. That rejection was made out of the concern of solving the urgent social need --- to provide housing to all segments of the society; the rejection of this petition was more out of the concern for getting a financial return from the development. The overwhelmingly supported policy and tradition of this city had been to return the water's edge to general public use, but it seemed that by late 1970s this policy had lost its priority.

IV-3-d. The Role Of Senior Governments

The senior government had changed since the late 60s and early 70s. Liberal leader Pierre Trudeau was out of office in 1978, six months after the downfall of TEAM in Vancouver. The more conservative Progressive Conservative Party was elected into federal government. At provincial level, the NDP was no longer a major force in the provincial government, the conservative Social Credit party took general control after the 1975 election. In the late 70s, with the recession, there was a conservative movement in the whole nation. Vancouver was inevitably affected by this movement. It was represented by NPA's regaining power at City Council. The conservative government generally believed in market manipulation and was against government intervention. To projects like False Creek redevelopment, senior governments at both levels became reluctant to support the subsidized housing program. Thus the whole project was in an uncertain state. This uncertainty of the future of the
redevelopment was in the air from the first term of Jack Volrich's office in 1977 before phase II was started.

(project manager) Doug Sutcliff said construction of the non-market units --- which includes various forms of subsidized housing --- would depend on continuous support from the provincial and federal governments. However, Sutcliff said both senior governments are becoming more lukewarm about certain kinds of housing especially co-operatives. As for private, market housing in the second phase development, Sutcliff said that would depend on whether private developers feel the market is promising next year.\[1\]

The disappearing financial support forced the municipal government to reduce the amount of social housing and put more emphasis on financial return.

At the same time when the senior governments stopped financing social housing in urban residential development, they supported extravagant urban development in Vancouver. The provincial government was directly involved in the proposal for the 60,000 seat stadium on north shore of False Creek in late 1979 and promised to build a fanciful trade and convention centre on the Vancouver waterfront as an election promise. The province also decided unilaterally to hold a major transportation exhibition, the Expo 86, on the BC Place lands, to celebrate the city's centennial in 1986. These initiatives from the provincial government basically agreed with the NPA majority council in Vancouver and their pro growth ideology. All these initiatives were later implemented to a certain extent. The social mix approach on south shore False Creek was never mentioned in the later phases and subsidized housing was kept to a modest scale.

The municipal government was also not committed to this project as was the previous TEAM council. In the implementation of the later two phases in False Creek South the city simply gave away its leading role and left it to the private sector to develop. Here once again, financial return was placed on the forefront of the development.


Chapter 5. Conclusion

The redevelopment of False Creek coincided with the change of social and political ideologies of the late 60s and early 70s. This change determined the direction of this inner urban redevelopment along the line of a more liberal and people oriented approach in its early stages.

Different policies and pursuits derive from different ideologies. These policies had their influences on different phases of this redevelopment. The whole process of this inner urban residential redevelopment experienced the change of two types of government, in which the role of this redevelopment and the role of the government in the development process altered significantly. The planning and architectural response to social and political pursuit was also very different. Thus the project becomes the architectural interpretation of past social and political changes of Vancouver.

In the course of this inner city redevelopment, the main theme had been the coming of and departure from people oriented ideology. The emergence of TEAM as a political force advocating liberal and people oriented ideology contributed to the implementation of the first two phases of the redevelopment. However, TEAM's merit is beyond the implementation of the first two phases. They encouraged active public participation in civic politics; they were innovative in urban development process; they made policies which contributed to socially conscious urban development. TEAM as a political force is off the political stage, but the legacy of their liberal ideology remains.
V-1. Planning and Design Aspects

V-1-a. Phase I and II

TEAM majority council implemented phase I and II of False Creek development in the early 70s. Nationally, liberal ideology made its way to the government at different levels. The social and political climate was in favour of concerns for the general public instead of the privileged few; public participation in civic politics was encouraged, public input mechanism was facilitated in municipal government. The spirit of that time was the pursuit of livability, quality of life, and social equity. There was a rejection of pure financial gain and physical growth. These approaches, in architectural terms, meant: lower density, more public open spaces; a medium to low rise approach in consideration of the living environment; a ban on the obstruction to the water front; and the pursuit of social and tenant mix within the redevelopment.

The city acquired this piece of land in 1968. To TEAM council the role of this redevelopment was very important. As it was stated in the False Creek Review Panel Report of 1973:

False Creek must be seen to be the key stone --- the centre of the inner city and its appropriate development as crucial to the realization of Vancouver as one of the world's leading cities. ...False Creek must become an exciting human place offering a variety of interests and experiences to all residents of the city \[^{[1]}\]

Along with the rationale that the development of this inner city site was crucial to the image of Vancouver, the TEAM Council wanted to take advantage of the ownership of this site and build a microcosm of its liberal ideology. In this sense, it was part of a social experiment. This development was implemented along with the concerns for liberal ideas which feature
concerns for the environment; concerns for the general public; and concerns for social equity.

Before the design work was done, the tone of this redevelopment was set. Encouraged by the ever increasing recognition of liberal ideology in the society, TEAM tried to "humanize the city" and to provide a neighbourhood of variety to the city of Vancouver.

TEAM council took the developer's role and set up all the conditions necessary for the smooth implementation of this development. Innovative ways in administration, use of senior governments' support, and expert generated and public evaluated designs were used. These measures were not only significant to this specific development, they also made some precedence for urban development and government administration which are still in use now.

It was in this development that the TEAM council innovatively used the first Design Guidelines composed by architects and professors of UBC in implementing the whole project. These design guidelines controlled in detail the physical appearance of the development which sought to be in harmony with the pursuit of livability and social equity. At the same time the guidelines were open ended which allowed space for specific designs.

Regarding the target residents on this waterfront inner city site, the TEAM council intended to make it accessible to all segments of the society --- the rich, families with children, young professionals, the handicapped, the poor etc. To avoid creating a homogeneous 'slum', it was regulated that a certain percentage of people from each segment of the society be accommodated on this site. Chart I shows projected resident composition target in 1972. Chart II shows the achieved resident composition in 1979.
Table III. RESIDENTS COMPOSITION TARGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Singles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over all the residents' family income composition within this development should maintain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low-income</th>
<th>medium income</th>
<th>high-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: *False Creek Policy Broadsheets, City of Vancouver, Planning Department.*

Table IV. RESIDENTS DISTRIBUTION OF PHASE I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>upper</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the chart above, low income is defined as below $12,000 a year; middle income between $12,000 and $19,800; upper income $19,800 and over

The result of the implementation of these policies was a residential development with an aesthetic physical environment and a diverse resident composition.

V-1-b. Area 10B And Phase III

Area 10B and Phase III were implemented under the NPA majority council. The municipal administration was more conservative than the TEAM government. The economic downturn from the mid 70s and the recession of the early 80s brought back the conservative civic government. In False Creek redevelopment, with the fading away of senior governments' support and the rejuvenated conservative movement, the active government intervention of the TEAM council was taken over by the conservative NPA. The NPA believed that "those with knowledge and experience should lead and participate, and that the city should concern itself with providing essential services and leave planning to the private developers."[8]

With this belief, urban development went back to the old way, i.e., less government intervention; more market manipulation. In the False Creek development, the City gave up its leading role. The private sector took over the development.

Thus in the following two phases on False Creek south the developers made use of the site --- being situated close to the waterfront, close to city centre, with great views of downtown Vancouver and northern mountains. They developed it with the first priority of getting maximum financial return. The result was: higher density, less public open space, and little consideration for social and household mix.

On city owned Area 10B, city handed this development over to the private sector. False Creek Development Group, which functioned earlier as the developer of the first two phases, was at this time ousted from the role and functioned as a advisory party. The private developer developed it with luxurious condos and apartments.

Phase III development was done on privately owned land. When TEAM was implementing
the first two phases, council considered to use its influence to supervise the development of phase III to make sure that these developments would be consistent with development on city owned land.

However, the NPA council was not in favour of government intervention in urban development. Development on phase III was left to the private developers. The result is high density luxurious apartments.

V-2. Demographic Characteristics of Different Phases

The change of political and social pursuit changed the nature of False Creek development. The first and second phase of this redevelopment was controlled by the TEAM council. It was considered as an experiment of building a balanced community. This community was in favour of social equity and quality of life. There was the pursuit of creating a socially mixed neighbourhood so that people from different segments in the society would have access to this redevelopment. The mix should, as suggested by the city council, "reflect the mix of the Greater Vancouver Region." This goal was achieved in phase one according to the post occupancy evaluation. (see Table IV of this chapter)

Starting from Area 10B the City Council was re-captured by the conservative NPA. Together with the unpromising economic situation and missing support from the senior government, the direction of this development shifted from a people oriented, socially conscious one to a free enterprise, market manipulated one.

Area 10B was developed as a site of luxurious condominiums with the preset 20% social housing. Phase III was developed differently, because the land was not owned by the City. Thus it was developed as luxurious apartments although city council managed to persuade the
private developer to provide 20% social housing in the development.

What was contemplated by the TEAM Council was that on non-city owned land in False Creek south, the city council would be able to persuade developers to follow what was done on the city owned land. This was not insisted by the later NPA council. The developers were given a free hand.

Table V. PHASE I HOUSING UNIT BREAK-DOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of project</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condominium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private non-profit</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-profit co-op</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit total</td>
<td></td>
<td>852</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: this includes two senior citizen, one handicapped and one family housing.

Source: composed according to John D. Hulchanski St. Lawrence & False Creek: A review of the Planning and Development of Two New Inner City Neighbourhoods, p. 153
### Table VI. PHASE II HOUSING UNIT BREAK-DOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of project</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private market condo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-profit co-op</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private non-profit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit total</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: composed according to John D. Hulchanski St. Lawrence & False Creek: A review of the Planning and Development of Two New Inner City Neighbourhoods, p. 164*

### Table VII. AREA 10B HOUSING UNIT BREAK-DOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of project</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>co-op</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit total</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: composed according to John D. Hulchanski St. Lawrence & False Creek: A review of the Planning and Development of Two New Inner City Neighbourhoods, p. 167*

Data of housing unit break-down for phase III is not available.
V-3. Administrative Changes

The first two phases of False Creek redevelopment was under close supervision by the City Council. It was TEAM that introduced more intervention to urban development. False Creek was the largest urban development in North America. The ideas of how to develop False Creek were part of the campaign issues of TEAM before 1972. Inevitably, False Creek development received a lot of attention. TEAM Council supervised the process of this development and provided a lot of innovative ways in administration to make it possible for the redevelopment to be implemented smoothly and quickly.

TEAM council considered different administrative measures, from forming a development corporation to founding a new legislative body to supervise the development. The second consideration was taken and a new institution was formed. It was known as False Creek Development Group. This group functioned as a distinct department in the city hall but had special powers compared to other departments; for example, the FCDG had a greater discretionary authority over expenditures, and it reported directly to the city council rather than through the City Manager's office. These special measures were granted to the FCDG so that this Group could supervise the development more efficiently.

When NPA came back to power, the active role of the city government was abandoned and the developers were given a free hand in urban development. The False Creek Development Group was ousted from its chief role, it functioned simply as a advisory panel. The whole business of implementing the later two phases was in the hands of the developers. The NPA majority Council was more apathetic to intervening in urban development. They believed in less government intervention and surrendered the whole development to market manipulation.
V-4. Public Participation Issues

One of the major characteristics of post-industrial ideology was growing public participation in civic politics and administration. The more revealing proof of this change was the record of the degree of intervention in public hearings before and after TEAM took office.

In the course of preparing and implementing the first two phases, the whole process was under public supervision. One of TEAM's merits was to encourage active public participation. When TEAM was elected as the majority party in City Council in late 1972, they believed that public participation was important to municipal administration. One of the important ways of facilitating public participation was through public hearings which provided the public with easy accessibility to council meetings. Public hearings were not invented by TEAM, but during the previous NPA administration public hearings were a matter of formality. Council meetings were held without the concern for convenient public attendance. The public was not informed properly about the issues of the public hearings before-hand, the timing and the places of the hearings were scheduled very inconveniently for the general public to attend.

Immediately after TEAM took office, some council meetings were rescheduled to start in the evenings. With a few exceptions, public hearings were also held in the evenings. According to a statistic, the twenty hearings in 1975 consisted of fifteen evening hearings, four afternoon hearings, and one morning hearing. The place of the hearings was moved to schools closest to the affected area to get more input from the affected people.

The following chart is a record of public intervention in the form of the number of interveners on public hearings between 1964 and 1976:
Table VIII. INTERVENERS AT PUBLIC HEARINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interest Group</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Companies and Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The chart above shows that the amount of public intervention increased in the category of interest group and individuals after TEAM took office in 1972. The number of interventions in the category of "individuals" increased, while in the categories of letters and petitions decreased. This indicates that the pattern of public participation changed from a pattern of passively sending letters to active attendance of the hearing.

The coming of the sense of public participation was also indicated by the role of individuals and interest groups. Normally the voice of the interest groups is more serious in nature compared to individuals; however public hearings were best attended by individuals. This should explain that individuals had a larger number and percentage in addressing the public hearings than the interest groups. At the time of controversy, 1967 - 1969 and 1972 - 1973, interest groups stood out and revealed an phenomenal increase of intervention as shown in
Table VIII and IX. 1967 - 69 was the time when people reacted strongly to the then NPA government's pro-growth approaches like the free way and project 200; 1972 - 73 was the time when the TEAM candidates and the NPAs were running for the city council and mayorship. The frequent participation of interest groups was consistent with the social and political changes.

Table IX. PERCENTAGES OF INTERVENERS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>Interest Groups %</th>
<th>Individuals %</th>
<th>Others %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While public hearings in City Council meeting existed before TEAM took office, what is significant is the different attitude towards public participation. The promotion of public participation in civic administration was an important component of the liberal ideology. TEAM endorsed public participation before it won the majority on the city council. After the 1972 election, TEAM tried and successfully installed various public input mechanisms into the
municipal administration.

The NPA administration was more biased to the conservative approach of municipal administration. The point of departure for this conservative ideology was very elitist. It argued that only those with knowledge and experience should lead and participate, leaving no room for participation from the general public. Therefore, developers and businessmen became administrators. Not only did they run the city as if they were running their businesses, they also believed that growth and boosterism was the primary goal of the city as it was the primary goal of their businesses. In urban development, they let the market determine what type of development was needed, again a strategy consistent with running their businesses. The result was inevitably money oriented development. To them, the less government intervention the better.

When NPA regained majority in city council, it trimmed the municipal policies of urban development to fit with the developer's demands. Public opinions and input was placed in a less important position.

Although TEAM was out of the municipal government, their ideology was not totally discarded. Some policies like the pursuit of environmental control and the social housing approach are still in practice; the process of development permit application as a means of urban development control continues; the pursuit of livable city is still an issue in municipal administration.

In the realization of False Creek South, "TEAM's leadership was critical, but it was part of a broader social movement, a tide of changing social values which shaped the design principles in 1970, and brought TEAM to power in 1972 to implement them. False Creek is a product of 'positive public reaction ... political dynamism and professional innovation.' It is a landscape testimony to a social movement advocating pluralism and the virtues of self-actualization in the residential environment, while pursuing the canons of good taste."


Urban development is very political. The urban landscape sometimes serves as a record or map of political and social history. Of course there are dozens of other factors that may influence urban development. For example influences of financial, economical, geographical, and demographical factors also have an impact on a city. In this research only political and social issues are taken into account.

In this research, it is revealed that the political and social issues could play an important role in altering the physical appearance of urban development. Housing development in the city has never been the same since the TEAM was out of the municipal administration because the social and political atmosphere has changed. However, what was achieved by the False Creek development has left behind some very thought provoking points.

Socially, the False Creek development emphasized the idea of social equity. This is an inevitable result of the ideological preferences of the TEAM administration. Social mix aimed at putting together people from all segments of the society instead of segregating people according to their financial or social status was introduced in this development. It was regulated that in False Creek, at least 20% of the housing must be subsidized and provided to lower-income families in order to achieve the goal of social mix. This policy was later applied to every major housing development in Vancouver. The idea was enhanced in the form of a by-law. Another endeavour was to encourage public participation in the decision making process of planning and municipal administration. After TEAM administration, social mix was never mentioned again in housing development and public participation was also not as highly preferred as it had been during the TEAM administration. The role of the public in the process
of municipal administration regressed back from "act" to "react". The government after TEAM seldom gave any direction to housing development except for requiring 20% "social housing"; everything else was left to the market place and the developers. The requirement of 20% social housing was often very hard to achieve. Not long after TEAM was out of power, in the mid-80s, there were City Council members expressing their dissatisfaction with the amount of money spent on social housing and questioned if it was necessary for the government to subsidize housing for the lower-income families. In the later north shore housing development on the Expo lands in False Creek basin, the private enterprise --- Marathon was reluctant to sell part of its land at a low price for subsidized housing development at the beginning. When Marathon agreed to use one portion of the land for subsidized housing, the senior government was not going to sponsor it; the City did not have the money to sponsor it. The "20% social housing" became a goal that could not be achieved.

This goal of providing social housing was pursued with different intentions. For the TEAM government, to provide social housing in urban development was pursued as an important way to achieve social equity and social justice; for the successive governments it was just something that was designed by the former government reflecting a past ideological belief. Because it was designed to benefit the underprivileged group in the society --- families with children, the poor and the handicapped, it would have been politically unwise to discard it even though the government may not have been in favour of it. In pursuing this same goal, successive governments were not addressing the same issues as when it was first proposed, so the result is not as successful and the whole requirement becomes a matter of formality.

In design, the TEAM administration first introduced the Design Guidelines to the False Creek development to establish planning and architectural controls. By applying these Guidelines the city had more effective control over the overall development direction.

False Creek housing development under TEAM administration succeeded in providing an appealing living environment with low-rise, medium density, and large public open spaces.
One of the very important reasons why all these could be achieved was that the City owned the land so the City Government was able to decide what kind of development to be implemented. The TEAM administration did not put government revenue as the foremost criteria in developing this piece of land; its first concern was placed on people. It was for the people who would live in it and for the equal accessibility to this beautiful setting to everyone in the society. The earlier government and the successive ones left housing development to private sector and the market. The private sector based housing development on economic gain. This gave us the kind of city with high-rise apartment buildings and higher density. Lower-income groups were/are expelled from attractive settings; a new demographic distribution based on economic establishment was formed and is forming. This is just what the TEAM administration fought so hard to get rid of.

What, then, is the significance of False Creek development during the TEAM administration in Vancouver? The essence of this administration was the priority of people over property. It reflected on the False Creek project the concern beyond revenue and profit expected from this precious piece of land. Instead, the emphasis was placed on accommodating people from every segment of the society, so that the waterfront site could be appreciated by people from every segment of the society. The process used to create this also created a successful social and architectural environment.
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APPENDIX
Application and intent
A By-law to regulate development in a portion of that part of the City of Vancouver for which the zoning district is described as "False Creek Comprehensive Development District (FCCDD)", which portion is shown below outlined by a heavy black line:
The False Creek Comprehensive Development District is of sufficient magnitude, and the developments within it will be staged over a sufficiently extended period of time, that detailed regulations and plans cannot be drawn too precisely. Modifications to the specific policies and regulations set out in this By-law may be adopted by City Council from time to time. City Council shall receive advice from the Development Permit Board and the Vancouver City Planning Commission before adopting modifications to this By-law in whole or in part.

This Official Development Plan By-law provides the framework for the preparation of development plans in two stages as follows:

1. "Area Development Plans" will be prepared for all or parts of the area zoned FCCDD based upon the policies and regulations set out in this By-law. These area development plans will be submitted to the Director of Planning in the form of appropriate drawings and other information. The Director of Planning shall forward acceptable plans, together with recommendations from the Development Permit Board and the Vancouver City Planning Commission to City Council for consideration at a Public Hearing.

2. "Development Permit Applications" will be made, in accordance with normal procedures as set out in the Zoning and Development By-law No. 3575, to the Department of Permits and Licenses. Consideration of any development permit application will be based upon both the policies and regulations of the Official Development Plan By-law, and upon such additional information as is included in the approved Area Development Plan for the area within which the application is made.

The intent in the adoption of this Official Development Plan By-law is to encourage high standards of design and development throughout the False Creek Basin. A significant degree of discretionary authority is given to those parties charged with the interpretation of many of the specific policies and regulations contained therein.

Interpretation

A distinction is made in this By-law between three forms of policies and regulations which require different interpretations as follows:

1. mandatory requirements for area development plans and/or development permit applications and for which no discretionary interpretation is possible;
2. requirements that may be interpreted for development areas within the False Creek Basin;
3. guidelines which provide qualitative guidance as to the required form of development through design interpretation, but which do not require literal interpretation for each individual situation.

Differences of opinion as to the interpretation of any of the policies and/or regulations contained herein shall be referred to City Council for decision.

The Development Permit Board, in the exercise of its jurisdiction, may relax the provisions of this Plan in any case where literal enforcement would result in unnecessary hardship. In granting any relaxation, the Board shall have regard to the intent and policies of this Plan, and such other applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council.

The Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board, as the case may be, may relax any of the provisions of this Plan where literal enforcement would result in unnecessary hardship in carrying out any restoration or renovation of buildings or sites on the Vancouver Heritage Inventory adopted by Council and in effect at the time of application for relaxation under this section. Any development permit issued shall specify the heritage aspects of the building or site that merit the relaxation authorized by this section. Before granting any relaxation, the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board shall:

(a) consider any advice from the Heritage Advisory Committee or any other body established by Council for this purpose defining the aspects of the building or site that give it heritage merit and advising on the proposed conservation work;

(b) notify such adjacent property owners and tenants as deemed necessary, consider the responses received, and if there is significant objection, refer the matter to Council for advice; and

(c) consider the provisions of this Plan and all applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council.

Definitions

The following definitions are related directly to the words and language associated with the Official Development Plan for False Creek. They must be supplemented by other definitions which already exist in the Zoning and Development By-law and other By-laws which are relevant to the purpose and intent of the False Creek development process.

Active Residential A residential household type that contributes to the general noise level and therefore does not require a quiet background environment.
Area Development Plan

Drawn plans and related information in sufficient detail to provide a clear understanding of the ultimate development form, density, building heights and public open space relationships within an area defined by some recognized boundaries.

Community

A social group of people perceiving itself as different and distinct from the larger society within which it exists.

Compatible Industry

Industrial uses which do not contribute noise, air or other forms of pollution detrimental to a residential environment, and which may contribute to the liveability of their environment.

Density -- Residential

Net the figure obtained when the sum of the total number of habitable dwelling units on a site is divided by the area of that site. Only that portion of the site intended exclusively for the use and enjoyment of the residents on the site may be included.

Gross -- the figure obtained when the sum of the total number of habitable dwelling units within a development area or neighbourhood as described in an approved area development plan is divided by the area of that development area or neighbourhood.

Enclave

A group of dwelling units entirely or mostly surrounded by land held in the public domain or intended for use by persons other than those living within the dwelling unit group.

Earth Balcony

An area, normally associated with an individual dwelling unit in a high-rise tower, which is set aside for the growing of decorative or useful plants.

Family with Children

A household which has one or more preschool, elementary or secondary school children residing with one or more adults.

Household Types

The categories used to group residents by their common interests, demands or lifestyles upon or within a community.

Live-aboard

Vessels, boats or ships which are designed primarily for the purpose of sailing in open waters, whether by means of sail, motor or other means and which are incidentally used as habitable accommodations.

Local Commercial

Retail and other commercial establishments intended primarily to cater to the needs of the residents or working population within the immediate community, neighbourhood or enclave.

Multi-purpose Outdoor Room

Outdoor space wholly or partially defined by roofs, walls, earth-berms or planting which provides opportunities for relaxation or activities.

Neighbourhood

A group of enclaves or dwelling units which form a visibly or socially separate entity from other similar or differing groups.

Node

A community focus, either natural or established as a result of emphasis of a particular design feature.

Noise Environment -- d.B.A.

A sound level measurement calibrated in decibels, weighted to duplicate the response of the human ear to the loudness of sound.

-- N.P.L.

A composite noise environment statistic reflecting the irritation on people due to noise and calculated over a twenty-four hour period.

-- S.T.C.

Applies to the airborne insulation provided by walls or floor-ceiling assemblies measured in dBA.

-- I.T.C.

Applies to the performance of floor/ceiling assemblies in controlling impact noise measured in dBA.

-- S.P.L.

Governs the noise produced by mechanical and plumbing systems in the building measured in dBA.

Pedestrian Route

A defined road or path primarily intended for use by people on foot.
1.0 SITE PLANNING

1.1 Mandatory Requirements

(a) NOISE OUTDOOR ENVIRONMENT

Consideration shall be given to noise in the environment. Evidence shall be presented as follows:

(i) the existing noise environment including noise pollution level (N.P.L.) readings;

(ii) the projected noise environment anticipated with proposed development; and,

(iii) an evaluation of the effect of the anticipated noise levels on the residents and other persons likely to be using the proposed development.

Statistical information will be provided as part of any development permit application, prepared by persons trained in current techniques of noise measurement, and mutually acceptable to the City and the applicant. The information provided will be assessed against the planning and design criteria set out in sections 1.2(a) and 2.2(g) of this By-law.

1.2 Interpretive Requirements

(a) NOISE OUTDOOR ENVIRONMENT

In recognition of the differences of tolerance to noise for different activities, the following are to be used as planning criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Target N.P.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIT RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE PARK</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE PARK</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL AREAS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In areas of transition from one use to another, a compromise in the criteria may be necessary.
1.3 Design Guidelines

(a) NEIGHBOURHOOD ENCLAVES

Arrange urban land to form many small enclaves of residential use, separated from one another by swaths of non-residential land (parks, schools, major pedestrian streets, commercial) which form the enclave boundaries. Make the enclaves really small, perhaps no more than 500 feet across.

(b) NEIGHBOURHOOD

To promote common awareness in residential areas, shape all neighbourhood enclaves so that they are basically round. Ensure that length is never more than twice the width.

(c) COMMUNITY FORUM

Establish within each community a local forum -- a place where people can come together.

(d) ADAPTABLE COMMUNITIES

Ensure that newly developed communities can adjust and change from within, as future needs are manifested. If unbuilt spaces or areas of relatively low density are maintained in the first development stages, subsequent change will be facilitated.

(e) COMMUNITIES FLOW OVER TRAFFIC ARTERIES

Reroute major traffic arteries around communities. Where this is not possible, bridge the area over the road and reduce the exposed roadway to a minimum.

City of Vancouver Official Development Plans 10 1983

City of Vancouver Official Development Plans 11 1983
(f) PEDESTRIAN ACTIVITY FOCUS
Create one major central place in each community where people can come together and orient themselves to the activities around. Make major pathways converge at this node and ensure that the highest and most public concentration of activities occurs here.

(g) INTERCOMMUNITY PUBLIC TRANSIT
Existing rail rights-of-way should be considered for an appropriate transit system.

(h) BUILDING THOROUGHFARE
Place a natural pedestrian thoroughfare through public places in buildings where it is hoped that people will linger. Make the thoroughfare a short cut with respect to paths around the facility -- line it with opportunities for involvement, places to sit, displays, etc.

(i) REFERENCE POINTS
Shape development so that within a few moments of every point, one has a vista of a large natural amenity or some other urban reference point.
(j) SOCIAL MIX IN COMMUNITIES
Ensure diversity at the community level by providing for various combinations of household types in adjacent neighbourhood enclaves.

(k) LEVEL STREETS ARE INVITING
Any pedestrian street that is to support browsing or gathering in small squares and parks should be basically level. The degree to which browsing is encouraged is directly proportional to its slope — with 100 percent browsing on level streets and none on streets with slopes in excess of 30 degrees.

(l) STREETS TO STAY IN
Make pedestrian streets subtly convex in plan, with seats and galleries around the edges and by narrowing of the path at both ends.

(m) HALF LEVELS
Where communication, movement and visual continuity is important, avoid full flights of steps. Create half level changes (less than 5-6 feet) and make sure that each level houses activities, and is not merely a landing.

(n) PEDESTRIANS 18" ABOVE CARS
In areas where pedestrians are the predominant activity, provide a clear separation between pedestrians and vehicles, such as sinking roads and parking areas or raising paths so that the paths are at least 18 inches above the roads.

(o) PRIVACY IN THE HOME
Where units at grade face pedestrian activity, place a wide raised terrace between the living areas and the public activity so that from the outside you cannot see directly into the unit.
2.0 RESIDENTIAL USE

2.1 Mandatory Requirements

(a) MAXIMUM DENSITY 150
   The maximum permitted density is 150 units per net acre.

(b) SUB-AREA DENSITY
   The net density of each of the residential neighbourhoods of the approved design shall have the density specified in the criteria for the specific area development plans.

(c) POPULATION MIX
   Population mix should not unduly emphasize one class or age group.

(d) HEIGHT AND BULK
   Heights and bulk of buildings to be arranged to permit views for project residents and visitors to the park areas, including views of the downtown profile and north shore mountains or other prominent city locations.

(e) BUILDING HEIGHT/WIDTH RATIO
   Allow lower buildings to be relatively continuous and restrict tall buildings to more pointal forms in order to reduce or prevent any overshadowing on pedestrian, park and other outdoor spaces, and to ensure that views and view-corridors are retained.

(f) NOISE INDOOR ENVIRONMENT
   Consideration shall be given to the noise environment within all residential developments. Evidence shall be presented as follows:

   (i) the projected noise environment anticipated within any proposed residential development; and
(c) MIXED DEVELOPMENT

Family accommodations may be permitted as part of mixed developments.

(d) HOUSEHOLD MIX

The following household types should be provided as a basin-wide objective:

- Families with children: 25 percent
- Couples (young and mature): 25 percent
- Elderly: 15 percent
- Singles: 35 percent

(e) AGE AND INCOME MIX

The population age and income mix as reflected in the Greater Vancouver region be adopted as a basin-wide objective.

2.2 Interpretive Requirements

(a) FAMILY DENSITY

A density of 20 - 40 dwelling units per net acre should be used as a basin-wide guideline for accommodations intended for families with children.

(b) MIXTURE OF USES

Mixture of compatible uses related to adequate open space is permitted. Residential buildings may incorporate other uses, such as commercial community facilities and day care centres.

(c) MIXED DEVELOPMENT

Family accommodations may be permitted as part of mixed developments.

(d) HOUSEHOLD MIX

The following household types should be provided as a basin-wide objective:

- Families with children: 25 percent
- Couples (young and mature): 25 percent
- Elderly: 15 percent
- Singles: 35 percent

(e) AGE AND INCOME MIX

The population age and income mix as reflected in the Greater Vancouver region be adopted as a basin-wide objective.

2.3 Design Guidelines

(a) BUILDING TYPES

Building types may include townhouses, garden apartments and multi-storey buildings.

(b) DWELLING TYPES

Dwelling units may include studio, one, two, three and more bedroom units, and may also include experimental type housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Transmission Class (STC-dBA)</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Isolation Class (ITC-dBA)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Pressure Level (SPL-dBA)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where, due to a land-use transition, the outdoor environment noise characteristics [see section 1.2(a)] have been compromised, the following are to be used as design criteria for a residential building facade in order to ensure acceptable indoor noise levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Pollution Level</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(c) BRIDGE SHADOWS
Build communities next to bridges and their approach ramps only if their development is of sufficient scale to overcome the dominance of the bridge.

(d) RESIDENTIAL CLUSTERS
Residential development should be grouped to afford a minimum area occupied by streets and provide ample open space between building complexes.

(e) LARGE BUILDINGS OVERSHADOW SMALL
Avoid placing a tall building so close to a small building that it overshadows living areas of small buildings.

(f) TAMING TALL BUILDINGS
In open spaces and streets to be used by the pedestrian, ensure that buildings fronting it above two storeys have the lower floors strongly articulated with canopies, signs or other means of visual interest. Treat upper floors so that they actually, or seem to, set back and recede. With large structures, make sure that they are surrounded by smaller structures or canopies.

(g) ROOF TOPS ARE FOR LIVING
Flat roofs should be accessible to people and "roof-scaped".

(h) THREE KINDS OF VIEW
Every dwelling unit should have access to three kinds of view: an intimate view containing nature just outside the unit—neighbourhood glimpse into the life of the surrounding community—and a vista that encompasses distant natural elements that remain "constant" such as the sea or mountains.
(i) **SUNNY MAIN ROOMS**

Ensure that the most frequently used habitable rooms in every dwelling unit are capable of receiving sunlight.

(j) **SIX FOOT BALCONY**

Make habitable indoor/outdoor space such as a balcony, gallery, porch, deck or arcade, at least six foot square.

(k) **DISTANCE RELATED TO BALCONY**

Where the facade of a high-rise building faces another (or where another is likely), make sure that the faces of the main rooms in the unit have deep balconies.

(m) **IDENTIFIABLE FRONT ENTRANCES**

Ensure that the front entrance of every unit is, or is capable of becoming, distinctly different from its neighbours.

Consider providing dwelling units above grade level with their own "earth balcony", and design them so that bushes, small trees, shrubs, flowers and grass can be grown.
Give each doorway and entrance an appropriate entrance transition by introducing alcoves, seats, level change, direction change, materials change, etc.

Break down longer corridors into smaller, less than 50 foot stretches by jogging them, opening them to courts, widening them into lobbies.

Wholesale and distribution facilities which need to be adjacent to downtown should be east of Cambie Street, and principally east of Main Street.

Existing industries may continue operations, provided they are compatible with overall Creek development.

New industries of a character compatible with overall Creek development, which are related to marine facilities or serve downtown may be permitted.

Commercial development in family residential areas should be of local character.

General commercial development may be permitted provided it is compatible with the residential environment.

Commercial development, including marinas, may be integrated with compatible uses.

The full range of marine commercial activities should be permitted west of the Granville Bridge.

Commercial developments shall generally be at or close to the main circulation and/or pedestrian levels. In areas of predominantly residential use, commercial developments, including offices, shall not be so oriented as to overlook or overshadow dwelling units or private open spaces.
4.3 Design Guidelines

(a) SHOP ON CORNERS
Put local neighbourhood convenience stores at points of maximum pedestrian density, on corner -- i.e. the local corner store.

(b) SHOP FRONT DIVERSITY
On any shopping street fronted by small stores, do not allow large scale commercial facilities to take over frontages larger than one and one-half times their neighbours.

(c) LOCAL SHOP EVERY 1,500 FEET
One local convenience store should be located within 1,500 feet of every residential unit wherever possible.

5.0 CIRCULATION & PARKING

5.1 Mandatory Requirements

(a) ADEQUATE LOCAL
An adequate local street system shall be provided to serve expected traffic requirements within the area.

(b) DISCONTINUOUS COLLECTORS
Collector roadways must be adequate to facilitate access for emergency vehicles, garbage collection and other service vehicles to individual properties. Collector roadways must not, however, disrupt the community, nor be so designed as to encourage automobile usage for trips made entirely within the False Creek basin.

(c) SLOW/FAST GRADIENT
Progressively limit the intrusion (save for emergency, etc.) of vehicles so that a vehicle-free zone is created around the water amenity.

(d) WALKWAYS AND BICYCLE PATHS
An extensive network of pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths shall be provided.

(e) PEDESTRIAN AREAS
The prime areas of the False Creek basin, including the entire waterfront, should be reserved for traffic-free pedestrian use.

(f) SUNLIGHT ON WATERFRONT WALK
Ensure that tall buildings will not cast long shadows on the waterfront walkway and that at least two-thirds of the waterfront walkway can receive direct mid-winter sunshine. At frequent intervals along the walk, create sunny pockets of varying size where people may linger in the sunshine and overlook the water.
(g) **NO NEW BRIDGES**

Bridges crossing over False Creek have an overwhelming effect on a wide range of community values, e.g. views, noise, community structure, etc. Bridges crossing on new alignments will not be acceptable. Existing crossings must be treated to ensure the best liveability standards in the new developments.

5.2 Interpretive Requirements

(a) **PARKING**

The provision of parking facilities may not be required with new developments.

5.3 Design Guidelines

(a) **T JUNCTIONS**

Wherever possible, make intersections not served by traffic lights T junctions, with the angle as near 90 degrees as possible.

(b) **COVERED PARKING**

Parking should be covered and out of sight in pedestrian and other high amenity zones, and to the greatest extent possible.

(c) **PERIPHERAL PARKING**

Parking should be located in peripheral areas in close proximity to existing arterial streets.

(d) **WALKWAY CONNECTIONS**

Walkways should be provided connecting activity centres and special use areas.

(e) **LINEAR PARKING LOTS**

Make large parking lots long and thin. Where the number of cars is very great, form the lot into a necklace of smaller parking lots and make pedestrian access points coincide with the spaces between the lots.

(f) **PARKING INTEGRATED WITH STREETS**

Integrate parking area with streets (either above or below them) so that distinct pedestrian realms are created at grade from which all vehicles are excluded save for emergency access.

(g) **CONTINUOUS PATHS**

Pedestrian circulation should be continuous throughout False Creek and separated from vehicular traffic wherever possible.

(h) **PEDESTRIAN PATHS ARE EXPANDING LOOPS**

Shape and locate pedestrian streets and paths so that they form a series of expanding loops such that no path is a dead-end.
(1) PEDESTRIAN WEB
CONNETS URBAN
NUCLEI
Link places of natural amenity and/or
community interest by means of a net-
work of pedestrian streets or paths.

(2) INVITING NIGHT
LIGHTING
Locate street lighting along pedestrian
pathways at safe intervals with
concentration adjacent to areas of
higher pedestrian activities. Make
sure that light standards are in scale
with the pedestrian (no higher than 15
feet) and emit a light quality that
enhances, and does not distort, colours.

(3) LOOPED LOCAL ROADS
Place all local roads in the road
network in such a way that they form
loops, with short cul-de-sacs serving
the residences.

6.0 OPEN SPACE

6.1 Mandatory Requirements

(a) ADEQUATE OPEN SPACE
Open space shall be sufficient in area,
size, and continuity to provide
openness between building complexes,
and to serve the area population.

(b) OPEN SPACE
EXCLUSIONS
School grounds, marinas and water areas
may not be included as forming part of
required open space.

(c) TWO ACRES PER
THOUSAND MINIMUM
Public open space shall be dedicated, or
otherwise provided to the satisfaction
of City Council, in each development
area in an amount of at least 2.0 acres
per 1,000 of anticipated population.

(d) OPEN SPACE
CONTINUITY
Notwithstanding the requirement
of section 6.1(c), public open spaces
shall be provided in association with
all residential buildings in an amount
appropriate to the nature and scale of
each development so as to provide
continuity of open spaces.

6.2 Interpretive Requirements

(a) OPEN SPACE GUIDE
FOR DEVELOPMENT
AREAS
The following sub-area open space
allocations are a guide for the
preparation of area development plans:

Area 6 -- 35 acres
Area 9 -- 15 acres
Area 10 -- 5 acres

6.3 Design Guidelines

(a) PRIVATE OPEN SPACE
Reference may be made to the open
spaces that would result from the
application of yard and light-angle
requirements that would be required in
corresponding appropriate sections of
the Zoning and Development By-law for
similar developments.
Concern should be demonstrated with regard to the private open space and its relationship to privacy of and sunlight penetration into the residential units.

(b) COMMERCIAL OPEN SPACE
Privately-owned and/or managed open spaces may be provided in association with commercial developments and may include public markets, plazas, sidewalk cafes and/or arcades.

(c) COMMUNITY PARKS INTERWOVEN
Locate community facilities next to parks and open areas so that the park and the community facilities for community participation can be seen together.

(d) PERCENTAGE OF PRIVATE AND COMMON LAND
Ensure that open space associated with residential neighbourhoods provides for a balance between open space for the use of each individual dwelling unit, and the open space to be shared by the community at large--i.e. a balance between private and common open spaces. The proportion of private spaces shall be larger in those areas where family accommodations are provided.

(e) OPEN SPACE EDGE SCALLOPED
Surround major open areas with smaller semi-autonomous areas to encourage smaller scale activities to co-exist with the activity in the major area. Define these minor areas by tree-planting, outbuildings, small mounds, etc.

(f) POCKET PLAYFIELDS
Relieve vast areas of playfields and open space with land form changes, landscaping details, and smaller multi-use open spaces.

(g) OPEN SPACES DEFINED
Make every playfield self-contained by allowing enough space to plant about 50 percent of its perimeter bordering on neighbourhood streets with trees or shrubs.
(h) **WALLED GARDENS**
In the great majority of cases surround small parks with either walls, densely planted trees or buildings that do not generate a lot of activity.

(i) **CONNECTED PLAY SPACES**
Link up spaces where small children will be playing so that children from at least thirty homes can reach each other easily and without crossing a street.

(j) **OUTDOOR SEATS**
Place outdoor seating where the sun shines, protected from winter winds and overlooking areas of activity, and/or with a pleasant view.

(k) **PLAY YARD DIVIDERS**
Define play areas for children of different ages by shaping the ground and utilizing low walls and natural dividers. Avoid fences -- especially chain link fences.

(l) **HIERARCHY OF OPEN SPACES**
Place smaller more intimate spaces around buildings and let them lead out into the larger spaces.

(m) **ACTIVITY POCKETS**
Surround any public space where people come to linger and collect with an alternating pattern of small activity pockets, entrances and access paths.

(n) **CENTRAL PLACE FOCUS**
In every square that is to have an atmosphere of public involvement, locate a focal element such as a small garden, playground for children, a kiosk, seats, a few trees, that will invite people in to participate.
(a) STAIR SEATS
In any public place where people gather, surround this place with raised areas which are immediately accessible from below (like stairs with seats, balustrades, a stepped terrace—a railed balcony will not do).

(p) NATURE IN EVERY SQUARE
Place natural growth in every square or plaza in order to soften the impact of the hard brick, concrete or blacktop surfaces. Arrange planting to accommodate social gatherings.

7.0 WATER'S EDGE, AREA AND USES

7.1 Mandatory Requirements

(a) PUBLIC ACCESS
The waterfront edge shall be continuously accessible to the public around False Creek, except as approved by City Council for specific area development plans.

(b) STABILIZED
An attractive shoreline treatment which is structurally stable shall be developed along the entire False Creek waterfront in association with the adjacent redevelopment.

(c) WATER AREA MAINTAINED
Water area at least equal to that existing in January 1972, in each sub-area should be maintained. If some filling is required, an equal area should be excavated.

(d) SMALL MARINAS
Marina activities should be limited in number, size and capacity in order to not overcrowd the Creek.

7.2 Interpretive Requirements

(a) MOORAGE
Facilities related to boat moorage should be permitted between Connaught and Granville Bridges.

(b) COVERED MOORAGE
Covered moorage (boathouses) will not be permitted in False Creek except under major bridges or within a distance of 50 feet from major bridges.

(c) LIVE-ABOARD PERMITTED
Persons wishing to live aboard their motor or sailing vessels in False Creek may be permitted to do so provided that such vessels comply with all City, Provincial and Federal regulations and/or standards.

7.3 Design Guidelines

(a) IRREGULAR ALIGNMENT
The water's edge should be given an irregular alignment to permit widenings of the water basin for creation of bays, views and usable waterfront.

(b) VARIETY ON WATERFRONT WALK
Create a variety of experiences along the waterfront walk by varying the treatment of the water's edge, by changing the walk's direction, width and elevation, by pulling the walk back from the water occasionally and by changing vistas along it. Encourage a variety of facilities and activities to develop along the walk that are sympathetic to the water's edge.

(c) 1,700 BOATS
The number of boats in the False Creek Basin be limited to a maximum of 1,700 until the Kitsilano Trestle is removed.
8.0 RELATED CITY POLICIES

The following policies have been established by the City Council. They
are not directly related to the process of development but do indicate
the City's intent. They are included here to provide guidance to persons
involved in the redevelopment of False Creek. Some of the objectives
specified are not presently attainable by the City without direct
assistance from other levels of government.

8.1 Public Transit

Provide for future mass transit facilities, and to provide linking
with adjacent areas.

All possible efforts should be undertaken to ensure the maximum
diversion from the private automobile to transit.

A high quality transit service must be provided (as an attractive
alternative to the private automobile) and transit service should be
introduced with the first developments.

First, sufficiently high quality transit will be provided so that it
will not be necessary to have an automobile in False Creek; and
second, the amount and location of parking will be controlled.

Possibilities include a dial-a-bus system, subscription bus services
(similar to a large car pool), as well as taxis and rental cars.

8.2 Water

With regard to water quality improvement, the hydraulic consultants
have recommended the removal of the Kitsilano Trestle causeway as
being an important component in the overall programme.

Public waterfront access should be retained around the entire Creek
and around Granville Island so as to connect the English Bay beach
area with Vanier Park.

Log booming and storage west of Connaught Bridge should be
discontinued immediately; log booming and storage east of Connaught
Bridge should be discontinued as soon as practical.

East of Connaught Bridge the water area is to be reserved, in the
long term, as a non-power boat environment.
Design Guidelines

Introduction

These Guidelines have been developed from the False Creek Area 6 Proposal by Thompson, Berwick, Pratt & Partners, submitted to the City in the Spring of 1974. They represent an elaboration of the spirit of that Proposal. They are, hopefully, more of a generative nature than of a restrictive one.

We have attempted to be as comprehensive as possible in formulating the ideas that follow; however, they are not complete without reference to the Proposal itself, and all those who wish to work with these Guidelines should acquaint themselves with the Proposal.

We issue these Guidelines with the understanding that they form a foundation for design, and that building upon this foundation requires dialogue. We welcome an exchange of ideas. We believe that a wealth of solutions can be found within the spirit of the original Proposal, and it is this spirit that we will look for in developing schemes.

Yours very truly,

THOMPSON, BERWICK, PRATT & PARTNERS

False Creek Planning Office
303/805 W. Broadway
phone: 873-3836
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4: Enclave Design

The guidelines in this section reflect much work that has gone before. Further reference can be made to the following:

1. Official Development Plan for False Creek; City of Vancouver; Schedule 'A' attached to the False Creek Comprehensive Development District; effective July 1974.

2. False Creek Area 6 Proposal, Thompson, Berwick, Pratt & Partners.

3. False Creek Proposals, September 1971, Report 3; False Creek Study Group.

4. The work of Britannia Design, Vancouver, and the Center for Environmental Structures, Berkeley, California, in development the Pattern Language. Many of the concepts herein are drawn directly from their work.

Enclave design is organized in five parts:

.a. STREET FRONT

.b. CIRCULATION

.c. ENCLAVE OPEN SPACE

.d. PRIVATE OPEN SPACE

.e. BUILT FORM

In each part, a general statement of intent is followed by applicable patterns and specific design requirements.

Footnote references against 'Pattern' concepts refer to the above sources.
4.a Street Front

"Any design must depict a compatibility between built form and adjacent open space - such that one is not detrimental to the other".  

The Street that has diversity has life; the street that has shape, a sense of spatial containment, becomes a space on its own. We wish to use buildings to shape and contain the street. (Refer to streets and services plans).

Street Wall

To contain the street in certain areas (see Street Plan), main elements of the facade, including such things as fences, screens, etc., must be on the building line. This creates a wall-like effect.

Streets to Stay In

Make pedestrian streets subtly convex in plan, with seats and galleries around the edges and by narrowing of the path at both ends. (See Street Plan)

Note that seats and galleries need not be built by private groups.

The Building Envelopes define a convex street shape; while one need not necessarily fill the building envelope entirely, the general street shape must be respected.
4.a Street Front

U-Shaped Streets: Give streets a gentle, "U-shaped" cross-section to emphasize a gradual change in scale, particularly in pedestrian areas. This can be done by stepping facades, canopies, planting, etc. This requirement does not apply to areas of "Street Wall".

Expansion Increments As needs change, expansion of non-residential uses can be accommodated horizontally. Each increment of expansion must retain the dominant module of width prescribed by the residential units above.

Shop Front Diversity On any shopping street fronted by small stores, do not allow large scale commercial facilities to take over frontages larger than two times their neighbours. (an exception occurs in Enclave 2a).
4.a Street Front

**Transparency and Change**\(^4\) (derived from Pattern "40% of Perimeter Suitable for Glazing").

Make residential facades so that they can be transformed. Infill materials must be such that future changes can be accomplished by the resident - or, at least, such that future changes do not require major structural alteration.

**Outdoor Seating** Where outdoor seating is provided, place it where the sun shines, protected from winter winds and overlooking areas of activity, and/or with a pleasant view.

**Inviting Night Lighting** Locate lighting along pedestrian pathways at safe intervals with concentration adjacent to areas of higher pedestrian activities. Make sure that light standards are in scale with the pedestrian, (no higher than 15 ft.) and emit a light quality that enhances, and does not distort, colours. Fixtures must be placed to avoid shining into living and sleeping areas of the houses. Street lighting will be allowed to be fixed directly to buildings in some areas, particularly areas of "Street Wall" (See Street Plan).
4.b Circulation

The circulation network shapes community image: it provides clues to orient the traveller and to indicate the nature of the space being experienced. It is also a socializing space, and must accommodate neighbour meeting neighbour.

Two Paths to House

WHEREVER POSSIBLE, EVERY HOUSE THAT IS ON GRADE SHOULD HAVE A "FRONT DOOR" AND A "BACK DOOR" - THUS THERE MUST BE A "PUBLIC" PATH AND A "PRIVATE" OR "FAMILY" ROUTE TO EACH HOME.

Parking Entrance Position

The parking entrance must be clearly visible and identifiable to approaching cars: clear for direction, identifiable for ownership (who parks there). Wherever possible, provide a glimpse into the enclave interior at the entrance to the parking garage. This glimpse should have the same orientation as the pedestrian exit from the garage. Garbage collection should be integrated with the parking garage entrance.
4.b Circulation

Half Levels\textsuperscript{1} Where communication, movement and visual continuity is important, avoid full flights of steps. Create half-level changes in lifts of 3-1/2 to 4 feet and make sure that each level houses activities, and is not merely a landing.

This guideline applies particularly to streets and main pedestrian routes for the public.

Wheelchair Access

Wherever the public is expected to go, access must be accorded wheelchairs. The necessary ramps, handrails, lowered curbs, etc. are to be provided in keeping with the National Building Code.

Suitable identifying signs, etc. are to be placed to direct wheelchair people to any special facilities. In public toilets, special stalls must be provided and in parking areas parking stalls (reserved) to accommodate wheelchair motorists. Again refer to NBC.
4.c Enclave Open Space

The open space within an enclave is shaped by the people who live there; it must clearly be these people's territory, or they will be unable to use it.

The minimum open space is defined by the Building Envelope and the open space requirement: 40% of enclave site area in Spruce Neighbourhood (Enclaves 6, 7 and 8) and 35% of enclave site area in Heather Neighbourhood (Enclaves 1 to 5). This figure includes the total of enclave open space and private open space within 15' of grade.

Hierarchy of Open Spaces

Place smaller, more intimate spaces around buildings and let them lead out into the larger spaces.

Houses Look on Open Space

All houses or units within the enclave must have a visual link to the open space; also, whenever possible, a direct physical link from house to open space must be provided.

Some houses may want to look only on a small corner of open space.
4.c Enclave Open Space

"Enclave Gateway: all points of entry to an enclave should clearly differentiate between public and neighbourhood territory". It is necessary to give a sense of territoriality to the enclave open space; to make it belong to the residents. This is not necessarily a "gate", but a series of clues such as paving changes, archways, steps, trellises, etc., that indicate a change of territory.

Continuous Open Space

As described by the Building Envelope, the open space in an enclave is continuous, not divided by buildings. In other words, all the enclave's residents share one open space... it may have major and minor parts to it.

In some designated areas (see Building Envelope Plan) up to 10% of the Open Space requirements of the enclave may be placed on the street or exterior of the enclave if there is an adjacent complementary function. But there must be a direct connection to the enclave interior.
4.c Encave Open Space

Connected Play Spaces  Link up spaces where small children will be playing so that children from at least thirty homes can reach each other easily and without crossing an automobile street.

Usable Open Space  (derived from "Usable Courtyards")
Design open space to be easily accessible, not totally enclosed, but with a view to street or park beyond. Provide "private" places within the open space, that are not overlooked, using planting or screening.

Play Yard Dividers  Define play areas for children of different ages by shaping the ground and utilizing low walls and natural dividers. Avoid fences - especially chain link fences.
4.d Private Open Space

Private open space is the chief determinant of active home life. Without it, the family cannot properly function. It is a place to be in touch with the world and with oneself. It should be, in part at least, totally private.

South-Facing Open Space

WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE CLIMATE OF VANCOUVER. FOR EVERY HOME, THERE MUST BE A PLACE TO CATCH THE SUN IN SPRING - OR EVEN IN WINTER - (FOR WHEN IT DOES APPEAR, IT IS A MARVELLOUS EXPERIENCE). THERE SHOULD BE SOME SHELTER FROM RAIN ASSOCIATED WITH THE SUN-TRAP.

Intimate Outdoor Space

All Residential Units that are on grade must have a private outdoor space that has at least one corner that cannot be overlooked or seen from the street.
4.d Private Open Space

Plants on Balcony or Terrace (derived from "Earth Balcony"1)

Balconies and terraces must be designed to allow a substantial amount of dirt and planting (or large tubs for trees). This means they must be structurally adequate.

Six Foot Balcony1

Make habitable indoor/outdoor space such as a balcony, veranda, gallery, porch, deck or arcade, at least six feet deep to accommodate furniture (exclusive of planting area).

For families, there must be at least one private outdoor space with a minimum area of 100 square feet.
4.e Built Form

Several basic principles underlie these concepts: first, we believe that 'neighbourhoods' are created where housing is stable and people have some power over their environment. This power must be reflected in the dwelling unit—its identifiability, flexibility and the manner in which it relates to the totality of "enclave". The house/unit must be capable of individualisation.

The three most powerful shaping patterns are: "Building Envelope", "Two Sides to the Home", and "Identifiable Unit". These principles add up to an overall objective: the enclave is, in effect, an aggregate of individual statements or "designs" which clearly expresses the importance of the house and allows any of the "parts" of the enclave to change without destroying the overall framework. It is our intention that, by design, we create as closely as is possible the freedom of the individual house on its own lot, within the context of urban multiple housing.

Building Envelope

The building envelope is indicated on the plan. It defines the volume within which the building must occur. It was generated by considerations of height and view and by the overall shape of the enclave, drawn from the 'False Creek Area 6 Proposal' by Thompson, Berwick, Pratt & Partners.2

Projections beyond the building envelope: chimneys, porches, stairs, ramps, balconies, roof hatches, canopies, (continued)
4. e Built Form

awnings, parapets, cornices, railings, signs, trellises, seating, display stands, etc. will be allowed. However, no projections can be allowed beyond the property line.

It is the intention that the building envelope is larger than the required volume (measured by number of floors and total allowable floor area) by up to 50%.

Two Sides to the Home

To allow a family to have a public and a private life, their home must have two sides. This applies to couples and single people, too. The two "sides" need not be opposite each other, nor even on the same level.

Identifiable Unit

Provide some means by which each home/unit can be distinguished from its neighbours. This could be accomplished through design of the original or through encouraging the resident to "personatise" his/her home. If standardized "units" are used, they must be capable of individual idiosyncracies. Not more than four similar units should occur in a row without some change in height, set-back, fenestration, or other idiosyncratic elements.

An important part of image is the entrance to the house. Ensure that the front entrance of every unit is, or is capable of becoming, distinctly different from its neighbours.
4.e Built Form

Materials

While we do not wish to restrict the choice of exterior materials and colours, we feel strongly that a profusion of them may create visual chaos and destroy the unity of an enclave. Harmony and respect for compatibility are important, particularly in the tightly-knit urban landscape that is False Creek. Few, rather than many, materials are required. "Ersatz" materials, those materials that imitate other materials, will be strongly discouraged.

Co-ordination with designers of adjacent developments will be necessary to achieve a harmony.

Families on Grade

Children need contact with the ground to play and to interact with other children; main living/working places in the home should overlook play areas and have easy access to them.

No family unit shall be more than three storeys high (excluding basement or cellar) and its entrance must be at or near grade.

Entrance Transition

Give each doorway and entrance an appropriate entrance transition by introducing alcoves, seats, level change, direction change, materials, change, etc. Ensure that functions such as mail deliveries, milk, garbage, etc. can be accommodated here.
4.e Built Form

Privacy in the Home
Where units at grade face pedestrian activity, ensure that from the outside you cannot see directly into the unit. Use screens, garden walls, planting, level change, etc. to accomplish this privacy.

Stepped Building Profile
(Derived from "Large Buildings Overshadow Small")

Avoid rapid changes of scale by stepping buildings gradually. This ensures that a taller structure does not dominate its neighbours.

Three Kinds of View
Every dwelling unit should have access to three kinds of view: an intimate view containing nature just outside the unit - a neighbourhood glimpse into the life of the surrounding community - and a vista that encompasses distant natural elements that remain "constant" such as the sea or mountains.

These views need not be from the same room, not even from within the home - they could be from the private outdoor space.
4.e Built Form

Sunny Main Rooms
Ensure that the most frequently used habitable rooms in every dwelling unit are capable of receiving sunlight.

Similarly, main living spaces should have natural light on two sides wherever possible. (By skylights, clerestories, through-plan spaces, etc.)

Short Corridors
Break down longer corridors into smaller, less than 50 foot stretches by jogging them, opening them to courts, widening them into lobbies, etc.

Roofs
Because False Creek Area 6 will be overlooked from many parts of the City, roofs become a very important part of its image. Also, because views from within the area are desirable and fun, roofs must be designed to allow openings and view corridors.

A general consistency of roof form and material will visually unite an area and give it a strong identity. Taking our cues from many of the older neighbourhoods of Vancouver that enjoy variety within a unity of roof form, we wish to give False Creek a familiar and yet exciting roofscape. Not more than four units can be under one continuous roof.

Where mechanical equipment is placed on a roof, it must be suitably screened from view. Vents, chimneys, etc., should be grouped to minimize visual disruption.
4.e Built Form

Flat Roofs:

Flat roofs must be accessible to people and "roofscaped" with decks, plants, furniture, etc. so that they become both useful outdoor spaces and pleasant places to look upon.

Pitched Roofs:

Pitched roofs should be pitched so that usable space can be created under them. Thus, by pitching roofs, greater height will be allowed and extra space may be gained. Pitches shall be in this range:

In any one enclave or part of an enclave under one sponsor, roofs shall have a consistent ridge direction - i.e. either perpendicular to or parallel to the long dimension of the buildings.

Where an extra half level is not being created under a roof, the pitch may be lowered to 5 in 12.

In any case, in any one enclave, pitches should not vary more than twenty percent.
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Additional Half Level

Additional floor space created under the pitched roof will be extra to the allowable maximum floor space. The intention is to allow an extra half level.

The extra space thus gained will be limited to one half of the amount of plan area of the ground level, thus:

Height Limitations

Height limitations are imposed principally to avoid one row of buildings blocking the view or sun of another row. Reference to the Building Envelope plan will indicate maximum heights in various areas, denoted by storeys above grade.

"Grade" is defined as the elevation at the property line on an adjacent street or public services right-of-way.

Heights are measured to:
- the top of a flat roof;
- the deck of a mansard or other roof combination of pitch and flat roof;
- the mid-point between eave and ridge of a pitched roof
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The heights for various numbers of storeys are these:

In any enclave (or part of an enclave under one sponsor) an area of roof may extend above the maximum height.

The excess area shall not be more than 5% of the maximum allowable floor area, and shall not exceed maximum height by more than 10%.
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In addition, cupolas, turrets, spires, screen walls, entrance hatches, trellises, trees, canopies, and such things as may normally be found on a roof deck may extend above maximum height limitations.

In all cases, the design of roofs must recognize views, and light access for all limits and a maximum effort must be made to create view corridors.

Roof Materials

Consistency in material is required for all the roofs in any one enclave, and the compatibility of materials with those of neighbouring enclaves must be assured.
4.f. Drawing Requirements

The drawings submitted for approval by the sponsors' architects should indicate that they have fulfilled the various requirements of the guidelines and the development by-law.

During the Design Phase, three reviews are suggested. For the second review, when design concept is established, the following information will be required:

1. **Building envelope**: Shown in plan and section in relationship to proposed design, including required height limitation.

2. **Floor Areas**: Show allowable built area, proposed built area, area of "bonus space" (extra half level) created under pitched roof.

3. **Roofs**: Roof pitches to be indicated (5:12, 8:12, 12:12, etc.) Area of flat roof to be indicated (square foot).

4. **Open Space**: Required open space (35% of enclave area in Heather Neighbourhood, 40% in Spruce Neighbourhood) to be indicated, and proposed open space to be calculated.

In areas where more than one sponsor share an enclave, the required open space shall be obtained by multiplying the enclave open space by this ratio:

\[
\frac{\text{ENVELOPE AREA OF SPONSOR}}{\text{TOTAL ENVELOPE AREA OF ENCLAVE}}
\]

The above information must be included on the drawings submitted for development permit.

Sponsors and their architects should refer to the "Design Guidelines -- Development Procedures" document which is a part of the design package.

It is essential that the proposals undergo these reviews at the stages indicated, so that the co-ordinating architect may assist the sponsors and their architects in fulfilling the spirit of the Design Guidelines and the Design Concept.
Street Names

We have proposed names for the streets in False Creek Area 6 in keeping with the history of the Creek and keeping in mind the proposed activities that will happen there.

In general, names of streets in the Spruce (western) neighbourhood have derived from the recently departed industry in that area — heavy machinery works; thus:

IRONWORK PASSAGE, a narrow path along the waterfront.

V.I.E.W. QUAY, a play on words reflecting the former Vancouver Iron and Engineering Works and the future view lookout quality and possible ferry stop.

FOUNDRY, COGHEEL, AND THE CASTINGS, also derived from the former ironworks.

SITKA SQUARE is at the foot of Spruce Street, a connection to the existing street pattern.

SCHOOLYARD, a natural extension of the elementary school into a "play street".

Two names derived from early history:

FOUL PLAY ROAD — False Creek's south shore was a "very terrible neighbourhood" in the 1880's (in the words of a city official). Then-coroner McGuigan declared "so many bodies have been found during the past year, foul play is the only explanation".

CEASAR'S BRIDGE — when the first bridge across False Creek was opened, it ran along the current Main Street. But: "Julius Caesar, a harmless eccentric with a vegetable patch on the south shore of the Creek, had little faith in the bridge; he continued to roll large boulders into the Creek in his spare time, so travellers could cross dry-shod at low tide". We feel such enterprise should not go unremembered.

The Heather or eastern neighbourhood has names derived from the first industry that graced False Creek's southern shore, lumbering. Many mills were established here, and some colourful history ensued:

MILLYARD, MILL STREET are self-explanatory.

SAWCUT describes this very narrow passage.

MILLBANK runs along the shore.

SANYER'S LANE is a pedestrian street.

LAMEY'S MILL ROAD — the road to the marina.

MOBERLEY ROAD: Walter Moberley was an explorer and surveyor. He was "paid" for some of his work in land by then-colonial Governor Douglas. Douglas' generosity allowed Moberley to file claim to the south shore of False Creek.

Other names reflect today's functions:

FRONT ROW and BACK ROW are just that in relation to the bay and marina.

---

1 Quoted by Alan Morley in "Vancouver: From Milltown to Metropolis"
2 Morley, op. cit.
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MARKET HILL is a sloping, mainly commercial, short street.

HEATHER SQUARE at the foot of Heather Street, is a link to the existing road system.

And the major square:

LEG-IN-BOOT SQUARE: Again, Morley tells the tale of the 1880's:

"In the gloomy nights, law enforcement was perilously near a breakdown. Life itself was unsafe. During July, a knee-high boot with a leg and foot in it was found near Lamey's sawmill on the south shore of False Creek . . . . the boot with its gruesome contents was hung from a pole on the police-headquarters tent for two weeks, but nobody identified it" . . . of such incidents was Vancouver's history made.