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ABSTRACT

Urban planning faces a tremendous challenge: changing its role from land use planning to one of responding to "the current and urgent problems of the city". Under such circumstances the entire approach to planning has come under question. Waterston summarizes the current problem in his "three-horned planning dilemma". He asserts there are three approaches to planning, all of which must fail: comprehensive planning which assumes long-range societal goals can be identified, systems planning which attempts to provide structured solutions to unstructured problems, and partial planning which merely fights "brush-fires". This discourse engages in a search for a way around the "three-horned planning dilemma".

A dual methodology was used in this study. First inductive research was selected which allowed a search for a new model of planning unconstrained and not misdirected by past planning theory—a confusing literature. With this freedom, the inductive method naturally directed the research from a broad empirical base to generalizations of a new theory. The second part of the methodology was the use of the case study technique.

This search for a new model focused on a seemingly innovative urban planning agency. A case examination of planning in the Greater Vancouver Regional District between 1969 and 1973 provided the data base for the research. The four middle chapters contain the detailed descriptions of planning in the GVRD.

The case material provided basic conceptualizations for a distinct model of urban planning as practiced in the GVRD. GVRD planning proved to be
absolutely different from current planning practice, and four major characteristics of their planning were identified: 1. Auto-Action which stimulates a wide range of planning actions, 2. Qualitative Analysis combining technique and diverse judgments, 3. Political Dialogue or working out program design, analysis, and solutions with politicians, and 4. General Interaction which involves the public, local and senior governments, and consultants.

The inductive process moved the interpretation beyond case material and the GVRD model to a new model of urban planning. Processes and theory of GVRD planning led to a new bundle of planning theory literature primarily the works of Ruth Mack, John Friedmann, and Edgar Dunn. A "Learning Model" of urban planning evolved which had four characteristics: 1. goal development as an essential part of the planning process and goal determination through widespread dialogue, 2. the inherent limitations of Social Knowledge which can be overcome by transactive planning and mutual learning, 3. Bottom-up Planning as the extensive use of local task forces, and 4. Social Change, in the form of new social structures, as offering promise for solutions rather than dealing with symptoms.

The Learning Model evolved from one particular case which limits its range as a generic theory. It has, however, provided a link between practice and theory and has complemented a new wave of planning theory.
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PREFACE

This study searches for a new approach to urban planning through the experiences of a major Canadian urban planning agency. The general objective is to identify a new model of urban planning.

Part One introduces the subject matter with a problem statement in Chapter One and a review of current practice, including some historical background, in Chapter Two. There are four chapters to Part Two which together form a case study of a striving urban planning agency over the past four years. Part Three offers an interpretation of the data from the case study which is contained in Chapter Seven. Finally, a new model of urban planning is presented in Chapter Eight along with conclusions from the research.
PART ONE

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH DESIGN

A tremendous challenge faces urban planning today. Nearly all North American cities have full time planning agencies, but their activities are largely based on traditional concepts of urban design and land-use planning. The planners' clients, politicians and the public, are demanding a new role for planning to which it is not responding. Herbert Gans says planners must develop a method of planning that will provide the cities with rational but politically relevant advice on how to solve problems of the city. To put it another way, what the cities are asking is that the city planner become a planner who deals with the current and urgent problems of the city, and cease being an urbanist, a professional concerned with the physical city and an advocate of an ideal (or comprehensively planned) city.

Critics of urban planning are becoming numerous. Jane Jacobs started the critical movement with her attack of the practice as applied to urban renewal. She was followed by others who proved conclusively that urban renewal was a failure. Subsequently, Robert Goodman found that the decentralized and participatory Model Cities approach came to the same end. He calls for "demystifying the profession" which really means transferring its useful skills to the people for a saner use of technology. Such arguments typically classify the planner as part of the problem and call for political solutions. Another example of criticism is Jon Gower Davies' study of a planning exercise in Newcastle upon Tyne. A decaying neighborhood was to be revitalized through planning instead of bulldozing, but through a comedy of
errors, and a blind belief by planners that their ways were right, the scheme ended in a disaster: the homes of 4000 people were expropriated for demolition and the residents condemned to anxiety and misery. Davies says

If planners and their colleagues in related fields are to be able to make a legitimate claim of being liberators rather than oppressors, then they must transfer the zeal with which they pursue the latest in technical gimmickry to an analysis of the society in which they function and in which they market their wares. The sloppy thinking that characterizes so many planning documents reveals just how committed to the status quo our planners have become. Brave words about affluence and modern image become so much hot air when confronted by the reality of a socio-economic system which must be changed before planning can become either possible or desirable.\(^6\)

Last, in our sampling of planning criticisms, we turn to a prominent planner. Marshall Kaplan has titled his recent book Urban Planning in the 1960's: A Design for Irrelevancy, indeed a very serious charge. From many years experience he observes

that one need not look for evidence, even if anecdotal, to show that the impact of the planning profession on the quality of urban life has been marginal at best and, at times, negative.... It is not easy to pinpoint the reasons for the impotence of the planning profession. I, for one, am convinced, however, that a good part of the blame rests on the unwillingness of planners—and indeed of clients and constituents—to challenge ideas in common currency concerning professional goals, patterns of behavior, and techniques.\(^7\)

The above comments suggest two approaches to overcome the irrelevancy of current urban planning: seek a political solution in place of planning, or develop new methodologies for government planning. While valid claims may be made for each, this thesis searches for new methodologies for institutionalized public planning.\(^8\) This does not exclude politicized planning as part of government planning.

The Problem

From the above discussion, the implied problem of urban planning is its failure to match its work to the conditions of the environment. But it is incomplete to see the problem as formalism, where institutional goals have taken over original goals, or simply as a problem of bureaucracy. We must expand our problem definition.
Following the relationship between planning and its environment a little further, we arrive at the paradox of planning. As Friedmann states it where the need to plan is greatest, because changes have accelerated beyond the levels of past experience, planning tends to be least effective; where the amount of perceptible change is small, so that planning can be carried out on the basis of nearly perfect knowledge, it is not needed. Trist also identifies this paradox when he says the greater the degree of change, the greater the need for planning, otherwise precedents of the past could guide the future; but the greater the degree of uncertainty, the greater the likelihood that plans right today will be wrong tomorrow.

With such a paradox to overcome it is no wonder that urban planning has had slight success. And it is most likely that the planning paradox never can be fully eliminated by any planning methodology. It is also most likely that large scale public planning will continue as a major activity of government in developed countries. Accordingly a planning methodology which minimizes the paradox is essential.

The problem of planning may then be broadly defined as developing a methodology which will make it a much more effective activity. The problem can be further understood by reviewing what is deficient in current methodologies. Albert Waterston, an internationally known planner, presents the following thesis

Three major approaches are discernible in the literature concerned with the theory and practice of planning. The first is the conventional form generally accepted today which seeks to maximize benefits through rational choice of means among available alternatives to achieve specific objectives. Conventional planning is usually embodied, at the national (or regional) level, in a global aggregative, multi-annual plan for an economy or, at the urban level, in a master or general plan for a city or metropolitan district. The second approach seeks to optimize benefits obtainable from available resources. It usually relies on sophisticated econometric techniques. The third approach is a partial, frequently intuitive, approach to planning which attempts to achieve results on a piecemeal basis.

These three approaches will hereafter be referred to as comprehensive, systems and partial planning for easy identification. Waterston's thesis is that none of these offers hope for planning. Briefly he presents a "three
horned planning dilemma"—(1) comprehensive planning is thwarted by inevitable data gaps and generalized goals cannot satisfy a diversified society; (2) systems planning just seeks to provide structured solutions to problems which are essentially unstructured; and (3) partial planning is "squeaky wheel" planning with no assurance of being any better than the other two. He suggests that "a new conceptual framework is required better to meet current needs." 13

Waterston's thesis can be expanded by examining each of these planning approaches separately, including more explicit definitions and a summary of defects. 14

Comprehensive Planning

A comprehensive plan "is the official statement of a municipal legislative body which sets forth its major policies concerning desirable future physical development." 15 Such plans are comprehensive in that they cover the total area of the city or metropolitan area, and are always long range: usually with a 20 to 30 year time horizon. Normally a comprehensive plan has three elements: a pattern of land uses, community facility needs and locations, and transportation networks for the future city. Comprehensive planning gained acceptance around the turn of the century and has been included in nearly all planning enabling legislation for Provinces and States in North America.

The comprehensive planning process can be shown in a simple model as follows:

```
 planning legislation
  v
 community goals
  v
 basic studies -- forecast of requirements and urban patterns

 planner selects "best" pattern

 political authority adoption plan

 plan implement, zoning and capital budget

 revise each 5 years
```
Since legislation assumes that a chief purpose of planning is to prepare a comprehensive plan, planners will usually initiate such plans as a matter of right. Basic studies such as population, economic base, land-use, transportation, recreation and community facilities are conducted with each yielding a prediction of needs for the 20-30 year planning period. These predictions in aggregate can be met by alternative physical patterns which are judged according to the planners interpretation of community goals (usually health, order, efficiency and beauty). A best urban pattern emerges which is then sold to the politicians who adopt the plan as a guide, but not as a legal document. In this context it is often called an impermanent constitution. Subsequent action through zoning and subdivision regulations and public investments implements the plan. Enabling legislation most often requires comprehensive plans to be updated every five years.

Most criticisms of comprehensive planning start out with the fact that it just hasn't worked. There are several more fundamental flaws. Friedmann has suggested six reasons for the failure of comprehensive planning.

1. Diverse values cannot be integrated into a single normative scheme, they can only be resolved through the process of negotiation, bargaining, and political pressure;
2. It cannot readily incorporate changes in the external environment, i.e. there are large uncertainties and prediction is therefore imperfect;
3. Partial knowledge by planners necessitates the filling in of the comprehensive plan by their intuitions which need be no more valid than anyone elsers, i.e. all needed data is never available;
4. "Comprehensive planners assume a capacity for central coordination that rarely exists in fact";
5. Comprehensive planning assumes static institutional arrangements whereas rapid change calls for new institutional arrangements to
handle innovation, and

6. "The logic of comprehensive planning is inconsistent with the imperatives for action" which focus on limited objectives, short range, and opportunitism. In other words, implementation of end-state plans requires a large leap forward which poses major political, economic and administrative hurdles. Waterston also adds the difficulty of formulating an internally consistent plan "because much of what passes for planning is ad hoc and based on hunch." Comprehensive planning also employs extensive use of standards and regulations: the former in determining urban patterns and the latter in implementing the plan. According to Webber, standards and regulations share deficiencies with the plan. He claims the planner has three major social inventions, the comprehensive plan, the technical standard and the regulation.

Three underlying conceptions of the plan-standards-regulations approach need to be re-examined: First is the notion that there is a meaningful community, comprising all residents of a city or conurbation, who hold to a coherent value system that ties them together. Second is the idea that technical requirements and standards can be discovered that conform to and further value systems. Third is the expectation that we can conceive a system-wide city-development policy that is technically valid and that will promote the overall community's interests. I suggest that the first two of these propositions are untenable and that the third is unattainable.

While comprehensive planning continues to be followed in practice, there has been during the 60's and 70's a "noiseless secession" from comprehensive planning in theory. This will be discussed under systems planning.

Systems Planning

A trend to the development of systems methods for urban planning is well underway. A dominant theme of this trend is to call for a replacement of the simplistic notion of a normative end-state of land uses by a view of "man's environment as being composed of several interacting and interdependent
dimensions" or a dynamic system. This has been conceptualized by Foley as a distinction between "unitary" and "adaptive" approaches. The unitary or comprehensive approach views the city as a spatial, physical form and views planning as the creation of a future physical form (goal) plan. On the other hand

the adaptive approach to urban or metropolitan planning views the city or the metropolitan community as a complex interaction of diverse and functionally interdependent parts, with the parts evolving over time as they seek to adapt to the ever-changing contexts around them. This approach focuses on process, particularly the interactions that take place on a daily or short-term cycle—such as commuting, shopping, weekday business dealing, weekend recreational trips and activities, etc.—rather than on longer-term cycles. Metropolitan planning, from this point of view, would seek first to gain a full understanding of how establishments and households interact (via the myriad actors involved), and how the metropolitan area develops over time. It then would seek to identify alternative development policies and to examine the probable implications of each in the light of certain established criteria as to desirable future conditions or optimal decision-making conditions. Planning, according to this approach, would seek to influence various of the development forces at work rather than aiming for a future metropolitan form as a goal.

While the systems approach is best developed in theory, there have also been some operational projects. Thirteen U.S. cities started systematic metropolitan land-use and transportation planning programs in the 60's, the most famous being the Penn-Jersey study. Also several urban simulation models have recently begun of which the Vancouver Regional Inter-institutional Policy Simulator (IIPS) is one.

For a clearer understanding of the systems approach a model based on McLoughlin's work is presented below.
Before tracing through the process in the above model, it is essential to understand the "systems trajectory plan" step. An urban systems trajectory is a sequence of future states at regular time intervals. These are obtained through a recursive model which simulates the evolution of a system in stages with the output of each stage being the input of the next. Advantages of the recursive model over more static predictive models are that one can observe dynamic evolution at each stage, non-linear trends can be inserted at the appropriate stage, and the planner can intervene in the simulation at any time to alter any assumptions as previous results may suggest. Several systems trajectories emerge from such modelling and a best alternative or a systems trajectory plan is selected by comparing the alternative with the given goals.24

The above systems model involves four steps. First an urban development proposal is received. Second, this proposal is added into the existing state model and its impact is simulated. Third, the resulting plan is compared with the best systems trajectory plan or intended state model. If the plan contributes to achieving the intended state, it is supported; if it leads in another direction it is rejected. This last step may be called a control activity which in practice would not be so simple. Frequently the comparison between the real world and the future model may not yield a clear answer on the desirability of the development proposal. However, in making the comparison new relationships can be discovered which increase the predictive powers of the systems approach.25 Lastly, advice is given based on the learning from the control activity and action taken.

Systems planning need not be so complex and may take the form of merely trying to keep urban systems in equilibrium. The objective is to bring the urban system into equilibrium after each disturbance. Holling and Goldberg have suggested a theory of urban planning of this type which is important to us because they are also the designers of the Vancouver Regional Inter-
institutional Policy Simulator (IIPS). They find a similarity between ecological and urban systems and suggest "there must be a set of urban equilibrium conditions...(and) these equilibrium states must exist within a domain of stability that defines the resilience of the urban systems.” To avoid unexpected consequences and keep urban systems from exceeding undesirable thresholds, they identify the following goals for urban systems: diversity and complexity to add resilience, and small or bounded decisions to maintain stability.

Systems planning is currently in vogue, and is referred to as the "new utopia".

"New utopian" city planners and social engineers project self-regulating large scale and complex organic eco-systems and biotectures. They study how to govern continuous complex social and physical environments. They experiment with systems theory and translate the latest results to our present cities, intending to support new directions in city planning: the change from the sequential implementation of unique ideas to a constant steering of tendencies and processes; the change from the practice of pure art and organization to a scientific method of steering urban systems. Their basic idea is to liberate society from material and physical restrictions through the implementation of an open, flexible, continually changing and transparent, balanced, non-exploited environment which is supposed to stimulate society to change and in turn be changed through society.

But through the mysticism of this new utopia many difficulties can be seen.

Major criticisms of systems planning are as follows:

1. Non-quantifiable variables are largely ignored because of the problems of relating them to quantifiable variables. In other words there is a data problem.

2. Qualitative analysis is rejected in favor of quantitative analysis.

3. Despite claims that systems planning can be a learning process, detailed outputs tend to be interpreted as solutions, i.e. computer magic.

4. All problems are seen as scientific problems with rational solutions. For example MIT's Dean of Engineering, Gordon Brown, has said "I doubt if there is such a thing as an urban crisis, but if
there were, MIT would lick it in the same way we handled the Second World War."²⁸

5. There is a tendency to functionalism rather than humanism. Present social structures are accepted as given and the idea of constructing a new social order is renounced.

6. It builds on the existing order, and therefore is low on innovation.

7. Urban systems thinking adapts to the irrationality of capitalism rather than to the needs of people.²⁹

Attention now shifts to partial planning.

Partial Planning

Partial planning is most simply what is done when the other approaches prove too difficult. Waterston says in theory partial planning is always worse than other approaches, but in practice it seems better because it is the easiest to apply. It is easily understood as "seat-of-the-pants" planning or as "squeaky wheel" planning. In planners terms this means problem planning or conducting special research for particular problems as they occur.

Specifically the model for partial urban planning is as follows:

```
tension → alternatives & consequences → recommendation based on the "public interest" → action
```

First, tension in the environment signals a problem. Through analysis alternative solutions and consequences are listed, generally as in Simon's "satisficing man".³⁰ In this process a solution is selected which best meets the planner's interpretation of the public interest and this will usually accord with what is considered to be politically viable. Action then follows directed at relieving the tension.

In theory, partial planning can be associated with Lindblom's
"partisan mutual adjustment" or incrementalism. Lindblom outlines a new theory of decision making which he believes describes reality and provides a normative model for good decisions. It absolutely contradicts the rational comprehensive model of decision making; therefore, partial planning and comprehensive planning are at opposite ends of a continuum. Essentially Lindblom's model minimizes the debate over values because ends can only be discovered in the consideration of means, it calls for a series of small decisions with only slight changes from the status quo which limits analysis over outcomes, and includes alternatives through the pluralistic structure of interests—consensus equals a good or rational decision.

Flaws in partial planning and incrementalism are as follows:

1. Partial planning doesn't yield satisfactory change. "Incremental change is only a form of adaptation which leaves basically intact what ought to be changed."

2. Policy development is not advanced by partial planning. Ad hoc policies may cancel out one another, be circular or lead nowhere. Partial planning is more a theory of agency survival than an advance in policy making.

3. Innovation is kept down by being limited to small or isolated changes. Since organizations already have a tendency to limit their search for alternatives, there is no need to further restrict them.

4. Incremental decision making really occurs within the context of fundamental decisions. "Most incremental decisions specify or anticipate fundamental decisions, and the cumulative value of the incremental decisions is greatly affected by the related fundamental decisions."

5. Small changes to the environment only can be considered optimal when there is high social stability. Under rapid change, the past
becomes a poor criteria for the future.

6. There is no way of evaluating the action. Consensus and pluralism are the ingredients to a good decision, but are the right representatives of pluralism present? Or does incrementalism and partial planning tend to represent the interests of the most powerful?34

It is now appropriate to summarize the planning problem. Comprehensive, systems and partial planning share two major problems. First, none of them adequately handle change. Comprehensive planning cannot easily incorporate unexpected change into its plans, systems planning is based upon continuity in the existing order, and partial planning minimizes change and is inadequate under conditions of rapid change. To be more effective urban planning cannot easily incorporate unexpected change into its plans, systems planning is based upon continuity in the existing order, and partial planning minimizes change and is inadequate under conditions of rapid change. To be more effective urban planning somehow must be able to include the dynamics of change in its processes. This change problem has been noted earlier in the planning paradox. Second, and perhaps the other side of the coin, these approaches are committed to the existing power structure. Comprehensive planning assumes static institutional arrangements, and the nature of the plan is inconsistent with the imperatives for action. Systems planning, according to Kuenzlen, is the tool of the power structure, and partial planning relies on consensus of the most influential. In other words, urban planning has a low action profile.

In addition to these two shared problems, there is a problem of a lack of synthesis among the three approaches. Each approach has its own weakness and strengths, an overview of which is presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Trade-offs among planning approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>major weakness</th>
<th>major strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive</td>
<td>simplistic goals</td>
<td>innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incomplete data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td>non-qualitative,</td>
<td>interrelationships,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computer magic</td>
<td>learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial</td>
<td>status quo</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approaches tend to be mutually exclusive; any one approach may overcome the weaknesses of the other two but brings its own particular shortcomings. This is a zero-sum game where one gain is offset by a new loss. In a highly generalized way, these three approaches could be characterized as utopian, scientific, and pragmatic, respectively, with major trade-offs involved among them. To make planning more effective, one could determine which approach best matches a certain environment or circumstance. Such a strategic use of planning approaches may yield short term benefits, but it clouds over the larger problem of a lack of synthesis. Planning methodology needs to move beyond exclusive alternatives and toward a methodology which can aggregate strengths while minimizing weaknesses.

Research Design

The objective of this research is to identify characteristics of a model of planning which may overcome the "three-horned planning dilemma". In other words, identify a planning activity which avoids the problems of non-adaptation to change, over-commitment to the power structure, and a zero-sum synthesis among comprehensive, systems and partial planning.

There are two major types of research: deductive and inductive. Deduction is "the process of reasoning from general principles to particular instances." It assumes the existence of valid general principles or acceptable theoretical framework and seeks to refine the theory by adding knowledge about a specific area which henceforth was unexplained. In practice, deduct-
ive research is characterized by a review of the literature, identifying an area of deficiency, suggesting an hypothesis consistent with the general theory, and testing the hypothesis through the collection and analysis of data. Bolan offers an excellent example of deductive planning theory in his article on "Community Decision Behaviour". He examines general theory in terms of rationality, roles, environment, strategies and issue characteristics for planning from which he presents a model of community decision behaviour and a series of hypotheses for future testing. Unfortunately many deductive planning theories emerging from academe are never tested.

On the other hand, induction "is the process of reasoning from individual instances to general principles." A generalized theory is not central to this method. It focuses on a particular phenomena requiring explanation. "The experimental method is basically inductive, in that general conclusions are derived from individual observations." In addition to inductive research in the physical sciences, that is describing seemingly peculiar phenomena, considerable social science research also follows the inductive method. A prime example is anthropological research which describes unfamiliar cultures in great detail.

While deductive research is often favoured, because of its appearance of being more rigorous, there are signs that inductive research may be of extreme importance to contemporary society. Numerous scholars see the growth of knowledge as not only cumulative but also revolutionary. Thus there are two modes of social learning,

Normally it is a process of social system refinement under the control of accepted system goals. This normal practice, however, occasionally reveals anomalies or new knowledge that leads to a paradigm shift or social reorganization. When this occurs the concepts of system entity and system goals are, themselves, revised. The developmental hypothesis takes the form of hypothecating that a different form of game from the one currently played might prove superior.

These correspond to the deductive and inductive approaches in which inductive research deals with fundamental societal changes or new schools of thought.
A frequently used example of paradigm shift is the replacement of Aristotelian physics by Newtonian physics and, in turn, its replacement by quantum mechanics. Similar major shifts are occurring within the social sciences. For example, Dunn identifies areas of major shifts in the following areas: philosophy, psychology, cybernetics and general systems theory, decision theory and organizational theory and economics. 41

Revolutionary theories or paradigm shifts occur through a process of concept displacement. 42 This is based on several premises. First, cumulative knowledge occurs within the assumptions of current orthodoxy but is subject to occasional revolutionary changes (as described above). Along with this is the recognition that man's knowledge of reality, at any one time, is small. Second, and most important, innovation or invention is acknowledged as the source of new theories as distinct from the completion of old theories. Lastly, a paradigm shift only occurs when these new ideas are accepted by the community which is similar to the diffusion of technical innovations. The latter means that theory cannot be separated from man himself. Within this framework inductive research is of great importance because it can identify innovation and provide the language for the diffusion of innovation.

This study follows inductive research. By accepting Waterston's thesis of the three-horned planning dilemma", the existing theoretical base of planning has been found wanting. Accordingly, this study searches for a new planning model which overcomes the deficiencies of the three schools of thought in the "three-horned dilemma".

In moving from the particular to the general, a particular example of innovative urban planning had to be identified. Such an agency was known to the author from an examination of planning across Canada, professional evaluations, and general observations. The Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) had the appearances of striving to reach beyond accepted planning practice and was selected as the particular example for study.
Next the case study research method was selected because it complemented the inductive approach. That is, it allowed a broad yet detailed examination of the selected planning activity. Case studies, however, usually imply that the case is typical. This rule is explicitly violated in search of new perspectives toward resolving the "three-horned planning dilemma".

Other reasons for using a case study are as follows:

1. The linkage of practice and theory. "Practice not only provides a springboard for new conceptualizations; it is also the condition for their ultimate test under fire." With such a broad and difficult problem to tackle, it became expedient to take advantage of the natural link of practice and theory and the tacit knowledge within an ongoing activity.

2. To capture the planning process in detail. Empirical studies of planning emphasize political constraints, issues or failings, and have not provided detailed descriptions of how planning is done (see Appendix A). A case study of a planning process promises a more complete understanding of urban planning, albeit one case which may be atypical.

3. Predetermined parameters would be inadequate. Parameters presume the outcome in advance whereas this research searches for an unknown. Accordingly a broad view of the agency was necessary.

Data collection for a case study presents a special problem: all data should be collected but cannot be. As will be outlined in Part Two, this was handled in two ways. First, what the agency spent their "energy" on, in terms of annual priorities and actual man/hours for projects, was used as a criterion for data collection. Second, verification of this data through systematic review by key staff members of the written accounts for each year was made.

Of equal importance, extreme care and hard work accompanied all data collection. The research concurs with P.W. Bridgman that in the end "the scientist
has no other method than doing his damndest". Ultimately it is up to subsequent research to verify or refute the record here presented.

Finally, it should be pointed out that this inductive exercise in search of a new model for urban planning offers no assurance that an acceptable new model will be found. The test of a paradigm shift for urban planning will be in the general acceptance of innovations uncovered in the GVRD. Mere identification of these innovations in no way guarantees their general adoption; five years from now they may all be forgotten and GVRD may be pursuing a different model. On the other hand, identification and amplification of these innovations is a prerequisite to their diffusion and the prime contribution that inductive research can make.
FOOTNOTES


8. In an excellent recent study, Reginald McLemore, "Effecting Change in Low-Income Areas" unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo, 1972, the political and institutional approaches are put in perspective. These are the community control model in which the community controls the change process, and an adaptive organizations model in which control is left in the hands of existing governments but planners are more flexible and open. While he favors the former he does not see them as mutually exclusive and says that maybe the adaptive organizations model is just a transitional stage to community control. This researcher believes that government planning will continue as a major activity along with big government; therefore, it is most likely that both will for some time be important parts of planning.


12. Waterston's conceptualizations apply to national, regional and urban planning whereas this thesis deals with urban planning. Accordingly a change in terminology makes our presentation apply more precisely to urban planning. Particularly note the change in the second approach. Waterston refers to this as involving econometrics, such as cost benefit. While this is the type of sophisticated planning which frequently occurs at the national level, the comparable approach at the urban level is systems planning.


14. Waterston's three approaches are accepted as an overview of planning theory rather than making a new review which would be very difficult due to the "babble" of this literature. Traditionally planning schools have included a planning theory course in their curriculum, but recently they are
disappearing. As one head of a Canadian school said, "we have not been able to figure out what planning theory is so we have no such course." Another reason for its decline is that "planning theory" likely cannot be separated from the theory of substantive planning courses. A review of "Planning Theory in Contemporary Professional Education" was made by Henry Hightower in 1969: Journal of the American Institute of Planners, September. He found that "theory can no longer be separated into its own pigeonhole" but went on anyway to list the contents of "planning theory". From this review we may briefly say planning theory covers administrative and planning procedures from such authors as Simon, Dror, Banfield and Davidoff; decision models such as cost benefit and PPBS; goals and values through authors such as Lindblom, Perloff, Altshuler and including citizen participation strategies; and literature from the large area of urban structure.


17. Waterston, op. cit., p. 20.


24. McLoughlin admits that choosing a plan offers unsolved problems. To help the planner he suggests three techniques to relate goals to plans: the cost-benefit method, the balance sheet method and the goals achievement method. In the end he says the political process may be the best judge. Ibid., Chapter 10.


29. These criticisms are all contained in Kuenzlen's provocative book, op. cit.


37. Theodorsons, op. cit., p. 199.

38. Ibid.


40. Dunn, op. cit., p. 143.

41. Ibid., Chapter 8.


44. This research choice was taken after considerable other explorations. A dimensions approach to understanding urban planning was developed by the researcher but abandoned after it proved too cumbersome and failed to give the whole picture. The researcher also developed a deductive model of an ideal planning process which underwent considerable discussion among practitioners (including a major address to the Town Planning Institute of Canada and a subsequent workshop). The model was quite abstract. Of interest is that the development of a new model in this research from a practical case differs considerably from the former, goes much beyond it in theory, and is also abstract (planning requires some difficult thinking).
CHAPTER TWO

AN OVERVIEW OF CANADIAN URBAN PLANNING

Canadian urban planning has a vivid history marked by dynamic actors, quiescence, the hard-sell to recovery, formalized professional influence, and recently, criticism. An overview of these events is presented in this Chapter to provide background information on the evolution of Canadian planning and to identify the current urban planning model which will be used as a basis for subsequent analysis.

The origin of Canadian planning can be traced to European antecedents. On the other hand, it may also be associated with nation building: early colonial town layouts, frontier towns alongside the railroads, the work of imaginative surveyors, civic leagues in the spirit of "city beautiful", or the institutionalization of urban planning. Since this historical review serves primarily as an introduction to contemporary practice, it is sufficient to begin with the institutionalization of Canadian urban planning. It is at this stage that the shift from planning for private clients to planning as a public activity occurred which set the course for today's urban planning. By definition this shift marks the birth of modern Canadian urban planning. It occurred in 1909 when the Commission of Conservation was established.

Within the modern period, five distinct phases can be identified for Canadian urban planning; each will be described in turn. These are

1. Formal beginnings: 1909 - 1931
   - influence of the Commission of Conservation of Natural
Formal Beginnings: 1909 - 1931

Strange as it must seem, modern Canadian urban planning arose from the early conservation movement, the latter being externally stimulated. In 1907 and 1908 two American Commissions were established to deal with inland waters and natural resources in general. President Roosevelt was aware that to safeguard some American resources would require cooperative efforts with neighboring nations. He proposed that we should take up these questions in Canada, and his proposal was accepted by the Laurier Government. Thus Canada created the Commission of Conservation of Natural Resources by Act of Parliament in 1909. Sir Clifford Sifton, draftsman of the Act, was appointed chairman.

Broadly, the Commission's function embraced all questions related to the better utilization of natural resources of Canada. Early in its existence urban planning came to be included in this function through Dr. Hodgetts, one of the first permanent specialists of the Commission. He saw "two important factors in the question of national conservation, the physical and the vital. The former relates (to) the protecting of our land, our forests, our minerals,
our waters, our sunlight, our fresh air; the latter, to the prevention of diseases, to health and to the prolongation of life. In housing and town planning we are dealing with most of the former and all of the latter". 4

This approach led the Commission into urban planning which was highlighted by the tenure of the eminent British planner, Thomas Adams. In Britain, Adams had been active in the Garden City movement, as a private town planning consultant, a planner for the national government, and one of the founders and first presidents of the Royal Town Planning Institute. He had previously visited Canada and the U.S. speaking to planning conferences. Upon his arrival in 1914, Sifton introduced him to the Commission as one who has "undoubtedly helped to create in the public mind a better understanding of the questions involved in what may be described as the science of town planning". 5

During the eight years, 1914 - 1921, when Adams was with the Commission, great accomplishments were made. As a preface to these accomplishments, and to put them in perspective, let us review planning progress to 1914.

According to Adams this included

the Winnipeg Tenement House Bylaw of 1909, the town planning begun at the same time and culminating in the Greater Winnipeg planning Commission of 1914, the Civic Guild of Toronto begun in 1897, the Toronto Housing Company's project of 1913, the metropolitan Parks and Planning Commission established in Montreal as a child of the (still extant) Montreal Civic Improvement League, and on local plans prepared for Prince Rupert, Port Mann, Edmonton, Brantford, Calgary, Ottawa, Halifax and many others; ...Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Alberta had Town Planning Acts, the earliest of them dating from 1912, based on the British Act of 1909 in part; ...(and) the movement for a National Housing and Town Planning Association or a Civic improvement League of some sort. 6

Keeping these notable but disparate and uneven accomplishments in mind, we may now turn to the accomplishments made by Adams and his staff. These may be summarized under five categories. First, and most general, the Commission planted the seeds of urban planning across the country especially through Adam's writing and speaking. Second, model planning legislation for provincial adoption was refined and promoted. Adams revised the Commission's model act,
secured conforming amendments to existing acts, and convinced all but two of the remaining provinces to adopt this planning instrument. The legislation contained provisions for the establishment of local lay planning commissions, zoning control, and subdivision regulation. Third, Adams spoke and wrote extensively on the need for provincial municipal affairs departments. Many provinces followed his advice, particularly in Western Canada. Fourth, Adams did special consulting work for local councils, for example: a zoning bylaw and draft Official Plan for Halifax, a large town extension scheme for Saint John, two new towns—Ojibway for U.S. Steel near Windsor, and one for a pulp company on Lake Temiskaming, advice on the development of Stanley Park, Vancouver, a housing survey for the City of Ottawa, a redevelopment plan for Halifax after the 1917 explosion, advice on the taxing of oversubdivided lands in Alberta, and a new highway route from Toronto to Hamilton. The fifth accomplishment was the establishment of planning as a formal professional activity in Canada through the formation of the Town Planning Institute of Canada; Adams led this movement and was the first President.

The Commission of Conservation established urban planning on a uniform basis in Canada. Their model planning legislation influenced all provinces and set the parameters for local planning: a lay planning commission, the right to adopt a comprehensive plan, and the powers to zone and regulate the subdivision of land. Other influences toward uniformity were the institutionalization of provincial planning in departments of municipal affairs particularly on the prairies, and establishment of a national professional institute.

Further insight into the period can be gained by viewing the Commission's approach as selective borrowing from British and American practices. The more advanced planning in these countries early in the 20th Century contained four major themes between them. In Britain there was the tradition of the public health movement in response to the squalid conditions of the Indus-
trial Revolution, and the utopian tradition best represented by Ebenezer Howard and the garden city movement. In America there was the new instrument of zoning, applied through a lay planning commission, and the city beautiful movement arising out of the Chicago Exposition of 1893. The Commission of Conservation deemphasized the more aesthetic approaches of garden city and city beautiful. For example, Dr. Hodgetts said it is "not so much the city beautiful as the city healthy that we want for Canada". Rather they borrowed from public health, zoning and lay commission traditions of British and American planning respectively. As a result, Canadian urban planning emphasized institutional mechanisms and ways of regulating the physical environment, primarily to secure air, sunlight and space. A specific example of compromise between British and American practices occurred over the local mechanism for planning. British practice favored planning as an administrative function of government while American practice favored the independent lay commission. Adams compromised in his model legislation by creating a commission with a blend of elected, administrative and lay members.

Bill 187 of the Canadian Parliament's Spring Session 1921 repealed the Commission of Conservation Act. Its demise has been attributed to the expansion of federal government departments into areas covered by the Commission, decentralization to the provinces of resource management and municipal planning, and certain rivalries built-up over time within the federal government.

The planning work of the Commission, however, had continuing influence. The new planning profession, which attracted able and energetic men, took over Adam's mission to strongly establish urban planning across this country. Of particular importance was the Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada. It contributed a profound literature on urban planning during its publication from 1922 to 1931. Of passing interest is the Institute's official definition of planning which prefaced the Journal: "town planning may
be defined as the scientific and orderly disposition of land and buildings in use and development with a view to obviating congestion and securing economic and social efficiency, health and well being in urban and rural communities".  

Unfortunately, the Great Depression brought a halt to nearly all urban planning activity in Canada which marks the end of this first period. 

Inactivity: 1932 - 1943

The Depression and Second World War left a corresponding void in Canadian urban planning. Local planning commissions, departments of municipal affairs and the profession became inactive. As evidence of this break, "In 1943 a survey was made to determine the extent of community planning in Canada. Only 100 replies were received to 400 questionnaires that were sent to cities and towns and these replies showed that not one city or town had adopted an official community plan. Only a few were doing much about it." Humphrey Carver provides one cogent explanation of the Canadian situation,

In both the U.S. and in Britain the foundation of present planning ideas and methods was laid down during the period between the two wars. In Canada this did not happen. For us the economic Depression of the Thirties was a vacuum and a complete break with the past. We had no Frederic Osbornes, Abercrombies and Clarence Steins. We had no public housing programs and none of the adventurous social experiments of the New Deal. In the Toynbee sense, we did not react to the challenge of the Depression perhaps our roots were not yet deep enough. We withered on the stem. So in 1946 we almost literally started from scratch with no plans or planners and we immediately hit a period of tremendous city growth.

From this we must ask wasn't Thomas Adams one of the greats who should have led us through these difficult times? In the first place, Adams left Canada for the U.S. in 1923 where he worked on the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs. Furthermore, Adams may have fallen just short of greatness. For example his plan of New York was strongly criticized by Lewis Mumford for the compromises made and what it did not do. In retrospect, one historian has said the following of Adams: "His conservatism kept him from being a truly great planner. He was incapable of being ahead of his time. Most of his proposals were already orthodox". There is no need to belabor this discussion.
Being a small and developing country and without continuous and great planning leadership, these combinations of factors caused the quiescence of Canadian urban planning between 1932 and 1943.

Restart: 1944 - 1950

With the preparations for post-war recovery Canadian urban planning got its second start. Housing and town planning was one of six major areas reported on by the federal Advisory Committee on Reconstruction. This report of 1944, today called the Curtis Report after its Chairman, had terms of reference "to review the existing legislation and administrative organization relating to housing and community planning...and to report regarding such changes...necessary to ensure the most effective implementation of...an adequate housing program for Canada during the years immediately following the war". With an assigned focus on housing and a strong economic bias less than one tenth of the report dealt with urban planning. Nonetheless, their planning advice was substantial; it is summarized in the following four points.

First, the report recommended the establishment of an harmonious three-level program among federal, provincial and local governments in which a separate national planning authority would be established to promote planning standards, encourage and assist provincial planning legislation and provide planning research. At the provincial level they also recommended a planning authority. It would prepare general provincial master plans, adopt legislation for local planning boards and make local master plans mandatory. Locally the Commission called for local planning departments who would prepare detailed master plans and enact and enforce ordinances which implement the master plan.

Second, the Curtis Report recommended that "the Dominion government should give financial assistance (to municipalities), in the form of long term loans at low interest rates, for large-scale assembly, acquisition and clearing of land, slums and blighted areas".
Third, in recognition that legislation alone "will not be enough to ensure the success of town planning", the federal government should develop a program of public education "to elicit the interest and cooperation of all groups of the public concerned".  

Fourth, the committee recommended that since "Canada has an altogether inadequate supply of persons properly trained in town-planning techniques, ... that the Dominion Government make available a fund for assistance to universities and other institutions able to accommodate appropriate students".

Regarding the basis of its advice, the Curtis committee referred to two British reports (Committee on Land Utilization in Rural Areas of 1942, and Committee on Compensation and Betterment of 1942—called the Uthwatt Report) and to the writings of two American professors (Dr. Guy Greer and Professor Alvin Hansen). Influence of the British reports on the above recommendations appears to be slight; however, the influence of Greer and Hansen, who emphasized master plans and land acquisition and clearing, was considerable.  

This may indicate a greater reliance or closer affinity to our American neighbor subsequent to the breakdown of Canadian urban planning during the depression and war. A more important observation on the source of their ideas may be a negative one. It is quite clear that the Commission's advice was not based on the groundwork of Adams and others. Of these earlier efforts, the report says:

It is true some "town planning" legislation exists. Most of the provinces have passed statutes, and town planning powers of a kind have been available to local authorities for a number of years past. But they are, almost invariably, not drawn to the necessary dimensions of the task. Most of the provisions are of a general nature, and by and large they represent a form of negative control. In some cases, they do little or nothing creatively by themselves, though they prevent certain things being done. Even within these limitations, however, town planning legislation in Canada has not been successful; and for the most part it is inoperative.

Federal action was taken on all of the Curtis Report major recommendations but not exactly as proposed. Instead of creating a separate federal
planning agency, planning was added to the functions of the newly created crown corporation for housing: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 1946. The Corporation had a primary responsibility for housing, particularly housing the returning veterans, which left urban planning in a secondary position. Many of the intended functions of a Federal Planning Authority, such as assistance in establishing provincial and local agencies and updating provincial planning legislation, were simply not done. With this weak effort, the old framework for local and provincial planning, which the Curtis report found inadequate, remained as the guide or constraint for the restart of urban planning. This compromise greatly limited the overall development of urban planning in Canada.

The second recommendation, of federal assistance for land assembly and clearance, was adopted. Concerning the two recommendations for public and professional planning education programs, these were initially considered as alternatives to the same end rather than complementary. There was a debate between architects, surveyors and planners, and federal officials as to whether urban planning should be established through the then defunct profession, the Town Planning Institute of Canada, or through a public grass roots program. F.W. Nicolls, Director of Housing for the National Housing Administration, 1935 - 1945, put it this way:

Most of the recognized planners (and there were few of them during the war years) wanted to revitalize the Town Planning Institute, thus placing the necessary missionary work in the hands of the professional planners. However, in the opinion of the National Housing Administration officials, education of the public should come first so as to be sure to reach the prospective home owner as directly as possible. Following this advice the federal government gave priority to a public education program. The philosophy was "unless interest was fostered on a broad base, progressive action by municipalities and provincial governments might well be slow in coming". A citizens organization came into existence to foster a public education-
al program for planning. Out of meetings and a conference, sponsored by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the exchange of planning ideas, the Community Planning Association of Canada emerged in 1946. CPAC's purpose was the dissemination of non-technical information on planning to the greatest number of people. It's membership was open, but professionals and planning devotees had the principal influence.

Through the late forties and early fifties CPAC became the motive force for the restart of local urban planning. While a small start toward educating more professionals was made in 1947 by establishing planning fellowships, CPAC made the major thrust by promoting planning. More specifically, CPAC's accomplishments can be summarized as follows:

1. successful promotion of professional planning,
2. encouragement of professionally staffed municipal planning offices,
3. communication of planners' work to the community,
4. lobbying for better provincial planning legislation,
5. public education through short courses and publications, and
6. locally, taking up special issues and controversies.

Regarding the output of local planning, CPAC made efforts to promote urban general plans by collecting and publishing examples of Canadian plans. These plans were largely schematic, differed in focus, and were extremely modest. Most were never completed or adopted, but they represent the first real effort to operationalize urban planning in Canada on a wide-scale basis. It is in the next period that a significant substantive impact came about.

In short, CMHC and CPAC provided the opportunity for Canadian urban planning to develop institutionally and professionally. CMHC stimulated planning through the funding of CPAC, the precedent of planning fellowships, and the enactment of redevelopment legislation. In turn, CPAC increased public awareness of the need for planning which facilitated the establishment of local planning agencies and the growth of the planning profession. Together
they were catalysts. Their facilitating roles make 1944 - 1950 a transitional period toward the rise of public agencies.


The current stage of Canadian urban planning can be characterized in terms of the rise of the public agency as an integral part of local government in most Canadian cities over 20,000 population as well as an activity in many smaller centres.

This period also may be seen in terms of the growth of the profession. In 1949 there were only 45 practicing planners in Canada, by 1967 there were about 650 and in 1971 there were 1,020. The Town Institute of Canada began operations again in 1952. Three main factors contributed to this growth.

1. CPAC promotion of urban planning greatly increased the demand for planners. Up until 1950 there were about six municipal planning agencies in Canada, by 1960 there were around thirty, and today about 75.

2. The unprecedented scale and extent of post-war urbanization led to a new awareness of urban problems, the recognition of a chronic shortage of qualified urban planners, and a demand for more professional positions in the public service simply to order the rapid growth process.

3. Schools of planning began during this period. In response to the demand for professional planners and influenced by CMHC's "prime the pump" policy of offering fellowships for the study of planning (started in 1947), there has been a proliferation of planning schools: McGill, 1947; Manitoba, 1949; UBC, 1950; Toronto 1951; Montreal, 1961; Waterloo 1964; York, 1969; Ottawa, 1970; and Calgary, 1971.

With the increased number of professional planners, a significant change occurred: the emergence of the professionally staffed planning agency.
Previously, urban planning was conducted by semi-autonomous planning commissions or boards. These were chiefly composed of citizens, with some politicians. They were semi-autonomous to keep them above politics and had a lay membership in the absence of professional planners. As professional staffs were attached to commissions or boards, or created as a regular department of local government, the model of urban planning was greatly altered.

The commission model of urban planning called for the lay commissioners to prepare a comprehensive plan, sometimes with the help of a consultant, and also to prepare zoning regulations to complement the plan. One deficiency of this model was its isolation from elected officials and municipal administrators.

The Commission...has met with difficulties that are inherent in the relationship between an advisory body and local government when a duality of functions exists over complex technical and administrative matters. The embarrassments experienced by both Council and Commission are not due to conflicts of personalities, or to deliberate obstruction, but to confusion of responsibility in an undertaking of great magnitude and complexity. To solve the difficulty it is now recognized that a permanent and well devised organization for planning should be established within the city administration, and that the function of the Commission as an advisory body to Council, should be unhampered by technical and administrative detail.

A second downfall of the commission model was its failure to have plans implemented. Plans were prepared in isolation, frequently never forwarded to city councils, and not officially adopted.

The new model for urban planning emerged out of the special studies of Professors H. Spence-Sales and J. Bland of McGill University. More generally their work followed the studies of R.A. Walker in the United States. Spence-Sales and Bland introduced their model to several Canadian cities.

The recognition of planning as a staff function which should have its own place in local government was the primary characteristic of the model. Full time planning agencies were proposed each to be headed by a planning director. Also the overall purpose of planning was reinterpreted as "to coordinate all functions of the municipality that bear upon physical development, so as to
conserve resources in attaining the development of the urban area". To achieve this, a mechanism called the Technical Planning Board was introduced in various forms. Typically membership included all civic department heads concerned with physical development plus the Superintendents of Schools and Parks with the Director of Planning as Chairman. Council could delegate powers to the Technical Planning Board, and it met behind closed doors so that public opinion could not affect technical considerations. This mechanism made planning more acceptable by increasing technical power and allowing others to share the added power.

During the 1950's and 1960's in Canada, urban planning became well established on a departmental basis in local government. Planning commissions and boards were retained, some with advisory and others with principal roles. But the emergence of the professional planning department changed urban planning greatly. Three major changes are noted below.

First, planners had to spend considerable time and effort in gaining acceptance of their new departments. They had to build confidence in this new function with politicians, administrators and other departments. Although urban planning has escaped most of the ideological arguments against planning, it could not completely avoid some backlash while carving out new territory within established institutional systems. As a result about half of Canada's urban planning agencies still have a primary role of building confidence in their activity. While a more technical or educational role would be preferable, in the words of one planner, they "have to keep going back to square one". Since confidence building as a primary agency role does not relate to the age of the agency, one can only conclude that the creation of planning departments has drained off considerable energy in mere institution building.

Second, urban planning took on a new relationship with politicians. As a staff agency planners became more directly accountable to political officials. Under this new relationship a compromise occurred over priorities and
goal setting. When planning was separate from politicians, analysis of the city and identification of problems was solely a planning activity. As a staff agency, with accountability to politicians, planning had to respond to externally set priorities. For example, a 1971 survey of Canadian urban planning found only thirteen per cent of all important planning decisions were initiated within planning agencies. However, Canadian urban planning did not give up its right of evaluation and initiation without a trade-off. While elected officials primarily set planning priorities, planners established as their responsibility the interpretation of community goals in the form of standards to be followed in seeking solutions to specific problems. A compromise resulted in which planners relinquished their previous domain of problem identification to politicians who responded to tensions in the community. But once problems were identified planners possessed considerable latitude in interpreting the public interest against which to judge alternative solutions. A reactive form of planning thus was formed.

Third, planning in a regular department setting involved considerable administrative effort. In addition to the normal administrative duties of running a department there was the constantly expanding administration of zoning and subdivision regulations. Each advance in the sophistication of these regulations added to administration. In 1971 Canadian urban planning agencies on the average spent 68 per cent of their budgets on administration.

The above three characteristics which emerged from the establishment of planning on a departmental basis had a profound effect on Canadian urban planning. All three, confidence building, greater political control, and increased administrative responsibilities, contributed to a reduced emphasis on comprehensive planning. While comprehensive planning was maintained as a part of planning it was no longer the paramount activity. However, mystery surrounds the current status of comprehensive plans in Canada. The Hellyer Task Force, in their nationwide tour of cities and inquiry into planning
"uncovered hardly a single community with a long-term plan". On the other hand a concurrent survey of Planning Directors revealed that 60 per cent of all Canadian cities have comprehensive plans. A likely explanation is different conceptions of what a comprehensive plan actually is. Working under other priorities and pressures, planners have produced generalized sketches of future land use patterns as comprehensive plans. While these may be comprehensive plans to planners they may not be so interpreted by politicians and other experts looking for positive urban guidelines. Regardless, comprehensive planning continues when routine lets up. Contemporary planning lives with a contradiction regarding comprehensive plans: legislation either urges or requires them while the realities of daily work leave little time for plan preparation.

There are several other effects on planning resulting from departmental status and the accompanying confidence building, greater political control and increased administrative responsibilities. Under these constraints the planning methodology remained very rudimentary. For example, a representative description of the comprehensive plan methodology states,

information is assembled in the form of maps, appropriately coloured, graphs and memoranda. The idea is that once the job is done and bound between covers any competent person, after reading and studying it, can take up precisely where we left off, without any waste of motion. It is like the hospital's detailed case report, on which after a look at the patient, diagnosis can at once proceed. It will be realized that a competent and complete professional planning report amounts in effect to a full diagnosis of the community considered as a living organism accompanied by the suggested cure in the shape of a plan for development of the community over a period of years.

Another effect is an insular approach to planning. In plan preparation 90 per cent of Canadian urban planning agencies do not normally go outside the government setting to involve the public. Likewise, 72 per cent of these agencies do not normally go outside their own office for data collection and only 26 per cent have a continuous research function.

A further effect of this situation is the emergence of the planner's
strategy of reactive, selective intervention. With politicians primarily setting planning priorities and with their delicate relation with politicians, most planners enter controversy only when an issue is very important to them. Half of the Canadian planning directors recently surveyed followed such a strategy. 50

Finally, the new departmental status frequently led to an emulation of the bureaucratic organizational model which was typical of other local government departments.

Recent Criticism: 1970 - Present

Recently there has been growing reaction and criticism of this still prevalent bureaucratic phase of Canadian urban planning. A sampling of these criticisms is presented below. 51

A piercing charge is that Canadian planning agencies have become more closely linked to the development industry through their constant interaction over regulations. This thesis claims Canadian urban planning agencies experienced a similar pitfall to that ascribed to American regulatory agencies. In the U.S. the evolutionary model of regulatory agencies has been

The groups and individuals that join forces to seek general approval of a particular regulatory program dissolve once agreement in principle is secured. Thus, most regulatory agencies can count on only vague, amorphous support. The political officials support the program in theory but remain weakly involved in its implementation. The groups to be regulated, however, are intensely involved and highly vocal. To guarantee its political survival, the regulatory agency must come to terms with its interest group clientele, often by weakening the original purposes of the program. 52

Generally this model applies to urban planning agencies in Canada at present. Once professional planning agencies became established CPAC turned to other matters such as publishing a planning journal. The external contacts of the planners narrowed to those being regulated: developers and realtors. Although planning ideals conflict with those of developers and realtors, the behavioral realities of their mutual existence turned the relationship to one of client. The regulated had considerable influence on the regulator and his regulations.
This linkage has been documented by Jim Lorimer in his study of urban politics. He has demonstrated that city planning is merely "preparing the ground--literally--for the developers."

City planning is not the protector of the interests of the people it has so often been portrayed to be. It is on the front lines of the development industry, setting up land for development and redevelop-
ment in the city, and administering the details of the system of reg-
ulation and control of land use and new development that is needed by
the industry for its own self-protection and profitability. It does
this job in the best interests of the industry as a whole, or of the
faction of the industry that has captured most power at city hall.
City planning is in fact the protector of the interests of the prop-
erty industry, guarding the industry--developers, property investors
and financial institutions--from the perils of free competition in
the industry on the one hand and a citizen-controlled city on the
other, where the needs of the industry would be subordinated to the
needs of the city's residents.

Another criticism, of a more general nature, comes from the Canadian
study of previous reference.

From a more thorough and detailed study of Canadian planning we have
the following summary:

The practice occurs within a local government setting where planning
roles and strategies are adapted to the community. It is a bureau-
cracy oriented, administrative practice which contributes to decision
making through a rational input (study of specific problems) and the
selected exercise of influence on controversial issues. In making
studies, Canadian urban planning follows an insular approach using
professional goals, internal data sources, and shunning citizen in-
volvement. The practice has a strong physical orientation and con-
cerns itself mostly with facilitating growth and the provision of
community facilities. Planning directors see the function of their
agencies as preparing and administering comprehensive plans, zoning
and subdivision regulations, but there are indications that adminis-
tration and special studies occupy most of their time. Although they
have been in existence for some time, many agencies are still prac-
ticing their institutional role. For the most part the practice is
reactive in that it plans according to the wishes of elected officials
and initiates proposals infrequently.

This model suggests a very limited function for planning. Canadian
urban planning has established itself firmly in urban governments and has got
its point of view across often, but as an editorial in the professional journal
says,
lets look at the situation in perspective. How many Canadian towns have adequate planning staffs and effective planning procedures? How many houses are being built in well laid out, fully serviced suburbs (let alone New Towns) compared with the numbers daily adding to plan-less sprawl? How many of our city centres can we be proud of? How many metropolitan and regional plans have been adopted as government policy? How many of our urban and rural slums have been replaced by decent, well designed housing?  

More widespread criticism of current urban planning in Canada is also evident. This part concludes with three brief quotes from two government reports and a mayor.

From the Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development there is the following observation.

Lest there be a misunderstanding, the Task Force did find planning at work in urban Canada. But it frankly was disappointed and discouraged by it. So much of it was concerned with minutiae while the need for a grand urban design goes begging. So much of it was a negative scripture, written in "thou shalt not's", when the situation cried out for positive thought and initiative. The Task Force found rules upon rules to establish the widths of streets, yet it uncovered hardly a single community with a long-term plan and design for basic transportation corridors. It found a multiplicity of regulation at all levels to set minimum requirements and hardly anyone to spell out maximum objectives. Some planners and officials had an economic term of reference; hardly any seemed to have given much thought to the broader ecological or sociological issues. The urban scene seemed to abound with bureaucrats—but to be sadly lacking in dreamers.

Mayor Sykes of Calgary made the following charge in an address to the Town Planning Institute of Canada in 1972:

Are Planners Really Urban Plumbers? It's not such a silly question as it sounds. I think that town planning in practice has been conferred for the most part to subdivision design, a two-party game between planners and developers that results in a further extension of growths on the third party, the public. I suspect that subdivision planning would be more successful as to design were it done by one party alone --either party--but the result, as matters stand, is far too often the same result you'd expect if you hired two plumbers, who disagreed wildly with each other on how things should be done, to design and install the plumbing in your house. Most of our planning departments spend most of their time, and our money, on various aspects of subdivision planning. There's nothing wrong with that except that:

1. it is essentially urban plumbing, and
2. there's surely much more to community planning than that.

Lastly, an Ontario Economic Council report offers its view of urban planning.
Two things are evident. First, the senior public planners have, in effect, been doing very little planning; they have served largely as planning administrators, carrying out chiefly housekeeping functions. Second, they have offered few initiatives and innovations. Professional planners in Ontario have carried out their jobs skillfully, to greater or lesser degree. They have not, in any discernible sense, emerged as a truly innovative force in the area of public policy formulation. Nor, equally, has the profession as a profession. Its institutional apparatus (the Town Planning Institute) has similarly devoted its major energies to internal housekeeping matters and has offered its members little beyond a basic trade union service. More dishearteningly, it has lent almost none of its professional expertise and influence to matters of important public policy.  

Conclusion

Canadian urban planning has evolved from an initial stage of inspired neo-professionalism to a well established activity of local government. Even though considerable criticism has been levelled at the current practice, this practice still remains dominant and well accepted. The historical review presented in this chapter identifies the following characteristics of the current model of Canadian urban planning. These characteristics will be used in subsequent analysis.

Although seemingly obvious, professionalism is the first characteristic of the current model. Before trained planners were available for each city, lay commissions or boards performed planning as a more or less amateur activity; that is, concerned citizens did their best as a substitute for experts. With the increase in trained planners and the proliferation of planning agencies, planning took on the characteristics of a professional activity. Planners now claim special knowledge with regard to zoning and subdivision regulations, comprehensive planning, coordination of development, and knowledge of the city. Urban planning thus became focused on experts and expertise, and devising plans and solutions within the insularity of their agencies. For Canadian planning, professionalism has brought greater depth of knowledge to the activity, and at the same time introduced the premise that urban problems can be met with technical solutions.

The second characteristic of the prevailing model is its reactive
nature. Planners had to accept a greater accountability to politicians when planning became a regular department of local government. This meant a move away from the comprehensive planning model, and a move toward the partial model (see pages 5 and 11, Chapter One). This shift has not been complete with comprehensive planning being maintained as an adjunct to partial planning. The resulting model is as follows:

In the actual model, comprehensive planning continues, in reduced importance, as a sometimes frame of reference for partial planning. The result is a compromise between the utopian ideal of comprehensive planning, which is a part of the planner's heritage, and the reality of day-to-day work in a practical world.

Lastly, the current model is extremely bureaucratic. The existing bureaucratic environment, into which the new agencies were placed, undoubtedly contributed to the bureaucratization of planning. In the absence of an established organizational model, it was natural to emulate other departments. Of larger effect was the growing administrative nature of planning. As planners developed more sophisticated zoning and subdivision regulations, administrative responsibilities proliferated. In fact, these administrative duties, which stressed controls and procedures, more or less took over the local planning activity. In this role urban planning more closely represented a typical bureaucracy than a creative policy-making organization.

In summary the current model of Canadian urban planning follows professional isolation, primarily responds to externally determined problems, and is organized on the bureaucratic model.

Rising criticism of this model, however, suggests that past planning
efforts have not been adequate. In retrospect CMHC and CPAC may have underestimated post-war planning needs. It has taken another 20 - 25 years of "coping" with growth to bring some realization of the need for new models of urban planning.
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PART TWO

URBAN PLANNING IN THE GREATER VANCOUVER REGIONAL DISTRICT: 1969 – 1973
Introduction

Part Two presents an overview of urban planning as conducted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District during its first four years of operation: 1969 to 1973. As previously stated the overriding research objective is to identify a new model of urban planning. Toward this end and with some preliminary evidence that GVRD planning is experimenting with new methods, Part Two provides a case history for the subsequent analysis in Part Three. There are four chapters in Part Two, each of which approximately relates to one year of the GVRD work program. This chronological case history corresponds to the evolutionary approach of GVRD planning in developing new ways of urban planning. An inductive research method is followed in search of a new planning model.

While Part Two stands alone as an historical account or case study and as the basis for subsequent analysis, there is another purpose for the lengthy account. Empirical research on urban planning has failed to provide complete descriptions of how planning is actually done. More specifically, studies of urban planning have not achieved a full explication because of three shortcomings.

1. An overemphasis of the political constraints on planning.
2. A focusing on issues and outputs rather than process.
3. Most recently, severe criticism which inevitably abandons technical solutions and seeks political ones.

These shortcomings are elaborated upon in Appendix A including a literature review of the most important studies of planning. The account of planning in Part Two consciously seeks to avoid these three shortcomings, and more positively, to present an accurate description of an urban planning process. In this way the subtleties of planning such as planning rationale, assumptions and organizing principles will appear and contribute to a deeper understanding of the activity.
Selecting data from the countless events in a complex process such as planning raises many problems and challenges for the researcher. Data selection has been based primarily on what the planning agency spent the most time and effort on; in other words, objectivity has been seen in terms of energy. Two guides have been used in interpreting this energy concept for the department: first the annual work program which outlines the priority items for the coming year, and second, the year-end record of man/hours of work by projects. Appendix B summarizes the man/hours of work by functions and projects for the research period. It has been extremely useful. The energy principle, however, is only a general guide and minor variations do occur. One consistent exception to the energy approach is to give slightly more emphasis to innovative planning and less to routine.

Also the account focuses on the planning activity as empirically perceived, and it does not incorporate related theory except as used by the agency. General planning and social science theory, which contribute to a further understanding of the planning process, is presented in Chapters Seven and Eight. This organization is not an attempt to separate practice from theory but to have the theory used by the department appear distinctly.

To insure a high degree of accuracy in this account, each chapter was reviewed and rewritten three times. A first review was made by academic Committee members familiar with planning in Greater Vancouver. Second, seven key GVRD planning department members, including the Director and all Seniors, examined and commented on the drafts as they were rewritten. Third, and last, discrepancies which still remained were checked with the appropriate department employee, and then a final review of the whole case study was made by the Director and other energetic staff members.

A brief introduction to the Greater Vancouver Regional District and its planning function is now appropriate. In the summer of 1967 letters patent were issued by the Provincial government creating metropolitan government
for Greater Vancouver. This action occurred under Regional District legislation, passed two years earlier. The Regional District of Fraser-Burrard, soon to be renamed the Greater Vancouver Regional District, contained fourteen municipalities and three unincorporated areas and covered the area of metropolitan Vancouver. GVRD boundaries are shown on the map in Appendix J. A metropolitan government of the federated variety was created. Each local area was represented by one Director on the Regional Board appointed by the Council while Vancouver and Burnaby received 5 and 2 Directors respectively. Unincorporated areas each had one Director who was elected directly. Voting on the Regional Board was based on population.¹

Prior to 1969 areawide planning for Greater Vancouver was performed by The Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board which was created in 1948. This Board consisted of delegates from municipal councils, membership was voluntary, and it had a full time planning staff. An extremely vigorous planning staff had been assembled in the LMRPB. Their work culminated in the adoption of an "Official Regional Plan" in 1966. A series of events in 1968/69 caused LMRPB planning to fall into political disfavor. In 1969 the provincial government dissolved the LMRPB and established the GVRD. Most of the planning staff was to be transferred, but the difficult circumstances involved made the transfer more of a new birth than a second life. The painful transfer of the planning function to the GVRD was completed in 1969.²

The new Regional District was not given a set of powers but must apply to the Provincial Government to take on specific functions agreed upon by the members. Debt management was the first function acquired and it worked well building credibility in the new government.³ In 1969 regional planning was added, in 1971 public housing, water supply and sewage disposal, and in 1972 air pollution control and regional parks. The planning, water, sewage and parks functions had formerly been conducted by special purpose boards.

Two committees are important for understanding planning in the Greater
Vancouver Regional District. First is the Planning Committee of the Regional Board which is normally comprised of nine members. This is a political committee which guides the planning function although major decisions are made by the Board. Second is the Technical Planning Committee whose members are the Planning Directors of all member municipalities and representatives from some Provincial Departments as well as a few other local agencies. This Committee offers technical advice to the Board and serves a liaison function.

A word must be said about abbreviations. The nomenclature of the Greater Vancouver Regional District Department includes the frequent use of letters and special names as substitutes for longer references. Because this is their custom, these short forms capture the flavor of the activity. The most frequently used abbreviations are:

GVRD — the Greater Vancouver Regional District
IIPS — the Vancouver Regional Inter-institutional Policy Simulator
LMRPB — the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board
ORP — the official Regional Plan from the LMRPB
LRP — the Livable Region Plan
"matins" — staff meeting of the planning department.

Lastly, the story of evolving planning in GVRD is not a simple one. It will cover efforts to build the department, a search for a new style of planning, and attempts to create a new regional plan. This has evolved in an experimental way, trying here and veering there, including multiple approaches at one time. As a very general guide to complement the narrative, the following chart is presented. Six streams of activity are identified, major events over the four years are noted, and linkages provided.
Figure 1: Streams of GVRD Planning 1969-1973


- LASH
  - Great City Debate
- Harrison Retreat
- Salt Spring
- Livable Region Idea

- Broome Report
  - Housing Director
  - Transportation
  - Regional Plan
  - Public Involvement

- TUPS
  - Rapid Transit Study
  - Several Studies
  - Project Alpha
  - Livability Indicators

- Kelly Report
  - Coach House Retreat
  - Report on Livability

- Policy Development
  - Plan Group
  - Buchanan Seminar
  - Issues
  - Task Forces

Separate housing function

Function acquisition?
FOOTNOTES

1. The 22 Directors have a total of 56 votes or approximately one vote per 18,000 population in Metropolitan Vancouver. Two Directors have five votes and seven have one vote. Directors having 5 and 4 votes are all from either Vancouver or Burnaby.


3. Debt management has advantages for all with few or no disadvantages. The reason is simple. GVRD can borrow money more easily on the international money markets as a major metropolitan centre than the individual municipalities can do on their own. Collective borrowing reduces the difficulties of borrowing individually and can demand lower interest rates.
CHAPTER THREE

A NEW CONSCIOUSNESS: GVRD PLANNING IN 1969-70

The transfer of the planning function from the LMRPB to the new regional district, GVRD, was delegated by the GVRD Board to a three-man committee. Allen Kelly, Board Member, George Carlisle, Secretary-Treasurer of the Sewage District and Treasurer of the Water District, and Secretary-Treasurer of the GVRD, and Brahm Wiesman, Professor of Planning, University of British Columbia, comprised the committee. Their frame of reference called upon them to (a) select staff members from the LMRPB for employment in the GVRD, (b) effect a transfer of the selected employees, (c) find a new Director of Planning, and (d) make final actions on these matters with the exception of (c) which had to be ratified by the Board.¹

Eleven of the LMRPB staff were guaranteed jobs in the new GVRD Planning Department and seven made the move.² The principal planners making the shift were Norman Pearson, Rick Hankin, and Dennis O'Gorman all graduates of the University of British Columbia's planning school in the 1960's. Pearson was named Acting Director while a search for a new director took place. During this interim period continuity was maintained although staff hostility naturally existed over the official rejection of the style of planning previously practiced by the LMRPB.

Victor Parker, Director of the old LMRPB, was not politically acceptable for the new directors job because of the recent controversies, and furthermore he had resigned thereby taking himself out of the running.³ In this sensitive situation the strongest criteria for a new director was articulated
by Kelly. He explicitly wanted the new director and planning function to be advisory allowing the politicians to be spokesmen for planning. In other words a low profile for regional planning was desired in contrast to the "crusading planner" style of the old LMRPB: in other words a closer working relationship between politician and planner. Several prominent local planners sought the directorship actively. In the end, however, an outsider, Harry Lash then of Montreal, was selected for the position. Lash impressed the committee with his view of the planner's role as a deputy minister which coincided with Kelly's concept. Lash's extensive experience and accomplishments provided sound professional background for the position. It appeared that the local aspirants for the position offered LMRPB planning in different packages, while Lash held promise of a different style of non-crusading planning. He took over as Director of the GVRD Planning Department in September of 1969.

Frame of Reference

The frame of reference for the new planning department had three aspects: carryover activities from the LMRPB, the Broome Report, and the implied conditions of Lash's employment. Although a new planning era was beginning, the influence of the LMRPB would continue through former staff members and accomplishments. The principal accomplishment of the LMRPB was the preparation and selling of the "Official Regional Plan". The ORP established land-use guidelines for the region particularly to check "sprawl" to protect farmland and open space, and to establish the idea of "regional town centres". It was officially adopted by the 28 municipalities of the Lower Mainland Region with slightly more than a two thirds majority vote. On the other hand, LMRPB's characteristic style of "crusading planners" and "hardsell", which contributed so much to both their success and their downfall, likely wouldn't be emulated.

A Report of the Broome Committee, dated February 26, 1969, established the priorities for GVRD planning long before Lash's arrival. The Broome report was prepared by the Political and Administrative Structure Committee,
a permanent committee of the Board dealing with corporate planning. Its purpose was to provide guidelines for the reorganized regional planning function. The report listed many planning projects according to priorities, and it served as the official frame of reference for the new agency. First priorities were assigned to studies on public transit, public housing, and transportation and urban pattern. Among second priorities were a review of the southwest shores study (Robert's Bank superport controversy), flood danger, and urban data gathering and information systems.

Regarding the implied conditions of Lash's employment, these relate primarily to his approach to planning as evolved during his extensive professional experience. Through talks with regional administrators, politicians, and planners in Vancouver prior to his employment he was able to determine that his planning approach was congruous with local desires. Accordingly, his employment provided at least an implied sanction to his approach.

An overriding characteristic of this approach was Lash's desire to bring a new kind of planning to Vancouver. He became attracted to the job principally because "it was an opportunity to make planning operational. Such appeared possible because of starting from scratch. The old ways of the LMRPB (i.e. the crusading land-use planner) had been formally rejected and the new regional districts opened up new horizons".

Lash's approach to planning can only be understood in terms of his evolving career. He obtained his planning education at McGill under Spence-Sales in the late 1940's. While somewhat disappointed in the educational program he found his knowledge of planning legislation and new towns to be useful in his subsequent employment as a planner with the Province of Alberta. Within a short time he became Director of Planning for the province and worked on rewriting the planning legislation including provisions on District Planning Commissions, zoning, subdivision control and new resource towns. When lack of ministerial cooperation in Alberta convinced him to seek new challenges
he took the opportunity to move to Toronto where in 1957 he became head of the research and long range planning section for the city. Here his work was largely influenced by a major urban renewal study recently completed. The study established a framework for planning by communities or districts in consultation with them, an advanced idea at this time. The nature of his division's work was to conduct planning district appraisals leading to zoning revisions with some notion of longer term plans. Although many factors were considered in the appraisal studies, recommendations almost always took the form of zoning changes. While doing this work Lash became aware of the shortcomings of this approach. Their formulas and rules of thumb seemed to apply to middleclass areas but were inadequate answers for the concerns and problems of other areas. According to him "the formulas and rules of thumb were a step or two removed from the real objectives of doing things—we didn't know what we were really doing—it was like an elaborate game".

Next, Lash took a position with the City of Montreal as Superintendent, Comprehensive Research Division. In this new job he promised himself to be more thorough in questioning and rethinking planning principles. The planning approach in Montreal was quite different. Rather than district plans, an overall regional plan was sought under the banner of "Horison 2000". The planning process did not involve public consultation because they didn't have full Regional support for this regional plan (a sounding board group composed of elites was once involved). The most important difference, however, was in the handling of goals. In Toronto goals were assumed to be physical order and convenience as represented in standards, but goals were to be much more explicit in Montreal.

Montreal's goals approach was inspired by Kevin Lynch's analysis contained in his paper "Quality in City Design" and is outlined by Lash in "On Goals". An umbrella goal of self-realization of its citizens was identified for Montreal and eleven other major goals: adequacy, accessibility, diversity,
legibility, singularity, stimulation, identification, health, safety, comfort and resilience. Concerning the advantages of having goals Lash has said, "We are much better off with goals than without them, for then our choices can find a consistent and rational basis, whereas in the absence of goals the criteria used would vary widely and enormously, and the possible choices become truly endless".13

Also while in Montreal Lash spent a year on a reorganization study of the planning department. This examination was provoked by some perceived failings of the existing bureaucratic organization. For example there were some who believed that the divisional arrangement had resulted in a whole division being used as a place where you put the "dead wood". But, it was rejoined, this division had to be relied on to do something, and more crucially, the arrangement appeared to be a cop out to the effective use of human resources. Implementation of the reorganization study, recommending a collegial approach to break down compartmentalization eventually failed due to deeply held paternalism, within certain elements of the French-Canadian culture of that time. Nevertheless this study provided Lash with an arsenal of ideas for application in Vancouver.14

From these historical developments in Lash's career a particular planning approach evolved the main elements of which were

1. Objectives—most traditional planning goals are just "catch phrases". A new approach must be strived for which translates goals into objectives which can be made operational.

2. Dynamic—planning deals with the process of becoming, i.e. what happens in the continuing, on-going state rather than the end-state. Since the end of planning is people, people in the here and now qualify as well as future people.

3. Involvement—Montreal's plan was prepared in a vacuum without any contact with people including politicians. That is the goals
developed only out of internal staff discussion. Planning must avoid this vacuum syndrome by being more open—to public, politicians and planning staff.

4. Strategy—instead of the limited and directed approach of traditional urban planning, an approach was needed which first took an overview and next identified the main lines of attack. This had a military origin, e.g. the "soft underbelly of Europe" which provides a main line of attack after which everything else flows.

Senior Staff

One of Lash's first priorities was to establish a "capable" planning organization which, in part, involved hiring additional staff. He envisaged a department headed by an interdisciplinary team of four senior planners. This conception differed from the traditional hierarchical arrangement of one director and one assistant, and he had to overcome initial resistance to his proposal from the Board's committee on corporate planning. Lash was convinced that the department needed several people with the status of Seniors in order for there to be high credibility in external relations. These would be experienced people, with ability to handle outsiders, particularly consultants. And several would be required to handle internal work but at the same time be able to liaise.

When Lash arrived, Norman Pearson dropped the title of Acting Director but retained the position of Assistant Director. Lash tried to get Pearson to stay on as one of the Seniors but he could not be convinced. He had ambitions to strike out on his own as a consultant. It must be noted that he had been a contender for the Director's job, and likely retained some distaste over the demise of the LMRPB. Pearson left the planning agency early in 1970 to go into private consulting work.

The first Senior planner to join the staff was Gerard Farry. Farry was a Vancouverite, a graduate of U.B.C.'s school of planning, and a planner
of extensive experience with the City of Vancouver. He was attracted to the planning agency to further his professional achievements. He had been involved in the whole spectrum of Vancouver city planning, felt he had been there too long, and was critical of their current style of planning. The knowledge which Farry brought to GVRD planning can be termed as administrative, generalist planner including expertise on transportation.

Drew Thorburn was the second Senior. His experience was in consulting on regional planning in eastern Canada. Academically he did graduate work in the London School of Economics focusing on regional economics; local, national and regional planning problems; and administration. He heard of the opening from several sources including a friend in Vancouver. The real reason why Thorburn came was that "everyone I talked to told me if you really want to find out what planning is all about work under Harry Lash". Thorburn investigated the evolving program very thoroughly and was impressed with what he saw. He joined the staff in the fall of 1970.

The third Senior to join the staff was Ted Rashleigh. He had an M.A. in Sociology from the University of Toronto and had previously worked with Lash in Toronto. At the time Lash came to head the department, Rashleigh was a lecturer in U.B.C.'s Geography Department. Almost immediately after Lash's arrival, he began work with the department as a part-time consultant. Rashleigh prepared an audio-visual presentation of the Rapid Transit Report for showing to the community (see discussion later in this part). Besides Rashleigh's expertise in public information and communications, he was sought after by the department for a permanent position because of his earlier work with the LMRPB and because as a Vancouverite he brought considerable local knowledge. He was attracted to the department by Lash's approach: "Lash represented one who was not going to follow preset ideas." Upon their joining the staff all Seniors were primarily involved in familiarization activities, completion of carry-over projects from the LMRPB,
and program development.

**Departmental Organization**

As already noted Lash brought the idea of an interdisciplinary team of Seniors as an organizational arrangement for the new department. In practice the Director and three Seniors met periodically to set departmental policy and strategy. All were of equal status including Lash, but this did not preclude the Director from mediating when agreement could not be reached. A principle of consensus or "solidarity" was followed among Seniors.

A second, extremely important type of departmental meeting was called "matins". Matins started out involving all staff, but as the staff increased it became limited to professionals. Matins provided a key vehicle for informing staff members of what was going on and provided a forum for the questioning of how individual matters relate to the overall departmental program and to other projects. Together the organizational arrangements of Seniors and matins are often referred to as the "collegial approach".

One further organizational mechanism of note was the large wall calendar. To keep track of all meetings and other departmental events, as well as to further communication, a 2 by 3 foot one month calendar chart was located at a central place in the office. All staff noted special meetings and events on the chart so that others could know what was going on and attend if they wished. This practice continues today.

During this early period Lash developed some ideas about his role as director and the role of the department which should be mentioned here. Lash defined his own role as having three components: (a) definition and/or development of goals, (b) responsibility for most of the political liaison, and (c) planning department strategy. Regarding the role of the agency he described this to Thorburn as follows,

- It (the agency) is largely involved with delineating the terms of reference of the studies which will be undertaken by consultants.
- It appears to be an agency that acts as a management and special advisor to the other line departments.

- (There are) two major approaches: 1) the politician--interest politicians in goals--1 year to develop their interest in goal definition, 2) prove technical and advisory competence with District Departments and Provincial Government, plus interest local planning staffs in working out broader integrated plans.

These early ideas contain certain principles which should be noted and commented upon. First is the idea of planning as management in the policy advice sense. Lash had worked in traditional planning agencies where planning occurred in isolation from policy-making. But he began to see that planning could move into a dynamic advisory position with a duty and right to interact with politicians. Second, the department explicitly understood that it would exert political influence but in a different way. There was no feeling of being intimidated by politicians but a desire to actually work with them. Third, the department was generally viewed as a small research organization. To maintain this it was decided "to keep to a 'staff' role and resist taking on 'line' functions". To facilitate communications and internal harmony, there was a conscious effort to keep the department small. Lastly, it should be noted that Lash preferred a "recursive" approach to departmental organization. By this he means that none of the arrangements be regarded as sacred but should be constantly reassessed and changed when necessary.

Preliminary role definition was also required for the Technical Planning Committee—a statutory committee comprising representatives from all member planning departments and charged with advising the Board on planning matters and liaising between the administration of the Regional Board and the member municipalities and some provincial departments. The Technical Planning Committee had some precedence under the LMRPB for special tasks only. One of Lash's early challenges was to thwart a move to make him responsible to them: a move begun by the Technical Planning Board prior to his appointment. In handling the situation, Lash made the planners aware that as a consequence of
his past experience he understood their point of view, namely the threat of a higher planning authority. He encouraged them to accept conflict as a non-aggressive developing process from which all could benefit. As a result of these actions, Lash perceived that "the TPC became an open forum, and its members quickly evolved mutual confidence while retaining openness—the original conflict attitude vanished". 22

An early description of the relationship between the Technical Planning Committee and the Planning Committee (political committee of the Regional Board) was outlined by Lash. He said "the relationship of this Planning Committee to the TPC and its Working Committees has not been defined, but my view is that this Committee and the various Technical Committees should both work on problems in parallel and at an early date, so that the work of the technical groups can be illuminated by the views of the political group and vice-versa". 23 Also the TPC should be able to pilot technical proposals through the Board.

To recap, early departmental organization was based upon the ideas of group and collegial management, an emphasis on communication, and a dialogue and interactive relationship with politicians. Regarding the role of the department, this was seen as advisory and research management. All of the above arrangements were seen as fluid, and regular efforts would be made to examine their relevance to changing circumstances.

Basic Work

The remainder of 1969, and 1970, as just noted, were dominated by organization building, and program development which will be dealt with later in this chapter. Considerable other planning work, however, was also performed. Some of the more important tasks will be next reviewed.

Primary efforts were expended on transportation planning. Prior to Lash's arrival, a rapid transit study had been commissioned jointly by B.C. Hydro Transit Division, and the GVRD and with some involvement of the City of
Vancouver. With the emergence of the report of the consultants, DeLeuw, Cather & Co., *Report on the Greater Vancouver area rapid transit study*,它 was Lash's professional evaluation that the affirmative answer on rapid transit and the specific routes were recommended prematurely.

We are now faced, at the end of the Rapid Transit Study, with the conclusion that Rapid Transit is not only feasible and desirable, but perhaps essential in some areas. Unfortunately, that study does not tell us what are the alternatives to Rapid Transit, because it dealt only with Rapid Transit.

Under this predicament, Rashleigh was hired as a part-time consultant to prepare an audio-visual presentation of the report and show this to the community. The objective was to avoid narrow discussion and too rapid a decision, and to emphasize the institutional arrangements needed for metropolitan transportation rather than a particular physical solution. In 1970 the planning agency worked extensively on examining the feasibility of the Rapid Transit Report both through public consultations and study with the Transportation Committee of the Board. This was their major substantive work of the year; it demonstrated the desirability of a regional transportation authority and the necessity of broader views of transportation through a "broad-brush transportation plan". The continuation of this work will be reported in subsequent chapters.

A second major work area of 1970 concerned housing. The Broome Report placed housing as a planning priority—particularly the adoption of a regional housing function for the equitable distribution of public housing throughout the region. Investigations on the adoption of such a function were conducted by the planning agency. It was decided to hire a Housing Director as part of the planning agency, and upon his familiarization with the GVRD and its intended role, to set up a separate Housing Department. The latter follows the agency's intentions to perform staff rather than line functions. It is also an example of their "seed bed role".

Thirdly, the planning agency began their involvement with IIPS, the Vancouver Regional Inter-institutional Policy Simulator, in 1970. M.A. Gold-
berg and C.S. Holling, principals in IIPS and faculty members at the University of British Columbia, invited the GVRD and planning agency to participate in the IIPS project. The basic objective of IIPS was to develop a regional policy simulation model that would be useful as an operational planning device in the Vancouver Region. It was to be a comprehensive simulator of the Vancouver region including factors such as environmental quality not previously included in such models. The project was organized on an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional basis. Participation was obtained from several academic disciplines, the Vancouver City Departments of Engineering, Planning, Finance, Social Planning and Community Development, and the Director of Planning of the GVRD. The main organizational instrument was a "Core Group" which had three university representatives and representatives from all of the above departments. It was intended that "IIPS should become a tool for community dialogue", that is, improve community participation in the public decision-making process affecting development. The project was jointly funded by the Ford Foundation, City of Vancouver, GVRD, and later by the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs. Several of the GVRD planning department staff were involved from the beginning.

Several other matters occupied considerable work time in 1971. These were review of amendments to the Official Regional Plan, setting up of the library and INTERMET. The ORP remained the legal land use document for the region. It required amendment with changing times but there was also pressure for some changes which were viewed as not having total harmony with the intentions of the plan. These requests, from member municipalities, necessitated careful examination. The department established a regional planning library using the extensive LMRPB collection inherited as a part of the departments public information program. This too took a large amount of time. Lastly, Thorburn brought with him an interest and affiliation with an international metropolitan study association INTERMET, and through him, the department became involved in it.
The Great City Debate--First Retreat

By mid 1970 the Senior staff was familiar with the new operation and the backlog of work carried over from the LMRPB began to subside. It was now time for a more explicit description of agency objectives. The four Seniors, Lash, Farry, Thorburn and Rashleigh, were the participants in the first departmental retreat held at Diamond Head near the end of August. The purposes of this first retreat were to get to know each other better, to exchange viewpoints, and to hammer out a direction for the department. As a starting point Lash presented a position on planning for Vancouver as a "great city", a position which spawned considerable debate.

Following the first day of discussions at the retreat four tentative streams of activity for GVP were identified for further examination. These were:

1. Plan preparation--Lash's desire to create a new operational plan including the promise of IIPS. He discussed his desire for an operational plan as a result of dissatisfaction with Toronto planning and some notions of a dynamic plan which emerged in Montreal.

2. Organization--"the development of the governmental and organizational structures and linkages both within the region and with the Provincial and Federal governments. This requires the organization of channels of communication and finding ways to involve both Federal and Provincial people in the decision-making and planning process".

3. Education and information stream--"mainly concerned with informing people about the Regional District and its activities, but which also has an objective of changing the image of Vancouver and the usual way of thinking about Vancouver. To Vancouverites the Region is not a reality, it consists of a number of separate communities. They are not ready to think of themselves as living in a
city which has a certain world-wide importance and some unique combination of features which give it opportunities which other cities do not have.31 and

4. Economic planning stream—raised by Thorburn, it was suggested that Vancouver may have to play a new economic role as a result of provincial, national and international economic forces, and that these external forces should be aware of the development problems Vancouver will have to face as a result of their actions. For the most part this is a communication and coordination problem, but there are also some basic questions—e.g. should Vancouver be the only major city in British Columbia, to what extent should all the Western provinces have a say in the functions that Vancouver takes on?

Subsequent examination of these four streams led to varying degrees of acceptance. The first two on developing a new type of plan and organizational structures were accepted. The economic planning stream was accepted with reservations. Tentatively they concluded there was a need to monitor the effects of economic policies, and for the time being "Let's call it the fourth level, and say that it has to do with the question of investigating economic planning as a part of the region's responsibilities".32

The education and information stream was accepted in principle but hotly debated in content. Lash had suggested that this stream be directed toward an awakening of Vancouverites to their great city. In fact Lash suggested the idea of a great city as the overriding goal for all four streams, or in other words, the whole planning activity. This became known as the Great City Debate and can be summarized as follows.

Lash proposed that the seniors search for an ideal or objective which could stir us up, and upon which they could base a five year planning program for Greater Vancouver. It should stimulate continuous enthusiasm and be suffi-
ciently concrete to build a program. He suggested "Vancouver the Great City" as such an overall goal. He claimed, among other things, "Vancouver's situation and setting, together with the fact that it happens to be in Canada which has a very high growth potential, and at the moment an open immigration policy, is going to keep on turning it into a very distinctive cosmopolitan area".  

All three other seniors attacked the great city idea with various views but the major opponent was Rashleigh. The following four points summarize the debate listing the attack first and the defense second.

1. Rashleigh doubted if they could sell such a "high flying banner" as "Vancouver—Canada's City in the Sun" to the people. It sounds too much like a slogan.

Lash replied "I'm not talking about mounting an operation to create a prestige image which is 45% ad-man's flim-flam, 25% Chamber of Commerce boosting and 10% real facts".

2. We don't need such a single all inclusive goal but can concentrate on smaller operational goals—more modest objectives. "Why do you feel this obligation to boil down the objectives to one, an all embracing one? I'd be satisfied with a few small successes that we can pull off as a department".

In response to Rashleigh's modest objectives argument and in reference to past experience with this approach, Lash said, "I'm a bit fed up with spending my life on the things that turn out not to make any difference".

3. The great city idea does not "jibe very well with the well stated aim to make our organization a very action oriented one;" we shouldn't "sell the people something that is only in our imagination".

Thorburn responded that Rashleigh's statement was inconsistent with his educational program in which he wished to inform and involve the public about different approaches and yet his action oriented program implied preconceived actions.

4. We should be more problem oriented and deal with matters such as
"the constant competition between limited farmland and urban growth" and such conceptualizations as the "livable cities in a sea of green". In a broad response Lash said,

The only urgency now, of course, is to set a program for next year. But I would resist setting next year's program by running down the shopping list and ticking things off. I would rather get to the point where we have agreed on some statements of possible objectives that are good enough to help organize our thinking. Many planning organizations give themselves the role of providing possible alternatives that decision-makers may want, without any sort of ideological input. The concept of "livable cities in a sea of green" is not satisfying to me as an objective any more than such objectives as "new towns" or "green belt" or "balanced transportation system". They are too physical. What you have to do is get beyond those concepts by asking why do you want this physical result? What is it going to do for life? I appreciate Ted's concern with the particular Vancouver situation, but it is the implication for life in Vancouver that I am looking for.40

This retreat did not come to a definite conclusion. Lash concluded by saying "you have got to set up objectives which are outside of your program, by which your programs are going to be measured.... Well, now that we are all feeling rather grumpy, shall we go and have a cup of tea?"41

Salt Spring

A second staff retreat was held in October of 1970 on Salt Spring Island involving all professional staff. The objective was to further discuss guidelines for a five year planning program, and become specific about the 1971 program. Seminars were held on philosophic background, role of the planning agency, major regional problems, and the 1971 program objectives.

The philosophical background seminar was principally a presentation by Lash covering his Montreal experiences in goal setting, the rank of Vancouver among cities, what identified Vancouver as a unique city, and some speculations on the future. One can note that despite opposition the great city idea persisted in Lash's mind. Largely, Lash was testing the idea more than being a die-hard advocate of it. To this point he had not found sufficient counter arguments or evidence to drop it, and further convincing opposition did not emerge.
In the seminar on the agency role it was accepted that they would be the research arm of the GVRD. Some important further explorations on role occurred regarding relations with the public, politicians and other GVRD departments. Would they interact with the public through advocacy, consensus building, "needling", "hew and cry", or sensitization? Lash summarized how he saw their approach as one of fostering images but not going out with a hard sell. Toward politicians, the ideal relationship was conceived as one which would create an atmosphere where political leadership develops. The department could assist this by bringing ideas to the politicians. Lastly, it was recognized that the "staff" or research function would naturally cause friction with the line departments. To minimize this friction, to help make GVRD a cohesive unit, and to provide staff assistance to line departments, it was decided that a "missionary role" of lending staff members should be followed.

The third seminar on major regional problems was less productive. In the absence of well defined short and long term objectives for the region the discussion of random problems was regarded as somewhat aimless. Accordingly they shifted to a review of functions which GVRD might adopt to make the regional district concept work. Some of the possible future functions discussed were transportation, public housing, pollution control, health, welfare, police, parks, plumbing code, garbage disposal, libraries, landscaping, land assembly for agricultural preservation and economic development, traffic, land banking, information centre, harbours, schools and urban development.

Finally, the last seminar tackled what the 1971 program should be. While there was a shopping list of program items almost all of the discussion centered on what type of plan they would be developing. Since these discussions were lengthy and crucial to further developments of the planning program they are placed under the following separate heading.

What Form of Plan

A major thrust of the LMRPB just prior to its demise was the Trans-
portation and Urban Pattern Study, called TUPS. Since it became central to discussion on a new type of plan, some elaboration on TUPS is necessary. The Official Regional Plan, adopted in 1966, was basically a land-use plan. It did include, however, the framework for a more dynamic and specific plan. Subsequent studies were intended on major transportation linkages in relation to urban patterns "to assume optimum use of these land resources and the transportation facilities that serve them". Thus the "Transportation and Urban Pattern Study", called TUPS, was initiated by the LMRPB.

Not only was TUPS to be a natural progression of the regional plan, but it was also to be a "new" type of plan. Planning practice up until the 1960's had employed separate transportation and land use studies and plans. Accordingly a transportation plan would be made to serve an independently projected land use pattern. Similarly, land use plans were prepared to complement an independent transportation pattern. The LMRPB saw both approaches as being wrong. Rather, the objectives and limitations in land-use and transportation plans should be mutual and developed coincidentally with full acknowledgment of the interrelationships. The nature of TUPS, as stated in a preliminary way in the study proposals included the use of a simulation model to evaluate alternative land-use/transportation patterns leading to the selection of the pattern that best achieves regional goals. This was to be followed by more detailed short and long term plans.

Discussion of TUPS at the Salt Spring retreat generally found the approach invalid for the current situation and searched for a different type of plan. The reasons for abandoning TUPS, expressed in terms of those at the meeting, were

1. We do not want a one study program for the planning agency but several studies with an undefined end product—that is, flexibility along the way. TUPS can be described as a series of study steps; our approach can be described as a series of study and
action steps. Decisions will be made along the way and direction changed.

2. The problem of "bringing the ORP up"—It is difficult to build on a plan with a narrow planning base when many additional dimensions may increase the implementation power, particularly the new functions GVRD may adopt.

3. Modification studies to the ORP may make it undesirable to follow this plan.

4. HIPS will look at all options for Greater Vancouver on a longer term basis than would TUPS.

5. We avoid the magic output at the end of five years of study, instead we should seek an ongoing output.

6. The ORP is primarily a regional zoning bylaw. "We do need this, but we can't make it work by itself. We've got to have policies that operationalize the goals along with it".46

As is evident, this evolutionary step in Greater Vancouver planning involved two different conceptions of a plan and accordingly the discussions can be viewed in terms of contrasting approaches about the process of plan making and the substance of the plan. TUPS involved many complementary studies over several years resulting in a complete and sophisticated plan. In contrast the proposed approach would be more short-range. Studies would contribute to evolving policy development in which an ultimate plan would be secondary to the on-going process: "The hell with more studies, let's build the bloody line".47 Regarding substance, TUPS sought to build on the pattern of urban physical form of the ORP which inescapably related to the LMRPB concepts of transportation corridors, town centres, and cities in a sea of green. The new approach would take a "fresh look". A systems orientation would be followed assuming a large number of development patterns which could be compared and evaluated on the basis of goals criteria. In combination with the short-range
characteristic, the proposed approach would continuously examine alternatives rather than settling on one optimum urban pattern.

While debate on these directions could not be completed, there was consensus to step out with the new approach as defined so far. For 1971 this meant two major projects: (a) continuation of the transportation work leading to a completed report, and (b) a beginning on a new plan--project Alpha. Concerning the concept of plan Alpha, it implied an abandonment of further work on updating and detailing the ORP, and commitment to a new type of plan.

**Harrison Seminar**

The next step in developing the new agency's program was to hold a further seminar in October, this time involving the politicians of the Planning Committee. They met at Harrison Hot Springs "to discuss long-term objectives of the Regional District program as it affects regional development, and within this context, the 1971 Program of the Planning Department".

To assemble all the preparatory discussions on program development and to provide a vehicle for seminar discussions, Lash presented a Position Paper. Because the position paper is somewhat of a "kitchen sink" report including most of the ideas from the previous retreats, it is difficult to summarize. Briefly it contained the following:

- Vancouver's future role including the great city idea;
- goals for Vancouver largely similar to the Montreal goals;
- role of the Regional District defined as: "to insure that the urban and regional milieu provided Vancouver's people is of the best possible quality both now and in the future, insofar as that lies beyond the scope of individual municipalities or can be more efficiently undertaken on behalf of those municipalities by the Regional District";
- an outline of the role of the planning department to include five main functions:
1. Coordination of and liaison between governmental agencies, municipal agencies and other organizations.

2. Corporate planning for the Regional District as an organization as distinct from regional planning for Greater Vancouver.

3. Acquisition of functions including "seed bed role" and planning department staff development.

4. Public information, communication, and feedback.

5. Development of a new regional plan and implementing policies.

With such a broad discussion base the seminar proceeded. It acted as a vehicle for the exchange of ideas and was educational about regional planning. More importantly, some crucial decisions emerged. The first of these was a change in the goals emphasis from the great city conception to livability. While it was accepted that "Vancouver's image is one of being a great place in which to live", its greatness was not seen as a great world city but great because of local livability. As Lash later said, Vancouver's umbrella goal appears to be "harmony with the environment" rather than great world city. From this point onward livability becomes the catch-word of GVRD planning. A second principle emerging from the seminars was that planning leadership should be a political responsibility. "The Board members themselves must offer leadership. The planners themselves have a low-profile role, and do not feel that it is their job to launch (or lead) crusades". And third, the seminars verified the five role functions of the planning department as outlined above in Lash's Position Paper.

Lastly, the seminars reached a conclusion on the content of the 1971 program. This can be best understood through the Planning Committee summary of the seminar.

In connection with the broad consensus arising from the Seminar Mr. Lash made a generalized graphic presentation, geared to the "Livable City" idea, showing the "flow" or progression of the vari-
ous elements, such as transportation (the present program or "public meeting" phase of which is already nearing completion); data gathering, fact finding, ORP amendments, information systems building, IIPS, and tentative new functions, etc. A critical path type of diagram was also presented.

An immediate, first approximation of the "livable city plan" (project Alpha) is scheduled to commence in January 1971. The ultimate plan is conceived as a "document" which will suggest how things ought to be controlled in the Region, and how things ought to be positively planned or done, so that a "livable city" ensues not only at the end, but hopefully, one that becomes increasingly livable as the Region progresses.

("Livable City" means livable within the region, or the Greater Vancouver metropolitan area.)

"Alpha" is expected to be finished with a rough report for the Board (through the Planning Committee) in February 1971. The proposed transportation corridors were discussed. It was noted that investigations should go ahead within three months....

Goals Seminar

Following quickly after the Harrison retreat was a Goals seminar with the Technical Planning Committee. "This Seminar evolved from an earlier one held by the Board's Planning Committee, when the political decision was made to define the goals of the Region by way of a 'Livable Region Plan'.... Something that may come out of this Seminar, aside from discussion (and perhaps some definition of goals), is an idea of how to stimulate greater consciousness in the metropolitan Vancouver area of the Regional District itself".

Three papers were scheduled for the seminar by Genevieve MeMarchand staff member, Harry Lash, director, and Hans Blumenfeld, consultant contracted for this purpose.

LeMarchand's paper was titled *Goals in Planning--a preview of goals for Greater Vancouver.* Her excellent paper, circulated beforehand, was divided into three parts. In the first, she traced the evolution of goals in planning from a position of being identified intuitively by the planner, to being an integral part of an interdisciplinary, dynamic, and systematic planning. The former applied until the beginning of the 1950's. After that date a broader perspective on goals emerged in theory: for example, Davidoff's
Choice Theory as a way of evaluating alternatives, and in Hill's "goals achievement matrix" to deal with multiple goals. Recently, she pointed out, goals are becoming even more important as we view our cities as systems, and as politicians and the public demand to know planner's goal premises.

The second part examined goals in planning literature and well known studies. She reviewed the methods of goal determination, the nature of goals and their cultural variance. She concluded that there was a failure to relate goals and policies: "No systematic procedure was clearly outlined. The goals seem to have served mainly as a general framework within which intelligent decisions could be made".

The third and last part reviewed the LMRPB and GVRD reports and identified the goals "implied or expressed" in them. Goals are identified and summarized for each report. LeMarchand's conclusion to the report was that we ought to define three levels of goals--general goals "which can be applied to the continuous quality of the planning process", operational goals "to help Planning deal with change", and objectives from which "a program of action can be defined". Regarding putting this into practice she said:

For Greater Vancouver, the concept of a "Livable City" was picked up at the Harrison Hot Springs Seminar. This is a fairly general goal with which it is hard to agree or disagree unless it is further explained. And here is where the analysis work of planners and specialists will help to establish the framework for operational goals. The operational goals I found in the examples were mainly influenced by the nature, quality and strength of natural resources (air, water, land) environment (natural setting, urban structures and services) people (behavior, motivations, values) socio-economic and cultural level.
If we follow the same pattern, conditions of livability in Vancouver would be defined by relationships between all elements within the four sets above and their subsets. The "livability" index, if there were one, might be the same in 1970 as in 1920, or by the year 2000. What would have changed are the conditions of livability. Therefore I am not speaking of an absolute definition of a livable city. What I mean is that a certain balance, an ecological balance, has to be maintained whatever the changes might be in population volume, in quantity of preserved natural resources, or in density of housing units, etc. There is a balance concept to define in these days of ecological crisis on our planet, while a "value" revolution is raging ....It is indeed the role of politicians to account for existing and
conflicting values, but it also belongs to them to design for change, by forming the opinion of people about the future, by "inventing preferred futures".  

She went on to recommend that a livability index be developed and to stress that the goals of the region are complex and beyond the comprehension of any individual—for understanding these "what is needed therefore is a communication between individuals, planners, developers, administrators, various kinds of specialists, and politicians—communication from which the mechanics and the dynamics of the Region, as well as the motivations of people, could be brought to light".  

For the next seminar session Lash did not present a formal paper as intended due to a recent illness, but he did outline his thoughts verbally. Several major points were made, the first of which explained the greater concern for goals today in terms of a changing ethos of the age. Elaborating on this theme he presented a chart of changing societal values over time which is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHOS OF THE AGE</th>
<th>PLANNERS' WATCHWORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800  Glory of God</td>
<td>Master Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Pomp and Paternalism</td>
<td>Grand Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 Rugged Individualism</td>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Prosperity and Promises (Progress)</td>
<td>Order, economy and convenience for some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 The Welfare State</td>
<td>Order, economy and convenience for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Reverence for Life</td>
<td>Quality of the City and the Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Up until eight or ten years ago it was easily defined that most planning was done to produce orderly economical and convenient development in the community. This clearly understood precept then began to cloud over with a diffusion of broader ideals or goals....What seems to be the emerging, current ethos is a "reverence for life", wherein man is realizing for the first time that he is not a supreme being—but simply that he is just another being. Planners, consequently, are now (or should be) concerned with the quality of the city and the environment. We are concerned with goals today because this change is just beginning, and it is a much sharper change than that between the era of rugged individualism and the era of prosperity and progress, or from prosperity and progress to the welfare state. The change in values appears to be much greater because these periods were concerned mainly with quantitative values, whereas the future indicates a concern with qualitative values.

The thing that is perhaps bothering planners is that the planning method, independent of where it sits—the way you go about planning—is the essence of trying to achieve something in an orderly and economical, rational, convenient way. During the past decade the goals of society, to some extent, coincided with the planning discipline's method of looking at things. But now that is suddenly no longer true ....Goals, then—general goals and operational goals—must be determined consciously. There may be a tendency to get extremely uptight about the choice because personal limitations are not realized.60

In essence Lash said, and was explicit about this, that the traditional goals hierarchy planning approach is no longer viable: "working within a hierarchy (thinking down from the top level to the bottom) may not be productive".61 A new goals approach was necessary, in Lash's view, and he presented a goals matrix which relates quantitative goals to qualitative goals.62

It is quite feasible to look at our problem in a different way—to use our goals in a much easier way. Our task as Regional Planners may be viewed simply as that to manage growth and change within a set of urban and regional systems. This may be illustrated in the following matrix:
Planners could use this goals matrix as follows. Regarding the set of urban and regional systems, minimum acceptable standards need to be established. Next possible desirable changes in the systems should be identified. And lastly, various patterns of desirable changes all above the minimum acceptable standards should be evaluated relative to the quality goals. In this way trade-offs between systems and quality advancement can be made as well as trade-offs among systems and among goals. "We are trying to progress in the quality goals from less to more, and in the systems, from insufficiency/inefficiency towards sufficiency/efficiency."

Following the papers of LeMarchand and Lash, the seminar divided into five groups in which they discussed the papers and some specific questions.

The third and last paper was presented by Hans Blumenfeld, the eminent planner now working in Toronto. Blumenfeld was contracted for three days to write and present a paper on Planning the Urban Form. His paper outlines the difficulty of prediction, implicitly accepts growth, and turns to the form for Vancouver at the next turn of the century when the population will be 2 million. In generally discussing urban form he identifies the primary contra-
dictory requirements of access to work and access to the real countryside: Howard's two magnets: city and country. To minimize all travel distances to work calls for "compact overall form (of) a circle, having a minimum length of perimeter for a given amount of area". And if the city grows beyond a certain size there would be the desirability of sub-centres.

The second and even more important form to satisfy the attraction of the "country" magnet is access to the "real" countryside, to fields, farms, and forests. This requires a maximum length of the "urban perimeter"—exactly the opposite of the circular form which is the form which urban areas tend to assume if they are directed by the "natural" forces of the market. In fact, the various proposals for "ideal" city forms all derive from the desires to lengthen the perimeter. In essence, there are only three such forms: the constellation, the ribbon, and the star.

He then goes on to show that the star, or "finger" plan, provides as good access to the countryside as the others and better access to all other parts of the urban areas. However, it requires adjustment to the geography and givens of the area. For Vancouver "nature has cut off half of the potential fingers. Consequently the remaining fingers must be longer, thicker, and more densely developed than they otherwise would be. This makes it both more necessary and more feasible to develop strong sub-centres in these fingers and to connect them to the main centre by effective transportation links".

In discussion, Blumenfeld made some pertinent comments on the gap between goals and objectives. His position was goals are motherhood statements and discussions about them are unproductive. Planning is corrective in nature because man knows what he does not want, not what he does want. Therefore, we should start with problems, develop objectives, and work toward the best conditions possible. "The need is to really understand the city as an ongoing and dynamic system, and to see not only immediate consequences by which something is done, but also all of the other effects".

Phillips, a Vancouver Alderman and Planning Committee Member, provided a summation for the seminar in which he said the following:

- a livability index should be pursued
- The distinction between the thinking of the 50's and that which has evolved over the past two years is important (the change from the emphasis on economic development to the quality of life is obvious politically, and is an important distinction to make);

- The old LMRPB goals reflect the values of the 50's and require updating. But goals themselves are not a substitute for something more tangible in the way of a plan (they are too broad and unenforceable).

- We should examine our goals partly by considering negatives—the problems that have to be overcome—but they must be considered on the same level as the goals.70

Summary

The Greater Vancouver Regional District Planning Department was formed in 1969 and its Director, Harry Lash, was appointed later that year. From the outset there was an opportunity to create a new style of planning, and Lash wished to seize this opportunity.

There are three distinctive features to GVRD planning in 1969 and 1970. First, efforts were made to build the new department: the addition of senior staff and the development of an organizational design. From the outset organization for planning was considered as an essential part of planning. Of note was the collegial approach used in "matins" for exchange of data and for more or less joint decision-making.

Second, the new department was committed to some work which had already been started. Of prominence here was the Rapid Transit Study which involved considerable time.

Third, and most important, the department undertook extensive deliberations toward defining their function and defining a five year planning program. Toward these objectives a series of retreats was held with broadening participation: first with senior staff, then all staff, and finally staff and politicians. The retreat conception was an extension of the collegial organization principle but it included the additional idea of working in partnership with politicians. From retreat deliberations many crucial matters were decided. The department's roles were outlined as coordinator among governments, corpor-
ate planning, acquisition of regional functions, public involvement, and development of a new regional plan.

Regarding the new plan, extensive discussions occurred; "livability" emerged as the umbrella goal of GVRD planning. Tentative steps toward the new plan included the use of public participation, operational goals, and development of a livability index and an urban matrix.

Overall this beginning phase of planning in the GVRD can be seen as a deliberate and open-minded search for a way of planning to meet local circumstances and avoid past failings. This approach resembles a new consciousness for planning.
1. Interview with Professor Wiesman, University of British Columbia, School of Community and Regional Planning, 1973.

2. Appendix C summarizes all GVRD staff.

3. The unfavorable judgement on the LMRPB, which fell primarily on Vic Parker as Director, should in no way be seen as a mark against his competence or that of the agency. In fact the opposite is likely the case; the success of the LMRPB inevitably led them into politically sensitive areas and to ultimate crisis. Their aggressive style, or what may be called the crusading planner, got them into trouble and not the professional competence which formed the foundation of their proposals. In retrospect, the LMRPB was as innovative in its time as the GVRD is in its, but it had an "Achilles' heel", whereas we have yet to see if the GVRD has one as well.
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CHAPTER FOUR

FIRST BOLD MOVES: GVRD PLANNING IN 1971

The 1971 planning program marked a shift from program design to substantive program studies. A detailed program design had emerged which provided a framework for determining the year's activities.

1970 was characterized by a series of retreats or deliberations out of which a program design evolved. Those deliberations, it will be recalled, involved successively broadening participation. Only the Senior staff partook in the Diamond Head retreat, most staff were present on Salt Spring Island, politicians (the Planning Committee) were the principals at the Harrison Hot Springs retreat, and the Goals Seminar included urban planners from all member municipalities plus some politicians. This broadening participation stimulated program development by bringing different perspectives and ideas to the process. Equally important, it involved all of those central to program implementation. Thus the emerging 1971 program emerged from a complex series of interactive decisions, an evolutionary process, in contrast to a single decision.

Lash translated these deliberations into a detailed program design which was specific for 1971 and more general for the next several years. It took the visual form of "a network diagram or chart showing the necessary links and precedence of activities", as well as detailed job descriptions for specific studies within the program; it incorporated features of a program budget.
and critical path analysis. Altogether 90 mini-studies were identified with the belief that a large number of them could be completed in 1971. The intention was to have most of these studies done by consultants. It will be recalled that the agency function had been conceptualized as guiding and managing research within an overall scheme rather than conducting most of the research in-house. Accordingly, an open meeting of the Technical Planning Committee was held at the Centennial Museum auditorium on January 29, 1971; consultants and academics were invited to attend. Lash explained the 1971 program and he "advised the consultants and UBC academics that the GVRD Planning Department would be happy to receive written proposals from any persons or firms who might be interested in undertaking work based solely on the details included in the 1971 program notes." Other guidelines laid down were (a) about $150,000 was available for consultants in 1971, (b) omnibus proposals would not be accepted, and (c) in the interest of objectivity, feasibility studies would exclude a firm from being awarded engineering work. Regarding (b), this was to maintain guidance and control by the planning agency, but it was also realized that managing many mini-studies would be time consuming. The outcomes of this program design and consultant interaction will be reported throughout this chapter.

The planning activities of 1971 can be best summarized under six streams of activity identified in the program design. These six streams along with the priorities for 1971 are as follows:

1. Information gathering and analysis—As prerequisite for planning studies, an information system should be established to make the best use of available data; to assist analyses livability indicators should be identified; and development of the Regional simulation model (IIPS) should continue.

2. Acquisition of new regional functions—Since the framework for Regional government in British Columbia is founded on the gradual acquisition of new functions, attention should be given to priori-
ties and readiness for such acquisitions (the transportation function acquisition is given a separate stream—number 6 below).

3. Regional plan and policy making—Program development in 1970 identified the creation of a Livable Region plan as a major priority of the agency and the "keystone of the Departmental program". It should be noted that this varies from the Transportation and Urban Pattern Study (TUPS) of the Broome Report in that it is not aimed at detailing the ORP but at developing a new type of plan.

4. The Official Regional Plan Stream—the ORP still remains as the legal land use guide for the Region. It requires occasional amendment, and provisions should be added for evaluating major development proposals.

5. Broad-brush transportation plan—A short term transportation plan should be prepared "to enable sound judgments about transportation priorities to be made during the period prior to acquisition of the transportation function". Of note is that this is a more comprehensive transportation approach than outlined in the Broome Report.

6. Transportation function acquisition—In preparation for this action, investigations, discussions and negotiations on the organization and financing of such a function should be made. The function should be acquired in 1971.

These streams provide an appropriate framework for reviewing the 1971 planning activities. They will be presented in order of their prominence during the year.

**Broad-brush Transportation plan stream**

Of the above six streams, the broad-brush transportation stream dominated the work effort of the year. It consumed 5063 man hours, which is 43 per cent of non-administration staff time, and included eight consultant re-
ports. Recent events relevant to this stream include the DeLeuw, Cather & Co. report on rapid transit which the agency reviewed in 1970. Also in late 1970 two provincial cabinet members suggested that public transit be turned over from B.C. Hydro to the Regional District for one dollar with an offer to absorb 50 per cent of any increased losses from the operation as well as covering 37\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent of capital expenditures for expansion.

In response to the latter, the GVRD Board appointed a Transportation Function Study Committee under the Chairmanship of Allan Kelly "to study the proposals that had been made to us and to determine the needs of the District, suggest how they might best be met, how they could be financed and how we would operate if the Region accepted responsibility for public transportation. In this study I was to have the assistance of Planning Department staff and such consultants as were deemed necessary". Regarding the Planning Department transportation was a priority study area assigned by the Broome Report, but the department had been diverted from this general task in 1970 to review the Rapid Transit Study. Their analysis of this study affirmed that a broader transportation strategy considering more alternatives was necessary.

Kelly and staff members worked on the study throughout the spring and summer with a self imposed deadline of October. Lash, Farry and O'Gorman were the staff co-workers. The 1971 program design provided a framework to begin the study. One additional criterion was to exclude the 3rd Crossing (major bridge) controversy from the study at the request of several Board members. Regional Board members were split regarding the proposed 200 million dollar bridge making it a sensitive issue. This placed Kelly and the staff in a difficult position because the bridge issue was central to the overall transportation picture. Changes to the study design were made as necessary with Kelly tending toward more action now (a characteristic political stance), and Lash tending to support the logic of original study designs. When matters bothered Kelly he would visit the staff for 2 or 3 hours at a time and search
with them for solutions. Frequent and long deliberations and compromises eventually led to progress. By fall, Kelly, Lash and Farry had prepared a draft report which was circulated to the Planning Committee, Technical Planning Committee, and the Transportation Function Study Committee. A final report was completed in October.

Under these circumstances, transportation was given priority in the 1971 Program. The specific objectives of the Broad-brush Transportation stream were:

1. Development of program for immediate improvements to transportation.
2. Identification of future transportation corridors and their appropriate designation in the Official Regional Plan.
3. Achievement of a suitable formula for financing improvements to the regional transportation system.
4. Develop an initial five year regional transportation program and priorities.

The procedure for achieving these objectives was complex and inextricably involved with the 1971 program design. A series of interrelated studies was proposed some to be done by consultants and others in-house. A precise program budget aided the process by (a) providing overall and study cost estimates, (b) establishing a sequence for projects, (c) providing more detailed frames of reference, and (d) establishing a time schedule for the completion of projects. While the transportation stream comprises only a part of the total program, it indicates well how the program budget device worked in practice, and will be explained below.

Figures 2 and 3 show the proposed transportation stream studies for 1971 and the studies actually undertaken. Although the proposed and actual study programs are basically similar there are some specific differences. The study changed as it advanced which was consistent with the agency's desire to think things through at every stage. Exactly what types of changes occurred? First, new needs were perceived and incorporated into the evolving study. For example the transmission line and pipe line aspects had become current problems (B and C), downtown transit study (I) was necessary to complement planning by
1. Compile existing transportation plans
2. Needs survey by district
3. Minimum standards and performance indices
4. Deficiencies from needs and indices
5. Grid plan for transportation corridors
6. Priorities from needs and indices
7. Immediate improvements transportation plan
8. Phase two immediate improvement plan
9. Investigate cost-sharing formula alternatives
10. Computer program to test formulas
11. Study four rapid transit alternatives
12. Costs and revenues for improvements plan
13. Annual cost-shares by municipality
14. Concept report

Figure 2:
PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION STUDIES -- 1971

function acquisition
Figure 3:

ACTUAL TRANSPORTATION STUDIES -- 1971

A. compile existing transportation plans
B. transmission line proposals
C. Cascade pipeline study
D. rights-of-way mapping
E. minimum standards and performance indicies
F. arterial street survey
G. needs of municipal councils
H. think piece on transportation
I. downtown transit concepts
J. transportation corridor concept
K. immediate improvements transportation plan
L. market study transportation needs
M. cost-sharing proposed by Transportation Committee
N. KELLY REPORT (concept report)
O. transportation service indicies
the City of Vancouver, arterial streets were included at the request of the Regional Board (F), and the think piece (H) was needed to sharpen the study conceptually. Second, certain short cuts were taken to allow the work to be completed in a reasonable time. Regional transportation needs were established through contact with municipal Councils (G) in advance of well developed transportation indices (O). And the proposed complex procedure for arriving at a cost-sharing formula (9, 10, 12, and 13 involving formula alternatives, developing a computer program to test the formulas, calculating additional costs, and apportioning these by municipalities) was all handled by the Planning Committee (M). A comparison of the separate steps of the proposed and actual study procedures is contained in Appendix D along with a list of the eight consultant reports and how they contributed to the study. Here we have an excellent example of how GVRD planning incorporated several small external studies into a larger study design in which they made the synthesis.13

Regional Transportation as a GVRD Function

The content of the above transportation report, or the "Kelly Report" as it was instantly named, is now examined. Upon completion of the report the 3rd Crossing controversy was still growing but the anti-crossing forces were gaining support. It may be that the Kelly Report aided a non-decision by providing an alternative, but certainly once the decision on the crossing was deferred the report gained credibility because it was the only alternative available.14

The Kelly report outlined a policy statement for adoption of the transportation function on a Regional basis, and it recommended a "Stage One" for improving Greater Vancouver's transportation system. A summary of the policy statement for adoption of the transportation function is:

1. The Regional Transportation objective is "to provide the people of the Region with diversified transportation service adequate to meet their diverse needs at the least cost consistent with the Livable
Region concept, and within the financial resources available to the District and its members".

2. Rapid transit should be treated as a service like fire protection, investment in public transit can reduce requirements for roads and highways, dollar benefits of public transit do not often show up in the books of the responsible public transit agency, therefore fares should be considered in the context of resulting travel habits, patterns, and costs of the entire transportation system, but fares should not be considered as the sole source of financing public transit.

3. Regional powers will be requested to develop and operate a wide range of public transit services, and for comprehensive transportation planning.

4. Sources of finance should not further strain the property tax; therefore, Provincial support will be requested plus a "cost up to the equivalent of one mill on the school tax base" from each municipality in the Region.

5. The Board should request from the municipalities the unanimous endorsement of the plan for an expanded bus system.

While the report was mainly about how GVRD might best take on regional transportation as a function, it secondly contained suggestions for immediate improvements to the region's public transportation system by expanding the bus system. Based on the studies done in the transportation stream, and with the recognition that this was only a limited plan, a "Plan for the Expanded Bus System" was presented in some detail. The plan called for

- Creation of FASTBUS and LOCAL bus systems,

- Increasing routes and coverage in areas which have had big population increases but no corresponding increase in bus service,

- Locating transfer points between FASTBUS and LOCAL systems at activity points like shopping centres, and increasing service to concentra-
tion of activity: Downtown Vancouver, Downtown New Westminster, various shopping centres, and the Universities.

- Restoring most of the service cuts made after the strike in 1971, including late evening service,

- Finally, but most important, increasing the frequency of buses, reducing the waiting time and making schedules more reliable.

The Kelly Report was considered at the Board meeting of November 17, 1971. With some minor changes the Board

1. Adopted the Policy Statement and Program,

2. Directed the Chairman to request municipal approval of
   a) the Policy Statement and Plan for the Expanded Bus System,
   and b) a contribution equivalent to one mill on the school tax base.

3. Moved that the Provincial Government be informed of these actions and be requested to meet with the Board's representatives for discussion on the matters raised.

These items were carried with all City of Vancouver votes against. The end of the planning agencies work on the broad brush transportation stream for 1971 has now been reached. At the outset four objectives were established and all four were achieved. A short term program for an immediate improvement plan was completed (without separate plans for immediate and 5 year periods), future transportation corridors were identified (but not included in the ORP), and principles for a cost-sharing formula were recommended.

A major difference between the Kelly Report transportation study and those which preceded it in the Vancouver region was that it did not attempt to offer an ultimate solution. Instead, it concentrated on the process of providing and planning for Regional transportation and short run improvements. Even so one may ask how this plan relates to the evolving Livable Regional Plan?

In response to such a question the report said:

Concern has been expressed that we should first be making basic decisions about how the Region is to grow and develop, and determine the plan for the Livable Region, before we decide what transportation services are needed. I share that concern, but the cycle of planning
can be started at any point; in fact, it has been started, and the cycle must constantly be repeated through the years ahead. I believe we can, and should, adopt the function now. To build the Livable Region we must act as well as plan.18

Regional Plan and Policy Making Stream

The regional plan and policy making stream was called the "keystone stream" in the 1971 program report although it turned out to be second in effort to transportation for the year. The program design however was for a Livable Region Plan to be finished by 1975. Three major advances toward this plan were made in 1971: Project Alpha, livability indicators study, and beginning of the Public Program. Each of these is extremely important in the evolving plan19 and will be dealt with separately.

Project Alpha

Alpha was the name given to the first mini-study commissioned out of the 1971 program. Norman Pearson, a former staff member, undertook the work in January and February. He obtained the help of several staff members and used special "matins" sessions to brainstorm with the professionals.

Alpha meant "a 'first run' at devising an operational plan and strategy for guiding Greater Vancouver's future development".20 It was an experimental task to identify a plan making method which could serve as a model for further plan development. Alpha used data approximation whereas future efforts would use more precise data.

The 1971 program design designated eight weeks for the completion of the project and set down the following guidelines for the consultant. (These guidelines are typical of the frames of reference used in the program design, and may be viewed as a representative sample from the report)21

Input
- goals, philosophy
- physical, social, economic and political features of the region today

Output
- awareness of the physical, social, economic and political features of the region
- first run of livability and its component qualities
- development of a process for working through the Livable Region Plan development
- reveal potential or limitations of a livability matrix
- awareness of the decision-making process in relation to livability
- awareness of lacking data needed for Livable Region Plan work
- first run regional structure alternatives and focus (including Blumenfeld comments)
- first run at elements of plan including transportation
- basis for interim guidelines for evaluating major development proposals
- noting of strengths and weaknesses of each output
- list of key questions and issues facing the region.

From this study, a succinct ten page report was produced to be used to stimulate public discussion. Its principal contents were:

1. An overview of Greater Vancouver today according to natural features, physical development structure, transportation linkages, and social and economic features.

2. A view of Greater Vancouver tomorrow focusing on growth and accepting a population increase from one million in 1970 to two million in 2000.

3. A restatement of the six major goals for Greater Vancouver in order of importance—ecological quality, vitality, practicality, identity, self realization and adaptability. "The impetus for these goals originated with the political group—members of the Board's Planning Committee (Harrison Hot Springs);...these were weighted as a result of the Goals Seminar (Technical Planning Committee), in terms of the things that were mentioned the most". 22

4. A review of urban structure options (e.g. satellite, star, linear), and a classification of transportation systems according to their essential capabilities.

5. An outline of thirteen major issues such as preservation of farm-land and conservation areas, decentralization versus centralization, space for recreation, density, etc.

6. A synthesis process which relates objectives to the two inter-
locking factors of transportation and development (options under 4 above in terms of the issues under 5. The synthesis is based on the unchallengeable principle of \textit{interrelatedness} among key factors.

To examine the interrelatedness among the three major sectors of quality of life goals, linkage systems, and structure and urban patterns, an objectives matrix was created. It was called an "objectives matrix" because it also translated the general goals into "more specific and tangible objectives".\textsuperscript{23} (More on the matrix in a moment.) From the synthesis process using the "objectives matrix" there emerged an overall desirable pattern:

Reinforce downtown as a multi-purpose centre by focusing major new regional facilities there, but reduce its relative retail commercial importance by focusing most new retail commercial development in, say, 15 multi-purpose town centres. Carefully relate these town centres to rapid transit in the inner areas and to freeways with supporting public transit in the outer areas. Decentralize some new office development and major institutions to 1, 2 or 3 major town centres strongly connected to downtown via rapid transit. Use rapid transit and freeways to assure fast movement between all parts of the region, to facilitate decentralization of employment, and to maximize choice open to people. Concentrate the 15 towns, averaging about 150,000 people each, in the upland areas. Focus most local commercial development and appropriate institutions in these town centres, supported by convenience goods and neighbourhood institutions in neighbourhood centres, and foster variety and innovation in housing types. Locate industrial clusters on transportation routes close to the towns throughout the region, and regulate emissions to avoid new and reduce existing pollution. Protect existing farmlands and conservation areas and acquire significant natural areas for recreation purposes.\textsuperscript{24}

Several urban shapes are possible from this desirable pattern.

The above matrix approach is important in the evolving Livable Region Plan and requires further elaboration. A "systems quality matrix" was suggested by Lash at the Goals Seminar.\textsuperscript{25} It related goals to urban systems such as housing and transportation and was intended to provide measures of achievements for each cell. The objectives matrix goes beyond this purpose to evaluate alternate futures. It is illustrated on the next page as follows.

First, general objectives were stated for each of the goals and placed along the x axis in order of priority: \(x_1, x_2\), etc. For Project Alpha
general objectives were taken from the goals statements made at the Harrison Hot Springs seminar and the priorities were taken from the weightings done at the Goals Seminar. Second, urban systems were placed along the y axis: recreation, housing, institutions, transportation, commercial, offices, industry and services. These represent the crucial aspects of the linkage systems and urban sectors. Third, within each cell of the matrix sub-objectives of the general objectives were listed in the specific sectoral area of concern. It was explicitly recognized that all sub-objectives could not be achieved by any one particular action and that trade-offs were inherent in the matrix.

Fourth, a policy scenario was selected, say limited growth, and an estimate made as to whether the scenario would complement or oppose each sub-objective. An optimum scenario would contribute to the largest number of sub-objectives in the highest part of the matrix (the preferred objectives). An example of the matrix is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for alternative future A</th>
<th>U1</th>
<th>U2</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
<th>U5</th>
<th>U6</th>
<th>U7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report had the following conclusion.

The matrix is like a piano, and the tune that results will depend upon the keys we play. The manner in which we resolve the conflicts in the matrix is part of the creative synthesis process. The desire of objectives that are fulfilled. We can each use the matrix as a basis for playing the "tune" on our own terms.
As part of Project Alpha two "tunes" or "scores" were worked out to examine the usefulness of the matrix and the inherent conflicts:
- goal oriented: this score gave heavy emphasis to the ecological quality and vitality goals, and satisfied virtually all of the objectives in the top half of the matrix, and many in the bottom half;
- trend orientation: this score gave heavy emphasis to trends maximizing the single-family dwelling and automobile-oriented lifestyle, satisfying fewer objectives in both the top half and the bottom half of the matrix.

Use of the goal oriented "tune" resulted in the desirable pattern noted above. The report ended by saying "this material should now be discussed publicly to aid in the process of evolving the best operational plan and strategy for the region". Project Alpha made a major contribution toward the development of the Livable Region Plan, and subsequent discussions will note its influence. Project Alpha report was widely distributed among politicians and planners and on a more limited basis to the public. Since it was an experimental project toward the Livable Region Plan official endorsement was unnecessary, and therefore did not occur. The agency was explicit about its experimental nature,

The criteria and objectives selected for "Project Alpha" did not, however, come out of a program of public discussion, but were selected by planners merely for the purpose of an in-house learning exercise.

A summary of matrix discussions as they have evolved to this point is now appropriate. Lash introduced a matrix approach in the Goals Seminar, and it was carried one step further in Project Alpha.

The first matrix related broad regional (human) goals to the goals of regional sub-systems (housing, transportation, etc.). It attempted to advance the regional goals while maintaining acceptable minimum standards of sub-system goals. This goals matrix brought two levels of goals into interaction. Project Alpha went further in that it developed a more complete goals hierarchy involving (a) general goals, (b) operational objectives, and (c) sub-objectives classified by sectors. Its second difference was to abandon the idea of minimum acceptable standards among sectors and merely recognize that all sub-objectives could not be met. General goals and objectives had primacy
over minimum standards. Third, Project Alpha could be used to test alternate futures while the Goals Matrix aimed at incremental advances in regional goals.

Both matrix approaches view the city as a highly interrelated social system in which tradeoffs are required in a process of dynamic interrelatedness. This contrasts with comprehensive planning's view of the city which simply assumes that man can change his city by design. The matrix technique essentially is a qualitative simulator for urban policy.

Livability Indicators Study

The second mini-study of this stream was labelled "Livability matrix" in the 1971 program design. A description of this study called for "determination of a livability matrix—if that is not workable, a system of translating goals into meaningful measures for the use in judging the development of the Livable Region Plan". Following the completion of Project Alpha, Norm Pearson was also retained for this study.

One of the first findings of this study was that a goal oriented livability index is a dead end. At the beginning of the project Pearson felt that the goals and objectives matrix from Project Alpha could be the basis for a goals oriented livability index. The relative weighting of each goal could be expressed in an index based on 100, and weightings were devised as follows (note these are the six Alpha goals and are used for experimental purposes):

1. ecological quality 25
2. vitality 25
3. practicality 20
4. identity 15
5. self-realization 10
6. adaptability 5

100

A perfect rating would be 100. In use an estimation of points for current performance would be made in each goal area. These goal area ratings could then be added up to give a rating of livability out of 100 for a particular time. Over time, progress toward goals and objectives could be measured and periods of low advancement identified.
In pursuing this approach it became apparent "that individuals hold broadly differing individual goals. While by some stretch of the imagination these might all add up to a consensus on the Alpha goals,...it also became apparent that the Alpha goals were rather confining". In addition, work by William Haythorn had applied the "hierarchy of needs" to the 10 Ekistics levels in a matrix, and "logical as it may seem, the whole thing led down a blind alley".

Thus the study abandoned the idea of producing a livability matrix and concentrated on livability indicators. It reviewed societal trends as moving from a quantitative to qualitative definition of progress, as well as recent efforts to measure the quality of life. Briefly a livability indicator would "monitor change" and would have the following properties:

- it would tell us how livable each part of Greater Vancouver is by comparison with the region as a whole and its parts,
- it would tell us whether over time the region and each of its parts is getting more livable or less,
- it would tell us if other metropolitan centres were to use a similar index, how much more or less livable Greater Vancouver (and its parts) is by comparison.

Problems of indicators were outlined such as how to measure, separate indicators or aggregated, normative measures or trend, etc. as well as the fact there is "no clear consensus on what qualities are most important to our quality of life". In other words, which qualities will be measured. As a step towards the building of a working set of livability indicators Pearson prepared a list of 47 qualities noting possible indicators for each.

Major conclusions of the report were (a) a full review of problems associated with indicators should be made to determine if they are truly feasible for Greater Vancouver, (b) no possibility can be seen for a single indicator, (c) time and cost investigations should be made for establishing and maintaining indicators, and (d) "the indicators should raise issues, not solve them--not a direct measure of what it is thought people want, but rather a measure of whether or not people are satisfied with what they are getting".
Along with Project Alpha the report on Livability Indicators were the first two explorations toward a new regional plan. The work on livability was intended to be an extension of Project Alpha and result in a Livability Matrix. Such a matrix did not seem possible at this time.

Start of the Public Program

The third and last component of the Livable Region Plan stream for 1971 was the Public Program. From the earliest retreat the idea of a communication and feedback function with the public had been conceived of as essential to a sound planning process. Lash and others had seen the ineffective consequences of planning in a vacuum and early staff deliberations had shown that goals for planning must involve the public. While Project Alpha and the livability indicators study made best guesses for regional goals, as they were experimental projects, it was now time to be more serious about the matter. In the context of the evolving Livable Region Plan, a Public Program was created based on a principle that "the community must play a major role in identifying the issues of livability and developing policies to tackle them". During the initial stages of the Public Program there was no specific staff assigned to it but Rashleigh was naturally the principal because this is the type of work he was hired to do.

Following Project Alpha it was now an appropriate time to take the notion of "livability" and the goals for the attainment of the Livable Region to the public. The 1971 program design identified the following aspects of Alpha to be presented to the general public:

1. The ideas of livability and its component qualities or goals.
2. The key questions and issues facing the region.
3. After showing the relationship between livability qualities and goals, show some indication of regional structure and pattern alternatives.
4. Some indication of the strategy by which desired goals, structure and pattern could be achieved.

At the April 7th meeting of the Planning Committee Rashleigh submitted a report on Goals for the Livable Region which requested authorization for pre-
The contents of the public discussion program were outlined as follows:

The Program should aim to operate at two levels—

1. To make the general public aware of the importance of setting regional goals and making choices. This requires initial wide publicity (news releases, TV exposure, etc.) plus follow-up including an exhibit if this can be arranged at the PNE and at the Public Library.

2. To give interested groups and persons a more complete knowledge of the subject and opportunity to respond. For both 1 and 2 we propose preparation of an audio-visual on the Quality of Life in a Livable Region, with a short back-up brochure. Meetings, as with the Rapid Transit program, would be designed to encourage discussion. The brochure would probably be designed to serve as a basis for comments—by summarizing the issues and choices available.

The Planning Committee authorized the preparation of an audio-visual program on the Region's goals and objectives including the use of consultants, and they requested progress reports by May 5th, and a trial presentation to the Board on May 26th. Rashleigh's progress report of May 5th reiterated the purposes of the public program and provided an outline of script themes.

The trial presentation to the Board scheduled for May 26th was not ready because "it was proving to be extraordinarily difficult in determining how best to illustrate the audio-visual and make it concrete, in order for ordinary people to grasp some of the notions about what the future city might be—what these goals really mean...." Lash also explained that the department was re-appraising the program over a concern to not put words in people's mouths, and the shortage of time. These problems and delays caused the politicians on the Planning Committee to raise some serious questions about the Public Program. Their pertinent points are as follows.

- Isn't the Planning Department being overly idealistic in this notion of informing the public through an audio-visual...and calling a meeting and getting feedback? Will this really give a feedback from a cross-section of people?

- When the ideas are put to people...you very often only hear from those with fixed ideas, who are organized and come out in droves and the masses don't really participate because they possibly couldn't care less until they actually see it on the ground.
- You're talking here about ideas that are much too abstract and complex to try and put into this form, and maybe this is one of the problems—talking about goals and forms of development, and all sorts of things which are "Double Dutch" to the public.  

- The best way is to get the press involved.

- I'm concerned that we're moving too slowly...people will get fed up and impatient...they already are, with all of the studies about freeways and rapid transit and nothing ever seems to happen.... We're perhaps spending too much time worrying about how to do an audio-visual for a few meetings that might hit a total of 500 people ....We need to move on, direct public participation or no direct public participation....A little further stage that perhaps the public can understand; I don't think they can understand this stage too well--or really genuinely participate in it.

- It's negative reaction; almost all of them in Vancouver were negative reactions (Strathcona; Britannia; Jericho and the Four Seasons) ....The problem is...that you really already know the public's reaction in a lot of things but when it comes down to forms of development and so on, you can't get the public's reaction--this isn't something they're qualified to react to--it's like nuclear fission.

- This is a decision best made at the administrative level, then ratified or changed through the politicians and put forth to the people and from that, whatever needs to be tied in with regard to transportation...we must go to the people with a plan nearly complete and get feedback at that point....You can't go throwing out bits and pieces halfway through--you're prolonging the item....People need leadership and guidance, basically, for everything and if you can put forth a reasonable plan, obviously there will be objectors and people will put forward reasons why certain things and not others should be done....We'll have to make a decision on the evidence they present but they have to be shown something near complete.

- I get the impression more and more people "don't give a damn what you're going to do, but for Christ's sake make up your minds to do something"....A backlash to participatory democracy.

In response to these general criticisms Lash said,

- People must be made to understand that there are choices and priorities that have to be made and this is what'll shoot down the plan --it's not the trick of putting the plan together and asking people if they like it....You go through all this work and discover that basically people really want highways and if they have to give up highways for rapid transit, then the hell with rapid transit.... It's a good thing to know something about this beforehand....

- Part of the original notion of this presentation was in fact trying to get people conscious of the fact that there is a Regional District and that it is there to do something....If there isn't any obvious demand to do something the Board may in fact have trouble doing things....

Although these discussions were an airing of views, and strong ones, no conclu-
sions were drawn for the Public Program.

A further report on a Review of Livable Region Public Program was presented to the Planning Committee at their meeting of July 21, 1971. It emphasized the difficulties encountered in preparing the audio-visual, the continuing need for such a program: "successful public understanding of Livable Region concerns will take some months and a series of public presentations to achieve...the public information--discussion program should be seen as covering the several studies and reports which will be released in coming months". Following considerable discussion the Planning Committee agreed that the program should carry on as outlined with a suggestion that it emphasize the activities and potential powers of the Regional District.

By the end of the year, part of the audio-visual presentation in slide-show form, plus a pamphlet had been prepared and viewed by the Planning Committee. The staff presented a program design which stated,

The character of the AUDIO-VISUAL is determined by the larger context of Livable Region Program. It will be mostly used in a meeting format designed to initiate the Livable Region Public Program, i.e. we will make no more content input to this public discussion before it starts
- the MEETING FORMAT will change over the months. It will be designed in the first phase (STARTING FEBRUARY '72) to:
- Introduce people to the Livable Region propositions and to GVRD.
- Get them to select and talk about Livability in their terms (Audio-Visual Program, small group discussions, recapitulation).

Besides contact with the public, the communications aspect of the Public Program was intended to reach other planning departments in the Region. Thus the technical aspect of the consultation took place through a series of regional-municipal staff meetings to increase information exchange, communication, and allow participation in the making of the regional plan. From the meetings there resulted a mutual awareness of regional and municipal functions, and statements of frustration. The latter meant frustration at the regional level in identifying regional goals and frustration at the municipal level in understanding how regional planning could help them. For example,
The GVRD expressed that they had great difficulty evaluating development proposals because they lacked elements for judgement. The region does not know what is going on in each municipality and what they are aiming for. It is impossible to define regional objectives without knowing what municipal objectives are; for the whole region can't be kept or made livable unless each municipality is kept livable or made more livable.\textsuperscript{56}

As a conclusion to these consultations, two major requests were formulated. The municipalities asked the GVRD "to provide them with development guidelines", and GVRD asked the municipalities to inform them about the kind of development contemplated. More precisely "the region would like from each municipality a statement of their objectives, and their 5-year targets and priorities. All municipalities favored the idea of holding similar meetings twice a year".\textsuperscript{57}

**Other Streams**

Only two of the six streams of activity for 1971 have been covered by the foregoing discussions: transportation and regional plan streams. However, these two represent 66 per cent of all man/hours work on current studies for the year. The remaining four streams were of secondary importance and will be discussed together.

Two of these streams dealt with the acquisition of new functions by the GVRD. Stream number six, called for acquisition of the transportation function; it was included in the broad-brush transportation studies and was a major recommendation of the Kelly Report. Logistically, acquisition of the transportation function had to follow the Kelly report which took it over into 1972. Stream two referred generally to the acquisition of new functions. While the feasibility of adopting other functions was discussed throughout the year, no major investigations took place.

A large number of man/hours accrued to the information gathering and analysis stream in 1971: This was almost entirely on library work. An extensive library collection, which was well used in the region, had been inherited from the LMRPB. It required full cataloging, however, and a librarian and
librarian's assistant were employed to do the job. Their exclusive work on
the library resulted in the large number of work hours for this stream. Also
the time record system did not separately assign librarian research on a par-
ticular study to that study account, thus inflating the library figure. In
1971, work also started on an urban information system and a regional data
base project. They were a small part of the stream, as can be seen in Appen-
dix B, and since they became major projects in 1972, further elaboration will
be left to the next part.

Lastly, there is the Official Regional Plan (ORP) stream which invol-
ved changes and supporting studies to the existing regional plan. While con-
siderable effort was involved here, it was of a maintaining and adjusting nat-
ure working closely with the Technical Planning Committee. Related to the ORP
the subject of how one evaluates major development proposals was raised; this
was a recurring problem. Difficulties in evaluating a major project, Barnston
Island development, early in 1971, triggered the Technical Planning Committee
to recommend that "a form of interim review for major development proposals be
undertaken at the Regional level". Subsequently a report was prepared by
Dennis O'Gorman, of the GVRD planning department, which set out interim guide-
lines. It identified three types of evaluative criteria in some detail:

1. Mandatory consideration of the contents of the Official Regional
   Plan,

2. Evaluative instruments of
   (a) project impact matrix,
   (b) goals achievement schedules,
   (c) a general objectives achievement schedules, and

3. A process diagram for major proposals.

The Technical Planning Committee forcefully opposed such "rigid pro-
cedures" while Thorburn assured them that the "Region does not want to act as
a 'super cop'". However, they "reiterated that the issue was reopening an
issue abeyanced two or three years ago—i.e. regional vs. municipal planners, and that there was a need to separate the regional and local planning issues".61

Summary

1971 was a year of significant accomplishments for the GVRD Planning Department. A program design emerged based on the previous year's deliberations, and several key portions of it were completed during the year. The most prominent accomplishment was in transportation. Extensive transportation studies were undertaken quickly, and a report was completed. The Kelly Report established conceptual and organizational guidelines for managing the Region's transportation system as well as an immediate plan for improvements. And the report was adopted in principle by the Regional Board, setting the stage for 1972 negotiations on implementing the recommendations. The second major accomplishment was in laying three key stepping-stones toward a Livable Region Plan. Project Alpha was stimulating and promising, the livability indicators study led to a dead end but much was learned, and the foundation of a Public Program was established.

Although greatly adjusted, the program design for the year served well. The open meeting requesting consultant bids on portions of the program drew many responses. Where consultant desires and program design were complementary further negotiations were pursued to where consultants were incorporated successfully into the program. The Planning Department satisfactorily maintained control of the total research effort, but managing the consultants took much more time than anticipated. In the end, however, the program design failed. It did not keep all the streams advancing as intended and many of the staff were preoccupied with transportation in the last part of the year. Once the transportation report was completed it was obvious that continuity had been lost.

There were several elements of GVRD planning in 1971 which may contribute to a new form of planning. Briefly, modern management tools, program
budgeting and critical path analysis, were used to organize the work. However, the program design was not rigidly followed in accord with the recursive approach. In completing the year's work there was extensive use of consultants as a conscious alternative to permanent staff additions. Also interaction with politicians continued with the major report on transportation being "authored" by a politician. Toward a new regional plan methodological experiments in terms of matrix and qualitative analysis were undertaken. Finally, community dialogue was incorporated into the departments ongoing program.
FOOTNOTES

1. The full program design is contained in a 42 page document titled Notes on Specific Studies: 1971 Program, Greater Vancouver Regional District Planning Department, 2nd Draft, January 1971. It represents an attempt to apply critical path techniques to a study program for urban planning. While in Montreal, Lash took university courses in computer science and operations research because he perceived a need for planners to have some familiarity with these increasingly important skills. With Malcolm Turner, the operations research expert on staff they developed this detailed program. A larger review of this program design does not add to our understanding of GVRD planning because it served only as a starting point undergoing major revision in 1972.


4. Ibid., p. 3.

5. Ibid., p. 3.

6. The staff time is calculated from Appendix B. Appendix D lists the consultant reports. For an annotated bibliography of these reports see Kelly, A., Regional Transportation as a GVRD Function, GVRD, October 1971, Appendix B.

7. Kelly, A., Regional Transportation as a GVRD Function, GVRD, October 1971, p. 2. For additional background let us review the transportation situation in Metropolitan Vancouver at the beginning of 1971. For several years small advances were made toward a freeway system but major commitments toward a freeway city such as Seattle had not been made. However, transportation studies mostly favoring freeways had been accumulating—over four million dollars worth of studies mostly under Federal financing. As mentioned, there was the DeLeuw, Cather & Co. report on rapid transit, and scattered cries for rapid transit could also be heard. In 1971 a freeways/rapid transit debate emerged over the pending senior government decision on another major bridge to downtown Vancouver. The proposed 3rd Crossing of Burrard Inlet had an estimated cost of 200 million, and the decision appeared to depend on the political whims of provincial and federal governments. Lastly there had been a recent indication that there may be some hope of improving public transportation.

8. Ibid., p. 2.

9. see page 56.

10. The desire among some politicians to keep the GVRD Planning Department out of the 3rd Crossing controversy reminds us of the previous political conflict with "crusading planners" of the old LMRPB. Political fears were justified, because some of the planning staff were severely opposed to the bridge and were making clandestine influences to this end. To them this would be a wrong decision, and their means would justify the end on moral grounds of rightness. In retrospect, this case does not look good for the crusading planner. They invite defeat of their cause by angering politicians, whereas a more
open dialogue approach, as we shall see, enhances the possibility of success.

11. Kelly acted as a one man committee until near the end of the study. At this point it became advisable to expand the committee to facilitate acceptance of the policy position from all member municipalities in the Region. The full membership then included, besides Kelly, Ald. E.G. Adams, City of Vancouver; Mayor W.H. Anderson, Richmond; Mayor M.S. Evers, New Westminster; Ald. H.G. Ladner, Burnaby; Mayor A.E. Langley, West Vancouver; Mayor D.J. Morrison, Delta; Ald. H.D. Wilson, City of Vancouver.


13. It is obvious from a comparison of the proposed and actual study procedures that the detailed program design, or program budget, did not control the study. To accommodate study changes, the flow diagram was amended several times, but it did not prove flexible enough to act as a satisfactory guide. Also, a major purpose of the program design was to keep the program on schedule through a critical path. In retrospect, program planner Malcolm Turner acknowledges that it failed in this regard. He said, "planners didn't like being pushed along by the system and they resisted".

14. After the decision Lash told the researcher that his best estimate of the outcome was a decision not to go ahead with the bridge. With this feeling he foresaw the ensuing policy void which would increase the importance of their transportation study from irrelevance during the controversy to acceptable policy afterward. We have here what appears to be an example of a successful planning strategy.


16. Ibid., Part 1, p. 4.

17. Regional Board Minutes, GVRD, November 17, 1971.


19. Official department terminology refers to the plan as a "Program/Plan". This attempts to account for the possibility that the new plan may not be a plan, or may not be only a plan. What might result is a program or set of policies rather than the traditional two dimensional land use plan. The researcher finds this terminology awkward and will avoid it as much as possible. If and when an end product that is not a plan emerges, it will be appropriately identified.


24. Ibid.
27. Two planners offered immediate criticism to Project Alpha. J.B. Chaster, City Planner for New Westminster and member of the Technical Planning Committee submitted a Report on Project Alpha, dated March 9, 1971. He claimed the real issue of Greater Vancouver was to stop growth, and he maintained "we are large enough". A second report was written by Rashleigh of the staff: Structural Concept of the Region, March 1971. He argued for a decentralized urban pattern. This was a return to the "islands in a sea of green" concept introduced in Chance and Challenge of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, and a return to a more traditional idea of a plan.


31. Ibid., p. 17.

32. Ibid., p. 3.

33. Ibid., pp. 4 and 5.

34. see Goals Seminar discussion, p. 76.


36. see p. 61.


38. Rashleigh, Goals for the Livable Region, April 1, 1971.


41. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, June 8, 1971, p. 10.

42. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, June 8, 1971.

43. Ibid., pp. 10-11, Ald. A. Phillips, City of Vancouver.

44. Ibid., p. 11, Mayor W.N. Vander Zalm, Surrey.

45. Ibid., p. '11, Ald. A. Phillips, City of Vancouver.

46. Ibid., p. 12, Mr. A.C. Kelly, Electoral Area A.

47. Ibid., p. 12, Ald. A. Phillips, City of Vancouver.

49. Ibid., pp. 14-15, Mayor W.N. Vander Zalm Surrey.

50. Ibid., p. 15, Ald. A. Phillips, City of Vancouver.

51. Ibid., pp. 16 and 17, Harry Lash, Director, Planning Department, Greater Vancouver Regional District.


53. Ibid., p. 2.


56. Ibid., p. 2.

57. Ibid., p. 3.

58. Technical Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, June 18, 1971.


60. Technical Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, June 18, 1971, p. 6.

61. Ibid., although the problem remains through 1971 no further use of the report has been made.
Upon completion of the transportation report in the fall of 1971, a reappraisal of the agency's program was thought necessary. It will be recalled that the transportation studies practically preempted the total program in late 1971. Completion of the Kelly Report reduced the gallop of the department to a walk and called for a stock-taking and redirection toward work on the Livable Region Plan. To regroup, a retreat was arranged for Mount Baker, November 10 to 12 of 1971, for all staff except a few needed to man the office.

Mount Baker Retreat

In preparation for the retreat all department members were invited to submit items for the agenda. When these were assembled, four themes emerged:

1. internal operations of the department—evaluation of last year,
2. external relationships,
3. the 1972 program,
4. the Livable Region Plan.

The major complaint about internal operations of the department can be summarized by the word "communications". From the discussions, it became obvious to the participants that the problem of 1971 was a breakdown in communications caused by too much work and by Lash and Farry drawn off onto the Kelly Report. In other words, the pressures to produce, especially during the
summer, were too great and interfered with an otherwise well thought out communications system. This led to a charge of inadequate communications: one doesn't know what is going on and one is reluctant to bother busy people to find out. Also it was questioned whether "matins" was working well: "matins" should be "more structured; bring up points, ramble on; need to cut off but sometimes need more discussion".¹ The remedial theme which recurred in the discussion was to revitalize the collegial approach which promoted communications through "matins" and Seniors meetings. Lash and Farry did not make this first session which some thought was indicative of the problem.²

Discussion on internal operations also included an evaluation of 1971. Project Alpha stood out as the highlight with most staff enthusiastic about their participation in the project. There was, however, considerable concern about the follow up of Alpha; it was completed and then just left, why? In this tone, and in the absence of an answer to where it was going (Lash and Farry not present), Turner questioned whether it was truly a good report, and Hankin referred to Alpha as "reinventing the wheel; it was all done before in one form or another by the LMRPB".³ A second major accomplishment did not receive much discussion. In retrospect, the transportation or Kelly Report also had to be considered a highlight of 1971.

The external relations session focused on two questions. First, what is the agency's role as perceived externally, and second, who is the agency's client? The first was disposed of rather quickly. It was readily agreed that the GVRD had a weak public image. Its newness was an obvious explanation for this low profile, but a further thought was that the agency had no direct role in the land development process; therefore, the agency didn't have a strong role in the community. Discussions about client implied that the agency can be more useful by identifying who its clients are and focusing on them. Several different concepts of who were their clients were tossed around, but two views predominated: politicians and the public. Thorburn spoke for the former
claiming education of politicians as the real role of the agency: "we would get more bang for the buck if we frequently met with politicians giving them an idea of planner's technical knowledge". With this knowledge the politicians could communicate more effectively with the public. In contrast, Rashleigh suggested intervention through communication with the public. Planning agency dialogue with the public would provide politicians with a better feel for public concerns and allow technical aspects of planning to be sensitive to the "messages received". A last comment on external relations referred to the developing liaison with the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs in Ottawa. While it was agreed to develop linkages between the two agencies, there was apprehension over allying too closely with the Ministry because their permanence had yet to be established.

Toward a specification of the 1972 program, they were guided by the realization that too much was attempted in 1971 and the unfinished state of the Livable Regional Plan. Having just finished the Transportation Plan, most of the staff were uncertain about where they were going. With Lash's leadership three objectives were selected for 1972.

1. Livable Region Plan--do sufficient work on the Livable Region Plan to have a total framework by the end of the year. The objective is to develop a new type of planning tool which emphasizes the interrelatedness of urban sub-systems.
2. Information system--to deal with the problem of lost and unknown data, an information system was proposed. The present system has perhaps relied too much on individuals rather than on a system. As an alternative, however, IIPS appeared to be too grand for them.
3. Help the Regional District administratively--principally this would be done by offering staff assistance to other departments. "The idea was to help integration of the Regional District which was (and still is) largely just a collection of departments with no
The above three suggestions for the 1972 program plus carry over items from the 1971 program were presented, discussed and accepted by the Planning Committee at their meeting of December 15, 1971.

The last theme handled at the Mount Baker Retreat was the form of the new Livable Region Plan. Lash led the discussion by presenting his current ideas and bouncing them off the staff. Here, one needs to recall that the traditional end-state plan had already been rejected. In response to the inadequacies of end-state plans many planners had turned to a problem solving approach. Lash explained that in Montreal they rejected the problem solving approach because they came to the conclusion that it just created more problems. In other words planning would be dealing with ever proliferating problems without any assurance of overall improvements. Montreal planning then took a goals approach which identified broad goals or desirable characteristics of the urban environment and then worked out what must be done to reach them. This is similar to the end-state plan except they were more explicit about goals and saw goals in a contemporary context. Lash was now off such broad goals; agreeing with Vickers, he stated that the idea of goals as motives has given us the "goals ridden man" which is a myth, like the rational man of classical economics. At this point Farry mentioned Gardner, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, who found from his experience in the 1960's that goals are unattainable: the ever receding goals, and an over concern with the next million population rather than the present million. Lash went on to say most people and institutions are really trying to maintain a set of satisfactory relationships: in our terms maintain a livable region. Planners therefore should be concerned about whether matters are getting better, worse, the same, rather than concern over standards. Lash suggested if one put down all the standards that planners would like to achieve and cost them, they would exhaust the resources by more than three times. Finally, he proposed a new model for
planning which emphasizes a "new concern for people", short term change, and
criteria to evaluate change such as livability indicators rather than goals or
"ideals" or standards.

Under questioning, Lash became more explicit about his new model of
planning. He drew a matrix on a board which he called the "Dry Bones Model". It resembled the matrix presented at the Goals Seminar of last year in that it
related urban sub-systems on one axis to "living quality" goals on the other. This approach would require a complete change in planning thought in that it
abandons the physical end-state as a focus. "All one ever deals with is the
accumulation of microscopic change". With the new model one wouldn't worry
about where things were going: rather one would postpone choices until the
moment that a strategic choice would be necessary. The question the group
next considered was where can we intervene in "dry bones" and have the greatest
effect in the living quality. In doing this criteria such as density and
spread (scatter-index) might be used. The notion of having shifts of priori-
ties from one project to another through a Gross Metro Product was discussed. The new approach under discussion was clearly moving away from the map.

The nature of this disucssion was, of course, exploratory, and after
awhile ideas began to get thin. Everyone was left though with the idea that
a new type of plan may be emerging which involves a different understanding of
the city and of change in the city. The Mount Baker Retreat provided new dir-
ection for the department, and early work in 1972 followed the program which
they had developed.

Lash's tour of British Planning

In February of 1972, Lash made a tour of British planning, with three
other Canadian planners, on the invitation of the Foreign and Commonwealth
Office, United Kingdom. They visited more than a dozen major planning offices
and research institutes. This learning experience undoubtedly contributed to
the evolving GVRD planning process. With this in mind, the following excerpts
are noteworthy.

1. From an interview with Sir Robert Grieve, of the "Islands and Highlands Development Board". "This interview crystallized for me the lesson that planning, if it is to be effective, must be accompanied by action from the beginning. Action is necessary to build from credibility to trust and faith, and progress is especially needed in a disadvantaged area because the development Board cannot succeed unless the people believe they can have a different future and start to act accordingly". 12

2. From a review of the South Hampshire Planning Unit's extensive public consultation program. 13

In spite of the early start on public information, the chief push on public consultation took place on the four alternative structures and strategies. This was perhaps a mistake. We in GVRD feel the public would not be able to react meaningfully to a set of typical Land Use plans because they are unable to evaluate how it would change life for them, except for specific land use proposals that may affect their home or neighbourhood. The following hastily jotted quotes of the Planning Units' evaluation of the process they had gone through are salutory:

"Snapshot of Future Situation" is not fair to put to people because it is likely to never exist. One should rather give a series of 'package of policies' but people can't yet think in terms of policies, let alone planners and politicians write them down. One should not get opinions until trade-offs can be made clear to people as basis for their choice". 14

Also the South Hampshire Planning Unit used a method of evaluating alternatives which included a "qualitative objectives-achievement scoring". A list of objectives was made and respondents would allot 0 to 5 points for each objective according to how a particular alternative would achieve it.

3. From a visit to the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, Lash obtained the greatest insights. Primarily he explored the approach of Friend and Jessop's, Local Government and Strategic Choice, which he was already familiar with. 15 He talked with Friend and his staff exploring many interesting questions. Briefly he left convinced that many of their techniques and approaches would work
in Vancouver. (Since these will be introduced in the next chapter they are not elaborated upon here.) Friend is a proponent of "an intelligence service".16

Public Program

Returning to the evolving 1972 program, the major accomplishment during the year toward the Livable Region Plan was made through the accelerating Public Program. Following the Mount Baker Retreat, a more explicit statement on continuing work toward the Livable Region Plan was drafted in the report The Livable Region Plan--History and Proposed Direction.17 It included a history of the progress to date and the proposed direction as follows.

Where we've come from in preparing the Livable Region Plan.
1. Key Planning Committee objective--production of "Livable Region Plan"--decided at Harrison Seminar.
2. Growth is a big factor that will condition future 'livability'. Committee discarded notion of limited population growth as impractical--at seminar with Wiesmann.18
3. Project Alpha posed several physical development choices for the region arising from growth and gave an indication of the impact of growth on the infrastructure of the region (roads, etc.)
4. The notion of establishing "livability indicators" as a tool for evaluating plans and monitoring conditions was investigated and 47 possible indicators were identified. Work on gathering statistics held up for 1972 program definitions.
5. A program of consultation with the public about livability and the preparation of an audio-visual as a stimulus was approved by the Planning Committee (to start in February).

Where are we going next in preparing the LRP? In reflecting on the public program we concluded that the FOCUS of our work with the Livable Region Plan must be,
A. On people, not things (vs. development choices as in Project Alpha).
B. On issues related to long term growth (or the long term consequences of present issues. Not on issues related to life styles, present zoning battles, possible ecological disaster outside the region, etc.) A horizon of +5 to +20 years seems appropriate.
C. On issues that will affect a significant segment of the population in the future.

To begin public discussion on issues, the department thought they should suggest some tentative issues as a basis for discussion. Accordingly staff members arrived at a "starter set" of six issues. These starter issues were:

1. A shortage of jobs--continuing high unemployment with population
growth.

2. Housing costs outpacing incomes—with growth land prices climb which increases the percentage of family expenditures on housing.

3. Decline in the ease of moving about the region—growth increases travel time to and from work.

4. Air and noise pollution—this is increasing, and it is now recognized that land use arrangements and controls are key variables.

5. Loss of feeling of openness—as a result of growth.

6. Fear of and opposition to rapid and unanticipated changes—resentment by present residents to what they believe are capricious and unnecessary changes in land use and density and to major traffic, utility or public works proposals which affect their residential environment are characteristic of today's development climate. In many cases present residents believe that their livability is being sacrificed for some future generation or people they don't know or care about.

The intended use of these issues was as a starter for public discussion, but also they wished to explore the policy options arising from these issues and "examine what these policy option packages mean for the spatial arrangements in terms of how they might best meet the criteria for livability". Finally, it was intended to report to the Planning Committee on these steps in October or November of 1972. The departments program's definition and emphasis as outlined in the above report was approved by the Planning Committee at their meeting of February 3, 1972.

In the following three months a series of ten experimental public meetings were held with community groups. A film was intended for these meetings but was not yet completed. For the first session a set of slides and a tape were used but these did not add to the dialogue and were not used again. Generally, the format was for a staff member to provide introductory remarks and then open discussion and invite questions. Politicians were present at these early meetings.

A large number of issues and concerns were raised in the discussions.
It is difficult, if not impossible, to summarize these. However, a few matters stand out due to their unexpectedness or frequency of mention among most groups.

1. The "stop growth" attitude encountered at all experimental meetings indicated we need to consider questions such as 'how much growth?', 'how do we manage it?'

2. Many low-income people don't feel they have enough chance to be heard by such a group as GVRD Planning Committee. This suggests that if they were given more information they could make more intelligent contributions to such issues as housing requirements for their groups.

3. Before these meetings, staff had attempted to identify those issues which they expected would be of greatest interest and importance to the community. A Shortage of Jobs was one of these, and yet the discussion at the meetings rarely touched on this subject....We conclude from this that persons attending our meetings automatically assumed jobs to be a Provincial and National issue which the Regional District and its Municipalities could not do anything about.24

It should be noted that there was no suggestion that "these groups either in numbers or in interests are representative of the views and concerns of the metropolitan community as a whole or of any part of it".25 Also there was no attempt made to limit discussions to those matters within the present or potential responsibility of the GVRD.

On May 29, 1972, an interim report on the Public Program was submitted to the Planning Committee. Its theme was that the experimental meetings produced useful discussions and the results were valuable. Accordingly, a continuation of the program for the next six months was considered important "if the Board wishes to have a good 'feel' about what the regional community regards as significant issues".26 Further it was concluded that "one-shot" meetings are of limited value and should have a follow up, "political representatives from the Board and staff have important parts to play in the public discussion, but it does not work for them to lead or direct discussion", and it is important for the program to reach as many groups as possible in this early stage.27

A further definition of the Public Program occurred in a staff report
to the Planning Committee in June. It outlined the next stage of the program as consisting of four parts.

1. Identification of issues including the new issue of "stop growth" to which the Planning Committee now assigned a study priority.

2. Preparation of background studies on issues, particularly growth, as well as tabloids on other issues to promote public awareness and discussion on these issues.

3. Continuation of the Public Program focusing on the issues raised and using the recently prepared film.28

4. A major report on the Public Program to be completed by November which would suggest policy options and maybe some immediate actions.

The staff also reported at this time that a study group from the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs had spent two days in Vancouver studying the Public Program. As a result the Ministry planned to send an expert on citizen participation methods to Vancouver for a week to advise on further development of the Public Program. Urban Affairs representative, Cyril Rosenberg, also said in part:

It would, of course, be an impertinence on our part to attempt to pass judgement on the ultimate appropriateness of the Livable Region approach to the planning process, or on its goals: that is a matter we would consider to be solely within the local prerogative. We nevertheless want you to know that the team was very impressed with the way in which you and your colleagues in the Planning Department are trying to fulfill the goals you have set yourselves. It is for this reason that the cross-Ministry team feels able to recommend in principle the Ministry's participation in aspects of the project.29

At the next meeting of the Planning Committee, July 5, the Livable Region Project was also discussed in the presence of Mr. Lennarson, expert on citizen participation on loan from Urban Affairs. Mr. Lennarson observed, many people don't know why they feel their dissatisfactions so respond to things that are topical; e.g. pollution; before some people can give responses...they have to learn about issues in an organized way; e.g. 'day care centres, which you want, and higher taxes which you don't want, are inseparable'. Most productive is the stage where citizens air their concerns in the presence of technicians, then within limits of time and money the two groups organize a method of solution.30
Further on the public program, Mr. Leonard Minsky joined the staff in July for one year as a staff Community Contact Person "to assist in achieving productive communication for Livable Region Project research". Minsky was a former professor of the English Department at Simon Fraser University and more recently a social worker with a family service agency. Most importantly, he was not a planner, and therefore did not bring the missionary approach common among professional planners. At the Planning Committee meeting of July 20, Minsky gave his first comments on the Public Program.

The need for such liaison became evident when review of material from experimental meetings revealed insufficient contact with some elements of the community.

He outlined his plan for "...reaching the people instead of local minorities that tend to have a small but overlapping representation..."

During the ensuing discussion it was noted that responses are predictable from interest groups about what they like, dislike and about some changes they would make. Mr. Minsky replied that this can be changed if people of specifically defined groups are given information about the kind of issues GVRD is concerned with and how to go about considering them.

Related to this Lash "noted that Urban Affairs (Dr. Michelson), in conjunction with UBC, will be conducting an opinion poll to determine what 2,500 people consider to be basic issues and the priorities they would award to each".

Lennarson again attended the Planning Committee on August 9, 1972, when he presented a one page report on Developing a Structure for Public Participation in GVRD. Verbally he outlined what was involved in this working structure. The basic principles upon which to build a structure were mentioned by him:

1. A clear statement of options for the politicians.
2. Access within an organized process over time for citizens.
3. An opportunity to become part of the decision making process for technicians.

From this will result "A coalition, the glue of which is access to regional planning...it brings people together to talk things out. It makes available
to them resources that otherwise would not be. The coalition happens, it's not built into the structure formally but is a process over time..."  

A wide ranging discussion followed which raised particular concern over responsible as opposed to irresponsible (wild demonstrations) public participation. Lennarson said "It's easy to be unreasonable if you don't have any responsibility in resolving a situation". Also how is representation achieved from the estimated 4,000 voluntary associations in Greater Vancouver? Lennarson noted that "Some groups are more representative of many more people than other groups. But this is not a representative process....It's just a way of letting people get in, so if you belong to any size group and you're interested in doing some work (on regional issues) this gives you a way of doing so in concert with an actual problem solving process". The GVRD Planning Committee endorsed the objectives and general principles of his report "Developing a structure for public participation in GVRD", and they also endorsed making a request to Urban Affairs for funds to put the ideas into an operational plan.  

Federal support even though promised still had not come, but the Public Program continued now under the direction of Leonard Minsky. Few professional staff members attended these sessions, their reason being pressure of work. Minsky's communication style was to draw out responses to the film and then try to get citizens to interpret their own responses. Most responses were of an emotional type, but public values were evident in these.  

**Issue Investigation**  

Besides the Public Program the second major thrust of 1972 toward the Livable Region Plan was issue investigations. This meant further clarification and understanding of issues raised by the Public Program through agency investigations. A dilemma faced the agency here. To keep the Livable Region Plan studies on schedule, issue investigations within the department should start immediately, but the Public Program had not advanced far enough to identify
issues for investigation. The dilemma was met by selecting tentative "starter issues" so that investigations could be started immediately and adjusted as results from the Public Program emerged. Six "starter issues" were selected, as outlined previously on pages 124 and 125.

Investigations were conducted on housing, jobs and pollution. The aim was to produce tabloids for each which described and analyzed the problem, reviewed what had been done and what could be done, presented alternative solutions, and discussed the Regional Districts role in these problem areas. Tabloids were produced for these three issues and were distributed to the public primarily through the Public Program. (A more detailed investigation on pollution, involving an extensive questionnaire, was also commenced. Since this particular investigation continued through into 1973, it will be discussed in the next chapter.)

Regional growth, a surprise issue, evoked the prime issue investigation. Growth was not one of the six "starter issues", but "since the first meeting held last spring the most commonly expressed feeling was that growth in the region should be stopped or severely restricted". In response to this public concern extensive investigations of the growth issue were carried out during the summer of 1972. A University of British Columbia planning professor, Michael Seelig was hired for the summer to design and coordinate this study project. "The general objective of this study is to critically examine and evaluate rates of growth of urban centres, in order to understand the consequences which would result if policies were instituted to alter existing rates of growth". Four specific tasks were identified for the study of which one would be done in-house with three summer planning students, and the other three contracted out. Because the evolving project failed to produce useful information, the staff suggested further tasks; the total project embodied seven tasks which are summarized below with the original four tasks listed first.
1. Regional Growth—Definitions and Causes by M. Seelig, P. Baross, A Duguid and R. Matheson. From "accepted literature", this report describes the basic concepts of population growth, economic growth, and urbanization.

2. Experience in the Reduction and Limitation of Urban and Regional Growth Policies by F. Guithelm. This report provides an overview of growth policies and specifically reviews 18 such policies. Its theme is that of the difficulty in controlling growth. "The available experience with urban growth limitation suggests that no city has yet succeeded in this difficult and sophisticated endeavour, and that it is probably beyond the power of cities or metropolitan regional governments to accomplish. If cities wish to limit their growth, they would be well advised to enlist from the outset the support of the provincial or state, and national governments with stronger powers and resources".

3. Comparative Empirical Study of Growth Rates. This task was undertaken by the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs. Their report essentially said no one has the information to make such a comparative study.

4. Population Growth, Economic Growth, and Related Problems, by Simon Miles, Executive Director, INTERMET. While examining this topic Miles was also attempting to provide direction for the project which had not been achieved from tasks one and two. "This paper examines the relationship between growth and other phenomena such as the natural environments, the individuals income, cost of living, land prices and others". Eight such phenomena are selected and the relationships between each and regional growth are documented. It concludes that,
the consequences of population growth may be very different than those resulting from economic growth. In general, while the consequences of economic growth may be viewed by many as favorable, the consequences of population growth may often be viewed as undesirable. Experience has taught us that in the long run it is impossible to have one type of growth without the other. Thus, when we seek to attain economic growth we must eventually also accept the fact that population growth will follow. On the other hand, when we decide to limit population growth, we must be prepared to accept the effects on economic growth which follow.47

5. The Consequences of Urban Growth: A Framework for Public Discussion and Policy Formation, by Ron Matheson, planning student, University of British Columbia.48 This report was prepared as a discussion paper for the growth team and other members of the agency. While it represents the views of one summer student, it may also be considered as a minority report. Its theme is "technocratic imperatives...provide the framework for discussion of urban growth issues and are strongly oriented to the status quo";49 therefore, there is a need for "informed public participation in the formulation of urban growth policies".50 Otherwise the public are in danger of having someone else's values thrust upon them".51 He calls for wider public participation in the growth issue.

6. "Migration", talk by David Baxter, Doctoral Candidate, University of British Columbia to the GVRD Planning Committee, August 9, 1972.52 Baxter explained how migration into an area previously occurred from economic growth or potential; that is, to areas with more jobs and higher wages. Today, and especially for Vancouver, migration is related more to life style. "When you're looking at migration into this region and the retention of migrants in this area you find that it's basically a function of the way this region is presented in other areas and the fact that the image of Vancouver to other areas tends to be compatible with a life style that is becoming more and more popular in the whole country".53
7. Growth Questionnaire. From the Growth reports Lash prepared a series of questions and submitted them to the Planning Committee, Technical Planning Committee, and some members of IIPS. About 20 questionnaires were returned and they were summarized and tabulated by Peter George. With the small number available for analysis and diversity in answering questions, little further insight was gained.

These growth issue studies were the subject of much discussions by staff, Planning Committee, and Technical Planning Committee without much progress resulting. The project died in the fall with no positive results. In summary the growth issue investigation can be seen in two lights; one, a process whereby the planning group became acutely aware of how complex the issue is, and, two, a major diversion of time and thought from the year's program.

Other Work

Several other major work efforts fall within the 1972 work program and require elaboration. It will be recalled that the 1972 program was to concentrate on the Livable Region Plan, information system, and helping the regional district administratively. Let us deal with the last two first.

One of the major objectives of the 1972 program was to establish a systematic information system. At the beginning of the year, Peter George joined the staff to perform this task. He was formerly in the City of Vancouver Planning Department, had worked with Gerard Farry, and had a B.A. in Economics and a M.A. in operations research. For the first six months of the year he supervised 29 data collectors on Local Initiatives Program grants. In the last six months he worked on the information systems design. Useful data was collected on land use, transportation, and utility services, and it was incorporated into two systems, geographical and geocoding.

Next in the 1972 program was the objective of helping the GVRD administratively. There were two aspects to this, Rick Hankin's "mission to parks"
was the first. Here Hankin was on loan to the Parks Department of GVRD for 50 percent of the time for six months to assist them in their planning and strengthen the relations between the departments. Primarily his parks work was on small studies, adding parks, changing parks boundaries, trail links, and in addition, considerable progress was made on the Boundary Bay study. The success of this "mission" project was somewhat limited by the anti-study (research) orientation within the Parks department.

Second, Lash prepared a report on corporate planning in the GVRD to examine and make existing arrangements more explicit. After reviewing present corporate planning administrative practices, and relating the planning department to these, he emphasized the necessity for cooperation now that all regional functions are joined under the GVRD. "If each GVRD department took the view that it has only an interest in 'service on demand' and could not express views beyond that, the result would be a failure to plan. GVRD departments therefore need to be interested in and take responsibility for the whole plan and not simply from their individual viewpoints."

Now we must deal with several secondary matters of the Livable Region Plan studies. There were four additional matters of which the first two occupied considerable time.

1. IIPS
2. Operational Development Plan Model
3. Report on the U.N. Declaration on the Environment, and
4. The Vancouver Urban Futures Project.

As outlined in Chapter Three, GVRD became involved in the Inter-Institutional Policy Simulator (IIPS) in May of 1970 and had one member in the Core Group and several other staff members participating in the development of sub-models: the Core Group consisted of representatives from the external government institutions. Administrative problems within IIPS, which would take a book to explain, demanded greater inputs by the GVRD to ensure some return
from the IIPS experiment. Thorburn accepted the position of chairman of the core group taking over the major guidance function for the project. Through his efforts, and others in the Core Group, IIPS stayed alive, abandoned the never ending debate over citizen use of the model, and set to work to operationalize the models. Their aim was to have some of the sub-models operating by early 1973, a topic which will receive more discussion in the next chapter. For the moment, we should note the unexpected time demands this rescue operation put on the department particularly on Thorburn.

Regarding the Operational Development Plan Model, early difficulties in evaluating major projects, such as the Barnston Island proposal, led to a departmental desire to discover an evaluation mechanism as part of the Livable Region Plan. Their first attempt at this was rejected by the Technical Planning Committee as embodying "rigid procedures". The next time a more qualitative approach was taken by a consultant, A.V. Gray, through the use of a simulation model. His report developed a model, a set of mathematical expressions adapted for running on a computer, for evaluating proposed developments of 500 to 10,000 acres with populations of 1,000 to 50,000 persons. The model is programmed in two versions. Version A evaluates one particular land development scheme and prints out the details summarizing it with respect to assumptions, population, dwelling units, land use by type and acres, assessments, capital revenues, and costs, operating revenues and expenditures by service.... The second version of the model, B, automatically calculates these factors for each of 45 different schemes, and prints out a summary of the end result for each scheme.

The model can then be used for comparing schemes in the following ways:

1. The schemes highest value to a developer (present worth).
2. The schemes highest value to a municipality (operating account).
3. Volume of expenditures on development throughout the life of the scheme.
4. Organizational problems relative to the scale of development.

5. Subjective comparisons such as quality of life: one can relate quality of life to one scheme against the loss of present worth ($) to see if the trade off is reasonable.

Guidelines for the last two points were provided but they were not part of the simulation model. The OPD Model was not pursued further in 1972 (or 1973 for that matter) because its computer language was not compatible with UBC's computer system. The project thus remains in abeyance until the computer language can be converted some time in the future.

The two remaining matters require only brief mention. Lash's Report on the U.N. Declaration on the Environment explains how the GVRD program is consistent with the declaration: it was distributed only for information.

Lastly, the Vancouver Urban Futures Project was a federally sponsored research project to determine public policy expectations through sampling and questionnaire mechanisms. The agency merely kept informed about this independent project.

Manning Park Retreat

A number of events caused internal uneasy feelings in the GVRD Planning Department over the summer. Accordingly the staff wanted a general retreat to air and straighten out these matters. This retreat was delayed due to financial difficulties, Urban Affairs had to this time renegged on the grant. Finally the retreat was held at the staff's personal expense and on their own time: Manning Park, September 28 to 30. The major complaints can be summarized as follows:

1. The 1971 program involved too many projects, was too budget oriented rather than objectives oriented, and the flow diagram did not provide adequate control.

2. The 1972 budget was inadequate (a situation caused by Urban Affairs).
3. Questions about how everyone relates to the Livable Region Program.

4. "LRP does not seem to be as radical as we intended it to be, (but) it could be subversive".

5. There are inconsistencies in the Public Program between how it was intended to serve the LRP and how it is operating, there is insufficient reporting of the meetings, and is it producing anything?

6. Staff have been working as loners—"people too compartmentalized", "extraordinary isolation".

7. "Many staff have doubts and criticisms of the competence and productivity of some of their colleagues".

8. Matins have been slipping—"discussions are superficial, papers are too lengthy to be decided upon at matins,...some feel we talk too much and pretend to discuss".

9. GVRD's public image is non-existant.

All of the points were discussed at the seminar. It became obvious through discussions that some form of internal reorganization was necessary, perhaps into some sort of team organization. Groups were formed at the retreat to come up with suggestions of how to redeploy staff. Various suggestions emerged, but consensus was not reached. It was clear, however, that reorganization was the central aspect. During the year the department had been torn by several centrifugal forces: the public program; the rescue of IIPS; special projects like the growth studies and the uncertainty of Urban Affairs support. Now was the time to unite individuals; some form of team reorganization or "home groups" seemed a natural direction.

Although the prospective redeployment by teams offered solutions for most of the complaints, it did not cover all. There was relevant discussion on some of the other points. On budgeting they agreed on a philosophy of "if we can't get money for parts of our program then we must say what can realistically be done under the budget". Also, over the matter of internal doubts and
criticisms of competence and creative ability, it was noted that a new organizational form wouldn't get rid of this kind of problem. Lash, however, suggested the staff follow a "principle of solidarity" like cabinet solidarity. Responding to GVRD's non-existing public image, with an implication that it should be a "high profile" one, a low profile was a more desirable one: "let's sell the steak and not the sizzle".

The major discussion of the retreat, however, fell on the Public Program. It should be remembered that this program had only recently become operational and was spearheaded by a new, dynamic, non-planner: Leonard Minsky. The debate centered on whether the public program was primarily a service to the Livable Region Plan studies or a mover of people: primarily a means or an end? Minsky maintained that it is imaginary to think of the Public Program in terms of "a mandarin going around the community gathering information and not being political....As soon as one goes out and talks to them with an implication to act, then this is a political activity". He went on to assert that "creating waves" is an essential part of the program, and "the program is not integrated with what everyone else is doing". In addition we must be concerned with evaluating our influence in the Public Program "because we need to know whether we are speeding up or slowing down the process".61

Lash responded by saying "it is not of central concern to us if the public program makes waves. If this is a spin off OK; but not central". He acknowledged the political involvement...."First, the public program will give politicians more information, but also it will give the people contacted better leverage. Last year Ted (Rashleigh) and I said the Public Program could get out of control and this may not be bad. It must be kept under control relative to (a) our financial resources, and (b) the satisfaction of politicians". Farry, however, was more concerned about the program getting out of control. He said "we should look upon this as a limited program of 40 meetings which has a limited effect. Once this is over we must ask if they have
been productive enough and to what extent further meetings might threaten the politicians'. Further, he argued that diminishing returns must set in somewhere.

Continued discussion revealed that concern over the Public Program prior to the retreat had recently subsided after several staff members had debated the merits of the program with Minsky. Consensus easily emerged that there is no risk of getting out of control by November, nor the risk of not having enough information for the report on the Public Program due then.

Minsky provided a conclusion to this discussion by saying both aspects are of equal importance. That is the content aspect of the Public Program as an aid to GVRD politicians, and the community development aspect as a counter to GVRD politicians: "there is a need to have the volume activity of the Public Program to get phone calls coming in sufficient quantity to let them (politicians) know we are in business but not too large to exceed our budgetary limitations or loss of credibility in the community".

The retreat was extremely successful. Many festering staff differences were brought into the open and thus partially resolved. And consensus on reorganization occurred without a definite idea of what type of reorganization. These accomplishments undoubtedly allowed work to proceed more smoothly for the rest of the year. Several reorganizations were tried but none with great success. A reorganization in the context of the 1973 program finally was settled on, but this will be reviewed in the next chapter.

Coach House Retreat

By the fall it was timely to have another major deliberative session with the Planning Committee. Thirteen topics were suggested to the Planning Committee for the seminar of which they selected four:

1. Creation of a Tri-level Committee for Greater Vancouver with attendance of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs and Provincial Municipal Affairs personnel.
2. Flood plain policy.

3. What should be included in the forthcoming November Report emerging from the Public Program and contributing to the evolving Livable Region Plan.

4. Planning Department 1973 Objectives and Program.

A retreat was held with the Planning Committee, eight staff members of the GVRD and three guests on October 13th and 14th at the Coach House Inn, North Vancouver. Results of these sessions are as follows.

The Committee discussed the formation and function of a Tri-Level Committee for Greater Vancouver using the now discarded 3rd crossing study as an example. It was recommended that the Regional Board ask the provincial government to consider such a committee.

Regarding floodplain policies, W.D. Hurst, consultant presented his report Preliminary Considerations of Floodplain and Related Matters. The report presented existing flood proofing requirements of the Official Regional Plan, confirmed these, and suggested provincial legislation to reinforce these. Also a Regional brief on this was recommended; there was discussion but no action.

Third, an outline of What Should be Included in the November Report from the Public Program was presented. In point form it briefly reviewed:

The Story so far
The mood of the region
Specific concerns and issues
What has been ignored so far?
Policy possibilities
Policy proposals of the Planning Committee
The rest of the Program: 1973 and later.

The "Committee considered the outline and agreed on approval".

With regard to the second last item, an extensive discussion occurred
at the retreat. A "think-in" session on policy proposals was led by Humphrey Carver who was presently participating in GVRD studies. The objective was to translate the public concerns raised in the Public Program into policy priorities. The staff presented policy choices taken from the Public Program results to date. Carver lead the Planning Committee "to an organized perception of the concerns (of the public) and to situate these concerns in broad policy fields". Planning Committee policy choices were recorded by the staff and confirmed at their next meeting. These choices soon would form a major portion of the November Report and will be fully outlined shortly.

The fourth and last item on the agenda of the Coach House retreat was to discuss the planning departments 1973 objectives. Planning Committee members became very anxious for the Livable Region Plan studies to produce something. While still strongly supporting the program, they insisted that it be accelerated. They became very specific about their views and laid down precise guidelines for 1973 which seem to be important enough to be outlined in some detail.

1. That the schedule for completion of the Livable Region Program and Plan be shortened by one year so that the draft Program/Plan be ready for presentation to the Board by March, 1974.

2. That the said draft Program/Plan be concerned chiefly with the Policies and action programs required to maintain livability within the next 10 years and that issues and policies which cannot be studied and resolved within the time permitted by the above deadlines be discussed in the Program/Plan as unresolved matters.

3. That the Planning Department be instructed to concentrate its efforts in 1973 as exclusively as possible on the carrying out of the Livable Region Project in accordance with the above schedule, and that other GVRD Departments be requested to participate and assist the carrying out of the Project as much as possible.

4. That testing and evaluation of the elements of the draft Program Plan, particularly as to the possible secondary and indirect effects of proposed policies, be done subsequently to the submission of the draft Program/Plan where it is not possible to carry out such tests and evaluation beforehand.

5. That in order to rapidly achieve efficiency in the handling of data and its analysis, and to enable efficient testing of policy options to be done as soon as possible, the Planning Department be instruc-
ted to continue to give high priority to the development of its Information System and to the advancement of the IIIFS Project.

6. That the Board be requested not to assign any additional projects to the Planning Department during 1973.

7. That the Department make recommendations as to how to deal with its current project workload, such as the Boundary Bay Development Plan, so as to free itself as much as possible from such workload and concentrate on the Livable Region Project.

8. That the Provincial Government be asked to increase its grants and staff-time inputs to the planning function and to the work of the TPC in 1973, and that with provincial approval a similar request be made of the federal government.67

The remainder of the 1972 activities include two main happenings: the November Report and tooling up for the 1973 program. The first will be discussed in this section while the latter is placed with discussions on 1973 in the next chapter.

A Report on Livability

With the inputs from the Public Program and the guidance from the Planning Committee, A Report on Livability, or the November Report as it was called in-house, was indeed finished by the staff in November. This report represents the first major public statement on the evolving Livable Region Plan. It is a landmark in the new planning program of the GVRD.

A Report on Livability summarizes regional issues as identified in the Public Program under the following headings: The Mood of the Region: stop growth, start participation; and To Maintain Livability Do We Build a New Regional Environment?; as well as six specific concerns—Transportation, high land costs and taxes, the ideal of the single family home, community life and services, pollution, and nature (protect it, make it accessible). Two further issues not mentioned in public discussions were also included: retain the farm-land, and urban beauty. The most important part of the report, however, is the summary of policies proposed in the report. These thirty policies provide the framework for the 1973 program and the evolving Livable Region Plan and are therefore extremely important. Accordingly they are outlined in full as they
appeared in the report along with the introductory statement to the report.

Preamble

This report describes progress on the Livable Region Program up to November 1972. The program is designed to translate what people say are the important issues affecting the Greater Vancouver Region into governmental action.

This progress report records what some 40 community groups have said to us so far and what the Planning Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District currently proposes as measures to deal with the issues of livability. It is a report from the GVRD Planning Committee to its Board of Directors, to the municipal councils of Greater Vancouver, but especially to citizens and community groups so that they may further contribute to this program to maintain and improve the livability of our Region.

GVRD PLANNING COMMITTEE PROPOSES THE POLICIES FOR THE LIVABLE REGION PROGRAM

Here is a list of the policies which are proposed in various sections of this report:

A. POPULATION GROWTH AND URBAN EXPANSION

1) Controlling the growth rate of Greater Vancouver should be a function of all three levels of government. The senior governments should be asked to look into the question of coping with growth.

2) GVRD should plan regionally the maximum and minimum population growth to be accommodated in residential developments permitted by the municipalities and program such growth for the 10-year period of the first Livable Regional Program.

3) The Planning Department should investigate a number of methods of making effective and economical use of the land in the Region in order to husband the land resources of the Region, which are limited.

4) The Livable Region Program/Plan should contain policies to provide maximum opportunities for people to live close to where they work, or to work close to where they live.

5) GVRD should discourage the location in this Region of large land-consuming industries and port facilities which have low employment densities.

6) Policies to keep development from occurring in Flood plain areas should be continued and strengthened (see separate recommendation for immediate action by GVRD in this respect).

B. CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

1) Preserve as much as possible of the unique and wilderness areas of the Region such as foreshores and mountainsides by Official Regional Plan designation, by acquisition and other measures. Most of the foreshores, especially that most accessible from urban centres, should be kept for public benefit.

2) Recuperate for public use unintensively used industrial areas of foreshore.

3) Seek to preserve as much farmland in production in the Region as is possible, by the existing policies of the Official Regional Plan, and by such measures as zoning, greenbelt acquisition, tax concessions, etc. Strengthen such policies by firm adherence to floodplain and flood protection policies listed under Topic A.

4) Continue to commit all Regional Parks funds to land acquisition.

5) Maximize the development of recreation opportunities within the Region:

   a) Conserve scenic values (by scenic easements, construction height levels, and other measures) so as not to permit developments which detract from those values.
b) Promote the development of mini-parks, especially in high density residential areas,
c) Pay particular attention to the development of bicycle paths and linear parks adjacent to watercourses, dykes, ravines, etc. (The forthcoming Greenbelt Report will provide a basis for development of such proposals),
d) Seek greater use of the rivers and bars, for their recreation potential, and find ways to develop public access thereto,

6. Preserve intact any unique or rare ecological areas that lie within the Region.

C. RESIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT

1) By such methods as land banking, GVRD should take action to control the location and price of land being made available for urban purposes. These efforts should focus on securing strategic land required for the development of public transportation facilities and for Regional Town Centres.

2) In the next decade residential settlement policies should emphasize the infilling and development of sprawl areas and vacant lots, but in areas where such action is inappropriate, GVRD should promote the assembly and development of large tracts for residential communities.

3) The Program/Plan should contain provisions to accommodate a variety of housing types and tenures throughout the Region, to reflect the diversity of life-styles of the families and households of the Region.

4) GVRD should create opportunities in every part of the Region for housing families and households at all income levels.

D. GENERAL GOVERNMENT

1) It is desirable to combat speculation in land, and GVRD should study and develop policies for doing so.

2) The Program/Plan should not seek to provide each municipality with a “balanced” tax-base, but instead propose land-use allocations based on rational overall regional considerations. Study should be given to devising regional ways of balancing out tax-base maladjustments that may result when land-use planning does not have municipal tax-base balance as an objective.

3) Encourage a public participation and discussion process prior to consideration by the Board of all major plan amendments and major projects.

4) Increase the visibility and general knowledge of GVRD and its activities among the public.

E. POLLUTION

1) Pollution control measures must inevitably be paid for both from general government revenues and by individual polluters, but emphasis should be on policies requiring the polluter to pay whenever this is in the public interest.

2) GVRD should continue in its present orientation of tackling all aspects of pollution — air, water, noise, waste disposal.

3) More effort should be directed to control automobile usage in urban areas.

4) GVRD should initiate experimental projects to encourage the sorting, recycling, and minimizing of wastes.

5) Attention should be directed to stiffening the regulations over all forms of pollution, and their enforcement, in accordance with the apparent wishes of the public.

F. TRANSPORTATION

1) No total urban freeway system should be built in the Region.

2) In meeting the demand for recreational travel, to areas outside of Region, the emphasis should be on providing better inter-regional services by bus and other public carriers, but the possibilities for providing additional ferry terminals and services as well as the possibilities of additional automobile routes to recreational areas should be studied along with the possibilities of increasing the capacity of existing routes and services.

3) Regionally control and develop “office centres” or “Regional Town Centres” outside of downtown, and attempt to decentralize some downtown growth to these centres. (See also Item A4 above).

4) Discourage autos entering downtown and provide better public transportation alternatives.

5) Plan a long-range, all-purpose transportation corridors network and seek the co-operation of the Provincial Government in preserving the corridors until needed.
In addition to these thirty policies, the report concluded with a proposal for continuing the program.

Work on developing (all) the 30 policy statements of the GVRD Planning Committee should proceed simultaneously during 1973. It is proposed to group the 30 statements into policy areas and to form Policy Committees to work on them. These Policy Committees have as their goal to report in the fall of 1973 on objectives for their policy areas, propose operational policies for moving towards the objectives, and set out the implications, financial and otherwise, of their recommendations. Between fall 1973 and spring 1974, these proposals would be worked up into the first integrated Livable Region Program/Plan, with the continued assistance of the Policy Committees. The Policy Committees would be formed of technical staff of GVRD, the municipalities, senior governments, members of the universities and other institutions of the Region, with representatives of interested citizen groups and associations.70

With the November Report, the staff and Planning Committee members began another round of "flying visits" to municipal councils to explain the policy statements prior to the Regional Board meeting at which time there would be a consideration of the report. This was a likely key to the ease with which the Board endorsed the report at its meeting of November 29, 1972. More specifically the Board's resolution contained the following: endorsement of the 30 policy statements; authorize distribution to the public and requesting comment; request from Committees of the Regional Board and Councils of member municipalities their cognizance, comments, or suggested amendments; and "authorize the Planning Committee to look into the feasibility of setting up Policy Committees (as suggested by the report) ... with the goal of having a report on each policy area come before the Regional Board by the fall of 1973." 71

Summary

1972 started off with three clear objectives: to develop a total framework for the Livable Region Plan, establish an information system, and help the Regional District administratively. The last two were accomplished but the number one priority of a framework for a Livable Region Plan was not. Nevertheless a major advance toward the plan was made by A Report on Livability which included thirty policy statements derived from the Public Program and
Planning Committee deliberations. Also the idea of Policy Committees for next year emerged.

For a good portion of the year, however, the department appeared to be flying apart. There were several contributing factors to this. First, the Public Program presented a strange activity for planners: widespread public dialogue. As well, Leonard Minsky, who conducted the program, had a different style and was a "non-planner" which added to the disquiet. In addition, the unexpected growth issue and the subsequent studies led nowhere. On top of these, Rick Hankin was drawn off on his "mission to Parks", and Drew Thorburn was likewise drawn off on his rescue of IIPS. And lastly, there were budgetary problems created when the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs failed to come through with their promised grant. These diversions frustrated the staff and led to the Manning Park retreat which started "to turn the ship back on course".

In the end a vigorous new approach became necessary when the Planning Committee asked that the Livable Region Plan studies be accelerated by one year.

Regarding the evolution of a new planning model, two aspects stand out in 1972: the use of retreats and the Public Program. Three major retreats were held in 1972: Mount Baker, Coach House, and Manning Park. Each demonstrated how the mechanism facilitates decision-making and can produce new directions. As well, political involvement, at the Coach House retreat, demonstrated that planners and politicians can dialogue on basic planning matters and that such dialogue adds greatly to goal and policy development. The Public Program placed goal identification as a major part of the urban planning process on an ongoing basis. It also showed that special communication skills, which planners generally do not possess, were needed for such public dialogue.

2. Besides the pressures of work, Lash thought that he and Farry might by their presence dampen the discussion on internal problems thus their absence was partially intentional. While such inhibitions were present in the early life of the agency, they were rapidly disappearing and new staff were quite outspoken. After this session, Lash realized that such tactics were unnecessary, and they are no longer considered or used. The whole organization has evolved to almost total interaction on a first name basis; this situation appears to have been in the transitional stage in which old habits were being shed.


4. Researcher’s notes on the retreat. The researcher attended this and subsequent retreats on the invitation of the department. Such openness is to be highly commended.

5. In an earlier draft of this chapter, a rough sketch used by Rashleigh was reproduced. As an example of the type of feedback received in staff review of these drafts, his comments are included here as follows. "My Dear Boswell: I didn’t think anyone paid attention to my sketch! My suggestion looks ominously like censorship and thought control. I think the explanation is that as far as communication was concerned, 1. we should promote better communication between the public and Region Board, 2. our technical contribution would also be sensitive to the messages received".


7. See p. 71, What Form of Plan.

8. Vickers, Sir Geoffrey, Value Systems and Social Processes, 1968. Vickers associates goal seeking with Skinner’s model of the hungry rat which follows programmed responses toward his goal. For Vickers the concepts and theories of information, communication and control provide a model more refined than that of the hungry rat. That is more than just responsiveness: a process of change in which "the whole of human progress may be convincingly described as successive redefinings of the unacceptable", p. 116.

9. A subsequent definition of "bare bones" by Lash is as follows. Anticipated future growth in the region will create demands for more dwelling units, hospitals, schools, roads, etc. The bare bones are envisioned as the cheapest and simplest elements required to accommodate this growth and could take the form of gravel roads, minimum site areas or minimum size transit vehicle fleets, for example, bare bones will serve as a basis for public choice; they will be able to choose elements where improvements above the basic minima are required but they will understand that, given limited resources, other options may be closed as a result. GVRD, Draft Program Directory, 1972-1973, first edition, April 1972, p. 1.

10. See p. 80.


13. Their public consultation program indeed was extensive. In addition to the usual staff and council consultation they organized a network of 50 umbrella organizations, each of which accepted some responsibility to provide positive responses at various stages of plan preparation. They also selected a stratified sample totalling 3,000 households from which they obtained 60 per cent response after follow-up, giving 55 per cent net usable returns. They mailed pamphlets to all households—letters, forms—and got churches to ask from the pulpit for their congregations' cooperation and interest in attending a series of public meetings, etc.


16. Lash, op. cit., p. 20.


18. On April 2, 1971, a visiting expert from the United Nations, gave a seminar on controlling population growth. Wiesmann emphasized from his experience that the control of population growth was impossible. This was a small event in 1971 and is not reported in the earlier chapter. However, the message had lasting effect perhaps because it coincided with a view already held by many of the staff professionals.


20. Ibid., p. 5.


22. Participants in the experimental meetings were: Dunbar Homeowners Association, Surrey Advisory Planning Commission, West Vancouver Organization Representatives, Delta Senior Secondary School, Fraser-Killarney Community Associations, New Westminster Chamber of Commerce (Urban Affairs Committee), Citizens Council on Civic Development, Inter-project Housing Council, North Shore Planning Forum, and Greater Vancouver Real Estate Board (Urban Affairs Committee).

23. The presence of politicians in these early meetings taught GVRD planners an important lesson. The involvement of politicians in public discussion within their electoral jurisdiction severely hampers dialogue. It promotes a conflict between politicians and citizens which reduces adequate explorations on public policy. But when politicians participate with citizens in electoral jurisdictions other than their own the contributions of various groups are more significant.

24. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, May 29, 1972, which includes an
interim report on the Public Program, p. 23.

25. Ibid., p. 9.
26. Ibid., p. 17.
27. Ibid., p. 18. Besides informing and discussing the developing Public Program with the Planning Committee, the staff had another reason for submitting the interim report. Additional expenditures were involved since the Federal Ministry of State for Urban Affairs had not come through with a grant they had promised. This was only a delay, from the Federal point of view, but the inability of the Ministry to be able to act quickly even when they had made up their minds did cause a problem throughout the year. The sum was $50,000.

28. To this date ten municipalities had been visited which involved an explanation of the project and a showing of the film. "Reaction to the film was generally favorable, however, Burnaby, Port Coquitlam, and Coquitlam expressed concern over the project and how it would affect them:" GVRD, Flying Visits to Municipal Councils, June 30, 1972.

30. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, July 5, 1972, p. 5.
31. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, July 20, 1972, p. 3.
32. Ibid., p. 4.
33. Ibid.
34. Lennarson, Fred, Developing a Structure for Public Participation in GVRD, GVRD, August 9, 1972.
35. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, August 9, 1972.
36. Ibid., p. 7.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., p. 8. From the extensive discussions that Lennarson had with the staff, Rashleigh prepared a paper on the Lennarson philosophy of citizen participation: The "Coalition" Form of Citizen Participation, undated (about October, 1972). This is a non conflict theory of citizen participation based on the need to participate and building positive participation through coalitions "by organizing around those things on which most or all participants can agree". Also basic to his approach is the linkage of citizens and technicians of government.

39. Rick Hankin and Peter George attended more than other professional staff and Martin Koops was a constant attender as part of the Public Program crew.
40. Minsky had discussed the citizen participation strategy with Lennarson and was generally following his approach. Further on the Public Program, in the fall of 1972, several students from the University of British
Columbia participated in the program to supplement manpower in recording meetings and as a unique learning experience. One major student report was prepared by R. Chernoff titled The Public Program, School of Architecture, fall 1972. His paper is preoccupied with the question of representation, the inadequacy of emotional responses, and the need to make the meetings more effective. The paper was distributed to the Planning Committee.


42. Seelig, M., Job Description Issues of Urban Growth, GVRD, July 5, 1972, p. 3.


47. Ibid., p. 33.


49. Ibid., pp. 2 and 27.

50. Ibid., pp. 26 and 2.


52. Baxter, David, "Migration" talk to Planning Committee, August 9, 1972.

53. Planning Committee Minutes, August 9, 1972, p. 3.


55. See p. 111.


58. Lash reviewed the early analysis in 1973 and told the researcher that the results were very similar to those obtained through the Public Program.

59. All of the following 9 points and quotes therein are taken from the Agenda for the Staff Seminar, GVRD, undated (about September 26 or 27). As for previous retreats, staff were asked to submit their comments to one person who assembled the agenda.
60. The researcher was present at the Manning Park Retreat and this summary is made from research notes taken there.

61. As before and to the end of this part, the source is the researcher's notes.

62. A few vigorous field games worked off some personal hostilities as well.

63. Planning Committee Minutes, October 4, 1972.

64. Hurst, W.D., Preliminary Considerations of Floodplain and Related Matters, GVRD, October 11, 1972.

65. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, October 13/14, 1972, p. 4.


67. Planning Committee Minutes, GVRD, October 13/14, 1972, pp. 4-6.


69. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

70. Ibid., p. 28.

71. Regional Board Minutes, GVRD, November 29, 1972, p. 8.
CHAPTER SIX

BIG PUSH AND DISCOVERY:

GVRD PLANNING IN THE FIRST HALF OF 1973

The Planning Committee and senior staff established the 1973 planning program at the Coach House retreat. Principally it accelerated the Livable Region Plan studies by one year, and accordingly set a priority to do as much work as possible on the plan in 1973. During the Great City Debate and Salt-spring and Harrison seminars of 1970, the planning program was set at a five year period ending in 1975 with a new regional plan. This sudden acceleration of the program to end in 1974 required a revitalized attack. Specifically the Planning Committee requested for October of 1973 a Plan of "desirable regional strategies and priorities, together with an assessment of the resources required for implementing them". This should then be followed by public discussion of the Committee's report on the plan, and a draft plan submitted to the Regional Board in March of 1974 followed by further public discussion.

Tooling up for the accelerated program

The Manning Park staff retreat concluded that reorganization into teams would be a desirable next step. During October of 1972 several team approaches were discussed, and reorganization, based on three groups of four people each, was implemented. These were resource groups to handle both special studies and routines; they were not specifically designated for certain areas or functions. Each group was assigned a group leader who was "respon-
sible and accountable for all work assigned to groups" and who reported to Seniors. How each group would tackle the work assigned to it would be determined by consensus of the group. Disputes would be settled by Seniors. These groups had barely got settled when the accelerated plan studies required a total reorganization. A much larger completely new attack was taken, the essence of which is as follows. Subsequent discussions in the chapter will explain each part of the program. An overview is presented here to place discussions in context.

First, a Plan Group was established with a responsibility of preparing a draft physical/environmental plan by October 1973. Lash took charge of this group, and to be able to devote full time to the task, they moved to separate quarters. Farry was made Acting Director for a minimum period of six months.

Second, a Policy Secretariat, under Thorburn was created to establish policy committees for nine substantive areas identified in *A Report on Livability*. This procedure was part of the report and had previously been approved.

Third, a request was made to IIIPS that some basic parts of the simulation model be operating by May so that it could be useful to the accelerated program.

Fourth, the Public Program was adapted to the changing circumstances. It will be recalled until *A Report on Livability*, the Public Program, had been established to obtain goal statements from the public. Their role had broadened, however, and with the accelerated program a redefinition was required.

Fifth, assistance on the accelerated program was desired from senior governments through Tri-level consultations and staff loans.

And sixth, the reorganization maintained the group concept for other aspects of the agency's work, but these groups would have more specific functional designations. Three such additional groups were set: Official Regional Plan, Administration and Information System.
The above six reorganizational steps represent a series of complementary streams of the 1973 program aimed at achieving a draft Livable Region Plan by the fall. In other words, they are part of a multiple attack on this objective. The 1973 program is presented diagramatically below. Previous work on the Livable Regional Plan had led to A Report on Livability which presented thirty general policy statements for the region and introduced the idea of Policy Committees to further explore the policy statements. In the remainder of this chapter, progress on the major parts of the 1973 program will be reviewed. It should be noted that this account covers only the period to the end of July.

**Tri-level Committee**

In October of 1972, the Planning Committee recommended,

THAT the Regional Board ask the Provincial Government to agree to the establishment of a Tri-level political committee and the appointment thereto of persons on the political level to represent the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, and the Regional Board.

From this invitation a Tri-level conference was scheduled for March 31, 1973 with Cabinet and senior politicians from provincial, federal and regional governments.
The agenda for this one day meeting was excessively long as each party had special interests to raise. Three major matters were dealt with. Of initial concern was the purpose, structure, and proceedings of these Tri-level meetings. The idea of Tri-level consultations was unanimously supported as an informal way of facilitating intergovernmental coordination in areas of mutual interest. A future Tri-level meeting was agreed to at an unspecified date, and in the interim, staff-level meetings of the three levels of government were scheduled. Federal participation in the Livable Region Plan studies was requested in the form of staff participation. There was considerable reluctance on the part of Federal representatives to become involved in this way in regional matters. Subsequently, one person was assigned to the Vancouver region primarily for liaison purposes and negotiations were begun about the loan of others to help with studies.

The next major item at the Tri-level was Mayor Phillips paper on the Management of Growth. The paper outlined the basic regional dilemma of high population growth in a region with severely limited space and presented alternative strategies for the resolution of the dilemma. Its major thrust, however, was to explain the evolving decision-making process in the region.

We believe that the setting of operational objectives and of operational programs is successfully done basically by establishing a proper process and framework for so doing. We think that it is not a question of defining a problem and then by a closed study to come up with a solution. Objectives and programs must be set by considering what will be at the same time desirable, effective, acceptable, and within the constraints with which we must deal realistically. This involves exercising value judgments, political judgments and technical judgments. The solutions or resolutions of problems and dilemmas are in our view not found but evolved in continuing study and dialogue. Means suggest and shape the possible ends, and the possible ends, when well defined, give rise to innovative thinking about means.

In the process we in GVRD have established these elements are all included. Our technical staff is exploring the policies that have been proposed as to their effectiveness, and analyzing them for their implications as to what objectives we are setting. The Regional Board and its committees are providing policy guidance to the staff on the appropriateness of the objectives and the political viability of the various policy options, and through the Public Program we are working with citizens and interest groups in the social and business world to
determine their reactions and the possible consequences of the programs as they will affect people in business and society. Furthermore this process involves on-going action steps while plan making proceeds. In the process of these action steps it is essential for all levels of government to participate the report stressed. What is needed now is agreement on consistent objectives by all three levels of government and action now particularly on "commitment to the decision-making process we have established". Federal and Provincial representatives were impressed with this approach and generally wished to participate.

Lastly, the Tri-level meeting took action regarding the Vancouver airport. Two standing problems made this a priority item. Airport expansion seemed much overdue, and the Burkeville community adjacent to the airport had received little satisfaction from the Federal Ministry of Transport over what were the future plans for them. The GVRD presented a position paper to the Tri-level which suggested a partnership study of airport expansion and related issues which included seven specific study areas and a proposal for a coordinated, open study process located in Vancouver. At the Tri-level meeting The Federal Ministers recognized that airport planning had been proceeding unrelated to the planning for the Region, and that they had not been sensitive enough to public reaction. There was agreement that a consultive process should be established. There was agreement that the GVRD position paper would be studied and responded to. At a subsequent Tri-level Staff Committee meeting held on April 16, 1973, Federal representatives proposed an alternative to the GVRD suggestion and after considerable discussion, the Tri-level Committee adopted a variation of the Federal proposals. An Airport Planning Committee was agreed to with members from all three levels. Rather than have all studies coordinated under the Committee and a study manager, the studies were divided up among Federal and Regional departments.

Gordon Stead, of the University of British Columbia's planning school, was appointed to the Committee as a special liaison person. He had recently worked as a senior official in the Ministry of Transport and knew many of their staff. Stead, with Nancy Cooley of the planning department staff, made
two major advances in the approach to airport studies. Following considerable exchange, the Ministry of Transport agreed to including in the studies the question of should the airport grow.\textsuperscript{13} This was a major accomplishment. Previously the national statistics on the increase in air travel were taken as givens for regional airport planning with regional planning limited to matters about the physical plant. From this concession a new perspective on airport planning related to its regional environment is possible. The second advance was a report on public involvement in the study process prepared by Nancy Cooley.\textsuperscript{14} Toward the growth of a "truly cooperative planning process" she suggests citizen representation on the Airport Committee and sub-committees, the holding of special meetings to hear interest groups, and the production of a newsletter reporting on the Committees activities.\textsuperscript{15} The report would be made available to the Committee for study.

Lastly, on the airport, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation recently commissioned a $50,000 study of Burkeville to be done by the residents. GVRD's public program is assisting residents in this study.

Public Program

The Public Program was conceived as having two major objectives: improve the image of the GVRD and determine the short range objectives of Greater Vancouver residents. To achieve these, a series of meetings with citizens groups were held in 1972. From these meetings GVRD visibility increased and citizen objectives emerged in the policy statements of A Report on Livability.

Public participation programs may often be on shaky ground because they threaten politicians. As will be recalled, there were early political doubts about the program. Even some of the staff saw it as a short term and limited activity of the department, but Lash and Rashleigh as well as the Public Program staff believed that community dialogue should be a continuing function of the department.

By the end of 1972 the status of the Public Program was as follows.
A major contribution had been made to the Livability Report but the role for 1973 was unclear. Also to date politicians had gone along with the program, but underlying reservations were apparent. These factors caused the department to prepare a report to explain the Public Program further and outline its objectives for the coming year.

In early January, Leonard Minsky prepared a draft report on the Public Program for discussion at "matins". It will be recalled that Minsky took charge of the public meetings in August of 1972 when he was hired on a temporary basis with a one year term implied. His draft report emphasized telling the politicians the "real story" of the Public Program; for him this was a program which involved "a tremendous amount of heat". For example,

One of the important consequences of so much activity is an inevitably high profile. Seemingly simple issues or problems, apparently innocent contacts burgeon into huge problems inviting and getting sporadic media coverage. In the public program, to date, two such events have already occurred—the Annacis Island controversy which was defused by creation of our first Policy Committee, and the Sea Island Ratepayers problem which is fueling an intensive effort in GVRD to get control of the Federal and Provincial Governments insofar as their decisions affect, and are not coordinated with, those of the regional district.

In reviewing his draft, several of the staff sensed a shift in the Public Program. They referred to the soft underbelly of the Public Program, its weakness, as being its appearance as a political activity. In discussions Minsky said this is "not so much a shift as a growth:" that is from listening, to assisting, to involvement in issues. From the discussion Rashleigh prepared a revised report which placed greater emphasis on the supportive role of the Public Program while maintaining the same basic objectives for 1973. The six objectives put forward for the year were as follows.

1. Contact, information to, and discussion with community groups.

This objective continues the role of contacting and listening to the public, but for 1973 it would be scaled down and aimed at filling specific gaps: "working class groups, ethnic groups, particu-
larly unions, tenants and people living in Vancouver" proper. 20

2. Assistance to the Policy Committees. This would be in the form of recruiting people to these committees, and aiding in communications and supplementary meetings, seminars and workshops.

3. Keeping the Board and Municipal Officials informed. "This means that the Board and the appropriate municipal officials should have the schedule of meetings available to them, notes of meetings held and, with advice to appropriate representatives of either the regional Board or municipalities of salient concerns, issues, complaints or problems". 21

4. Increased publicity for GVRD—"get information out to people fast" about what GVRD is doing. 22

5. School program: Young peoples' concerns about Livability and the Region.

6. Discussion of draft Livable Region Plan when this is ready later in the year.

It would be helpful now to review the Public Program in practice; what has been done and how have the objectives been met?

The record is as follows. 23 Regarding the first objective of community dialogue, some follow up meetings were held, but a special effort was made to contact unions and tenants. The major focus of public dialogue, however, was in assisting citizens groups having particular problems: that is, involvement in particular issues by assisting citizens in getting their views across to government and urging government to be more responsive. Some of the major involvements were

- South Surrey plan group: local area planning with a conflict over a proposed major development.

- Annacis Island: environmental controversy over treating sewage. Brought environmentalists, politicians, GVRD administrators and
citizens together.
- Burkeville: helped citizens to gain a hearing from Federal officials and are now aided by the $50,000 study.
- North Vancouver, Seymour Plan Group: controversy over development.
- New town centre, North Vancouver.
- Cottonwood: help the Cottonwood residents of Coquitlam to organize a renters association.
- Bowen Island.

While it is improbable that successful solutions have been reached for most of these, at the least the Public Program facilitated actions which enhance a future solution.

In giving assistance to the policy committees, the second objective, the Public Program recruited citizen members to these professionally oriented committees. Specifically representatives from unions and tenants groups were recruited.

The third objective of keeping the Board and officials informed does not have as good a record. Feedback about their activities and what the people are saying poses a constant problem for the Public Program. While they do report occasionally in a formal way and frequently informally, complete reporting does not occur. This may be unsolvable. As Minsky explains there are problems in reporting everything beside the sheer effort of doing so. There is a communication problem in that some of the information is not in the Board's or officials' interests. In addition there would be no use for much of the information. Accordingly, Minsky and his staff are not inclined to pass all information upward.

Next we turn to the objective of increased publicity for GVRD which is seen as getting information about GVRD out to the people fast. This serves two purposes: first, it increases the visibility of the GVRD, and second, it facilitates constructive feedback which was seen as impossible if you have a
secret level of government.

Regarding the school program, the Public Program staff encouraged high school and elementary school projects on community awareness which yielded many well done displays. These were assembled for a one day showing at Simon Fraser University and were well received by the public and School Boards. Continuation of this program is being explored.

Since the draft plan had not been completed by mid-year there is nothing to report on the Public Programs dissemination role.

The Public Program cannot be fully understood by cataloguing its record relative to objectives. It is much more: it is a radical activity loosely integrated within an institution; it feeds off attacking the shortcomings of its employer; it is uncompromising and has a mind of its own.

Minsky's philosophy which has great influence on the program, is to help the people to see the nature of their existence in preparation for change. While he sees revolution in North America as inevitable, he believes in the usefulness of reform in the interim. Concerning his personal style, he is careful not to become a shill for the GVRD or to become too closely identified with them: "personification".

Within the collegial organization of the planning department, this orientation of the Public Program provides different insights into planning deliberations and greatly adds to learning and the development of planning ideas. Furthermore, it constantly reminds planners of the real needs of people when traditional solutions are occasionally dragged out. The frequent disagreements, fostered by the Public Program, would appear to have contributed to building a dynamic, diversified organization and have enhanced personal development of staff members.

Senior administrators of the GVRD, however, have seen Minsky as a threat and have tried to terminate his employment. Minsky and the administrators have clashed on several occasions. A Sea Island ratepayer and Minsky de-
manded a hearing at a GVRD executive meeting (GVRD executive meetings were closed). Their request was refused but their efforts brought a subsequent change in policy to open such meetings. Also, several other issue dialogues, of which Minsky was part, have demanded that some senior administrators account to the people for certain GVRD actions. When it was suggested to Lash that Minsky be released, he strongly refused to consider such action except as a rejection of the whole planning program.  

The Public Program, run by Minsky, continues as the most dynamic aspect of GVRD Planning. The program appears to be able to facilitate action where mandarins cannot. For example, the Burkeville community conflict with the expanding airport was not responded to by administrators or planners other than treating this as an academic problem. On the other hand, the Public Program saw it as a human problem and has forced actions from otherwise passive governments: a federal grant of $50,000 was given to the residents to study the problem, and the GVRD have explicitly recognized the problem and urged the Federal government to respond and the Ministry of Transport to reconsider their forecast of future air traffic for the Vancouver Airport. Also the Public Program has advanced the image of GVRD, and has helped to make them the only level of government that appears able to effectively guide federal, provincial and municipal governments to action.

Policy Committees

As part of A Report on Livability the Regional Board accepted the idea of Policy Committees to work on the thirty policy statements. "These Policy Committees have as their goal to report in the fall of 1973 on objectives for their policy areas, propose operational policies for moving towards the objectives, and set out the implications, financial and otherwise, of their recommendations". The department's report on their 1973 program elaborated further on the Policy Committees as follows.

We recommend that the Livability Policy Committee be organized so as
to focus the attention of each committee on one or more urban systems, since it is essentially these systems which through their operation affect the everyday lives of the people of the Region and consequently affect livability. We would propose a set of committees to deal with the following systems:

1. Transportation and Transmission
2. Residential Living
3. Recreational
4. Educational and Research
5. Social Services
6. Health and Public Protection
7. Production and Distribution (economics)
8. Environmental Management

In addition, the report was explicit about Policy Committee duties.

1. Investigate those policy statements relevant to each urban system.
2. "Examine other policy points not originally assigned to them which they might feel should be examined from their particular viewpoint".
3. Deal with new public concerns that might be identified in the course of the Public Program during the next two or three months.
4. "Deal with any additional or alternative policies that might be assigned to them by the Planning Committee or Tri-level Committee".

Early in 1973 a Secretariate for the Livability Policy Committees was established under Thorburn. Two additional staff members were initially recruited for the Secretariate to help manage and provide secretarial services for the Policy Committees, and a third was added later. To start up this program, Thorburn prepared a report on Terms of Reference and Selection Process for the Policy Committees which was adopted by the Planning Committee at their meeting of February 9, 1973. This report presented the objective of having representation on the Policy Committees from all levels of government, academia, and the public. "The Public Program staff of the Planning Department will be primarily responsible for soliciting nominations from groups in the region" including newspaper advertising. Considerable emphasis was also placed on securing able chairmen.
By October, the report goes on, each Committee will be expected to submit a written report to the Regional Board which contains a statement of livability objectives for its field, the role the Regional District might take in achieving these objectives, suggest livability indicators to measure progress in these areas, verification or rejection of policy statements from the Livability Report, immediate action steps in their area, and financial implications including possible funding for these steps. The report also added that "since only a limited number of organizations will be able to have members on the various Policy Committees these Committees will have to actively solicit public views by taking part in the Public Participation Program, by asking for briefs and by advertising and holding public meetings".  

From February to March all nine Policy Committees were established. They started with 350 participants, most of which were professionals, and once a regular work pattern was established the active numbers levelled off at about 200. Two basic questions arose in the early meetings. First, they asked what power do we have? The GVRD response to this was they "operate under the aegis of the GVRD and have the same power as staff to make recommendations to the politicians". Second, what resources do we have? To this question a GVRD representative explained that a professional resource person from the Planning Department had been assigned to each Policy Committee. In addition, a sum of $2,200 has been initially allocated to each Committee for their use.

As of this writing, July 1973, the Policy Committees are just gaining momentum; therefore, it is premature to report on their outcomes. To obtain an early glimpse of where they are, the following brief summaries are now presented.

**Transportation and Transmission Policy Committee.** Four subgroups have been formed covering livability of transit, economics and financing, goods and services transport, and technical aspects of transportation. Currently these diverse interests are being explored.
Residential Living Policy Committee. They began by inviting several people to speak on Housing: Peter George and Ian Birtwell of the GVRD on "The Housing Issue" and the "GVRD Housing Department" respectively, and Professor Hurst of Simon Fraser University on "Some Comments on the Concept of 'mixed' Housing Localities". Three sub-committees have been formed: 1. philosophy of housing which is focusing on how to control growth and decentralization, 2. land supply and devices which is tending toward land assembly and the single tax on land, and 3. special design needs which are concerned with designs for the elderly and handicapped.

Recreation Policy Committee. An outdoor recreation subcommittee has been formed which is further broken down into eleven study areas with two people assigned to each. A second sub-committee is titled "re-creation", and it is identifying problems for research.

Education and Research Policy Committee. Their discussions have focused on the issues of community schools and principal power in schools. They have debated whether to improve the present education system as a basis for interest and discussion and stay together as a Committee".

Social Services Policy Committee. This Committee contains many recipients of social services who are displeased. The attitude is for more community control over social services to avoid the undesired results of professionalism and bureaucracy. "It was moved...seconded and agreed that the Committee go on record with a statement of its belief that the great majority of existing social service agencies are over-bureaucratized, impersonal and do not meet the needs of their clients".

Health and Public Protection Policies Committee. After several sessions the Committee established two objectives: in the short term to identify missing links in health care services and publish a directory of services offered, and in the long term to encourage the promotion of preventative medicine. In working toward the first objective of identifying missing links a large
seminar has been planned for August which will include representatives from all health services. These groups will be surveyed by questionnaire beforehand and the analysis will be available at the seminar. All of the $2,200 may be spent on the seminar.

Production and Distribution Policy Committee. This Committee selected several of the 59 objectives to focus on for example urban and population growth. "In addition, the Committee adds as an important objective for consideration the question of municipal financing, tax base, the consequences of amalgamation of municipalities (eg. Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody). The Committee also wanted to consider regional assessment equalization to reduce inequalities of consequent land use".37

Environmental Management Policy Committee. Three sub-committees on pollution, land-use, and recreation and conservation were formed and many reports collected. A draft pollution report, emerging out of an earlier GVRD issue investigation, was presented to the Committee. Discussions tended to focus on specific issues such as a new sewage outfall and where tank trucks were dumping. Regarding the latter, they asked for and received an explanation from the GVRD on a particular complaint.

Government and Society Policy Committee. Generally this Committee was concerned about government: too little, too much, alienation. "It was agreed that the Committee should begin by studying specific decision-making situations and analyze them to determine the way the decisions were made and the role of different levels of government and citizens groups. From this analysis it might be possible to isolate common factors and come up with some recommendations for facilitating the decision-making process".38 Subsequent meetings reviewed several case studies trying to resist getting involved in the issue but to focus on the process.

It is too early to pass judgment on the Policy Committees. Some unanswered questions about the Policy Committees are as follows: are they repre-
sentative, are they politically activist or politically supportive, is this another way of making planning acceptable or do they add a new dimension to planning knowledge, do they reduce alienation and offer a real way of participating in decision-making? Such questions must be left until the full story unfolds. For the moment they stand as an important new approach to urban planning which may have considerable promise.

Plan Group

A separate Plan Group began working on a physical plan at the beginning of the year. A draft plan was to be ready by fall which would compliment social and economic policy development of the Policy Committees. These two major outputs could then blend into a final plan for 1974. The principals of the Plan Group were Lash, Rashleigh and Julie Seelig, and with support staff, they were located about three blocks from the regular office. For the first half of 1973 they had three priorities: first, definition and management of policy exploration studies mostly to be done outside the group; second, matrix and constraint studies to be done in-house; and third, preparation of a synthesis report on growth and management for the Tri-level meeting. The latter has been reviewed above, and shortly the other two will be explained, but first it is important to understand the evolving philosophy of the Plan Group.

In explaining the current stage of the Livable Region Project to the Planning Committee, Technical Planning Committee and others, Lash articulated the following principles as central to their approach.

1. Regional planning can be viewed as one of three intersecting policy systems as follows:

- Social Policies
- Physical Environmental Policy
- Economic Policies

Intersecting Policy Fields
The Plan Group acknowledged the physical bias of their approach but hoped that the Policy Committee would make up for this.

2. Regional policy development is extremely complex; therefore, planning becomes decision-making under uncertainty rather than simple, sweeping solutions. To explain this conception, Lash used Friend and Jessop's three components of uncertainty.

3. The policy systems operate cyclically through a feedback loop.
For present studies this cyclical characteristic means that particular studies can be started at any time, for example the transportation report of 1971, and several studies can be conducted simultaneously. Furthermore, action may be taken at any time; as evolving research suggests certain acts may be implemented as seems appropriate while research continues. The cycle adjusts to such changes.

4. Regional policy systems are affected by "outside influences". Outside influences may alter the expectations for satisfaction within the region for regional policy development occurs in an open system. Accordingly, linkages with other levels of government are crucial—the Tri-level Committee for example.

5. To move from problems to a plan, qualitative analysis is necessary. In this way the important policy areas can be identified in preparation for specific interventions. In the case of the evolving plan of the GVRD, qualitative analysis takes the form of an ends-means matrix which will be discussed in detail shortly.

The above principles underly the evolving plan and place the current study program in context.

Turning to the substance of the Plan Group's early work of 1973 their
definition and management of policy exploration studies requires review. Such studies were necessary to further understand the policy statements of *A Report on Livability* and to prepare for policy development. A short list of the studies started is as follows:

- population capacity of infill areas: Consultant;
- characteristics of Regional Town Centres desired by public: Consultant and Public Program;
- delineation of communities and their receptivity to change: Consultant;
- prospects for maximizing "living in proximity to workplace": Consultant;
- costs and benefits of opening up for development land at higher elevations or steeper slopes: Technical Planning Committee Working Committee;
- potential for greater densities within existing policies: Technical Planning Committee Working Committee;
- patterns of regional growth conducive to economies in providing major sewer, water, and drainage facilities, 1976-1986: GVRD Engineering Department.
- patterns of regional growth conducive to savings in the provision of road facilities, 1976-1986: Consultant and Broad-Brush Transportation Committee Sub-Committee;
- prospects for controlling the location and price of land being made available for urban purposes: a symposium is planned.

In addition to the above, policy exploration studies were also to be started in participation with Senior Governments. These cover the following subjects:

- extra regional travel demand, and a network of all-purpose transportation corridors including major water crossing;
- preservation of farmland;
- environmental assets and classification;
- port studies;
- decentralization of tertiary employment from Downtown;
- "housing mix".  

These studies have not been completed; therefore, they cannot be reported on here. As with other studies of 1973, they should be viewed as a multiple approach to interrelated urban problems which should facilitate subsequent policy synthesis or policy strategy. Results are more apparent from the matrix studies to which we now turn.

Matrix One

As mentioned earlier the major in-house work of the Plan Group was on matrix and constraint studies. The latter primarily involved data collection and presentation of physical constraints which planning could not alter. The dominant work effort of the Plan Group, however, was on an objectives-means matrix or Matrix One as it was called. Matrix One had an objective of identifying key policy areas which could yield the greatest impact on livability.  

The basic conception of Matrix One is to make a knowledgeable estimate of the impact of policy options on short term livability objectives which will reveal the policy options having the greatest impact on livability and those having the least. It is based on the assumption that policies have a multiple and differentiated effect on objectives. In the following example policies p2 and p5 would appear to be the most promising.
There are five distinct steps to the ends-means analysis of Matrix One as developed by the GVRD. These deserve review.

**Step One**—identification of short term objectives. This was done through the Public Program and culminated in the thirty policy statements of *A Report on Livability*. From these statements the planning staff identified 58 livability objectives which are presented in Appendix F. They form one axis of the matrix. One should note they are short term objectives under the umbrella goal of livability and not generalized goals.

**Step Two**—identification of means which may achieve the objectives. Objectives-means thinking is not natural, but useful for urban planning as they explain.

Every human endeavour is a complex of goals and means, but ordinarily we do not need to think about them in those terms. However, in a complex social endeavour like our present one, "to maintain or enhance the livability of the region", we do need to be clear about goals and means. In fact, it is practical and productive to do so—

1) a clear statement of a higher level objective helps us invent or discover alternative means of attaining it,
2) we can more easily see how a single means can help reach several objectives, and how several means can be used in combination to reach one objective, and thereby see how to reach our objectives most effectively,
3) we can more easily see how objectives or means may clash or conflict, and thereby see what we may have to sacrifice on one objective in order to gain on another,
4) we can more easily be certain of keeping our main objectives in mind, rather than lose track of them in our preoccupation with sub-objectives and the practicalities of means, only to find, as sometimes happens, that we have taken actions that are counter to
what we really want to achieve.

This analysis is a first rough sorting out of the 30 policy statements in terms of 1 and 2 above. Tackling the conflicts as in 3 and 4 will come later.\textsuperscript{46}

Means were identified by going through the objectives and listing means of achieving them that come to mind. "Sometimes these were in the Policy Statements, sometimes we had to invent them".\textsuperscript{47} At this stage there was not great worry over subjectivity. For example, in the first work session on Matrix One with the Planning Committee the planners said,

\textit{You'll probably realize that breaking our goals and means "pyramid"\textsuperscript{48} into only three levels is artificial and that actually things are a good deal more complicated. Please don't let that worry you. What we want now are the thoughts that this kind of analysis brings to your mind: new goals or objectives, possible means and sub-means, rewordings of our statements to suit you better, your perception of links between means and objectives that we have not perceived or wrongly perceived.}

You should use these diagrams as doodle sheets, and by adding or changing, put down your own thoughts much as the Plan Group has done. The definitive statement of objectives and means for the Livable Region will come gradually, out of a learning process in which the Policies Committees, the GVRD committees and the public all participate. The Plan Group itself can never hand you this statement on a platter because the value judgments that enter into it are just as important as the judgments about what kinds of means will work. It is only in the latter area that expertise gives an advantage.\textsuperscript{49}

The ends-means "doodling" did prove too abstract for the Planning Committee and most of the means were identified within the department. In the end a total of 84 means were identified which correspond to the 71 objectives. These 84 means are presented in Appendix G.

\textbf{Step Three}—estimate the positive and negative impact of each means on each objective. Here is where professional knowledge of cities and regions including how they grow and change comes to the fore. Under the GVRD style of planning this is a prime knowledge area for planners.

How this works is as follows. A planner takes a mean from the matrix and relates it to each objective by listing all the positive impacts that the mean would have in achieving the objective and rating it on a 0 to 5 scale. Similarly a negative impact rating was also done because of the realization
that these also occur.

Since this was a first attempt at matrix analysis for members of the Plan Group, considerable experimentation was necessary to arrive at the above procedure. More complex efforts were tried but abandoned because they were too time consuming. Even so, going through the 58 by 75 matrix was a laborious job.

Estimates of impacts by planners were not always the same. In the early going they discussed their differences which was a tremendous learning experience and led to consensus. Because of the time involved, discussions could not be continued. To speed up the process planners outside the Plan Group and outside the GVRD were involved: about 12 in all. The matrix was gone through three times, noting positive and negative impacts, and the highest score of the three was used in subsequent analysis.

The matrix exercise had a strong influence on those who participated extensively. Rashleigh, for example, claimed it changed his ideas about planning. He had long been an advocate of greenbelts and decentralized town centres. The matrix exercise, however, taught him that these concepts were not the panacea he once thought and that policy making for planning is much more complex.

Altogether the matrix work took about four months. While this includes all of the studies involved in Matrix One, an extraordinary amount of time was spent on the cross impacts. Being the first attempt naturally involved more time. To correct this in the future some effort was made to cluster means and objectives. They did discover the Institute for Operational Research, in London and Coventry, were working on a similar problem, but contact with them revealed that they were no closer to a solution.

Step Four—obtain weights for the objectives. Cross impact analysis does not differentiate among objectives as to their relative importance. While all are important, since they were derived from public concerns, ratings were
now needed among the objectives. To obtain such weightings, a questionnaire was sent out to all persons on Policy Committee mailing lists and to Board members. 300 questionnaires were sent out, and 126 replies were received.  

The questionnaire listed 71 objectives, see Appendix F, with a Likert scale for each: five choices from "not at all important" of "of utmost importance". There was some criticism of the questionnaire, which in retrospect the Plan Group agreed with. Also some Policy Committee members were suspicious of the questionnaire. They felt that they were not there to do such things and wondered if they were being used. The eventual response to the questionnaire, however, did make it more valuable.

Questionnaire results were tabulated by means and standard deviations, and each objective was placed under one of 13 subject headings. Regarding the latter, the Plan Group found "it would have been just as productive and easier on the respondents to set up a smaller set of objectives reflecting the main purpose of our efforts under the 13...headings". These headings, e.g. farmland, wilderness and recreation, transportation, etc. allowed relative ratings which could be applied to each objective. It should be noted that no objectives were rated as unimportant.

**Step Five**—apply the relative importance ratings of objectives to the impact ratings of step four to obtain tentative results from Matrix One. Two types of results emerged: those means that are likely to be most successful and can be recommended for early action, and those means that are likely "losers". Best and worst means will be fully listed below.

In the report Selecting Means for Early Action, they say, two things will indicate 'successful' means: the higher its positive score, the better, and the less negative points attached to it the better. In addition, we may want to recommend early action on some means which are very efficient even though they are not particularly strong on positive score. An "efficient" means is one that creates relatively few negative impacts compared to its total positive impact. Based on these criteria, the following means come to the top:

1. Control the location and price of all land being made available
for urban purposes.

2. Cluster housing, planned unit development.


4. Make public transit more competitive with automobile by raising level of service, giving priority to transit vehicles, allocating more traffic lanes exclusively to transit.

5. Balance out tax-base maladjustments that may arise because "balanced municipal tax base" is not an objective of regional land use planning.

6. Plan and program regionally the maximum and minimum population growth to be permitted/attained in the sub-areas of the region over a 10-year period.

7. Increase population in areas where good facilities are already provided at high per-capita costs so that maximum use is made of these facilities +/or at lower cost per capita.

8. Locate enterprises where their job skills and pay match those of local labour force.

9. Increase supply of indoor recreation facilities.

10. Encourage better public litter behaviour.

11. Encourage sorting, recycling and minimizing of wastes.

12. Increase public knowledge and visibility of GVRD.

13. Prevent "leapfrogging".

14. Ensure Board and staff understand public views before beginning new policy studies.55

From these fourteen highest means, three are favored by the Plan Group for priority action. These are 1, 5 and 6. They suggest the combination of controlling the location and price of land, with balancing out tax-base maladjustments, and using "growth targets" forms a powerful tactical weaponry for attaining a wide range of objectives. A further reason for favoring these is that they can be operationalized without great difficulty. Some others, like 3 and 4, offer problems.

Turning now to the means that look like they are "losers": "those that are terribly inefficient and ineffective, whose negative impacts are numerous
and sometimes more important than their positive ones." They were five main "losers".

1. Continue to commit all (85 per cent at least) funds for regional parks to land acquisition in the designated Regional Park areas as planned.

2. Continue and strengthen policies to keep development from occurring in floodplain areas.

3. Protect the watersheds.

4. Preserve hobby farms.

5. Reserve sufficient attractive areas for new housing for upper income groups.

For the record we dropped these (last) two means on the grounds of their high negative net impact.... The remaining apparent "losers" on the list of means are surprising and puzzling: we did not expect, intuitively, that they would be "losers". We have not yet had time to find out why they hit bottom, and perhaps there are some plain old errors in the cross-impact assessments. But it is a virtue of cross-impact analysis that it makes you think twice. Here is the list:

6. Reduce housing costs by changing standards for prepaid services.

7. Make unusual housing types pay their fair share of municipal tax burden (house trailers and house boats).

8. Make pollution more costly and create higher prices for goods and services that cause pollution either in their production or consumption by: emphasizing policies requiring the polluter to pay.


10. Scenic easements, construction height levels, and other measures. Cones of vision and building siting restrictions.

11. Provide new housing that can be afforded by low-income groups in the Region.

12. Increase the supply of foreshore land developed and publicly managed for recreation and public use by 40 per cent.

Most alarming about these losers is that four of them are existing GVRD policies: 1. land acquisition for parks, 2. floodplain protection, 3. protecting the watersheds, and 11. public housing. Even more important the three urban patterns of centralization, decentralization and deconcentration (satellite centres) proved to be inconsequential relative to the livability priorities of the Region. If true, this is a major blow to traditional
urban planning.

Regarding the matrix procedure itself, several observations and conclusions were noted by the Plan Group.

1. **Inter-relatedness.** We have often said during the course of the Livable Region Project that "everything is connected to everything else". But Matrix One showed us a much higher degree of inter-relatedness than we had expected. Instead of only 25 per cent of the 1,300 pairs of means and objectives having some interaction, we found impacts with over 60 per cent. Negative impacts were more numerous than expected. Only one means was without negative impacts. Any given means has many more impacts on other objectives than the ones it is primarily intended to serve.

2. **Complexity.** We expect, as a result of this exercise, to find a number of "strategies": sets of policies jointly supporting one another towards sets of inter-related objectives. The complexity of inter-action is such, however, that no simple division into such strategies is apparent. We have recently learned of some computer programs we can use to sort out the matrix results in this way.

3. **Unexpected Impacts.** In quite a large number of cases the impacts we found were contrary to our intuitive expectations, or not in line with what "planners have always been taught", and changed our thinking about the efficacy of various "solutions" to planning problems. The exercise is evidently a good way of checking out one's thinking about solutions to problems.

4. **Clarity of Statements.** Objectives and means need to be clearly stated if one is to rate their cross-impacts. A few of the original policy guidelines were found to be so vaguely worded that they had to be left out.

5. **Need to be Selective.** A cross-impact analysis can be rather time-consuming if the number of means and objectives is large. The number of means-objectives pairs increases proportionally as the product of the number of means multiplied by the number of objectives. To use cross-impact analysis in an ongoing way, it is therefore essential to eliminate means and objectives from the matrix as the work advances: This can be done by taking out those that fall to the bottom, with low scores and negative impacts, and also some of those that rise to the top, that are such strong "winners" that their scores are unlikely to be much affected by anything new added to the lists of means and objectives.59

Results from Matrix One were examined by politicians in July at a Land Prices Seminar and at the Buchanan Seminar which will be discussed under the next two headings. Before reviewing these, another matter must be examined. While tentative results were emerging from Matrix One, the Plan Group brought Hans Blumenfeld to their operation for a three week period. The
eminent international planner, prepared a series of reports presenting his
impression on the work in progress.

Blumenfeld presented five reports in his brief stay. In these he
disagreed with many aspects of the Livable Region Plan studies. He claimed
regional growth could not be stopped without excessive unemployment, argued
for a concentrated growth strategy, felt that matrix results were wrong in
the negative treatment of freeway systems, and believed that equal allocation
of growth throughout the region would distort the land market. On the positive
side, Blumenfeld strongly favored a single tax on land to control land prices
in the region.

His papers were discussed at an all day "supper matins" on June 21,
1973. The differing perspectives stimulated many reexaminations within the
matrix and thereby expanded its meaning. While the single tax idea was looked
upon favorably, there were doubts that it could reduce the cost of land by
raising land taxes. Many thought that land owners would just pass additional
taxes on to the users.

Blumenfeld was not the only one to criticize the matrix. Some staff
members occasionally raised misgivings.

Land Prices Seminar

Since controlling land prices ranked first as a livability policy,
the Planning Department wished to have the results of its research on this mat­
ter and "some emerging ideas on operational policies discussed by knowledgeable
persons in the problem area, as a guide to further work". Stan Hamilton,
of the University of British Columbia's Faculty of Commerce and Business Admin­
istration organized the one day seminar for the department, July 5, 1973: "the
seminar was attended by three major developers, CMHC representatives, the
Minister responsible for Housing and staff, Mayor Phillips and Alderman Har­
court, Mr. Wally Ross (representing a sub-committee of the Residential Living
Policy Committee), Prof. Hamilton, and the GVRD Director of Planning. Mayors
of two suburban municipalities were invited, but unable to attend. 

A wide-ranging discussion occurred from which the following action points seemed to receive consensus.

1. Increased taxation on undeveloped land through a gradual shift to a single tax on land rather than improvements.
2. Prohibition of Foreign (non-Canadian) ownership of undeveloped land.
3. Promote greater understanding of the causes of growth in GVRD and the need for various municipalities to accept their share.
4. Establish minimum and maximum growth targets for sub-areas and municipalities.
5. Raise residential taxes to make growth pay its way.
6. Speed up the development of public land holdings.
7. Knowledge of private land banks should be obtained including what is preventing them from being developed.

Discussions from the seminar were to be published later in the summer, but in the mean time the seminar yielded important guidelines. A further seminar was planned to deal with some uncovered points, and GVRD was asked to meet with major developers to help "unlock" serviceable land held by them.

**Buchanan Seminar**

On July 11, 1973 a Planning Committee Seminar was held to review studies in progress toward a Livable Region Plan. Its location was the penthouse of the Buchanan Building, University of British Columbia, and there were morning, afternoon and evening sessions. As background material a report titled *Review of Livable Region Studies* was circulated in advance; this report was a collection of eight smaller reports.

Largely this was an educational seminar in that most of the material was new and the matrix analysis takes time to comprehend. Lash emphasized the need for more political involvement at this time, and that the scheduled plan
for early 1974 could not be met. There were sharp pressures for this deadline to be met. While a traditional plan could be completed by then, Lash replied, he had done enough of them. He stressed the process which had been evolving rather than a plan. This was not a new idea but seemed to finally be absorbed at the seminar. It is premature to comment on the effect of these deliberations. Committees were established to further explore actions suggested by the matrix analysis and to examine existing GVRD policies which appear as losers.

Other Work

Before concluding this review of the first half of 1973, several other matters should be briefly mentioned. Negotiation on acquiring transportation as a regional function continued. A change of government at the Provincial level, meant that negotiations had to start again at square one. As of mid 1973 Farry believed they were 90 per cent toward acquisition of the transportation function. Work also continued on the IIPS project. The May deadline for IIPS to be of use to the evolving Livable Region Program had come and gone without being fulfilled. Naturally, much other work on Administration and the Official Regional Plan occurred during this year, but principally this was of a routine nature. During the year the Technical Planning Committee went through considerable soul searching regarding their role. They saw their role as limited to Official Regional Plan amendments, but they half-heatedly took on supplementary studies to the Livable Region Plan.

Summary

As can be seen by the volume of work started and the considerable progress in the first half of the year, 1973 has indeed been a big push. Four dynamic streams have been maintained simultaneously: Tri-level consultations, the Public Program, the Policy Committees, and the Plan Group. Several Tri-level meetings were held with mutual gains for all. The Public Program continued to be a dynamic force in Regional issues and to assist the Policy Commit-
tees. The Policy Committees were established, are well into their investigations, and promise to have substantive recommendations in their fall reports. Lastly the Plan Group carried out their first phase of matrix analysis and have identified priority action areas to be further advanced into Regional policy.

Furthermore, the matrix analysis led to surprising discoveries for urban planning. The policy priorities arising out of this exercise were atypical for urban planning. Urban pattern and such two dimensional physical policies emerged as of little importance. This greatly contradicts the existing Official Regional Plan. Also four existing Regional Policies, on parks, flood plain, watersheds, and housing seemed to be "losers". If their analysis is valid, a new perspective on urban planning policy has been identified.

The first half of 1973 was a period of tremendous activity in GVRD planning. Many complementary streams were kept going, new organizational forms for planning were tried, and several major seminars were held. Several new organizational forms for planning stand out. Tri-level discussions brought federal, provincial and local elected officials together for talks on mutual problems. The Policy Committees represent a unique use of many task forces for urban planning. As well the Plan Group was an example of how part of an agency may temporarily isolate itself for a special purpose. In addition there was the normal use of seminars and the extensive use of consultants.

Most prominent for this period, however, was the work on matrix analysis. This new form of systematic analysis moved into areas where quantification is difficult: goals, policies, and their interrelationships. Inputs into matrix analysis were public goal statements, political ratings on objectives, professional refinement of goals and objectives and judgments on their interrelated impacts. The results of matrix analysis provided new insights into urban policy-making.

This brings to a close the case study portion of the research. Since any stopping point is unfortunate in an ongoing process such as GVRD planning,
the reader may be inclined to wonder about subsequent steps in their program. The most important next task of this research, however, is to interpret what has happened and to understand what type of future planning this implies.
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PART THREE

INTERPRETATIONS
Introduction

As previously mentioned, the case study of Part Two has concentrated on the activities of GVRD planning and the theory used by them. Seemingly related theory was omitted so the GVRD approach and theory could stand alone.

Part Three incorporates related theory. Chapter Seven presents an interpretation of GVRD planning through a descriptive model incorporating theory suggested by the GVRD approach. Chapter Eight moves further into theory extrapolating from the GVRD model a more idealized model.
CHAPTER SEVEN

AN INTERPRETATION OF GVRD'S PLANNING PROCESS

What meaning can be attached to the multiple of events recorded in Part II? Toward greater understanding of GVRD's planning process, and with the objective of capturing the essence of this process Chapter Seven identifies four prime components of GVRD planning and presents these in the form of a descriptive model. The four components are Auto-action, Qualitative Analysis, Political Dialogue and General Interaction. The model is presented as Figure 4 with the result of this process being planned action.

In this chapter, each of the four components will be separately reviewed identifying their meaning, how they have been used in GVRD planning, and particularly referring to related theory which amplifies these emerging concepts. Finally, the chapter will compare the GVRD model with the current model as identified in Chapter Two and revisit the "three-horned planning dilemma" raised in Chapter One.

Auto-action

Auto-action refers to a normative conception of public action as well as a planning role of assisting such action.

In GVRD planning, a positive stance toward action originated with Harry Lash. His experience in Toronto and Montreal had revealed how plans prepared in isolation, more or less following the comprehensive planning model, had a low probability of implementation. This was dramatically expressed by Lash when
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he said "I'm a bit fed up with spending my life on the things that turn out not to make any difference". In addition, the new Senior staff members, Farry, Thorburn, and Rashleigh, were attracted to the GVRD because they wanted to do something different. All knew that Lash had new ideas for planning, and Farry and Thorburn were dissatisfied with traditional approaches to planning. Symbolic of their desire to do something new was their rejection of comprehensive planning. Early staff discussions on the direction of this new planning agency, strongly favored a new type of plan which was short range, operational and a series of "action steps". In contrast, comprehensive planning, which identifies an ideal end state and assumes that interim actions will be guided toward the ideal, is passive and indirect regarding action. The fact that so many comprehensive plans have sat on shelves collecting dust attests to their low action characteristic.

Auto-action pervades the GVRD planning process as an explicit desire to achieve an immediate impact on the environment. Not only does it contrast with the indirect approach of comprehensive planning, but in theory it contrasts with the reactive approach of systems and partial planning. Auto-action in GVRD planning has three characteristics, action-now, facilitate action, and a motivation force, which requires brief mention.

Action-now, as embodied in GVRD planning, views action as an ongoing process, linked with implementation, and frequently a necessity even under uncertainty. Regarding on-going action, GVRD planners criticized the end-state plan as a long series of studies with a magic output at the end. In contrast they strove toward an operational plan which was dynamic: "planning deals with the process of becoming—i.e. what happens in the continuing, on going state rather than the end-state. Since the end of planning is people, people in the here and now qualify as well as future people". The new type of plan they had in mind was a series of action steps in the form of a cyclical program which perceives dissatisfactions from the environment, investigates, acts, and then
receives feedback. Planning was not seen as a major decision or major decisions but as a series of actions which continuously occur.

Implementation, as related to action-now, meant the linkage of goals and action. For example, GVRD planning identified short term community goals and then identified policies for immediate action to meet these goals. By directly linking action to community desires, implementation could be enhanced. This contrasts with comprehensive planning which separates the end-state plan from subsequent implementation through zoning and subdivision regulations and capital budget decisions. Practice has shown that the implementing measures more often than not, go their own way, leaving plans on the shelf.

Action-now also meant, for GVRD planning, a conscious search for what actions should be taken now. For example the matrix analysis suggested that existing parks policy, among others, may be wrong, and an action-now recommendation was made to correct this anomaly. Here we have the essence of action-now: consciously identify potential action areas which otherwise may be missed. In theory, this action-now position is justified by the work of Ruth Mack, Planning on Uncertainty, a book which had considerable influence on Lash. Her objective was to reduce the costs of uncertainty in decision making. For problems of high uncertainty, such as most urban planning problems, the choice is often between taking no action or taking a specific action. She finds, however, that government administrations and business have a bias toward inaction or a "conservative bias of management". Mack says,

Organizational practice often tends to discourage executives from choosing change....Efforts to make useful changes must overcome the viscous resistance of custom, break down walls of vested procedures, and bear the erosion of bargaining among interested parties. This implies that the optimization of utility for individuals in organizations is by no means necessarily identical to optimizing it for the organization itself. The ramifications of this tendency are a matter to which organizational theory has given a great deal of attention since Luther Gulick and Chester Barnard pointed it out long ago. My point here is simply that the uncertainty with which most evaluations are made supports the individual's hesitation to transcend organizational constraints. It thereby widens the difference between the individual's preference scheme, given the organizational framework, and the true preference
scheme of the organization as a whole.

In government administration, the pressures toward the do-nothing choice are far more powerful. The "howl meter", attuned to the noises made by the press, pressure groups, and the general public is more sensitive to the shout occasioned by change than to the perennial low growl associated with customary incompetence. Accordingly, a major way to reduce the costs of uncertainty is to reduce the conservative bias of inaction, or positively, to increase the proclivity to act.

The second characteristic of auto-action is to facilitate action. Essentially this means increasing the potential for policy action by broadening participation in policy development. Three examples of how that was done in GVRD planning are the political seminars, the Public Program, and the Policy Committees. These will be elaborated upon shortly; briefly they functioned as follows. Political seminars explore public policy and prepare the way for action. The Public Program balances two opposing roles: providing information to the politicians and planners on public concerns, and increasing public awareness about the government decision-making process. The latter sharpens and heightens the demands on government. Regarding the Policy Committees, professionals and citizens, external to the agency, obtain the opportunity to generate additional policy actions to broaden the policy field. A further example of facilitating action occurs in the "seed bed" function. Here the department helps to establish new regional functions, but once established sets them free to act on their own. Examples are the housing function and the pending transportation function. In short, they broadened participation in policy development to include politicians, the public and other professionals.

In facilitating action, the planning agency has independently arrived at an action orientation which resembles Etzioni's prescription for The Active Society. Etzioni sees a new direction for man and society in which man has increasing capacity to transform life rather than accommodate to or merely protest against, the social structures he encounters.
Heightened activation seems to be the best, perhaps the only, way to release the material and political and psychic energies necessary to reduce inequality, to transform ethnic and status relations, and to overcome tribalism and the wars that accompany it. An active society would absorb the energies of its members, in particular their political energies. Societies lose this capacity for the utilization of energy as their institutions tend to perseverance as if they had a life of their own...If no mechanisms for activation and transformation are operative (or tolerated) and they are replaced with manipulation, inauthenticity will grow.\(^6\)

For Etzioni, inauthenticity refers to major segments of the population being unrepresented in the political system. While GVRD planners apparently did not follow a particular theory of democracy in determining their style of planning, they did recognize the necessity of broadening participation for effective planning.\(^7\) Unconsciously they are moving toward an "active society".

Lastly, auto-action meant that the agency considered themselves as the motivating force in the urban planning process. Through internal and external deliberations they arrived at a five year planning program and set out to achieve a new form of planning under this program. The agency acted as the driving force in bringing many actors into the process and in stimulating them. This motivating role should not be seen in terms of a political confrontation, for GVRD planning is primarily low key. It meant inventing new ways of looking at problems and bringing various actors together to pursue investigations.

GVRD planning's motivating role, however, may be seen as a threat to administrative accountability and thus dangerous to political democracy. For example, collegial decision-making within the agency may be seen as a rising power of professionalism in government. To date, this appears to have been avoided through two measures: first, through close dialogue with politicians which includes working out the department's program, and second, by maintaining a high degree of professional pluralism in the staff.

In summary auto-action, as identified in GVRD planning, has three characteristics of action-now, facilitating action, and motive force for planning. Together this orientation affects the remaining three parts of the GVRD model.
Political dialogue and interaction are maintained by auto-action momentum, and qualitative analysis provides a medium for action. Auto-action also implies a conception of planning which is broader than mere decisions and involves a series of actions. As Friedmann says, "If the focus of planning is shifted from decisions to actions, it is possible to assert that any action that is deliberate is also to a certain degree planned. The problem is no longer how to make decisions more 'rational' but how to improve the quality of the action".8

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis forms the core of GVRD planning. It combines technical analysis with qualitative inputs and evaluations. Within GVRD planning, three prominent examples of qualitative analysis are as follows.

1. extensive use of contracted research which was then interpreted and evaluated by the agency staff and incorporated in revised form into the program. This contrasts with taking specialists' studies carte blanche regardless of their frame of reference or narrowness.

2. identification of community goals through public and political dialogue with agency staff (and on a continuing basis) rather than through formal social science research techniques.9

3. determination of strategic policies through matrix analysis in which public and politicians provided goals inputs, judgements on goals priorities and suggested means to achieve these goals, and planners contributed professional judgments on the trade-off among goals and means.

The qualitative analysis approach of GVRD planning appears to embody two propositions: (a) study of urban problems involves a deliberative process largely relying on human judgments (qualitative aspects), and (b) while rational procedures are of limited application for such problems, attempts should be made to make analysis slightly more structured. Regarding the theory be-
hind these, again Lash and other staff members were influenced by the work of Ruth Mack, *Planning on Uncertainty*. Their emphasis on this work, however, may be well justified. For example, in a review of the book, Laurence Mann has referred to Mack's book as "the most profound, balanced, and generally useful book in the area of planning theory in more than 15 years". These above two propositions will now be reviewed more thoroughly.

Mack's most significant contribution to decision theory appears to be the assertion that the decision-making process must match the nature of the problem being examined. Problems range from highly structured ones to highly unstructured, and decision processes range from rational procedures (qualitative probabilities of outcomes) to deliberative processes. She demonstrates that highly structured problems can best be solved by rational procedures, and highly unstructured problems can best be solved by deliberative processes.

To determine whether the problem is structured or unstructured she presents an "attributes profile" which is summarized in the following table.

**Table: Attributes Profile for Urban Planning Problems.**

1. uni-dimensional --- multi-dimensional
2. quantifiable ----------------- non-quantifiable
3. sharp information ------------------ vague information
4. clarity of goals ------------------ vague and changing goals
5. solution decisions ----------------- solution decisions
   irreversible
   adjustive
6. few alternative solutions ------------------ many alternative solutions

Planning problems tend to be of the unstructured variety. For example, the preparation of an urban plan (as has been the GVRD's main activity) would fare as follows. The variables of the urban environment are so numerous that plan preparation definitely would be multi-dimensional; although many urban variables are quantifiable about as many are non-quantifiable leaving the total urban complex quite non-quantifiable; data on all aspects of the urban environment is
never available, and available data is often out of date; goals relating to urban life are changing and difficult to establish priorities among (vague); some solutions involve long term commitments but most urban policy is changeable; and finally there are many alternative solutions to the many urban problems. According to the attributes profile, urban planning problems are highly unstructured.

If Mack's theory of matching the problem with the decision-making process is correct, then urban planning requires a deliberative process. What is the nature of this deliberative process? Mack suggests a process called DOSRAP. It is an exercise in the perception and solution of problems (and is) deliberative in that thoughtful consideration and striving are presumably involved throughout...The process is ongoing in that perception of and effort to solve one problem take time and, in addition, opens up new problems; the continuousness often has a spatial as well as time dimension. It is staged in that the process runs through the five stages identified (problem recognition, specification of alternatives, decision proper, effectuation, and correction). It is recursive since a five-stage sequence often starts all over again after a first go-round, in continuous cycles related to yet different from the first. It encompasses deliberative aspects of administrative activities closely intermeshed with most other aspects of administration. (The P stands for process.)

In addition deliberative behavior is purposive which "presupposes a value scheme that provides a basis for preference". Value judgments of two types are involved: those to understand causality (what will happen if a certain action is taken), and those to understand goals (how pleased will we be if that causality occurs). For unstructured problems this process relies heavily on human judgment. For example,

Such problems first need to be discovered, brought into focus, alternatives thought through and fought through; and only then can a choice be made, at least as a start from which further tests, suggested changes, and further "decisions" may proceed. Clearly this is a process in which participants, trying to do the best they can, behave as human beings with whatever admixture of rationality is, under the circumstances, accessible to them.

Minimizing the cost of uncertainty in such drawn-out, time consuming situations--situations where at best only loosely quasi-optimal solutions are possible, where deliberative conduct must address itself to
people-oriented (broadly, political) as well as task-oriented matters, where an input of good ideas can be as productive or more productive than expert calculation of relative advantage of existing alternatives—minimizing uncertainty's cost in this context must require very different procedures from those needed to devise a sampling method for achieving adequate quality control of machine products.\textsuperscript{15}

The second proposition of qualitative analysis is to make the problem more structured. For GVRD planning this primarily refers to their attempts at matrix analysis. Matrix One can serve as an example. This matrix concept evolved as an alternative to the traditional comprehensive plan.\textsuperscript{16} Instead of identifying general goals and reinterpreting them into a preferred urban structure, Matrix One analysis related operational goals to operational means to arrive at best probable policy actions.

Matrix One made the problem of high interrelatedness (particularly attributes 1, 2, 3 and 6) among urban ends and means a more structured one. Each policy (operational mean) was examined separately and its impact on each goal, both positive and negative, was estimated. In this way a systematic procedure for better understanding a highly unstructured problem was devised. Such analysis applied the planner's knowledge of cities, separate from his normative concepts, in a judgmental simulation of policy impacts. And as previously recorded, a new perspective on urban policy for Vancouver emerged.

For Mack, man is unsure about the results of his actions, therefore, these actions are "probabilistic". The matrix merely gives probability ratings about the impact of means on objectives. From these, sets of the best probable policies, as well as the worst, emerged. For example policies such as controlling the price of land, balancing the tax base, and providing growth targets emerged as the essence of any new planned action. These may be seen in terms of Friedmann's \textit{principia media} a term he borrows from Mannheim.

Friedmann says,

we might speak of the \textit{principia media} as developmental processes that lead to structural change within society....Complex systems, according to Jay W. Forrester, are remarkably insensitive to changes in many of their parameters. But they also have high sensitivity to change in a
few parameters and to some changes in structure. These key points for policy intervention are not usually self-evident: they must be discovered through laborious study and analysis.\textsuperscript{17}

It is not clear if Friedmann means sensitive pressure points or major thrusts for action. He vacillates between "skilled employment of indirect controls", and "control all actions that are believed essential to the aims pursued".\textsuperscript{18} GVRD's auto-action follows the latter. It may be termed as strategic intervention. In any event, matrix analysis by the GVRD has demonstrated one form of qualitative analysis which shows considerable promise to improve urban policy development. Many other qualitative techniques must be possible.

In summary, qualitative analysis, as reviewed here, brings together qualitative judgments and structured analysis to yield a new perspective on urban policy.

\textbf{Political Dialogue}

As shown on Figure 4, Political Dialogue and General Interaction are situated on either side of the professional activity of Qualitative Analysis. Both are interactions of different types. Political Dialogue is a special type of interaction between planners and politicians; General Interaction refers to a more widespread interaction principle involving the community, internal staff and interorganizational relationships. These two major types of interaction, labelled Political Dialogue and General Interaction, are separated on the diagram and in the text because they exist with an underlying conflict. It is here that power becomes an issue, and the reduction of uncertainty through dialogue brings a dichotomy between planner interaction with manifest and latent power. As will be outlined later, these also can be complimentary. In this section, however, Political Dialogue will be dealt with separately.

Traditional dialogue between politicians and planners involves political requests for studies, and subsequent submission of a completed report by planners usually with recommendations. In contrast, political dialogue as practiced in GVRD planning involves on-going collaborative deliberations over
the role and program of planning, problem identification, analysis, and arriving at solutions.

Throughout the case account this new style of political dialogue was evident. Some outstanding examples can be recalled. Early in the program, the planners and politicians were explicit that "planning leadership should be a political responsibility" which differed from the challenge of crusading traditional planners. The Kelly and Phillips reports on transportation and growth demonstrate political leadership in planning as well as the collaborative approach. The most outstanding example of collaborative deliberations between planners and politicians, however, must be the seminar retreats. One major seminar was held each year and many minor ones as well. These seminars allowed full discussion between politicians and planners on matters at an early stage when redirection was still possible.

In theory and practice, the relationship between planning and politics has been a matter of debate and adjustment. A general theoretical framework for this discussion focuses on the role of administrations. Public administration theory, over the past thirty years, has engaged in a debate over accountability of administrators to elected officials. Roughly this ranges between the position of Herman Finer, who argues for loyalty to elected officials, and Carl Friedrich, who argues that administrators should sense and respond to public needs. The former would be held in check by legal devices, while the latter by professional values.¹⁹

Turning specifically to planning, historically urban planning distrusted politics and politicians. Largely through the influence of the local government reform movement, urban planning was established as a semi-independent commission to keep planning "free of politics".²⁰ The intent was to have planning guided by "respected" citizens which implied a trusted accountability to the community as a whole insured by the status of "respected" citizens. This model of planning, which isolated planners from elected officials, severely
hampered the implementation of plans and led to a shift to a staff department within civic administrations to overcome this deficiency. Although not recognized in the planning literature, this move influenced planning accountability in the direction of elected officials.

Walker, in his classic work of 1940, revised in 1950, argued that for planning to be successful it must cultivate harmonious relations with politicians. He also argued the converse that for planning to advocate its own policies or recruit public support for them would bring its demise. 21 Altshuler, in 1965, went on to show that "the 'Walker' approach is very likely conducive, as he (Walker) claims, to the survival and growing respectability of planning in the American political environment, but that it encourages planners to eschew all but the most non-controversial values and the most predictable effects of actions". 22 More recent studies, however, verify planner's frustration under political pressures but also emphasize that "planners have been made aware of the political nature of their work, and as a result, there seems to be a growing recognition that they must develop political skills if they are to be effective". 23 One planning theorist, in devising ways that planning and politics can be made more supportive, has suggested that the two form "a Machiavellian Team", thus their association with politicians may not be a "fatal alliance". 24

GVRD planning appears to have gone beyond a fatal alliance to a positive alliance. The nature of a new relationship between planning and politics has been explored by three leading scholars: Etzioni, Trist, and Friedmann (a sociologist, social psychologist and planner respectively). 25 Their thoughts are as follows.

Etzioni discusses this relationship in the context of decision-making. He claims that planning segregated from politics, even if possible, would be ineffectual. The separation itself means "its products are likely to be rejected, ignored, or radically altered by the political decision-makers". 26
Etzioni believes we need "interwoven planning" in which the planner takes the perspectives of decision-makers into his planning (as well as the perspectives of those to be affected by the plan), which reduces the segregation between decision-making units and planning units. Extensive consultations between planners and decision-makers should occur from which "both the plan and the perspectives of the units are altered to allow for more consensus and for less alienating and more effective control (thus increasing the likelihood that the units will comply and will do so voluntarily)."

"The political engagement of the planning process", according to Eric Trist, has become a necessity in a rapidly changing society. This demands both more technocracy and more democracy.

...planning is not so much a programme as a process, which, however technical many of its aspects may be, is in underlying nature a social process. This process is both continuous--its phases of formulation, implementation, evaluation and modification succeeding and interacting with each other without reaching a final limit; and participative--all those concerned must contribute in appropriate roles. Else, one may ask, regarding continuity, "what of the plan, now that circumstances have changed?"; and regarding participation, "who is making plans for whom about what?". Planning processes, understood in this way, will, in my hypothesis become the basis of a new "culture" of politics. On the one hand, this new political culture will involve continuous dialogue, "animation sociale", bargaining and accommodation among interest groups--leading to innovative joint problem-solving as experience is gained and greater trust is established. On the other, it will demand a full technical "input" from the planning professions and their supporting sciences at all stages and at all levels. I suspect there will always be a certain dissonance between the technical and participative aspects, ...though the attendant conflicts, we may hope will on the whole be benign rather than malign....

While Trist is speaking of political participation on a broad basis, his comments apply to politicians. He takes Etzioni's "interwoven" concept one step further and links planners and politicians in a "social process" built on dialogue, innovation and joint-problem solving.

A Further development of the link between the planner and the politician is made by John Friedmann. He presents a theory of "transactive planning" in response to a widening communication gap between planners and politicians. The essence of transactive planning lies in two concepts, dialogue and mutual learn-
ing, and the objective is to bring knowledge into action. Friedmann recounts his Chilean experience where he was hired to work on a problem, set about doing his studies, and subsequently submitted a report which was not adopted. In retrospect he finds this type of relationship with the client to be presumptuous and arrogant. As well "the traditional means, an exchange of formal documents, has not proved spectacularly successful in the past". Rather the "dialogue planner" needs to establish a relationship with the client long before report preparation. This is not mere communication. Dialogue involves relating as whole people, with openness, an acceptance of conflict, and a growing relationship over time. In contrast to the impersonal style of formal communication, the dialogue style appears intimate. This is desirable, claims Friedmann, for the relationship of whole persons allows patterns of shared interests to be identified and reciprocal growth to occur.

Mutual learning combines the knowledge of the planner and client. It recognizes each has a different method of knowing: the planner works chiefly with processed knowledge abstracted from the world and manipulated according to certain postulates of theory and scientific method; his client works primarily from the personal knowledge he draws directly from experience. Although personal knowledge is much richer in content and in its ability to differentiate among the minutiae of daily life, it is less capable of being generalized and, therefore, is applicable only to situations where the environment has not been subject to substantial change. The "rule of thumb" by which practical people orient their actions is useful only so long as the context of action remains the same. Processed knowledge, on the other hand, implies a theory about some aspect of the world. Limited in scope, if offers a general explanation for the behavior of a small number of variables operating under a specific set of constraints.

Friedmann goes on to say,

In mutual learning, planner and client each learn from the other—the planner from the client's personal knowledge, the client from the planner's technical expertise. In this process the knowledge of both undergoes a major change. A common image of the situation evolves through dialogue; a new understanding of the possibilities for change is discovered. And in accord with this new knowledge, the client will be predisposed to act.

Under transactive planning, the politician and planner become fused in dialogue
and mutual learning. As has been recorded, GVRD planning has arrived at a similar position.

All three scholars, Etzioni, Trist and Friedmann, agree that a new relationship between planning and the political process is necessary and all suggest a form of "transactive planning" as the emerging model. They appear to offer an important addition to the debate on accountability which vacillates between political and professional accountability. Besides these two roles, they suggest that the relationship between politicians and their policy advisors can become one of collaboration. The GVRD case offers a practical example of such a "transactive" relationship. Transactive planning stands as a potential major breakthrough for administrative theory and particularly for urban planning.

In closing, it should be noted that transactive planning also applies to the relationship between the planner and the community.

**General Interaction**

Beyond Political Dialogue, discussed above, a principle of interaction pervades all GVRD planning activities. This principle is captured under the label General Interaction. Normatively this principle has been referred to by Fagin as the "collaborator" role of the planner. In describing the scale of collaboration he says,

It implies a process and structure of collaboration, a capability to cooperate, for which we are as yet quite unprepared. The planner ought to operate as part of a collaborating structure with a great many other specialists speaking in many other tongues. These include (1) at least twenty other important disciplinary and professional contributors -- economists, ecologists, lawyers, statisticians, engineers, political scientists, agronomists, etc.; (2) administrators and functional specialists in each of the organizational divisions used to make the total governance task tractable--highway transportation and labor relations, waste management and equal opportunity, housing and medicare, public safety and higher education, and all the rest; (3) other planners in the whole intricate web of planning, working in every kind of planning agency, and at all the levels of government, and in all the private or voluntary enterprises that interact with public activities; and (4) representatives of the scores of interest groups that constitute the planner's clientele (including the political parties) with whom and for whom the planning process is conducted and plans are made. Real collab-
oration with all of these is of the essence. More effective performance of this collaborative role hinges on the development of better institutions, instruments, and personal skills for collaboration—and especially on a fuller sense of the importance of collaborative capacity. One crucial measure of the progress of the profession will be the extent to which it is transformed into a meeting place for all the collaborating planners.  

For the purpose of reviewing collaboration, or General Interaction, in GVRD planning three major classes of interaction, (a) community, (b) internal, and (c) interorganizational, will be reviewed in this section.

From the case study of GVRD planning, there are numerous examples of community interaction.

For example,

1. discussion of the DeLeuw, Cather rapid transit report with the public,
2. extensive goals discussions with community groups,
3. involvement in numerous community issues like the Burkeville residents adjacent to the airport,
4. citizen involvement on the Policy Committees.

What is most important to note about community interaction in GVRD planning is its ongoing nature with a specific staff allocation. The Public Program operates as a division of the planning agency, although it is highly integrated as well. Also of note, this community interaction is not ordinary citizen participation, protest when something goes wrong, but it may include the latter. GVRD's community interaction is based on the idea of opening up the public decision-making process on a continuing basis. The objective is to have a decision-making process which, in Lennarson's terms is a "coalition" among citizens, politicians and technicians.

In theory, their community interaction corresponds to Friedmann's "transactive planning" and Etzioni's "interwoven planning" previously discussed. GVRD planning involves mutual learning through the interaction of personal and processed knowledge with an output of the mutual development of public
policy. Regarding interwoven planning their planning enhances implementation by taking into account the perspectives of citizens or the recipients of planned action.

The second class of interaction is internal interaction. It raises the whole matter of organizational management. Since this is an appropriate place to do so, the organization principles used by GVRD planning will be summarized here. Most of these relate directly to interaction.

1. Collegial—staff members are considered to have special knowledge and important personal views to contribute to the organization. As much as possible all staff are considered as equals and joint decision making is followed. In the absence of direction, this is stimulated by the director. 35

2. Communication—to complement the collegial approach, communication among staff is a major objective. It is facilitated through the "wall calendar" and "matins". The latter occupies about 40% of many staff members' time. 36

3. Staff pluralism—the diversity of staff is considerable which resembles the interdisciplinary team (economics, english, geography, operations research, sociology, transportation planning, urban planning). However, the dialogue does not generally split by disciplines but by personal perspectives. 37

4. Keep staff small—although there have been considerable work demands on the department, a conscious effort has been maintained to keep the staff small. Chiefly this has been possible by using external consultants for about one third of the work. 38

5. Recursive organization—it is realized that no one organizational form will be right for many different priorities. Accordingly, all organizational matters are considered flexible and impermanent, and can be changed by the staff with general consensus. Principally
this involves reorganizing the groups—the group concept is their most consistent organizational arrangement.\textsuperscript{39}

6. Research and management function—primarily the department wishes to maintain a research and management function and not take on "line" functions. To meet the diverse staff requirements of changing research needs, and innovation, consultants are often preferred to hiring additional staff. The department often just manages the research.\textsuperscript{40}

It is obvious that GVRD planning has abandoned the bureaucratic model of organization which requires partial involvement of employees, rules, and vertical communication. Rather they follow full involvement of employees, few and flexible rules, and horizontal communication. In theory, they can be seen within the "human relations" school of Public Administration which implies an employee centered organization. The most prominent contemporary proponents of this school are Argyris, McGregor and Likert.\textsuperscript{41} Argyris's work points to the unavoidable conflict between the organization and the individual, and he suggests tolerant and sympathetic leadership as the remedy. McGregor is more explicit about this theme developing his theory x and theory y which correspond to leadership assumptions. Theory x leaders assume their employees dislike work, are lazy and require constant direction, whereas theory y leaders assume employees are largely self motivated. Likert carries this distinction one step further by proving, with a tremendous amount of empirical evidence, that theory y managers, "supportive", in American business and government had the best records and were the firms with the highest productivity. Although these managers had not conceptualized their own styles, a common pattern was evident. From this common pattern Likert developed an explicit theory for the "human organization".

This theory has two main concepts: groups, and supportive relationships. He says "management will make full use of the potential capacities of its
human resources only when each person in an organization is a member of one or more effectively functioning work groups that have a high degree of group loyalty, effective skills of interaction, and high performance. Supportive relationships occur within each group, and since groups overlap, most employees will be members of a variety of groups. Likert's model of the overlapping groups form of organization is presented below. The heavy lines represent the "linking pin" function in which a member from each group links into the next higher group.

Likert's two main books have been read by Lash, are part of the GVRD library, and have been suggested by Lash to several staff members. This form of organization most closely resembles that of GVRD planning. Its emphasis on interpersonal relations and interaction are central to its successful operation.

The third and last class of General Interaction is interorganizational interaction. This occurs in two main ways: interaction with consultants and other governments. GVRD planning has made extensive use of consultants in a special way. As can be seen in Appendix E, a considerable percent of their budgets went to consultants. Also of note their "special" use of consultants refers to their preference for small firms or individuals as consultants. This allows them to manage the consultants and integrate their work into the depart-
merit's program rather than the other way around.

Widespread use of consultants in planning is one way of bringing an immense and growing knowledge to the organization quickly. Lessinger in *Every Kid a Winner* employed a similar technique for education but used performance contracts. His theory was that the best knowledge available should be applied to education, and a similar claim could be made for urban planning. GVRD planning has not used performance contracting, as did Lessinger, but they have paid close attention to drafting precise frames of reference for consultants (often they have exploratory work done by a consultant to see if a project is feasible).

GVRD planning interacts with local, provincial and federal governments through the Technical Planning Committee, the Tri-level meetings and many informal contacts. Interorganizational action on urban problems is necessitated by the interrelatedness of these problems. For example,

> the central feature of urban problems is indeed their interdependence. Because each problem is itself so complex, and the interdependencies are so variegated, it is difficult to measure the precise relationships between them...the system is recursive: a poverty problem aggravates the housing problem, which in turn augments the poverty problem, both directly and indirectly via transport and the public economy. This means that the links are highly complex and diverse, and that the ramifications of an urban problem are substantially wider than simple bilateral examination would tend to suggest.

Interrelatedness of problems is also present in Chevalier's conception of "meta-problems". These are "a set of related problems which are perceived as a single problem and whose elements cannot be isolated from one another". These problems diffuse through the environment and are connected to a multitude of other problems. Interorganization action on these problems involves connectedness and coordination among all three levels of government and at each level.

A new field or interorganizational decision making is on the horizon which is of relevance to this discussion. Trite, Chisholm, and Rander note changes in modern organizations and their environments which create a situation where interorganizational decision making becomes critical.
This represents a shift in focus from single organizations (acting as unified systems and operating in diffused environments) to large complex systems of organizations, each attempting to operate on the larger system to which it belongs, as one of several cooperating subsystems. A decision to act cooperatively is not, however, sufficient to achieve the benefits of joint decision optimalities. The interacting systems are not single decision makers but are themselves each complex systems. To succeed in their endeavors it is necessary for them to find means to coordinate their planning, information, and decision making systems, through multi-decision maker models, and so arrange the payoff structure such that each party can justify the joint goals on independent criteria.47

Interorganizational decision making involves mixed conflict-cooperation (i.e. a nonzero-sum game) which aims at conflict resolution. It explicitly recognizes that organizations will have different goals but aims at the optimum goals set.

As we have noted earlier, Friend and Jessop are extremely interested in interorganizational matters for planning.48 From their study of Coventry they conceptualize planning as being done by many agencies, each with their own goals, with some of the agencies being outside the local community. To reduce one class of uncertainty, what others are doing, there is a need for coordination among agencies involved in urban planning. A coordinated planning process in effect results in a multi-organization. Friend and Jessop also note certain problems for planning activities involving several agencies and prescribe ways of handling these. The problems and their proposed action are summarized below.

Problem of mechanisms for strategic control: periodic meetings of central board to regulate activities of specialist policy groups; setting-up of predictive reporting system.
Problem of authority for strategic control: formal powers of authorization of proposed actions vested in central board and resource-allocating committees.
Problem of sufficient information: principle of 'soft' information system with opportunities for scanning by all members and departments.
Problems of democratic guidance: councillor involvement at three levels of decision-making process: operational control, strategic choice, strategic control.
Problem of common language: formation of a communications development unit.
Problem of sufficient motivation: principle of cautious experimentation with emphasis on maintaining acceptability of system to all participants.49
Such sophisticated interorganization arrangements do not exist for GVRD planning. However, GVRD planning has been promoting interorganizational activity and through their efforts have been educating other levels of government in ways of cooperating and joint problem thought.

Lastly, one should note that the university may be seen as an organization with which to interact. GVRD's involvement with IIPS is an example of this. Along this line, Chevalier and Choukroun see a breakdown in the traditional distinction between university and practice. Following Jantsch they conceptualize the transdisciplinary university which "will provide the necessary integration of knowledge for making urban change". 50

In brief, General Interaction refers to a broad collaborative process among planners, the community, other organizations related to planning as well as internal collaborative procedures.

A Comparison with Current Practice

A brief modern history of Canadian urban planning was presented in Chapter Two including a descriptive model of current practice. This model had four characteristics which can be summarized as follows.

1. bureaucratic—Canadian urban planning solidified its position in the post-war period by becoming a regular department of local government which bureaucratized the activity.

2. reactive—with the move into local government, political accountability increased and planners largely responded to problems raised in the environment rather than comprehensively evaluating the environment.

3. professional—striving for professional status, Canadian urban planners concentrated their expertise on the preparation and administration of zoning and subdivision regulations.

4. isolated—with its heritage of a special claim to interpret the public interest and the professional nature of the work, Canadian urban
planning largely confined itself to the government setting and did not involve the public in its studies.

The GVRD planning model presented earlier in this chapter, identified by the four components of Auto-action, Qualitative Analysis, Political Dialogue and General Interaction, contrasts greatly with the above characteristics of current practice. Auto-action with its positive or motive force toward action is opposite to the reactive characteristic with its implied "squeaky wheel" philosophy. The former assumes that man must constantly be acting to improve his existence while the latter assumes that everything is fine unless one hears to the contrary. Next, Qualitative Analysis with its emphasis on values and judgments is generally opposite to the traditional professional stance of known solutions and rational procedures. Third, Political Dialogue contrasts with the bureaucratic position. The latter maintains a separation of powers and formal relations with politicians while Political Dialogue opens the planning process into collaboration with politicians. Lastly, General Interaction differs with the isolated approach of current practice. While current practice is being drawn into more community involvement, this is involuntary; whereas, GVRD planning follows broad and continuous interaction as an essential element of urban planning.

The contrast between the descriptive models of current practice and GVRD planning appear to be absolute. Therefore, this comparison need not be belabored; for a more complete comparison see Appendix H. Rather one should accept that GVRD planning is different. But what does this mean? Does GVRD planning solve the underlying problems of urban planning? The Three-horned Planning Dilemma Revisited

This study started with the general problem that urban planning has not been effective which was put in a methodological context by Waterton's three-horned planning dilemma. He claims the three major approaches to urban planning, comprehensive, systems and partial, do not offer hope for planning.
Each of these has major weaknesses: simplistic goals and incomplete data for comprehensive planning, non-qualitative and computer magic for systems, and status quo oriented for partial. Also there is a problem of synthesis among these three approaches. While each has certain advantages, innovative, ability to deal with interrelationships in urban systems, and qualitative, respectively, these appear to be mutually exclusive. In addition, it was noted that none of the three approaches adequately deals with social change, and they are highly oriented to the existing power structure. Thus there is a triple problem: non-synthesis among the three major approaches, failure to deal with social change, and a subservience to the existing power structure.

How does the GVRD planning model as identified fare relative to these problems? From the evidence presented in the extensive case study and the subsequent interpretation through the four components, GVRD planning seems to offer a solution. It appears to capture the strengths of the three basic approaches while avoiding their weaknesses. More specifically it is able to be innovative, examine interrelationships in the urban environment, and be qualitative, while it appears to minimize weakness of simplistic goal statements, incomplete data, non-qualitative, computer magic, and status quo orientation. Of equal importance, GVRD planning has attained a positive stance toward action, through Auto-action, which introduces a conscious concern for social change to urban planning. Lastly, GVRD planning has not become fully committed to the existing power structure. Instead it has followed a broad conception of power which carefully balances political collaboration with community and intergovernmental collaboration.

One way of interpreting the GVRD planning model relative to the "three-horned planning dilemma" is to view it as a new model. As noted earlier, GVRD planning differs with current practice, and it may equally be contrasted with the three major approaches to planning—for this comparison see Appendix I. In this vein, the GVRD model could offer an important contribution to a new
theory of urban planning. While it is presumptuous to announce a new planning without numerous practical examples, one should note that such revolutions in knowledge are legitimate. Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions, or "paradigm shift" attests to this. However, it is not the purpose of this work to enter into such a debate; the remaining task is to seek greater understanding of the conceptions of planning identified in this examination.
1. see p. 69.

2. see p. 59.


4. Ibid., pp. 126-127.


7. The closest to a theory of Democracy would be Lennarson's "coalition" form of citizen participation. See p. 129.


9. The Vancouver Futures Project, see p. 136, is a "scientific" way of determining values and perhaps goals. GVRD's approach does not preclude using the outputs of such research in dialogue.


13. Ibid., p. 148.


15. Ibid., pp. 7-8.


18. Ibid., pp. 38 and 37.


27. Ibid.


29. Ibid., pp. 15-16.


31. Ibid., p. 172.

32. Ibid., p. 185.

33. It should be noted that this breaks down the sharp distinction between administrators and politicians to which considerable Public Administration Theory clings. Actual practice seldom maintains a strict separation of powers.


35. Theory suggests that a collegial type of organization would be desirable for planning. Kornhauser, in his famous study of scientists in industry, demonstrated that normal bureaucratic organizational procedures do not apply to creative work. Thompson has carried this theme into his work. He says,

it seems reasonable to expect the professionalization of work to give rise to important changes in relationships and administrative practices within organizations. A professional has had a long period of pre-entry preparation for his work. Unlike the desk classes of the past, professionals do not come to the organization empty-handed to sell their undifferentiated time and effort to be used as the management thinks best. The work of the professional is not determined by the organization, and that work is usually a source of great personal satisfaction to him. Professionals develop associations to protect their work and their work standards from organizational opportunism and authority....Professionalism, then, is an alternative to bureaucracy (or the market) as a social control. As a system of control it is pluralistic and collegiate rather than monocratic and hierarchical. From a different approach Burns and Stalker have arrived at a similar conclu-
sion. Their study of innovation in industry discovered a relationship between the organizational function and the type of organization. Where the organization function was certain and subject to little change a mechanistic or bureaucratic organization was suitable. But when the organization function required a high degree of innovation, an "organic" organization (very like the human relations school) was suitable. See Kornhauser, A., Scientists in Industry; Thompson, V., Bureaucracy and Innovation, 1969; and Burns, T., and Stalker, G.H., The Management of Innovation, Tavistock, 1961.

36. Calculated estimate by Harry Lash, Director.

37. Alonso in "Beyond the Inter-disciplinary Approach to Planning", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, May 1971, criticizes the interdisciplinary approach and calls for meta-disciplinary planning; a unifying substantive focus on the city. Staff pluralism is similar in that it goes beyond the interdisciplinary approach but different in that it provides a more personal basis of dialogue not necessarily based on "common good". The only treatment of such pluralism, although remote, known to the researcher is by W.I. Thompson in At the Edge of History, Harper, 1972. Thompson identifies four complementary roles which he finds persistent throughout history. He begins with a story of the Bushmen of South Africa which used a four man hunting team. Their roles are Shamon (or priest), Clown, Headman, and Hunter. He then expands this model of four over time to explain the whole organization of society. Applied to an organization one could hypothesize that these four roles are the essence of a necessary pluralism. For the GVRD these might be strategist, critic, administrator and technician, and one could attach Lash, Minsky, Farry and Rashleigh to these roles. (Caution is necessary, for in reality all play very complex roles.) The point being, however, that a form of organizational pluralism may be essential in innovative organizations.

38. see Appendix E.

39. Broady suggests organizational theory is a new approach to planning as being a more appropriate means of achieving socially desirable ends than the physical design solution. He sees urban planning organization as "a social unit of human groupings deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals". In supporting his proposal he relies heavily on Joan Woodward, British industrial sociologist. From her studies of organizations she has asserted that "organization and management processes...should vary with purpose, function, technology and working methods". Here we get a strong clue that organization form for planning should relate to its particular function. See Broady, M., "Town Planning and Social Issues", Architectural Association Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 3, July 1969.

40. Serving both line and staff functions creates a conflict in organizational form. For example Simon has identified "Gresham's Law of Planning" which says routine drives out innovation. Michael's law of goal displacement says the same thing in a different way: "In the course of adopting means to attain organizational goals the means may become ends in themselves that displace the original goals". Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, 1961, p. 229.


42. Likert, op. cit., p. 142.
43. Lessinger, *Every Kid a Winner*.


47. Ibid., p. vi.


49. Ibid., p. 286.


CHAPTER EIGHT

A LEARNING MODEL OF URBAN PLANNING

This study began in search of a new model of urban planning which would move us beyond the three-horned planning dilemma (i.e. that comprehensive, systems, and partial planning each had fundamental shortcomings). From here three major steps have been taken.

First, Canadian urban planning was historically reviewed identifying the current model characterized as professional insularity, reactive, and highly bureaucratic. Also, considerable dissatisfaction with this model was identified. In retrospect, many of these shortcomings related to the three-horned dilemma particularly partial planning and to a lesser extent comprehensive planning.

Second, a case study of a seemingly innovative planning agency, planning in the Greater Vancouver Regional District, was made in considerable detail. This study provided an overview of a planning process including its many explorations and some divergences. The case study also provided numerous insights into the planning process as well as many glimpses into what a new planning process could be like.

Third, an interpretation was made of GVRD planning identifying four principal characteristics: Auto-action, Qualitative Analysis, Political Dialogue, and General Interaction. These characteristics were explained in terms of contemporary theory. Also the GVRD model was compared to the current model
with almost a complete contrast. There was a preliminary conclusion that GVRD planning shows promise of overcoming the difficulties inherent in the three-horned planning dilemma.

The final chapter extends the interpretation of Chapter Seven one step further into a theory concerning a new model of urban planning. Thus this inductive or search process ends with a proposed "Learning Model of Urban Planning". As previously noted this model, as well as the GVRD practice, may be peculiar and thus may be an unacceptable future guide. But as shall be explored later in this chapter, such a conclusion is premature and cannot be made in advance of professional and intellectual judgments of the model. Acceptance of these ideas will be the ultimate test.

The new model, the learning model of urban planning, has truly grown out of the inductive approach. Inductive research moves from particular instances to generalized theory. This research has moved gradually from practice to theory in its evolution. The historical review of Canadian planning was a record of practice, the GVRD case history emphasized the practice but theoretical discussions came to life and there were occasional references to contemporary theoretical works. Only in the interpretations of Chapter Seven did theory move into the forefront. And now, moving into an amplification of a new model, the inductive process comes to a conclusion with a broad theoretical interpretation for urban planning.

The researcher has changed in this process. At the beginning fragmented planning theory had to be discarded in favor of objectivity regarding the development of planning and the case history. Next, new theoretical works appeared at random, requiring extensive reading and new exposures. And finally the accumulation of new theory linked to the synthesis of an evolving activity achieved its own synthesis which comes forward in the form of the Learning Model.

It is essential to make this final interpretation, although more abstract, to complete the research. There is considerable danger in doing case
study research of a good example; the identified good example model may wrongly be interpreted as an ideal future model. This is because what is good for today may not be good for tomorrow. Banfield and Meyerson, Altshuler, and Rabinovitz all suffered from this problem. Their subjects were chosen because they are leading agencies or considered among their peers to be among the best. However, what was learned from these studies, particularly the political constraints on planning, has been taken as truth for future practice. The most glaring example is Altshuler's 1965 study which is still a key reference book for the American Institute of Planners exams. To optimize insights towards the future from such case studies the researcher should put what he sees into a generalized theory which goes beyond what he merely sees, following what the progressive practice suggests, and filling in the seams. The Learning Model is such a theory.

During the case history and the interpretation of Chapter Seven many theoretical works have emerged as a preface to a synthesis theory: Etzioni's *Active Society*, Friedmann's *Retracking America*, Mack's *Planning on Uncertainty*, as well as the marks of Trist, Chevalier, Friend and Jessop, and Likert. Each of the above was introduced in the context of the GVRD in the last chapter. From this inductive research process, and the conscious search for related theory, a new package of planning theory was independently discovered by the researcher. Upon completion of this search process, the researcher discovered that others had made a similar discovery. Friedmann and Hudson identify this as follows.

As if by design, a radical shift in the paradigm (see Kuhn, 1962) for planning occurred soon afterward (i.e. after Etzioni's *Active Society*, 1968). The Sixties, which through its counter-culture movement, had sought to express a new humanism had also given rise to the notion of a "turbulent" environment (Emery and Trist, 1965; Emery, 1967). In the unreason of the Indochina War, the decade had revealed the absurdities of the rationalist-scientific approaches to planning. The new paradigm insisted on man's psycho-social development as a central focus of planning, and portrayed planning itself as a form of social learning. The first book of this "new wave" to appear was Charles Hampden-Turner's *Radical Man* (1970), followed by Edgar Dunn's *Economic and Social Devel-
opment (1971) and Donald A. Schon's Beyond the Stable State (1971). Conceived independently of the earlier studies, John Friedmann's Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning was published two years later (1973).

All four authors rejected the bureaucratic model of organization in which traditional planning had been moulded. They stressed the cognitive limits of a central intelligence and its inherent incapacity to gain a comprehensive overview of large, complex, and rapidly changing social systems. They understood planning as a form of social learning that occurred in loosely linked network structures consisting of small, temporary, non-hierarchical, and task-oriented working groups. They emphasized interpersonal transactions as the basic means of exchange between technical experts and clients. In this process, scientific and technical knowledge was seen to fuse with the personal knowledge of client actors in a process of mutual learning. They also pointed to the spoken work of dialogue as the medium through which mutual learning would occur, facilitating the transition from knowledge to action. The direct object of such planning was the innovative adaptation but its ultimate purpose was to support and enhance man's own development as a person in the course of the transforming action itself. The future was thus collapsed into the present, and the classical dichotomy of ends and means, decisions and actions, was washed out.

The New Model

With the above introduction, it is now time to take a first glimpse at the new model. It involves four principles and each of these is followed by what it means for urban planning.

1. social goals are short range, pluralistic and changing.
   *urban planning must incorporate a mechanism for continuous interpretation of community goals.

2. technical knowledge is inadequate without integration with the values of the community.
   *urban planning must invent ways of bring technical knowledge into dynamic interaction with personal knowledge.

3. public policy builds from the bottom up.
   *urban planning must facilitate dispersed community dialogue (as in 2 above) and then encourage integration of the emerging public policy.

4. public policy deals with social change.
   *urban planning must go beyond allocative process to social
structural change.

The above are very general statements about the new model but they do represent the essence of it. In the next several sections of this chapter these principles will be further developed first through the example of Dunn's theory, and second by further discussion on each.

Dunn's Theory

Throughout this research several minor references have been made to Edgar Dunn's *Economic and Social Development: A Process of Social Learning*. His theory, however, has a major significance to this study and therefore requires elaboration. Dunn's broad theory provides the basis for further extrapolation of GVRD characteristics into a new model. It is essential to understanding this new model and is therefore briefly reviewed as follows.

1. He compares biological evolution and social evolution and finds both to be creative learning systems. Social evolution, like biological evolution, is engaged in maintaining, reproducing and transforming environmentally relevant information that serves to guide behaviour. In so doing it generates information novelties or new ideas internal to the process and subjects them to selective scrutiny by criteria (both environmental and normative) generated to a major degree internal to the process. It is, therefore, a process behaving as a creative learning system. It has the capacity to reprogram its own behaviour.

2. Next, Dunn finds that social evolution differs from biological evolution in one very important instance; in social evolution the invention of new ideas and behaviour are not random but a conscious activity. This means that in social evolution man includes perceptions of how his fellow man may act, human values and goals, and rapid environmental feedback (in contrast to life cycles).

3. There are severe limitations on prediction for social evolution. While man has had considerable success in predicting his physical environment, "an ever increasing part of his environment is social rather than physical". Prediction for social evolution as a conscious creative learning system encounters major obstacles. The variables involved in social evolution as a
learning system are beyond current or near future computation capacity. Information to predict an optimum future is not commonly available. Last, and most important, even if an optimum future could be designed, it would not serve the adaptable nature of man and the corresponding need for future flexibility.

4. The social learning process is a repetitious series of experiments in social action, or as Dunn puts it, "evolutionary experimentation". This is the reality of social evolution and not the practice of social engineering which predicts an optimum future and attempts to engineer this prophecy.

In short, prediction as hypothesis and planning as experimental design are the fundamental core of social learning. It is this rudimentary and fundamental form of prediction and planning out of which social knowledge and environmental control have evolved. The goals of this process are not predetermined by history, but are provided by man as a fundamental component of the predictive hypothesis; history only helps define the constrained realm of the possible and the valuable. This remains the root method of social progress. Through this process man is acting to invent history...There is a directed normative component to this process that is supplied by human goals.

5. Evolutionary experimentation centres on "behavior directed to changing behavior". Since established ways of adaptation are frequently inadequate for social system situations, social systems cannot escape social learning; this involves social system self-analysis and self-transformation. Therefore, because of its nature, social learning with its principal of evolutionary experimentation, involves social reorganization.

The above captures the essence of Dunn's theory of social change through a social learning metaphor. It asserts that man sets goals, and incorporates into society what he finds useful while rejecting what he considers harmful. Also man escapes the equilibrium trap, socialization into sameness, by his ability to learn from experience.

Dunn's theory, however convincing, is only one of many theories of social change. A widely acceptable theory has yet to be recognized; Friedmann says the following on this.
It may be best to regard these several theories as complementary to one another. None is capable of fully accounting for the varieties of social change. From the standpoint of guided social change, however, all but the last are useless. The "great man" of history cannot be planned at will. Insufficient socialization is considered dysfunctional by most societies to the point where greater cultural homogeneity in the population is encouraged, while "creative minorities" whose actions may be dangerous to the established order are excluded from the exercise of power. The dialectical theory is offered as an explanation of the historical process as though this process worked independently of human volition. The revolution in which, from time to time, class conflict culminates may be accelerated through revolutionary actions. In its propensity to cataclysm, however, it fails to offer a basis for continuously guiding the processes of social change.

Diffusion theory is rather more concerned with the mechanisms of innovation transfer than with the roots of social change. The idealistic theory is completely non-deterministic. It simply asserts that the mind is essentially free, not subject to the otherwise great powers of society to mold man in its image. The theory of the hiding hand posits social ignorance of the future as the mainspring of change in society. But ignorance cannot serve as a major principle of societal guidance.

What then does Dunn's theory, plus the previously discovered material introduced in Chapter Seven, say about the four principles of the new planning model?

Goals

The position taken on goals explicitly accepts goal development as an essential part of the social learning or planning process. Goal development means a conscious effort to allow man to think about goals and become more explicit about goals. It assumes that man is goal oriented and that short term goal aggregation is difficult but possible.

Goal development differs considerably from the norm of goal assumptions and goal discovery. Within the norm there are four stances on goals. First, biological and social evolution are seen as largely guided by a non-human or hidden hand. This is a deterministic stance in which history defines the goals. Marxian theory is of this variety; the overthrow of capitalism is seen as historically determined, a goal. Second, and akin to the first, goals are defined by the problem. One assumes that a hidden hand guides social evolution, and when a problem arises, it is assumed that man has contradicted this evolution. The goal then becomes solving the problem to return to the "proper" social evolution. In other words, once a problem is perceived, the goal is
implied in the problem. Third, long-range future goals can be discovered by experts—in our case planners as experts on the city. Following the latter view, knowledge brings special insights into the goals of man, or at the least, defines what these goals should be. Fourth, and last, is the expert on existing values. In planning this position has its origin in the Chicago School which attempted to scientifically determine the values of society, and more recently it is evident in attitude surveys.

The Learning Model of planning rejects the above four approaches of goal-identification. The first is rejected because man can largely determine his own destiny; this also applies to the second. In addition, taking goals from problems ignores the fact that problems occur in multiplicity which creates goals in conflict. While the third (long-term goal prediction) may work in stable times, it is impossible in "turbulent environments". Since the current environment is "turbulent", with little evidence of change, it has limited current applicability. Lastly, objective measurement of goals is difficult mostly because goals change frequently. The Learning Model rejects these four approaches; conversely it accepts the conscious, self-determination of man through goal dialogue. In short, the Learning Model rejections deterministic and scientific approaches to goal identification. Within the learning model of planning goal identification appears to have three major characteristics. First, goal development is an essential part of planning, and of equal importance to and a sin qua non of policy development. This idea is based on the premise that policy outputs are only as good as the validity of the goals which they intend to serve. In other words, distortions in goals will lead to distortions in policy. GVRD planning has provided an example of goal development within a planning agency primarily through the Public Program. It demonstrates how difficult the task is and at the same time provides optimistic signals. By adding goal development to urban planning, the planning process is greatly enlarged.
Second, the Learning Model of planning seeks to identify operational goals. Two seemingly contradictory realities exist in this regard. On one side, society is underdeveloped regarding goals because deterministic models are still widely accepted. On the other side, Vicker's has conceptualized the "goals-ridden man" who has created more goals than he can possibly achieve with the resources available. In the middle is the real deficiency: operational goals. These are short term goals which improve the existing environment, allow judgments and trade-offs to be made among rival goals, and protect future flexibility. Operational goals require more goal development within the context of other goals. A further reason for supporting short range goals is the changing nature of goals. The latter means that goal identification must be a continuous process.

Third, goal identification occurs through widespread dialogue. It is now obvious that politicians and planners alone are not enough for goal identification. They cannot possibly perceive everyone's goals and they are constrained by their own perspectives. For example, in Vancouver the public goals of slow growth and participation per se were not seen by politicians or planners as major goals prior to goals dialogue. The objective of goal dialogue is to identify as many goals as possible and interrelate these according to priorities so that the structure and actions of urban planning may be congruent with the client's (broadly used) goals. Goals dialogue places considerable challenge on planners. Planners have in the past promoted planning ideas such as greenbelts and rapid transit. Under goals dialogue they would be more facilitators than promoters: planning does not identify the ideal future "but facilitates people in generating their own goals". In addition to the skill of facilitating goals dialogue, the learning model requires skill in handling a large number of goal dialogues. As GVRD planning found, there was greater demand for participation than they could handle. This is made even more difficult when recognizing that many citizens are not part of existing groups.
and thus require special contact.

In summary, the Learning Model recognizes that man determines his own goals; therefore, goal development is an essential part of planning. Also the model seeks to identify operational goals through community dialogue.

Social Knowledge

The current societal emphasis on technical solutions has been questioned. Specifically Dunn has suggested a social learning model in which learning occurs on a societal, experimental basis rather than as a separate intelligence function (intelligentsia or professionalism). As well Mack has shown that unstructured problems (most urban problems) require an administrative, participative process rather than a technical one for optimal solutions.12 And Friedmann has introduced the concepts of processed and personal knowledge about which he suggests society must join scientific and technical intelligence with personal knowledge to achieve a heightened capacity for learning and to transform learning into action.13

In essence, the above claim that social knowledge (social science and applied technologies such as urban planning) must be humanized. Solutions prepared in isolation and handed to society for implementation are inadequate. At the root of this inadequacy is a failure to differentiate between physical and social sciences. The great success of physical science has been its ability to identify laws which can be repeatedly verified and applied to practical purposes. Largely the social sciences have followed the physical sciences model—they have studied man in his environment and tried to establish laws of human behavior and adaptation to the environment. Economics provided some of the seemingly verifiable laws of human behavior, but as Galbraith and others have shown, these so-called laws change: for example laws based on scarcity do not apply in a consumer oriented, affluent society. Social science has not recognized its limitations relative to the adaptable nature of man. Social knowledge is different from physical knowledge. It cannot be separated from
man himself and is highly imperfect and variable.

In noting the inadequacies of scientific and technical knowledge Friedmann has said it is

ephemeral, conservative, sequential, tenuous, incomplete, fragmented, probabilistic, oriented towards the recent past, prone to large and undetected error, and likely to generate images that are reality-distorting. It is not what many people think it is—a stock of verities, solid and permanent, true knowledge of the whole, deterministic and complete, a seamless web, pressing forward into the future, an honest guide to action.\(^4\)

These are major charges which would require a book to explore fully. However, brief elaboration on five points will make this position more explicit (the first three relate to the adaptable and goal oriented nature of man).

1. Rapid social change deems social knowledge obsolete. The phenomena of accelerated change has become widely accepted through such terms as "turbulent field", "future shock", "temporary society", and "beyond the stable state".\(^5\) Although proponents of these theories believe the change is irreversible, at the least it is a current reality and it greatly affects social knowledge. For example, theories of the city have changed with the introduction of the streetcar, automobile, and air transportation (sector, multi-nuclei, and special function theories). One can anticipate that theories of the city will alter with the energy crisis, zero population growth, the women's liberation movement, and so on.

2. Related to the above, existing social knowledge is based on past knowledge. This is the conservative nature of knowledge. It particularly refers to the addition of new knowledge to old in preference to the validity of scientific revolutions, or in Kuhn's term, "paradigm shift". Paraphrasing Kuhn, Dunn says,

The great bulk of scientific research in all fields is what Kuhn characterizes as "normal science". This is the orderly cumulative work of science that takes place under the unifying control and direction of a "paradigm". The paradigm is a metaphor (not considered as a part of language but as a framework of thought) or unifying theory that has emerged out of earlier scientific practice and supplies the foundation for its further practice... One of the striking things about the con-
duct of normal science is that it does not aim at producing novelties and when it is successful in its own terms it finds none. Normal problem solving with its conservative reference to well established paradigms, resists theoretical innovations which are necessary in a rapidly changing society.

3. Scientific and technical knowledge are methodologically oriented to the past. The scientific method relies on observation and verification, and therefore is inherently backward looking. In short, this is inadequate in a rapidly changing society.

4. Social knowledge is at best partial. In a highly complex, contemporary world, social knowledge can only explain a portion of it. The variables and data requirements are merely too great to be all examined in any one decade.

5. Theoretical models may distort reality. Such distortion is not only because of their propensity to be obsolete, but also because they are abstract, symbolic relationships of society, tend to oversimplify, and may appear as a magical substitute for reality.

The above do not invalidate social science or technical knowledge but merely emphasize their limitations. Full acceptance of these limitations, as has unfolded, logically leads to a transactive approach in which the failings of formal knowledge are overcome by relating it to personal knowledge. For example, in urban planning, planners may discover land use laws of the city, and translate their ratios into future plans, but new values, such as resistance to high rise living or environmental preservation, may alter the ratios. Accordingly, technical knowledge is based on the assumptions of yesterday, and it requires adjustment for today and tomorrow. The only way around such knowledge deficiencies is dynamic interaction between the possessors of formal knowledge and as many politicians, other experts, and citizens as possible.

Planning through the Learning Model, with its inherent recognition of the limits of normal social knowledge, places severe demands on the planner.
He must bring the best and most current knowledge to the process which may only be done through extensive use of knowledge networks and consultants. At the same time, he must be skeptical about this knowledge and apply it in transaction with clients. Trist has noted this dual demand, as referred to earlier, and Friedmann has extended it into the conception of mutual learning. It should be noted that the process of mutual learning should not be limited to political clients. Besides their limitations of time and numbers, there are many other uniquely knowledgeable people within any community which should be involved.

In short the Learning Model acknowledges limitations to social knowledge which demand greater diligence and skepticism in its use as well as linking it to a broad participative process.

**Bottom-up Planning**

To this point the Learning Model has been explained for goals and social knowledge, but these have not been placed into a structural context. However, the participative and open characteristics of the Learning Model relate directly to organization for planning. They suggest a decentralized form of planning.

It is beyond the scope of this research to fully deal with the centralize-decentralize question in government. A few brief comments must be made because the Learning Model raises the issue. First, it should be noted that these are two distinct approaches. Maruyama, in discussing how groups can interact in society, favors group relationships which favor one another. He calls this symbiosis, and he goes on to comment on organization for symbiosis:

There are two ways to conceptualize symbiosis. One is organismic, and the other is mutualistic. The organismic view assumes that there is a whole to which the parts are subordinated. The parts cooperate with one another in order to fulfill the task of the whole. There is a hierarchical, causal, and teleological priority of the whole over the parts. The whole is more important than the parts. The mutualistic view, on the other hand, is that there are only parts, and parts create a system of interaction. There is no "whole" prior to the parts.
These are alternative positions, and urban planning has long followed the organismic view through the conception of the "public interest". The learning model, as it has emerged so far, appears to favor the mutualistic view.

Beyond such philosophical discussions there is the question of which works best. Technical knowledge, narrowly conceived in experts, normally corresponds with a highly centralized organization. Schon says this results in an elaborate game in which centralized planners propose certain actions and decentralized groups claim they want what central planners propose, to get part of the action. In this game, however, the real needs of decentralized groups continue to go wanting. Schon compares this situation with the diffusion of innovation (from a central locale) while he favors social change as emerging at the periphery. He supports the latter particularly in these times of rapid change. A quotation will illustrate his view.

the formation of policy cannot be neatly separated from its implementation. Every alleged example of local implementation of central policy, if it results in significant social transformation, is in fact a process of local social discovery. After-the-fact, there may be a way to state the new social policy to which all the local discoveries conform. But before the fact, there is no single policy statement which can be used to induce them. For government to become a learning system, both the social system of agencies and the theory of policy implementation must change. Government cannot play the role of 'experimenter for the nation', seeking first to identify the correct solution, then to train society at large in its adaptation. The opportunity for learning is primarily in discovered systems at the periphery, not in the nexus of official policies at the centre. Central's role is to detect significant shifts at the periphery to pay explicit attention to the emergence of ideas in good currency, and to derive themes of policy by induction. The movement of learning is as much from periphery to periphery, or from periphery to centre, as from centre to periphery. Central comes to function as facilitator of society's learning, rather than as society's trainer.20

U.S. planning provides a specific example of centralized planning and coordination in the Model Cities program. Warren analyzes this strategy looking at the manifest and latent functions of organization for this activity. He finds that the latent functions obliterate the original purposes of the program. He says,

In sum, the local comprehensive planning coordination strategy performs
the following latent functions: it strengthens existing local agencies; it tends to reduce competition; it provides funds for agency expansion; it defines the poverty problem in terms of needed services which the existing agencies can offer; it gives the agencies a major role in channeling the efforts which go into solution; it gives the aura of massive change efforts with little threat to the status quo; and it provides stimulus and funds for employment.21

Warren presents one example of how centralized planning distorts the original purpose--this is becoming a major theme in which the centralized aspect appears to be the villain.

The final argument in favor of decentralized planning, and most central to the Learning Model, is the need for participation itself. With the constant need to identify goals and the need to blend technical and personal knowledge, centralized planning is almost impossible. Widespread participation necessitates decentralized planning.

The above brief arguments which favor decentralized planning do not eliminate central's role. Decentralization within the Learning Model merely emphasizes working from the bottom-up rather than from the top-down. For example GVRD planning found slow growth to be a major metropolitan goal. Realizing that limits to growth require action by all three levels of government, they communicated this finding to senior governments and entered deliberations aimed at examining all policies relative to this goal. While this is a single incident, full operation of the Learning Model would mean a continuous flow of goal statements from the bottom-up. Centralized action is necessary, but the stimuli for action can come from below rather than be created in isolation.22

Accepting the congruence between decentralized planning and the Learning Model, what is the basic organizational structure of the Learning Model? Again borrowing from GVRD planning, task forces are suggested as the basic organizational component. Task forces offer the possibility of bringing together the keenest citizens, the best knowledge, and related politicians of a community into dynamic dialogue. Friedmann identifies similar groups, which he calls working groups, as a complement to transactive planning. He lists eight char-
acteristics of these groups which also serve to explain the task forces of
the Learning Model. These characteristics are:

1. temporary—created to deal with a particular problem, and once this
   is done it disbands.

2. small scale—limited by the ability to maintain face-to-face
   encounters, seldom more than twelve.

3. interpersonal—verbal communication and minimizing of role playing.

4. voluntary or representative membership—membership as inclusive as
   the problem requires.

5. self-guiding—high autonomy.

6. responsible—they are given their charge by a parent organization
   (planning agency in our example).

7. networks—as work requires, links are made with other task forces
   or organizations.

8. permeability—open membership, and always room for new task forces. 23

From GVRD planning's experience, with the Policy Committees, several
additional matters can be added to the above. In practice, task forces re-
quire both professional and secretarial services which are demanding and time
consuming. Politicians should definitely participate, but they are most effect-
ive when not playing a political role. Lastly, task forces should have the
power to make direct policy advice otherwise they may feel like pawns.

To recap, bottom-up planning complements the participative and open
requirements of goal identification and applied social knowledge. Task forces
are the principle organizational structure of bottom-up planning.

Social Change

At this point it should be obvious that the new planning model involves
social change. There is a need to be explicit about this, however, since con-
temporary urban planning does not much involve social change. Most planning
can be classified as allocative planning. That is "the distribution of limited
resources among a number of competing users". The three types of planning in the three-horned planning dilemma, one now realizes, can all be classified as allocative planning. Comprehensive planning seeks an optimum future pattern of land uses: how to most efficiently allocate future land uses onto an existing pattern of land uses. Systems planning to the extent it has been tried, again uses the criterion of optimal choice, "which is the intellectual foundation for allocative planning", one part of the system is balanced against the other seeking equilibrium. Finally, partial planning is merely the making of minor changes to the existing system to restore balance. Allocative planning serves the interests of those who are strong and seeks to maintain the existing system. It does not have a strong orientation to change.

One of the major findings of this search for a new planning model is the necessity to go beyond allocative planning models. These models have been found wanting in theory and practice (with lessor evidence from practice on systems planning). Furthermore, Dunn's theory of social change rejects growth models which can only treat social change as a move to a stable state. Rather he favors development models in which man learns how to improve the quality of life.

The difference between allocative and development models, in the sense used here, is the former merely distributes resources while the latter also deals with social structural change toward a higher level of human existence. Advanced societies tend to think they have adequate structural arrangements and need only to solve specific problems (allocative planning). But this may be fallacious. As Dunn points out,

But all social behavior is not reactive, and absorbed with maintaining behavior. The human cognitive process has the capacity to be active and anticipatory in nature, and to promote its goals through behavioral innovations. It has the capacity to discover new knowledge and new modes of behavior through play—that is, through behavior that seeks understanding and experience not immediately relevant to self-maintenance. It also has the capacity to modify old goals and develop new.

Planning under a development model requires advancive behavior. On an
individual basis advansive behavior is recognized as a personality type. The traits of this type are action oriented, creative, self-motivated, commitment and willingness to take risks. "Foundations of development psychology are laid in the notion of built-in energy and a spontaneous need to change in a manner which fulfills and amplifies the individual. Gordon Allport identifies 'growth motives' in contrast to the familiar 'deficit motives' which seek equilibrium. Such 'Propriate striving confers unity upon personality, but it is never the unity of fulfillment or respose, or of relieved tension. ...its goals are, strictly speaking, unattainable'".  

Likert also found advancive behavior in his studies of the "new management". He found it to be "the motive of satisfying curiosity, creativity and the desire for new experience".

Does advansive behavior apply on the societal level. Empirical evidence suggests that cultural attitudes to leadership and development have contributed to greater economic development. In normative theory, Etzioni has conceptualized the "active society" in which any future is possible.

What is needed to make an active society? Social scientists have generally seen "the social code" as set and locked: societies move through stages, as from folk to urban. Urbanization and modernization are recent examples; they are viewed as processes that cannot be changed. Our active-passive dimension cuts across these traditional social-science categories. A basic new distinction is created for social science: social units standing above the ongoing processes and seeking to bring them under scrutiny and control. To be active is to be in charge; to be passive is to remain under the control of ongoing forces. The fact is: social laws can be altered. It is here that we find the key to a secular conception of man. This is the ability of men to change themselves by changing their social combinations. By doing this they become the creator. And, the re-creator.

Advansive behavior on a societal level must go beyond refining the existing system to the creation of new social structures, or changing social laws. Trist has identified a basic need for this in the concept of "structural-cultural mis-match". The latter refers to the condition where social structures do not change as fast as the culture and society's institutions clash with the environment. But advansive behavior extends much further than matching cultural change: it invents new social structures and applies them experi-
mentally. The task forces are one such social structure; however, the possibilities are endless.

Within the Learning Model of urban planning social change is considered as a prime responsibility, and the form of social change is seen as inventing new social structures. New organizational forms, with a potential for advancing the community, are constantly sought and encouraged. These may be in the form of institutional reform, collaborative processes, organizational assistance. Planning in this way may deal with causes rather than symptoms and holds promise for a developing society. One brief example from the GVRD case is submitted. The Health and Public Protection Policy Committee focused their attention on health care services. They planned to hold a large one day seminar with all health care service agencies represented and a large representation of clients. The objective was to identify gaps in current service. Within this step is the seed of social structural change and advansive behavior. Health care costs have been skyrocketing, and the service is impersonal, and thus unsatisfactory. But through the seminar clients and servers may form a new relationship to solve both problems; this offers real hope where dealing with glaring issues does not. Here is one example of how a Learning Model planner could facilitate social structural change. There is much to be learned about this role.

Social change, in summary, is an integral part of the Learning Model. It emphasizes social structural change, or advansive behavior, rather than the efficient allocation of resources.

Some Nagging Questions

A learning model of urban planning has been briefly outlined but some nagging questions need be made more explicit and discussed. Four such questions are (a) what does the learning model mean for urban design and subdivision control skills, and the like, which are part of the planners traditional kit bag, (b) what is the planner's expertise under the learning model, (c) can everyone
participate, and (d) will politicians accept a learning model of urban planning?

Traditional planning skills, such as urban design, have suffered from the general criticism laid on urban planning recently. In fact some areas may have been wrongly judged. The Learning Model of planning would evaluate the special aspects of say urban design as evolutionary experiments and relative to contemporary goals. It may very well be that urban design could gain renewed popularity under such an examination. But some also would come under criticism. The effect of the Learning Model on planner's skills would be that these skills would have to stand the test of evaluation and relate to community goals otherwise they would not be needed. This contrasts to the current situation where planner's skills can be turned into community goals because of their existence and implied need to use them.

This brings us to the question of what are the planner's skills under the learning model. The casual reader might conclude that the planner would have few skills and just bring others together. Such is far from the truth. Under the learning model the planners would have to be more skilled in dialogue, serving clients, organization and the use of knowledge experts. As well, in the process of mutual learning the planner's skills should allow him to contribute concepts, theory, analysis, processed knowledge, new perspectives, and systematic search procedures. Friedmann has this to say on the planner's skills under such a new situation.

The planner's special skill, therefore, lies in his ability to be a rapid learner. His is an intelligence that is trained in the uses of processed knowledge for the purpose of acquiring new knowledge about reality. He comes equipped to bring order into a seemingly chaotic universe of data and sense impressions, to reduce this to a structure of relative simplicity, to isolate the processes responsible for the emergence and maintenance of the structure, to probe its propensities for change, and to locate the points of potentially effective intervention. Regardless of his specific procedure, the planner makes substantial use of analytical techniques in his work. The greater his virtuosity in this regard, the greater his pride in the results obtained.32

Regarding the question will everyone participate, this is highly unlikely. Everyone should have an opportunity to participate if he or she wants
to, but in reality there are other preferences and the right of non-participation. Along with Friedmann, the researcher accepts his participation estimation of "between one fifth and one third of the entire adult population". This would be a tremendous number in contrast to the non-participative nature of present Canadian society.

Finally, will politicians accept a Learning Model of urban planning. From case study we have conflicting evidence. For the most part GVRD planners were able to convince the politicians that their approach to planning was correct. But there were troubled spots over the Public Program, and the Task Force both of which fall under the conflict between representative democracy and participatory democracy. This researcher believes that their political opinion, in the Greater Vancouver Area, is split on this matter. The old guard politicians are skeptical while some of the "reform" politicians support it. In the end, however, the Learning Model, or whatever such an approach may be called, will have to earn respect throughout the community and this will bring political respectability.

Conclusion

This study started with a search for a new planning model to solve the three-horned planning dilemma. While a synthesis of the models in the three-horned dilemma was considered a possibility such did not prove to be the case. In fact, all three can be classified as allocative models while the investigations have led to a developmental model. What in fact may be happening in urban planning is a paradigm shift, or a major change in theory.

The research has identified three models of urban planning in conceptual terms. These can be summarized as follows.
The current model contrasts with the GVRD model while the Learning Model is an extension of the GVRD model. Arrows indicate the relationship among concepts.

The Learning Model was developed through the inductive examination of a seemingly innovative planning agency, and it is a theoretical extrapolation from the case study. In essence, the Learning Model of planning begins with goals dialogue, develops policy through the extensive use of task forces (bottom-up) which blend formal and personal knowledge into meaningful social knowledge, and wherever possible aims at inventing new social structures to advance the human condition.

It is neither a pure normative model or a pure descriptive model. Accordingly it may lack the conceptual clarity that normative models may possess, but hopefully it has a sound internal unity from its practical origin. This type of planning theory may fall into what Mann and Wiers call "practicable planning theory". They start with the premise that planning theory has had little impact on practice.

As academicians and planners, we must honestly face the gap between theory and practice in our profession. Despite two decades of steady exposure, planning theory has had relatively little impact. Even its nominal use by planning agencies could be easily inventoried, and serious efforts to apply planning theory to practice could be counted with embarrassing ease. Experience shows that even those students most traumatically exposed to planning theory quickly recover from its effects upon engaging in practice. Reformed theorists become the most practical of men.

Next they recognize that some theory does not lose contact with observable reality and can have a major impact on practical human affairs—for example, Keynesian economics. Accordingly they suggest four criteria of practicable
planning theory. These are

1. it should clearly imply what practitioners should do to achieve specified consequences;
2. it must make the mechanisms by which things happen more understandable to practitioners (not magic);
3. "practicable theory must contain few if any assumptions that will appear absurd to the practitioner";
4. it must have a meaningful reward structure for the practitioner.37

The explicit link of practice and theory in this study should satisfy the first three criteria. Care has been taken to link or compare current practice with GVRD planning, and GVRD planning with the Learning Model. Through these steps necessary actions should be clear, the model should be understandable in practical terms, and absurd assumptions avoided. Regarding the last criterion, the Learning Model offers a meaningful reward in its action, accomplishment orientation. In addition, there is the reward of learning. Mann and Wiers see a reward in "the practitioner himself becomes an agent in testing the theory".38 GVRD planning offered such a reward system frequently with the planners inventing theory and then testing it.39 Matrix analysis was a particularly rewarding learning experience with many of the planners gaining new perceptions of the city and planning policy.

Also of note, Mann and Wiers identify the landmarks in planning theory. They identify only four books in the 1970's: Robinson, Decision-Making in Urban Planning; Mack, Planning on Uncertainty; Dunn, Economic and Social Development; and Friedmann, Retracking America. Except for the first (a collection of earlier methodological writings) these are the same prominent works which become evident through the inductive process of examining GVRD planning. As well there appears to be a "new wave of planning theory".41 It is hoped that this research, linking practice and theory, and presenting a Learning Model of urban planning, can contribute to the new threshold of planning theory.
In closing, a word of caution is added. The Learning Model was discovered through the practices of one agency in its attempts to create a new planning style. It has further developed because the inductive research process led to recent theoretical works which complement the experiments of the GVRD. Practice and theory have met in this examination. But the validity of the Learning Model must be left to its acceptability and modification through future use. The Learning Model is itself an "evolutionary experiment".
FOOTNOTES

1. see the Bibliography.


4. Ibid., p. 86.

5. Ibid., p. 118.

6. Ibid., and Lowry, p. 123.

7. Ibid., pp. 136 and 133.

8. Ibid., p. 240.


12. see p. 199.

13. see p. 206.


17. see Appendix E.

18. see p. 205.


22. Etzioni calls for more control as well as more consensus from the bottom at the same time to attain an "authentic" society. See the Active Society, Free Press, 1968.


34. The former non-partisan monopoly on Vancouver City Council was recently broken by a "reform" party, The Electors Action Movement, which now has a majority.


39. This contradicts the traditional view that theory is created in the university and applied by the professions.

40. see Bibliography.

41. Overviews of the new wave may be found in Friedmann and Broady, Mann and Wiers, and in a statement by Friedmann in the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, September 1973.
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Studies of Urban Planning

In accord with the overriding objective of advancing the theory and practice of Canadian urban planning, this study has an interest in studies which relate to Canadian planning. Within this boundary, there exists a small but growing literature on empirical studies of urban planning. It consists of 14 major studies, 9 from U.S., 2 from Britain, and 3 from Canada.

These studies will be reviewed in this appendix in an attempt to learn from past experiences in the study of planning. Although considerable diversity in studies is present, a classification into three types has been made to simplify the matter. The studies are grouped under the appropriate type on Figure 5.

1. planning in a single environment - for the most part this refers to case studies which focus on the local power structure and the political restraints to planning.

2. comparative studies - these extend the local power structure focus to a comparative level search for how planning varies with the environment.

3. criticisms of planning - largely polemics which attack the current practice of planning from the recipients point of view.

Prior to a review of studies under these three categories, it is worthwhile to separately examine the classic study by R.A. Walker: The
Figure 5: Major Studies of Urban Planning
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- Many others (sociology, anthropology)
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- Goodness
Planning Function in Urban Government. This study precedes the others by 15 years, has had a major impact on the practice of planning, and minor influence on the study of planning.

Walker was concerned with the bridge between planning and administration, and he sought to discover the shortcomings in planning by a separate commission, which was the model of his time. He studied the planning functions in the 37 largest cities, all over 250,000 population collecting data on the occupations of planning commissioners, types of Ex Officio representation on commissions, city planning budgets, and size and composition of planning staffs. In addition, he studies planning more thoroughly in seven of these cities through the use of case studies. Walker found the city planning commission form of organization was inadequate to perform the basic advisory and coordinating functions of planning. Planning commissioners, although dedicated people, were ill equipped to advise on planning matters, and commissions spent most of their time on zoning and public works and sometimes becoming "watchdogs" over staff departments. He also found that the cities which went beyond these narrow roles were ones where the planning function had moved closer to the legislative and executive bodies. These findings led him to strongly advocate that planning agencies be "established firmly within the administrative hierarchy of municipal government."

Largely through Walker's influence, urban planning in the U.S. and Canada has moved from the commission form to a staff agency. At the same time it has spurred a theoretical debate over the ideal type of planning organization. But in contemporary planning literature Walker is seldom mentioned, most likely because it is widely accepted that administrative reorganization is only a part of urban planning problems. On the other hand Walker may have been too quickly dismissed. His work contains important contributions toward understanding planning. For example he showed that planning and administration were inseparable but the political role of planning must stop short of
political leadership, he brought organizational theory into the study of planning (example which has not been followed up), he showed that "the scope of city planning is properly as broad as the scope of city government," he discovered the importance of informal relations in planning, and he laid the rudiments of PPBS. 4

Walker's work is an example of applied research. Directly it has not spawned other work which may relate to its time-dated problem orientation.

Planning in a Single Environment

Turning now to the first category of studies, planning in a single environment, we find four studies. Two of these, Meyerson and Banfield, and Altshuler, are the most widely recognized documentations of urban planning. 5 The remaining two are of a special nature. 6

Meyerson and Banfield and Altshuler's studies can also be classified as political science, community power studies. This approach examines society principally as the actions of elites. In North America, community power studies became prominent in the 1950's with Community Power Structure by Floyd Hunter and The Power Elite by C. Wright Mills (and followed in Canada by the Vertical Mosaic by John Porter). 7 This approach breaks from traditional political science which focused on voting and pressure groups.

Politics, Planning, and Public Interest is a case study of the public housing program in Chicago between 1949 and 1952. In 1949 the Chicago Housing Authority proposed building 40,000 low rental housing units over the next six years. This was in response to a local housing crisis, 272,000 less housing units than families, and the national Housing Act of 1949 which authorized assistance for 810,000 low-rental housing units over 6 years. The study principally covers the matter of site selection for the first 10,000 units.

In short, various forms of political influence caused the Chicago Housing Authority to compromise, and compromise etc. until the final package accepted was contrary to all the principles they stood for. "Decision by
political power took precedence over decision by planning."\(^8\)

The case study is concluded by a conceptual scheme for the three conceptions of "politics", "planning" and "the public interest". It is claimed that "the case material was largely selected, organized, and interpreted" in the light of this conceptual scheme. And "we have also had to focus rather narrowly on some aspects of the case-study to the exclusion of others which from the standpoint of common sense notions about politics and planning would be of equal significance. It follows that there is much in the case-study which is not explained by the ideas elaborated here."\(^9\)

All of which leaves the reader wondering whether the conceptual scheme actually guided the study or was tacked on after. This student strongly suggests the latter.

If one accepts the validity of Banfield and Meyerson's work, what does it add to planning theory? The answer is clear: rationality is the sine qua non of planning (assumed), and rational planning is impossible due to the political realities of human behaviour. On the positive side, the Chicago Housing Authority, although it could not achieve its aims, "framed one view of the public interest and made it a basis for decisions in the spheres of politics and planning. This we (Meyerson & Banfield) think was a considerable achievement."\(^10\)

The second study, The City Planning Process, was conducted by a student of Banfield's, Alan Altshuler. Altshuler did case studies of four planning issues in Minneapolis-St. Paul: location of a freeway, a land-use plan, a hospital site, and a downtown plan. Following Banfield's theme his objective was to identify "the political obstacles to general planning" in government. He concludes that "the political culture of the Twin Cities tended to inhibit the development of conditions in which comprehensive planning, even at the level of the city, could have a great deal of impact."\(^11\)
Altshuler differed from Banfield's work in two important ways. First, his study placed much more emphasis on planners and how they acted. Although the objective was still to show the limits of planning, the planners approach does not become obviously secondary as in Banfield's work. Second, he evaluated planning against the traditional ideal of comprehensive planning. This was a sub-theme of Banfield's while his main criteria was pure rationality. Since neither are achievable in their pure form, it was not too difficult to prove that the practice of planning was deficient. Through Altshuler's greater consideration of planners, he does not deem planning impossible and suggests "those who call themselves 'comprehensive' planners ought to be broadly learned and thoughtful men."\textsuperscript{12}

Besides re-echoing many of Banfield's themes, Altshuler does add to planning theory. He shows that planning is not a monolithic activity: one may pursue comprehensive, long range, or middle range planning. Also, he shows that three types of rationality may be followed by the planner: technical, general evaluative, or general inventive. Lastly, and most important, he demonstrates that planners have several strategies with which to handle particular political restraints. These planning strategies, (a) aggressive - upsetting a few members of city council, (b) neglect overall plans and concentrate on smaller tasks which had a good chance of success, (c) provide information through factual analysis, or (d) comment on the proposals of others, are extremely simplistic. The important point is that strategy is a reality of planning and sheds promise for overcoming the political restraints to planning.

The two remaining studies under this category differ widely from those just discussed. Kaplan's study of Metro Toronto examines the whole political system with only minor references to planning.\textsuperscript{13} It is included, however, first because it covers a Canadian city, and second because it emphasizes differences between U.S. and Canadian urban political systems.
Following Talcott Parsons, Kaplan employs functional analysis using the basic concept of system viewed as a network of interrelated roles primarily in equilibrium. The two major recurring functional roles are (a) adaptive - a leader oriented to problems perceived in the environment, and (b) integrative - a leader committed to defending the system (status quo). His study found that "democratic political systems are inclined to perform the integrative function better than the adaptive", there is a "conflict between adaptive and integrative leaders, . . . this conflict produced an impasse in policy making", and "this impasse will be broken only by the construction of a Council majority behind some multifaceted package plan." 14

Accordingly, Toronto Metro system is advancing very slowly toward total amalgamation.

Of particular importance to planning are the five differences between American and Canadian urban political systems identified by Kaplan. 15 These are:

1. home rule - "the 19th century crusade for local home rule was less significant in Canada than in the United States". As a result, Canadian provinces, although sensitive to municipal demands, are much freer to change the structure of municipal government.

2. brokerage politics - Metro Toronto leadership went beyond brokerage to where councillors were free agents allowing greater consensus building. "In Metro many issues are resolved on the basis of arguments offered in legislative debate and are settled on the merits of the case. This fact should make us wary of equating pluralism with bargaining, compromise and logrolling. Banfield's statement about governmental decisions having to be made on political grounds should not be transformed into a general law."

3. policy making - the Metro pattern of policy making where the centripetal forces outweigh the centrifugal forces, departs significantly from
the pattern in large American cities. The community power studies have ignored policy-making by public administrators and contributed to the lack of study on this process.

4. patronage - the good government reform movement in the area has built a political culture which is strongly anti-patronage.

5. interest group involvement. - "Metro groups are much less active than their American counterparts."

Until further research is done, these differences should be considered as hypotheses.

Specifically on planning, we learn that the two Metro mayors studied who were the major policy initiators, trusted their own judgement more than the planners which effectively minimized the planners influence. Indirectly, however, Kaplan's study shows that political systems can be open to reason and planning particularly in the Canadian political culture.

Lastly, we turn to Friend and Jessop's study of public planning in Coventry. Their study applies operations research to an analysis of the planning process. They systematically analyze how the planning process has worked in specific instances, more generally they develop models of planning, and finally offer a prescription to improve the process. Particularly important findings are as follows:

1. a recognition of the close relationship between changes in the planning process and local government reform,

2. improved "organizational forms for planning requires a very different approach from that normally used to define hierarchical management structures."17

3. the importance of the organizational context of planning, and

4. identification of organizational problems of public planning - coordination, sufficient information, ways of communicating
information, democratic guidance, and motivation.

Although much of their work focuses on problems of coordination which are peculiar to local government in Britain, their approach identifies a new way to understand the planning process.

**Comparative Studies of Planning**

Moving to studies in the second major category as outlined on Chart One, these studies differ from those discussed in that they examine planning on a comparative basis - that is comparing planning among cities. Walker's work, already discussed, falls into this category and as already established it has not greatly influenced other research designs.

Daland and Parker follow other stimuli. They view planning as a "social control process" in which "role" is the key concept and thus they employ role analysis. Data was collected through extensive case studies of six cities in North and South Carolina. Three principle dimensions of role were measured - role as derived from (a) cultural norms, (b) personality of the role player and (c) behaviour of the planner. Under these three dimensions they found a large number of variables which gave some insight into the role of the planner. Through an overview of combinations of roles they concluded that the planner has considerable control over roles that he and his staff play but the environment also determines role, and that there is a natural history of development, or stages theory, for small planning staffs. This latter is as follows: when the agency is first organized an institutional role is in order to build confidence in the agency; this can be followed by an educational-public relations role promoting the understanding of planning; next is the professional role where comprehensive planning can be introduced; and finally the political innovative role where the planner injects new ideas into the political-decision process. Planning theory is advanced here throughout our understanding of planning in an evolutionary way in relation to
its environment.

Francine Rabinovitz's study is influenced both by the community power studies and by the comparative approach relative to the environment, but not directly by Altshuler or Daland and Parker. She examined planning in six New Jersey cities which were classified by a board of experts as five with effective and one ineffective planning. Planners roles were "identified by analyzing the actual behaviour of planners in each city, both in his dealing with major issues and in his day-to-day relationships with other urban actors." Also planning decisions were studied for each community to determine who influenced these decisions. From this "a typology of political systems that placed most of the observed variations in context was drawn up." She found the following relationship between planning roles and political systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Systems</th>
<th>Cohesive</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Fragmented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>technical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broker</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobilizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this one we learn that effective planning can occur all along the spectrum of local political systems with a complementary planning role, and that the technical role of the planner is only one of several roles although likely always present to some degree.

In an attempt to extend work done by Daland and Parker and Rabinovitz, Gerecke conducted a comparative study of 52 to 74 Canadian urban planning agencies. Three types of variables were used: (a) procedural which included planners roles plus other matters such as methodology and strategy,
(b) environmental variables such as local power structure, and (c) output variables in the form of planning decisions. The objective was to better understand the inner workings of planning and second to put this in context of the environment and planning influence. On the whole, it was found that Canadian urban planning was very traditional and rudimentary, did not vary with the environment (maybe due to its narrow approach), and had an influence limited to land use and community facilities.

Hitchcock's study, on the other hand, relates more directly back to the work of Daland and Parker. Participant observation was used to study two planning directors in Ontario. "The basic method consisted of 'shadowing' the two directors for a period of two weeks each, maintaining a running diary or 'time budget' of their activities. The primary focus of the study was the general structure of this occupational role." The objective was. Tentative findings were that the planner gained the most influence as (a) a manager of the orderly process of decision-making by providing important information early on an issue, and (b) as a site planning advisor where his professional expertise was strongest.

Before discussing the last two studies in this category it is essential to introduce Bolan's theoretical work. It not only sets the stage for these studies but adds clarity to all the studies in this category. Bolan proposed his theory to promote empirical research - it is not based on empirical findings. He follows both the community power and comparative studies approaches.

The major points of the theory are:

1. the "community decision arena" through its rules, customs, and actors determines the fate of community planning proposals (community power studies approach).
2. comparative examination of planning in various "community decision arenas" will extend understanding of the planning process and "will help in determining appropriate strategies and techniques for planning and intervention.\(^{27}\) (comparative approach)

3. it is assumed that rationality is the essence of planning.

Accordingly Bolan's model is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning input</th>
<th>SIEVE</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Community Decision Arena&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capabilities of Actors</th>
<th>Planning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Socio-Political Environment</td>
<td>Nature of the issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His theory establishes the framework for more rigorous empirical research on the planning process. Two such works which have been completed are Burby and Kruekeberg.

Burby conducted a comparative study of urban planning from a sample of 325 cities over 10,000 population in southeastern U.S.A. (77% response).\(^{28}\) His objective was to demonstrate how a better understanding of the political system could serve the planner as a substitute for deficiencies in the rational model. Simply, if we knew what factors caused certain planning policy decisions we could better know where, and maybe how, to direct our efforts.

Following David Easton, as does Bolan, Burby created a systems model for municipal policy determination.

```
| environment (stimulus) | political system | planning-related policy outputs |
```

Independent Variables | Dependent Variables
Using factor analysis he arrived at 19 independent variables from the environment and political system. These covered three general areas: land use composition and growth indices, characteristics of the social structure and characteristics of the political structure. Also there were 15 policy output dependent variables which represented the municipal record in public works, scope of local government activities, and the role of planning. He then hypothesized "relationships between environmental and political system characteristics and municipal policy outputs." These were usually of the form "where there are children, there will be schools," etc. and suggested hypothesis of: where there is a stimulus of this sort (or political system), there will be an increase (decrease) of outputs.

The results of statistical testing were as follows. Of 285 tests of the variables in the model, only 24% of the implied hypotheses were supported, a further 25% were significant in the opposite direction, and 51% of the hypothesized relations did not exist.

From this mammoth study, Burby was not able to understand the determinants of planning policy outputs adequately enough to demonstrate for planners the "strategic utilization of political data." Through further working of part of his data, Burby developed a model relating the environment and "policy style" to "planning approaches". Systematic relationships were found between characteristics of the environment and support for various approaches to planning. Rational planning gains its greatest support in high status urbanized communities, while communities with a class cleavage tended toward an "adjudicative" policy style.

Lastly in the comparative category, Krueckebberg provides an empirical study stimulated by Bolan's theory. He "attempts to build an empirical model of the behaviour of planning organizations" by examining "variations in output related to variations in input and environment." Data was
obtained for planning in 109 U.S. metropolitan planning agencies. There were 23 input variables most relating to staffing, budgeting and maturity of the planning agency, and 10 output variables – almost entirely being the number and types of studies done. Using principal-components factor analysis, "the intercorrelations were weak, suggesting weak linkages between input variation and output variations." Toward stronger correlations, agency profiles were constructed which yielded 6 input types and 4 output types. He found that agencies with large constituencies and strong federal support tend to be either budget oriented or service oriented. Professionally mature city-supported agencies tend to produce comprehensive plans or socio-economic programs. Professionally youthful agencies with small constituencies tend to be service oriented. Small, poor agencies dependent on consultants tend to have very little output at all. Large, wealthy county agencies tend to be budget oriented, and state-supported agencies tend to be service oriented or to have comprehensive plans and socio-economic programs.

Interpretations of these findings yield little for planning theory except that there are different output patterns for developed and developing planning agencies.

Methodologically, Krueckeberg questions the emphasis on specific outputs for research on planning practice. He notes that planning has shifted from long range plans to more short-range programming – from ends to means. "Planning theory, and its application in planning practice, focuses on ideal end states for organizational behaviour not on workable means of organizational development, and so provides an inadequate basis for real planning."

Criticisms

Finally, and more briefly, we can turn to our last category of planning studies – the criticisms. Since these are negative in nature their contribution to planning theory is limited. Jane Jacobs, in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* starts the critical trend by her "attack on current city planning and rebuilding." Primarily through an examination of U.S. urban renewal she finds planning creates stagnation and is usually retrogressive.
Goodman collects further evidence from the "model-cities program" to show that the urban-industrial complex, with scientific planners, exerts repressive forces on the people. He calls for a political solution. Davies provides us with a sociological analysis of the interactions between residents of a decaying residential area in Newcastle and planners who sought to revitalize the area rather than demolition. The planners failed largely due to their professional self-conception of solutions in the light of information that they were wrong. In the end it was decided to demolish most of the property condemning 4000 people to anxiety and misery.

Criticism of planning in Canada has proliferated recently as has been outlined in Chapter Two.

These works are polemics. They point out the need for desperate rethinking of urban planning. Except for Jacobs they call for political solutions and offer few hints on how to restructure planning. Theoretically they tell us that planning has not thought out its role and has become a willing pawn in the hands of powerful forces in our society. The inevitability of this result may be too easily accepted.

Shortcomings in the study of planning

The foregoing has reviewed empirical studies of urban planning under three categories - single city or case studies, comparative studies and criticisms. A variety of study approaches occurs within these types. The relevant question, however, is have these methodologies contributed significantly to planning theory. Generally the answer must be no! The major case studies have concentrated on the restraints to planning rather than the nature and possibilities of planning, the comparative results have not been significant, and the criticisms are too negative. These three shortcomings are elaborated upon below.

1. An overemphasis of the political constraints on planning. Most of the studies follow the unstated assumption that political influence is anti-
planning and reduces planning to a minimum effect. This bias largely comes from the community power approach with its focus on elites. The major works of Meyerson and Banfield and Altshuler particularly follow the community power approach but all of the comparative studies except Walker and Hitchcock, employ it as well. Kaplan demonstrates that policy development can occur outside political bargaining, compromise and logrolling. Planning can and does make its own contribution to public policy making as shown by Daland and Parker, Rabinovitz and Burby. One should recognize that the inflation of political influence to the exclusion of planning, as purely represented by Banfield, consists of anti-planning intellectualism. (Canadians should also be cautioned about accepting such U.S. based theory as valid!)

2. A focus on issues and outputs rather than process. Myerson and Banfield, Altshuler and most of the critics emphasize issues which clouds over how planning is done as an ongoing activity. Studies of individual communities and the criticisms focus on issues which represent only a small part of the process, and the comparative studies only look at the overt outputs of the planning process. As a result, the literature still does not reveal how urban planning is done and the subtleties of urban planning. Hitchcock's brief study is the only one which actually examines the planning process as a daily, ongoing activity. Also Friend and Jessop make important contributions to understanding the planning process through their treatment of planning in its organizational context. Regarding the emphasis on output, Kruekeberg has identified this as a weakness of the comparative studies. He is referring to the fact that urban planning has shifted from long-range master plans to more short range programs. Accordingly, it is misleading to treat the plans or studies produced as the output of planning. Gerecke tried to solve his problem by using planning decisions as outputs rather than
plans, reports or studies. Another problem results however - how does one record all planning decisions and how does one order them according to importance? A more comprehensive view of the planning process is needed. One must be sceptical about associating certain outputs with the total planning process.

3. Severe criticism which inevitably abandons technical solutions and seeks political ones. Although criticisms of urban planning may be extremely helpful in identifying problems, largely they are id of remedies for planning (Jacob's new theories being an exception). The tendency is to abandon planned action through governments and to seek a political solution. While valid in its own right, this perspective ignores the reality of large scale institutionalized planning which a complex society likely cannot do without. Accordingly political activist solutions to urban problems are no panacea and may divert attention from the problems of planning.
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## Appendix B

### Work By Subject Matter (work hours/yr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) gen. admin., work organization, staff meetings</td>
<td>4980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>3778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Board, Executive, Planning Comm. and special meetings</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>4002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program definition &amp; development</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regional Plan Administration &amp; Service to Technical Planning Comm.</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data updating &amp; Collection - information services (library)</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5394</td>
<td>3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) urban information systems</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) regional data base project</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Current studies</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) transportation</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5063</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Livable Regional Plan Studies</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9090</td>
<td>12047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) IIPS</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) completion of previous years studies</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) other specific - mostly requested (only these over two weeks work)</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cascade Pipelines</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Burnaby Lake Park Study</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Third Crossing proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green belt report</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delta/Coquitlam Floodplain Evaluation</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Boundary Bay</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BBDS (Burlington/Northern)</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parks Administration</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tri-level meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B.C. Land Commission Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Airport Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f) ORP Studies (including evaluation of outside projects)</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g) operational plan model</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h) Local Planning-Unorganized Territories</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i) INTERMET Participation</strong></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee Benefits, Building Admin. and Duplicating</td>
<td>6153</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4443</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>14033</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39606</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* to Sept. 14/70 only
** to August 3/73
*** of which 4767 hours are for the Public Program and 3027 hours for the Policy Committees
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### Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, N.</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>April 1, 1969*</td>
<td>late 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Gorman, D.</td>
<td>Regional Planner</td>
<td>April 1, 1969*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hankin, R.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>April 1, 1969*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lash, H.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Sept., 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemarchand, G.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Dec., 1969</td>
<td>late 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forny, G.</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td>April 13, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorburn, D.</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td>June 29, 1970</td>
<td>late 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashleigh, T.</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td>Aug. 10, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, M.</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Aug. 31, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, P.</td>
<td>Planner III</td>
<td>Jan. 1, 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopherson, F.</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>(1970?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsen, E.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Feb. 21, 1972</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seelig, J.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>early 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooley, N.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Feb. 1, 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matoff, T.</td>
<td>Transportation planner</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* from the LMRPB
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Groups for 1973 work

Plan Group - Lash, Rashleigh, Seelig
Official Plan - Hankin
Information System - George
Public Program - Minsky, Cooley
Administration - Fonny as Acting Director, Turner, and Christopherson
Policy Secretariat - Thorburn, Matoff
## Appendix D

### Comparison of Proposed and Actual Transportation Study Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Comments (on work done) and Resulting Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | A      | a compilation of all previous transportation reports  
| 2        | G      | defined needs as seen by municipal councils *none |
| 3        | E      | measurement of transportation service and minimum standards indices  
*Kates, Peat, Marwick & Co., *Minimum Standards & Performance Indices |
| 4        |        | projects on Transmission Line Proposals by B.C. Hydro,  
Cascade Pipeline Study by joint effort of Lower Mainlands Regional Districts, and Rights of Way Mapping by the department. Also documentation of the dimensions, hierarchy and the concept of transportation grids and corridors; the implications of user requirements on urban growth, and the feasibility of developing a grid or corridor concept,  
*S. Swan-Wooster Engineering Co. Ltd., *Regional Networks:  
Transportation and Utility |
| 5        | B,C,D,J | reports on improving the bus system, Light Rapid Transit and exclusive bus lanes.  
*B.E. Sullivan, *Immediate Improvements to Public Transportation in the Greater Vancouver Region  
*P. Roer, *Memo on exclusive Transit lanes |
| 7        | K      | public transportation needs analysis and market study of work trips to CBC  
* S. Sullivan (above)  
*B.G. Hutchinson, *Transportation and the Vancouver central business district |
| 9,10,12,13 | M   | finance decisions by Transportation Committee with the use of an audit of B.C. Hydro transit operations with forecasts |
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to 1976. Also costs and revenues for immediate improvements.
*Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., Financial Examination of a possible Greater Vancouver Regional District public transportation system.
*Sullivan and Hutchinson reports above.

11 N final concept report
*A.C. Kelly, Regional Transportation as a GVRD function.
(* the Kelly Report)
## Appendix E

### Consultants used by GVRD Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McElhanney Surveying</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood, McLellan</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.V. Gray Management Science Ltd.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. Lea</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F. Gilmour</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F. Gilmour</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Pearson</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Presentations</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan-Wooster</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Sullivan</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom E. Parkinson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hutchinson</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Pearson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Smith and Associates</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oliver and Associates</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minor = under $500, Secondary = $500 to $1999, Major = 2000 and over.
### 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Pl. Cttee Oct. 13, 14</td>
<td>N. Pearson</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group sessions use of Video Media</td>
<td>J. Halstrum</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Plan - Mobile Home Site, Surrey</td>
<td>Metro Media</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORP Amend. Surrey</td>
<td>Urban Program Planners</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Pressures in Floodplain</td>
<td>N. Pearson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Reg. duplications of ORP CV72-4 (N. Surrey)</td>
<td>N. Pearson</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic Survey</td>
<td>Milton S. Hicks</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation into Base Map</td>
<td>School of Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter draft</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Hooper</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Vancouver Growth Eval.</td>
<td>Prof. R.A. Holmes</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Program Ph. 2 - Schools Prog.</td>
<td>Hilda Symonds</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt</td>
<td>N. Pearson</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Review Floodplain Delta/Coq.</td>
<td>W.D. Hurst</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Activity Travel Study</td>
<td>Paul O. Roer</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Data Base: Geographic Info. Retrieval System</td>
<td>Joel Yan</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plan Development Model</td>
<td>A.V. Gray Management</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIPS Videotaping meeting FB &amp; Party</td>
<td>Metro Media</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Consumption &amp; Land Use Changes</td>
<td>Dr. Jas. L. Parker</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Issues Program</td>
<td>Mary Rawson</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Services &amp; Serviced Areas</td>
<td>Stanley &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFY Transit Study Project</td>
<td>Paul Roer, Hiro Koike, Minor</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Areas B &amp; C.</td>
<td>V. Corbett</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues for Public Discussion - Tabloids</td>
<td>J.F. Gilmour</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Program</td>
<td>L.E. Horton</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Policy Public Information</td>
<td>John Pearson</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Livable Region audio-visual)</td>
<td>Dharma Presentations Ltd.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Meetings, videotaking</td>
<td>Metro Media</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold Livability Meetings</td>
<td>L. Minsky</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November Report</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Seelig</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Issue Paper</td>
<td>Doug. Halverson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing Services: supplement to Immediate Improvements</td>
<td>Elaine Parker</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Issue</td>
<td>Acres Western (P. Baross)</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrite Fact Sheet - Jobs Issue</td>
<td>Ruth Calder</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth &amp; Change</td>
<td>Frederick Gutheim</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Job Desc. Growth &amp; Change</td>
<td>Simon Miles</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Possible Policy Options</td>
<td>Dr. M. Seelig</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service Indices</td>
<td>Kates, Peat, Marwick</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>Brian Sullivan</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Transportation</td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Transit Locations</td>
<td>Wilbur Smith</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Transit Locations</td>
<td>N. Pearson</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Consultant's proposals for an environmental study of transmission lines</td>
<td>John Oliver</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Bay Development Study</td>
<td>Dharma Presentations</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Bay Development Study</td>
<td>Thompson Berwick Pratt</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Bay Development Study</td>
<td>Neil Griggs</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Evaluation of Boundary Bay Development Concepts</td>
<td>Howard Paish</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Evaluation of Boundary Bay Development Concepts</td>
<td>Leighton, Swan-Wooster</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Bay Development Study</td>
<td>McDonald, H. Paish &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of the BNR Roadbed - Boundary Bay Development Study Swan Wooster Engineering Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning-Electro Areas</td>
<td>J. Gilmore</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check List ORP Amendments</td>
<td>R. Mann</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer-LIP Project</td>
<td>J. Horsman</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation-Livability Meetings</td>
<td>D. Halverson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Review-Floodplain</td>
<td>W.D. Hurst</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Group Preliminary Studies</td>
<td>R. Mann &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Studies-Airport</td>
<td>Barron &amp; Strachan</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Property Values-Airport</td>
<td>Squarey &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Review of LRP</td>
<td>Blumenfeld</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Program</td>
<td>J. McBride</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Work Policy Exploration</td>
<td>Wilbur Smith</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTR of Community Workshop</td>
<td>Metro Media</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Pollution Paper</td>
<td>Mrs. M. Franson</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delineation of Communities</td>
<td>H. Spence-Sales</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit Housing Paper</td>
<td>Mrs. Metcalfe</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Road Investment-Policy Exploration</td>
<td>N.D. Lee</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription-Pollution Meetings</td>
<td>T. Simmons</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Program</td>
<td>H. Symonds</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote infilling-Policy Exploration</td>
<td>Thompson Berwick Pratt</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting Questionnaire</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitizing Geog. Data</td>
<td>A.R. Boyle</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Planning Committee Advisor</td>
<td>G. Stead</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter-Policy Committee</td>
<td>Sinclair</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics-Policy Committee</td>
<td>J. Moody</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist T.V. Program-Policy Committee</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist T.V.-Policy Committee</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Bridgeview Issue</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Traffic Forecasts-Airport</td>
<td>Rupenthal</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description Basemap-Land Use Series</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format Requirements for G.I.D.S.</td>
<td>Jervis</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plan Implementation</td>
<td>K.P.M.</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Prices Seminar</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Liability - I</td>
<td>Paton &amp; Smith</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Town Centres</td>
<td>Thompson Berwick Pratt</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Control System</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Lines-Coquitlam</td>
<td>EIKOS</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departmental and Consultant Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Dept. Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Consultant Expenditure</th>
<th>% Consultant Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69**</td>
<td>$96,593</td>
<td>$6,135</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>$262,598</td>
<td>$16,579</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>$390,232</td>
<td>$80,927</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>$460,735</td>
<td>$80,430</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73***</td>
<td>$351,228</td>
<td>$60,253</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minor = under $500, Secondary = $500 to $1999, Major = $2000 and over
** April 1 to December 31
*** to August 3, 1973
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List of Objectives

1. Preserve GVRD farmland
2. Preserve land for food production, GVRD and Fraser Valley.
3. Preserve unique and wilderness areas
4. Economize on GVRD investment in Regional parkland
5. Preserve scenic areas and views
6. Minimize costs of future transportation facilities
7. Reduce need for transportation facilities
8. Reduce time, cost and inconvenience of travel to work.
9.* Accessible daycare facilities (Statement from Policy Committee or Public Meeting)
10. Facilitate intra-regional travel to recreation
11. Achieve economies of scale in house construction
12. Reduce risk of land speculation causing sprawl
13. Minimize costs of basic utility systems
14. Maximize use of existing public buildings, capital works
15. Local area growth rates least disruptive to local community
16. Make growth more predictable
17. Realize sub-area population targets
18. Reduce air pollution (autos)
19. No increase in # people, property subj. to flood hazard
20. Reduce flood hazard to people, property now in floodplain
21. Availability of fresh milk, fruit, crops
22. Reduce pollution – air (non-auto), water, land, noise.
23. Reduce public costs of pollution prevention.
24. Reduce fear of change in existing communities
25. Increase community identification, local pride
26. Build "resilient" regional facilities and transportation systems
27. Keep options open for post-1986 land use decisions
28. Self-sufficiency in food supply
29. Make short-term economic use of land preserved for future
30. Keep options open for future new transportation technology
31. Opportunities for working close to home
32. Increased choice of recreation places
33. Utilize (not just preserve) natural features
34. Capitalize on scenic values
35. Variety of kinds of recreation
36. Town centres economically linked by public transp.
37. Secondary industrial development in areas easily reached by nearby labour force
38. Capture for public large share of land value increases created by public expenditures
39. Easier "comparison shopping" for goods and services
40. Bring "downtown goods and services" closer to local areas
41.* Daycare facilities in all major new developments (Statement from Policy Cttee or Public Mtg.)
42. Lot prices to permit larger % of population to afford single-family detached housing
43. Low priced lots for lower income people
44. Reduce prices and rents of new and existing houses
45. Increase choice of housing types and tenures
46. Increase choice of housing locations for certain life-style groups
47. Housing - all incomes, all parts of region
48. Opportunities for living close to work
49. Minimize time lag - services to new residential communities
50. Minimize conflict while creating mixed-income communities
51. Prevent land values, assessments, taxes from "squeezing out" certain groups - retired, etc.
52. Keep cost of raw land for urban development in line with cost-of-living
53. Public participation in government decisions
54.* Build new neighbourhoods around community not shopping facilities (Statement from Policy Cttee or Public Meeting)
55. Reduce delay between development of a public issue, and GVRD's involvement
56. Travel choices to "central place" facilities
57. Increase accessibility to "central place" facilities
58. Increase accessibility for people without cars
59. Increase accessibility of external recreation areas to people without cars
60. Reduce travel distance and time to exterior recreation for GVRD residents
61.* People served by social services should take part in determining delivery methods and priorities (Statement from Policy Cttee or Public Mtg.)

62.* Participation of local residents and consumers re: social service facilities in their areas

63.* Residential areas with households of different ages, size, and housing requirements

64.* No isolation of housing for groups with special needs

65.* Full range of community and social services in new res. communities

66.* Public transp. routes to serve community facilities not located in shopping areas

67.* Public transp. easily utilized by elderly and handicapped

68.* Opportunities for small businesses, co-ops etc. in new retail developments

69.* Preserve existing small business locations

70.* Canadian ownership and control of land

71.* Lively, pedestrian-oriented commercial areas

* Not tested in cross-impact analysis (Matrix One)
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List of Means

1. Concentration (with local decentralization through regional towns).
2. Deconcentration (satellite centres)
3. Decentralization (redirecting growth out of the Lower Mainland)
4. Increase population where standards of public and community facilities are low so that needed facilities can be provided at good standards +/or faster.
5. Residential infill of partly urban areas
6. Promote assembly for residential development of large tracts in presently unurbanized areas
7. Opportunities for living close to work
8. Opportunities for working close to home
9. Set 10-yr. population targets by sub-region
10. Balance out any tax base maladjustments resulting from regional plan
11. Provide parks accessible to local areas (esp. high-density)
12. Regionally control and develop "Regional Town Centres"
13. Decentralize downtown growth to regional town centres
14. Good public transp. services from each "Regional Town" to its centre(s) and link centres with each other and with downtown by fast public transp.
15. Do not build a freeway system for urban area. Note: The following options were suggested but have not been tested in the cross-impact analysis:
   a. Freeways in rest of region, but not in central city
   b. No freeway links until Kelly Report effected.
   c. No freeway links at urban perimeter until light rapid transit is provided.
   d. Extend freeways and arterials progressively; only to areas assigned major population growth.
16. Keep urban development compact
17. Prevent "leapfrogging"
18. Contain urban development within a greenbelt
19. Discourage location here of industries with large land requirements and low employment densities
20. Recuperate for public use unintensively used industrial foreshore
21. Official plan designation & zoning of farmland
22. Greenbelt acquisition of farmlands
23. Keep development out of floodplain
24. Protect watersheds
25. Preserve hobby farms
26. Acquisition of unique & wilderness areas
27. Prohibit development of areas by official plan designation
28. Keep for public benefit foreshores most accessible from urban centres
29. Accommodate housing types not now provided (mobile homes, houseboats, etc.)
30. Permit development in areas considered unbuildable for physical and cost reasons
31. Amend building by-laws to make new buildings more suitable to the handicapped
32. Provide new housing low-income groups can afford
33. Control landlords' rights to exclude certain kinds of tenants
34. Keep attractive areas for new upper-income housing
35. Unusual housing types to bear fair share of the municipal taxes
36. Reduce housing costs by changing standards for prepaid services
37. Subsidized housing units
38. Cluster housing, planned unit development
39. Subsidize persons not units. Minimum income maintenance
40. Increase street cleaning and litter-picking in public areas
41. Stiffen pollution regulations and enforcement
42. Make polluting more costly by requiring the polluter to pay
43. Encourage sorting, recycling & minimizing of wastes
44. Encourage better public litter behaviour
45. Severe standards for automobile design and operation
46. Discourage auto use by regulating minimum parking fees
47. Make public transit more competitive with automobile by raising level of service, giving priority to transit vehicles, allocating more traffic lanes exclusively to transit
48. Import tariffs on foreign produce
49. Keep farmland in production
50. Improve drainage of low-lying farmlands
51. Tax concessions to farmers
52. Increase supply of indoor recreation facilities
53. Limited recreational use of watershed areas
54. Commit all (85%) of regional park funds to land acquisition
55. Commit 15% of funds to park development and unforeseen opportunities to acquire lands.
56. Public transportation to recreation areas outside the region
57. Develop bicycle paths and linear parks adjacent to watercourses, etc.
58. More recreational use of rivers and bars
59. 40% increase in foreshore land for recreation and public use.
60. Identify scenic areas
61. Prohibit developments which mar the landscape
62. Urban design requirements for street and building orientation in new areas
63. Scenic easements, building siting restrictions & height levels, cones of vision
64. Keep farmlands for unforeseen future open space or urban development needs
65. Facilities for interim public use on land for future parks
66. Long-range, all purpose transportation corridors network
67. Control location and price of all land being made available for urban purposes
68. Secure strategic land for development of Regional Town Centres
69.* Land Banking
70. Public participation prior to Board consideration of major plan amendments and projects
71. Increase public knowledge and visibility of GVRD
72.* Combat speculation in land
73.* Local growth to occur in densities and locations advantageous to livability objectives.
74. Locate enterprises where their job skills and pay match those of local labour force.
75. Ensure Board and staff understand public views before beginning new policy studies.
76. Increase population in areas where good facilities are already provided at high per-capita costs so that maximum use is made of these facilities +/or at lower cost per capita.
77. Home-ownership assistance program.
78. Secure strategic land required for the development of Regional Town Centres.

* not included in Cross-Impact analysis (Matrix One) because better definition required.
Comparison of GVRD Planning with Current Practice

The comparison of GVRD planning and current Canadian practice draws data from the generalized description of planning in Chapter Two and the lengthy description of GVRD planning in Part Two. To facilitate this comparison a long list of categories has been assembled. Such an extensive comparison was favored to give a broad overview, which is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Practice</th>
<th>GRVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. accountability</td>
<td>politicians as client</td>
<td>ultimate clients and politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. orientation to power</td>
<td>employers</td>
<td>collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. political dialogue</td>
<td>limited, antagonistic</td>
<td>extensive, complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. terms of reference</td>
<td>politically established</td>
<td>jointly determined (retreats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. normative stance</td>
<td>growth, standards</td>
<td>livability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. change strategy</td>
<td>reactive intervention</td>
<td>active intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. planning priorities</td>
<td>community crises</td>
<td>goals dialogue (anticipatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. prime agency function</td>
<td>administration</td>
<td>research &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. strategy</td>
<td>incremental</td>
<td>optimum policy interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. advisory tactics</td>
<td>provide alternatives</td>
<td>joint deliberations with politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. type of influence</td>
<td>legal (regulations)</td>
<td>educative (learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. profile</td>
<td>selective crusading</td>
<td>low key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. community values</td>
<td>static</td>
<td>changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. conception of public interest</td>
<td>unitary</td>
<td>pluralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. scope</td>
<td>limited to physical</td>
<td>physical plus social and economic policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. time horizon</td>
<td>long term and short term</td>
<td>middle range and short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. urban analysis</td>
<td>land-use planning</td>
<td>simulation modelling (IIPS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H con't

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>planning tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>relations with environment (citizen participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>contact with other levels of gov't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>relations with other departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>organization model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>staff composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>organization divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comprehensive plan, zoning and subdivision regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>available office records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primarily with developers and planning commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rivalry, technical coordination partners, informal coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>generalist planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functional divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matrix and means-ends impact analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extensive data system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>linked to universities, consultants &amp; research institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organized public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recursive groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above comparison, GVRD planning differs absolutely with current practice. Some aspects of the GVRD approach may be found in current practice, but they would be isolated exceptions according to present knowledge of current practice. In its totality, the GVRD approach to planning is a major departure.

A staunch defender of current practice might say "but are the results any different?" Or in another way, admitting that GVRD planning employs a different process and method, their effect on the community may be the same as other agencies. One could interpret this as meaning the political environment places similar constraints on both making their output identical. However, we have seen that GVRD planning works closely with politicians and has gone far beyond the constraints assumed by current practice. This question can only be answered by comparing the outputs. Fortunately data is available for this.

From a review of the GVRD case study material, twelve outputs stand out as being most important. The first six of these have been accepted, the next two are in the process of execution and the remaining four have been proposed and favorably received.

1. develop a new program plan - idea accepted and considerable accomplishments made.
2. establish a regional public housing function.
3. establish a program of community involvement: Public Program.
5. assist residents in preparing their own plan for development - south Surrey Plan Group.
6. establish Policy Committees of external experts and citizens.
7. establish a transportation authority: the Kelly Report, almost a reality.
8. assist residents adjacent to an airport with planning and involve Federal officials in regional planning: Burkeville and Airport Planning Committees.
9. control the location and price of land in the Region.
10. establish growth targets for sub-regional areas.
11. move toward a single tax on land rather than on land and improvements.
12. reexamine some well established Regional policies: on parks, floodplain and watershed protection and public housing.

These can be compared with the most important planning decisions of current practice as revealed in a recent survey.¹ Planning Directors in all Canadian cities were asked to list the ten most important planning decisions made in their community during the past five years. The twelve most frequently mentioned planning decisions, listed in order of frequency, were as follows.
1. preparation and/or revision of a comprehensive plan.
2. preparation and/or revision of a zoning bylaw.
3. preparation of parks and schools plans.
4. urban renewal studies and projects.
5. establishment, expansion or reorganization of the planning agency.
6. special land-use studies.
7. transportation plans.
8. suburban residential and shopping plans
9. subdivision control procedures.
10. civic centre plans
11. sewer and water projects and schemes
12. development control procedures.

Again we see that the contrast is sharp. Only on departmental organization is there similarity and on this point one suspects the substance to be different: current practice is internally oriented while GVRD planning is externally oriented. To complete this comparison, each of the 347 important planning decisions from the Canadian survey was related to the twelve GVRD outputs. Only four could be similar: one on a housing program two involving citizens and a "major goals effort". Nowhere is there the slightest hint that GVRD's style of planning is duplicated in any Canadian city. A plausible
explanation of these contrasting outputs would attribute the difference to the fact that GVRD is a metropolitan planning function while most urban planning agencies are local or municipal. This point requires consideration.

The essence of this argument is that GVRD can afford to be different because it does not have to deal with comprehensive planning and the regulation of development. Regarding the former, GVRD inherited a comprehensive land-use plan in the Official Regional Plan. However, they made a conscious and deliberate choice to develop a new type of plan rather than continue with comprehensive land-use planning. The regulatory aspect is not disposed of so easily. It is true that GVRD planning does not have nor seem to want the regulatory functions of local planning. One should remember that nearly all GVRD planners have previous experience as urban planners, and the principals, at least, reject the regulatory approach. While the absence of regulatory duties may facilitate a new approach, it does not appear to be the cause. GVRD planning explicitly desires to develop a way of planning to overcome the defects of current practice. Much of the search for a new consciousness in Chapter Three attests to this. And the supreme example of these contrasting ways is the tentative discovery from Matrix One that various urban patterns make very little difference to the achievement of metropolitan objectives. Here the difference is explained in Gan's terms: "what the cities are asking is that the city planner become a planner who deals with the current and urgent problems of the city, and cease being an urbanist, a professional concerned with the physical city and an advocate of an ideal (or comprehensively planned) city."2

The difference between GVRD and current planning has consciously evolved within the GVRD, as Part Two attempts to capture.

1 Gerecke, op.cit.

Comparison of GVRD Planning with the three basic types of planning

While discussing the "three-horned planning dilemma" in Chapter One, three models of planning were identified: comprehensive, partial, and systems. These models are compared to the GVRD model under four categories of the decision cycle which they all share.

1. Problem Recognition.

For problem recognition the GVRD model differs absolutely with comprehensive planning. Planning occurs from the bottom up in the GVRD, i.e. from people's values, goals and concerns. On the other hand, comprehensive planning relies on a normative interpretation of societal goals by the planner. Partial and systems planning have a dynamic relationship with the community, but they find values in a reactive process. Partial planning reacts to a problem, tension, while systems planning reacts to a proposed action, for example a development proposal. GVRD planning seeks goals directly to anticipate problems or proposals and be active rather than reactive.

2. Analysis

Analysis, as conceived in comprehensive and systems planning, attempts to handle the whole urban environment. Of course this is impossible and in adjusting to the impossibility many problems result, like incomplete data. Partial planning and GVRD planning avoid this problem, and they both have a more limited but focused analysis: partial to problems and GVRD to community goal priorities. However, GVRD planning uses matrix analysis, rather than identification of alternatives, and involves the community in analysis.

3. Implementation

For implementation, GVRD planning is again similar to partial planning and as well to systems planning. All three closely link decisions with implementation in contrast to comprehensive planning which is loosely related
to implementation.

4. Feedback

Lastly we compare the correction phase of these models. Principally this refers to how quickly the decision cycle occurs. Comprehensive planning has a very slow decision cycle. Normally comprehensive plans are scheduled for revision every five years, but in practice this is often longer. Partial and systems planning are reactive processes; therefore, the speed of their decision cycles is controlled externally; in some periods there may be many planning advised decisions and in others only a few. In contrast to all of these, GVRD consciously attempts to keep the decision cycle moving fast to effect a continuous dynamic process.

These differences may be summarized as follows: no equals dissimilar, while yes equals similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. problem recognition</th>
<th>2. analysis</th>
<th>3. implementation</th>
<th>4. feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(IIPS)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GVRD planning differs much more than it is similar to comprehensive, partial and systems planning. It stands apart because it goes to the people for community goals, seeks strategic interventions through qualitative analysis, involves the community in analysis, and consciously works at keeping the planning cycle moving fast.