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ABSTRACT

This study analyses planning and decision-making methods. It is concerned with the soundness both theoretically and practically of the planning process used for the False Creek area of Vancouver for the period 1968-1974.

Based on a case study, the evolution of the planning process from planning for decisions which resulted in further planning to planning for action is analysed. In doing so the study monitors the role of the planner, the influence of the politician and the involvement of the citizen in the planning decision-making process.

Data for this study was assembled from numerous Vancouver City Council Minutes, Committee Minutes, Planning Department reports, newspapers (Vancouver Sun and Vancouver Province), and a series of personal interviews with many of the actors involved in the process including politicians, planners and citizens.

Prior to conducting this study there were indications that in False Creek would be found a new and innovative planning process; perhaps even an example of John Friedmann's 'Transactive Planning'. The grand scale of the planning, the existing location of the site next to the downtown area and a changed political climate all pointed to something new. Also the fact that change around the Creek was beginning to occur in early 1974 where it had not for thirty years prior, suggested a new found process of achieving action.

However, upon completing this study, that which had appeared to be a new planning process was in fact largely political domination of the
planning decision-making process. While change did occur in the aim and roles of the actors in the process, the change was not the result of a new planning philosophy or process. The change was in the political approach to achieving desired ends. The Vancouver City Council, elected in 1973-74, was dominated by the 'TEAM' party which was elected on a platform of building in False Creek within two years. To accomplish this the TEAM Council established an organizational structure through which the False Creek planners reported directly to the Special Council Committee on False Creek. In doing so the politicians were not only the main motivating force behind redevelopment on the City owned lands (area 6) in the Creek, but they also became the administrators who controlled preparation of Creek plans. One conclusion of this study is that the influence of the politician was the single most important and dominating factor which created and carried out the move to building in area 6 of False Creek.

This study also concludes that while the role of the planner varied in False Creek between 1968 and 1974, in the final analysis their role remained unchanged. The planning department was working on overall Creek concept plans between 1968 to 1970. Four years later, in 1974, it seems a return to that role was emerging. The time in between witnessed the planning department's involvement on City owned lands in the Creek diminish to that of a spectator.

Insofar as the involvement of Vancouver residents in False Creek planning is concerned, the general trend was toward less constructive and less influential input. While citizens were consulted during the 1968 to
1970 period, with their ideas forming the basis for concept planning, they were channeled, during 1973, through two city bodies (the Social Planning Department and the City Planning Commission) who had, at best, a minor input into the Creek planning process. This situation left citizens in a position of being peripheral to the process.

From this study it has become apparent that when the politician controls the planning decision-making process to the extent that they did in False Creek during 1973, not only will a transactive process of planning not occur but the roles of the other two main actors, the citizens and the planners, are likely to diminish to the point where they have little or no importance to or impact on the planning decision-making process.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
The planning decision-making process is the vehicle through which plans are drawn up, political decisions made, and approved directions pursued. In many institutions this process is fragmented into three isolated and distinct stages; planning, decision-making and implementation—each with its own actors. When this occurs planning tends to aim toward decisions resulting in further planning. An absence of implementation is characteristic of this situation. At the other extreme when decision-makers become involved in planning, and implementation results, the implementation tends to be action for action sake. Alternatively, modern planning is tending toward an integration of the traditionally distinct stages of the process, which brings together the planner, the politician and the citizen. This situation focuses on action as an evolving product of the planning decision-making process, as opposed to implementation of static plans.

This study analyses planning and decision-making methods. It is concerned with the soundness both theoretically and practically of the development process used for the False Creek area of Vancouver for the period 1968 to 1974. Based on a case study, the evolution of the planning process from planning for 'decisions' to planning for action is analysed. In doing so the study monitors the role of the planner, the influence of the politician and the involvement of the citizen in the process.

In analysing these aspects of the False Creek process, four basic questions are presented and form the focus of the study. These are

1. How did the False Creek planning decision-making process which evolved between 1968 and 1974 reflect the theory and practice of planning?
2. What was the role of the planner in the process?

3. What influence did the politician exert over the process?

4. How have the citizens of Vancouver been involved?

**PROCEDURE**

The basic methodology of this study is one of comparing select aspects of theoretical planning decision-making processes with the realities of an existing situation. To accomplish this an in-depth case study for the period 1968 to 1974 has been made of the process of planning False Creek.

Data for the case study was assembled from numerous Vancouver City Council Minutes, Committee Minutes, planning department reports, newspapers (Vancouver Sun and Vancouver Province), and a series of personal interviews (list in bibliography) with many of the actors involved in the process, including politicians, planners and citizens.

Also, the author has had considerable exposure to and involvement in the False Creek process through a Federal Government Opportunities for Youth grant in 1972 to research and prepare a historical chronology of False Creek, and through working with the False Creek planning team during the summer of 1973, on plans for the Fairview Slopes.

**LIMITATIONS**

An important limitation of this study is the magnitude and complexity of the issue of False Creek. This is evident in the vast amount of information included in the case study which is necessary for understanding what was happening but which is beyond the scope of this study.
Another limitation stems from the case study. In researching and writing a "complete story" it is very difficult to trace all influences on and participants in the process. This results in reliance in some instances on newspaper reports which are not always totally reliable.

A similar situation arises from the personal interviews where conflicting opinions of the same event occasionally occur.

The fact that this study is concerned with the planning-decision-making-implementation process, and that implementation did not take place until after the period documented in the case study may also be considered a limitation of this study. However, the details of implementation are not central to the workings of the process being analysed. Those details form a new and very interesting story for another study.
The area chosen for this analysis of the planning decision-making process is a basin adjacent to Vancouver's downtown district called False Creek. See Map 1 for location of the Creek in the City.

False Creek presently extends approximately 2½ miles inland, from the east end of English Bay to the Columbia-Quebec Connector, and has a shoreline of approximately 5½ miles. It has an established harbor headline, beyond which no filling may take place, and has been dredged to a general depth of 20 feet, though some areas are much shallower at low tide. Maps 2 and 3 indicate location features and official sub-areas which make up the Creek basin.

The history of False Creek prior to the 1970's is the story of a railroad and its significance to development, and of industry and its impact on a physical area such as the Creek. The story is dominated by constant filling of the Creek, repeated studies and plans on the future of the Creek, and the railroad.

The railroad was first introduced to False Creek in 1884 by the Canadian Pacific Railway. By 1886 the Canadian Pacific Railway had laid a rail line along the north shore of False Creek, and had built the Kitsilano Trestle across the Creek to the south shore. (The Kitsilano Trestle stands to this day.)

At the request of Vancouver City Council, the C.P.R. in 1887 located their terminal yards on the north shore of the Creek, between what are now the Granville and Cambie Street bridges. As an incentive to locate their terminal yards on the north shore of False Creek, the City granted the C.P.R. tax exemption on the land for a period of 30 years.
MAP 1 FALSE CREEK REGIONAL SETTING
MAP 2 FALSE CREEK LOCATIONAL FEATURES

Key to MAP 2:

1. Burrard Street Bridge
2. Kitsilano Trestle
3. Granville Street Bridge
4. Cambie Street Bridge
5. Georgia Street Viaduct
6. Columbia - Quebec Connector
7. C.P.R. Rail Yards
8. Granville Island
9. V.I.E.W. Site
10. Fairwiew Slopes
11. C.N.R. Rail Yards (False Creek Mud Flats)
Gradually industries moved in; first, sawmills, then shipyards, a creasote mill and slaughterhouses, all dependent on the estuary for transport of raw materials and finished products.

As the industries moved in the railways stretched out their steel arms to feed them. The mud shores were filled with logs, boulders, mud and garbage, providing more land for industrial expansion and choking off the fresh-water creeks.

In 1913, the dredging of a 350 foot wide 20 foot deep shipping channel began. From the need to dispose of the sand being removed, Granville Island was born and by 1915 was completed.

While Granville Island was being created in the western part of the Creek, the mud flat area east of Main Street stretching to Clarke Drive was being filled by the Canadian National Railway. The years 1914 to 1916 saw the C.N.R. fill the entire False Creek mud flats area and create their western terminus.

False Creek originally had a water area of more than 500 acres, stretching east, almost to Clarke Drive. Over the years it has been filled to the approximately 250 acres of water it is today. (See Map 4).

The fact that False Creek bordered the downtown area on the south and east, and acted as a barrier for movement into the downtown peninsula has made the Creek the most often bridged body of water in the region. Not only are there three existing bridges, Burrard, Granville, and Cambie, but also the Kitsilano Trestle and the Georgia Street Viaduct. In addition, there were earlier bridges where all three presently stand, as well as a bridge at Main Street. The point to be made here is simply the fact that False Creek has had a significant influence on transportation in Vancouver.
Key to MAP 4:

- Original high water mark
- 1974 high water mark
- Creek area filled
From the standpoint of the bridges influence on the Creek, the constant jumping over the Creek facilitated by the bridges led to a lack of internal roads around the Creek. The impetus which created the bridges served to isolate the Creek.

Whereas the City had given the C.P.R. 30 years tax exemption for locating on the shores of the Creek, they gave the C.N.R. a large tract of land, (known as the False Creek Mud Flats), and the right to fill in the end of the Creek (the False Creek Flats).

In exchange the City received a promise from the C.N.R. that they would supply roads and sewer services to the Flats and establish a steamship line from Vancouver.②

In 1926, Vancouver's first Town Planning Commission was established. Then, on August 2 of their first year, the Town Planning Commission hired Harland Bartholomew and Associates to prepare a "Comprehensive Town Plan for the City of Vancouver and a Regional Plan of the contiguous or adjacent territory".③

This first City Plan dealt with False Creek in a separate section of the report, though it considered the Creek in relationship to the areas surrounding it.

In studying the Creek, Mr. Bartholomew observed that "the False Creek industrial district has been permitted to become an eyesore and a menace to health. Its regeneration is essential to normal civic development".④

Bartholomew's report, presented to the City on December 28, 1929, suggested bulkheading the Creek into a 600 foot wide 20 foot deep shipping channel, an idea which has been forgotten only recently. Bartholomew's
ultimate vision was that "the entire False Creek area may be reclaimed (from its deteriorated condition) and used for purposes more appropriate to a city of a million population. The theory of the plan is, briefly, to create greater land values by increasing the desirability of the lands for high-class industries".5

The 1929 Bartholomew plan had little impact on False Creek, and little changed in the Creek throughout the 1930's to the late 1940's. A few new industries came, many plans and development schemes for the likes of fisherman's wharves were proposed and most often forgotten6, along with considerable filling of the Creek, reflect highlights of these times.

False Creek grew smaller and more fetid as industries poured their wastes into the water.7

Significant during this time was the very poor quality fill, such as sawdust and junk-garbage, which found its way into the Creek, and which would become an important consideration of future development plans for the Creek.

In light of growing pressures from businesses and citizens alike, to do 'something' with False Creek, City Council in March, 1948 established a special False Creek Planning and Development Committee to unite all parties with an interest in the Creek.

From discussions of concerned parties, a disagreement between the City Council and the Town Planning Commission over future plans for the Creek,8 and the coincidental fact that the then Alderman Halford Wilson happened to have been visiting Toronto, seen that Toronto had similar waterfront problems as Vancouver had in False Creek, and had hired
Mr. E. L. Cousins to draw up plans, which to Alderman Wilson looked good,\textsuperscript{9} City Council decided to hire Mr. Cousins as a consultant for False Creek. Thus the 1950 False Creek Development Study was undertaken, to look at railways, waterways, sawmills, and the general economic condition of the Creek.

Three years after it was authorized by City Council and 20 months after it began its work, the False Creek Development Survey was discontinued. It had amassed all possible data but found itself with nothing to recommend.\textsuperscript{10}

Keeping in mind the problems stemming from the complex ownership pattern which existed in the Creek;\textsuperscript{11}

The survey seems to have fallen over the stumbling block which had tripped all previous attempts to obtain a feasible development program. A plan, no matter how realistic in an engineering way, can have small chance of materializing if it is administratively unrealistic. Because all the False Creek planning up to 1953 was directed solely at solving engineering problems to the virtual exclusion of any consideration of the administrative problems, the well engineered cart was always in front of the political horse.\textsuperscript{12}

This situation which existed surrounding the 1950 False Creek Development Study should be considered in light of the fact that the consultant, Mr. E. L. Cousins, was a 'railway man' from years gone by,\textsuperscript{13} who could hardly be expected to produce recommendations which might threaten the railways stranglehold on False Creek.

In October 1955, two years after he had completed the 1950 False Creek Development Study and two years after he had failed to supply the City
with any substantial recommendations from the three year study, Mr. E. L. Cousins presented a report, based on his 1950 to 1953 survey work, to City Council. Cousins now recommended that two committees be established; one consisting of major land owners around False Creek, and the other being a technical committee.

Cousins did present several alternative schemes for developing the Creek, none of which were pursued.

The two committees he recommended were established in 1956.

Following the establishment of the two committees, and continuing throughout the late 1950's, was a process of realizing the complexity and the problems of the False Creek basin. The inefficient use of land around the Creek, the polluted condition of the Creek waters, the ownership situation and the leasehold patterns reflect only a portion of the complexity, and a few of the problems which existed.

As awareness of False Creek grew, so concern for the area grew. City Council, on January 13, 1959, reappointed the False Creek Development Committee it established originally in 1956. The Committee was authorized, under the chairmanship of Alderman Halford Wilson, to "call together interested parties in order that recommendations may be made to Council in respect to proceeding upon recommendations contained in the Cousins' Report".

It was little more than two months later, on March 24, 1959, that the newly re-appointed special committee recommended to Council that the planning department be instructed to carry out a 'high priority' study concerning the relocation of the False Creek harbour headline. This is
significant not only because Council requested 'high priority' work on False Creek from the planning department, but also because this was the beginning of major efforts by the planning department, over the next few years, to improve the situation which existed in False Creek.

The plight of the Creek was further articulated and publicized by the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board's 1959 industrial survey. The survey indicated that a long run potential demand existed for industrial sites such as those found in False Creek. The survey also brought to light many deficiencies which hindered industrial growth in False Creek. The dissatisfactions were the restrictions imposed on navigation by the Trestle and by the shallow channel, the lack of adequate road access, traffic congestion and an array of administrative and financial factors.¹⁷

In September, 1960 the Director of Planning, Mr. George Fountain, reported to City Council that there existed many long leases on False Creek land, and that any cleaning up of Creek conditions or redevelopment of the area would be difficult until these leases expired in 1971.¹⁸ Fountain went on to say that some industries should not be in the Creek, especially the wood processing industries which use the Creek as a large booming ground. He also stated that the road system around the Creek was inadequate, the air and the water was polluted, and the land and the water were being inefficiently and uneconomically used.

December 20, 1960 saw the Special False Creek Committee present a report in principle to City Council, that the Creek would be a secondary harbour and industrial area. Council adopted this statement of principle direction for the Creek¹⁹, and was promised a concrete plan for the Creek.
Considerable optimism existed at this time, as Planning Director Mr. George Fountain reported that an atmosphere of cooperation had been reached between major land owners and government agencies interested in the Creek.  

The cooperation was in fact in the form of a technical committee which included the railway interests, the Provincial and Federal governments, the National Harbours Board, major industrial land owners around the Creek and two planning department staff members, Mr. Gerard Farry and Mr. Franklin Wiles. The important point here is that it was no surprise that the planners, working closely with an industrially oriented technical committee, produced industrial plans for the Creek.

As the planning department continued working on False Creek, an updated version of Harland Bartholomew's 1928 ideas for the Creek seemed to emerge. Ideas of a high-class industrial area, a narrow shipping channel, an improved road access around the Creek, all originated in Bartholomew's 1938 plan, all were refined in the early 1960's to suit the times.

On the advice of the City Engineering Department, solutions to the circulation and access problems around the Creek began to materialize. The idea of the Columbia-Quebec Major Street Connector was born and presented to City Council in January, 1962, by the Special False Creek Committee, as one of several ways to improve the road circulation system around the Creek.

This idea, along with others aimed at finding the ways and means of achieving better industrial use of the Creek, passed through a series of
planning department reports on the rehabilitation of False Creek. During this time (late 1962 through early 1964) the Director of Planning Mr. G. F. Fountain left the City, and Mr. Harry Pickstone took the position of Acting Director. Then, in early 1964, Mr. W. E. Graham became the Director of Planning.

May, 1964 saw Mr. Graham present his report "Notes on Unified Management", in which cooperation between the major False Creek owners was seen as the key to rehabilitation of the Creek. On July 22, 1964, the Planning Department presented "The Columbia-Quebec Major Street Connection and False Creek Rehabilitation" report to council for approval. By the end of 1964 the major land owners affected by the connector, B.C. Hydro and Power Authority, Ocean Cement, and Deeks-McBride, had agreed to the project. In April, 1965 the Board of Administration on behalf of City Council approved the connector. Work began on the connector shortly afterwards, and with property owners causing delays in a couple of instances, was not completed until the summer of 1973.

Through the mid 1960's planning and policy continued toward more intense industrial use of the Creek. In addition, several sawmill fires had, by the 1960's, removed all but one of the major sawmills around the Creek. Large portions of the Creek were left vacant or underutilized as storage yards. Thus more intensive uses of the land were feasible.

During this time industries such as Ocean Cement, Deeks-McBride and Johnston Terminals began pressuring City Council for formal assurance that False Creek would remain an industrial area.
The Planning Department continued work on the Harbour Headline, the rail situation, and the leasehold policy in the Creek.

The situation as it existed, moving into the later 1960's saw the City striving to clean up False Creek and make it an economical high-class industrial area.

Stemming from this underutilization and general run-down conditions which permeated the Creek over time, was the stigma attached to the Creek. As far back as the 1930's and 40's Vancouver residents had been disturbed about the blighted conditions of the lands around the Creek, and the quality of the water in the Creek. In more recent times, this dissatisfaction with the condition of the Creek has been a motivating factor in people pushing for a change in land use around the Creek. The water quality issue has served to make people question whether a change in use is even feasible around such poor water quality.

Another aspect of the Creek which contributes to its unique situation for planning is the fact that other than a small live-aboard floating home community there are no permanent residents living around the Creek. Traditionally, planning would suggest that citizen involvement should stem from the residents of an area. Without residents in False Creek, the City found itself in a situation of having to involve all people of Vancouver in the process, a task which is by nature impossible.

Events between 1940 and the mid 1960's have been summarized on Tables 5, 6, and 7.

In retrospect, to this point in Creek redevelopment, little action had taken place and uncertainties as to what should be done still loomed ominously around the Creek.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESUME: LATE 1940's - EARLY 1950's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- clean up the Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more economical industrial use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fish dock talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1950 False Creek Development Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1951 Railway Services as Related to the Industrial Use of False Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1952 Preliminary Appreciation of the Development of the Wood Converting Industries in False Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1953 The Economic Study of the False Creek Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN PLAYERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- consultant Mr. E. L. Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council: False Creek Planning and Development Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- studies without follow-up action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council established False Creek Planning and Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council hired consultant Mr. E. L. Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- began removing squatters from the False Creek Flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- planned fish dock for the Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOREBOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- much talk, no action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- small steps for Council, no steps for False Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 6**

**RESUME: MID 1950's - LATE 1950's**

| TREND | Creek as a secondary harbor  
|       | better use of the Creek by industries located there  
|       | much fish dock talk  |
| REPORTS | 1955 Report on False Creek, Cousins  
|         | 1959 False Creek Planning and Development Committee Report  |
| MAIN PLAYERS | consultant Mr. E. L. Cousins  
|             | Alderman Halford Wilson and the False Creek Planning and Development Committee  |
| RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS | Creek becomes high priority area  
|                       | City committees and Creek landowners talk  
|                       | Council establishes a landowner committee and a technical committee  
|                       | Federal wharf opens for commercial fleet boats  |
| SCOREBOARD | much concern  
|            | some direction toward more industrial use  
|            | no policy  |
| COMMENTS | City acting without a clear idea of where it was going  
|            | a time for talk, tea meetings, and agreement that something must be done  |
TABLE 7

RESUME: EARLY 1960's - MID 1960's

TREND
- industrial future for Creek assured
- city planning department produces numerous reports aimed at creating a high-class industrial area in the Creek

REPORTS
- 1960 False Creek Development Study
- 1961 False Creek Development Study
- 1962 Technical Committee on False Creek Development Report
- 1963 False Creek Rehabilitation Report
- 1964 False Creek Rehabilitation Report
- 1964 Notes on Unified Management
- 1964 The Columbia-Quebec Major Street Connector and False Creek
- 1964 Report on False Creek Rehabilitation
- 1965 False Creek Report

MAIN PLAYERS
- City Planning Department
- False Creek Planning and Development Committee
- City Engineering Department (advisory)

RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS
- Council adopts in principle False Creek as a secondary harbor
- Council approves actions toward an upgraded industrial area;
  - new harbor headline, shipping channel, Columbia-Quebec Connector
- considerable effort studying leasehold policy and rail situation

SCOREBOARD
- much concern
- directions set for high-class industrial area, secondary harbor
- some policies set, some actions

COMMENTS
- revival of 1928 Harland Bartholomew concept for False Creek
- wheels in motion for industrial future
In the context of this study two important aspects of the Creek emerge from this period. The first is that the Creek being located next to Vancouver's downtown core area has considerable potential for planning to occur toward redevelopment. Combine this with the condition of existing development in the Creek and the entire area is extremely 'ripe for development'.

The second emerging aspect of the Creek was the variety of actors who were involved. Politicians, planners and private enterprise were all showing considerable interest in the future of the Creek. Citizens at this point were involved only in as much as they complained about the eyesore condition of the Creek.

The variety of actors and important location when combined with diverse land uses, ownership and physical barriers made False Creek a complex and challenging redevelopment situation. It is the planning decision-making process which tackled the potential of the Creek that will be analysed through the remainder of this study.

This chapter has outlined the intent for this study, a historical perspective on the area, and pertinent setting and background data necessary to understand the topic False Creek.

Chapter II presents a discussion of literature outlining various aspects of the planning decision-making process. The role of the planner, influence of the politician and involvements of citizens in the process are also discussed.

Chapter III is the case study against which the theory outlined in Chapter II will be compared. Following each period in the case study, a point form resume of the period is presented, along with an analysis
discussion of the questions this thesis focusses on.

Chapter IV presents the points which have been discussed in Chapter III and summarizes these into basic conclusions.
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CHAPTER II

LITERATURE DISCUSSION OF THE
PLANNING DECISION-MAKING PROCESS
LITERATURE DISCUSSION OF THE PLANNING DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

This chapter is an overview of the forces which have traditionally shaped planning-decision-making processes. Specifically the planning-decision-making process is discussed, with particular reference to the role of the planner, the influence of the politician, and the involvement of the citizen. In response to the four main questions this thesis examines, as outlined in Chapter I, this chapter is divided into four basic discussions and a resume.

The first discussion is of process, outlining the necessity to deal with planning-decision-making as a continuum without making planning, decision-making, and implementation separate activities in the process.

The second discussion reflects on planning and the planner in relation to his heritage, a bureaucratic organization, and politics.

Just as the planner finds himself encumbered with circumstances, so the politician is influenced. The third discussion is on politics and decision-making, and focuses on the politician's situation in the decision-making process.

Citizen involvement and the public interest are discussed last, in such a way as to outline where citizens have been involved in planning, and how their 'interests' have been considered.

A short resume discussion closes this chapter.
PLANNING-DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The idea that planning and implementation are two distinct and separable activities dies hard. Planning, it is said, leads to the formulation of plans; implementation is concerned with carrying them out. The intervening step is a decision.\(^1\)

Where in one light it is said that a decision separates planning and implementation, it could in another light be said that a decision links planning and implementation, and in fact creates a continuous process from traditionally separate activities. If planning and implementation are separated institutionally, as is often the case, the plans "are shelved away",\(^2\) or "are likely to be rejected, ignored or radically altered by the political decision-makers."\(^3\) Implementation of plans produced this way often requires "a large application of power and, thus generates considerable resistance and alienation."\(^4\) Further, "failures of planners and implementers to understand one another's motivations and limitations, and the failure of both to understand the political context in which they operate, are at the root of the overall problem."\(^5\)

In viewing planning and implementation linked by decisions, it is possible to overcome the hurdle of planning for decisions to undertake further planning in favor of planning for action.

If the focus of planning is shifted from decisions to action, 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.\(^6\)
John Friedmann in his article "Notes on Societal Action" proposes an action-planning model which "fuses action and planning into a single operation so that the conceptual distinctions of planning-decision-implementation-recycling are washed out." It is the elimination of the somewhat artificially imposed distinction between planning and implementation, which has traditionally isolated the planning decision-making process into phases or steps, that directs our focus to action and process. As Friedmann points out, "the common denominator of all effective planning is that planning must be 'actionable' and as such must be an integral part of an organization's decision-making and managerial processes".

Planning is not merely concerned with the efficient instrumentation of objectives; it is also a process by which society may discover its future.

Our traditional emphasis has been upon the physical city, conceived as artifact; upon the spatial arrangement of activity locations, conceived as land-use pattern; and upon the urban settlement, conceived as a unitary place. We have sought to influence the forms of each of these, with the purpose of improving certain behavioural aspects of the society. Yet we have neglected the conception of the city as a social system in action.

With our past emphasis centering on physical plans, not only have we used economics as a yardstick-crutch against economically unquantifiable social concerns, but we have fallen into the pitfall of physical plans, by emphasizing a "desired future state, without a clear view of the processes by which that state is achieved." Again this points to the
separation of planning and implementation, a hurdle which must be overcome in order to realize that planning and implementation are little more than labels attached to actions comprising a process ad infinitum. At the same time process should not create a situation where the end product becomes irrelevant, so long as the process was good or proper.

John Friedmann in his book *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning* attributed the problem of plans not being implemented to a weak or non-existent link between knowledge and action. Friedmann explains this situation as planners (with the knowledge) relating primarily to other planners or related professionals, and producing documents written more to maintain their image to their colleagues than to aid the client decision-maker. The solution to this problem, Friedmann believes lies in improving the communicative relationships between individual planners and clients. As an interactive model of planning, "transactive planning changes knowledge into action through an unbroken sequence of interpersonal relations."15

Within transactive planning, Friedmann identified two inseparable levels of communication. The first is person-centered communication which he terms the 'life of dialogue'. The second is subject-matter-related communication "which is sustained by the primary relation of dialogue... Both levels are indispensable to planning. Where they become disassociated, thought is reduced to theorems and action to pure energy."16

Friedmann's transactive planning is based on interpersonal relationships where an individual's ability to work with another individual is paramount. This is an interesting and distinctly different process from his
earlier references to action planning, where the implementability of plans was the main aim of the process. Both of these focuses of the planning process are relevant, however transactive planning would likely be more susceptible to breaking down in bureaucratic organizations where individuals simply cannot manage to communicate well.

PLANNING AND PLANNERS

Planners are influenced greatly by their heritage, the bureaucratic organization they are part of, and the politicians and political structure they find themselves working under and being directed by.

The placement of the planning function in the decision-making system is determined largely by forces outside the planning field.

Far more controlling are the social, economic, and political forces which shape the structure and role of government; which define the system of checks and balances; which momentarily resolve the balance of powers among the several levels of government, among the regions of the country, and of competing interest groups. Far more important is the impact of emerging ideas conflicting aspirations, and the perception or the lack thereof with respect to City development, current needs, and future prospects. The weight given different ideas, values, and aspirations is more likely to determine at any given time how strongly the planner fits into the decision-making system. Figuratively, the planner is like the girl with a big bust when Twiggy is in style. She has a lot to offer, and can even be well used; but she's not favored with Saturday night dates, and she goes to the movies with her girl friends.
With the role of the planner being set largely by forces outside his control, the planner traditionally assumed the role of professional technician. A generalist who, when challenged had not easily identifiable strength such as an engineer or economist, and as a result had little to fall back on other than a physical land-use plan and qualitative arguments. The planners heritage is of an emphasis on physical design, a reliance on physical utopias, and a distrust for local government.18

Planning was initially conceived as a set of rules and structures designed to keep politics out of urban development. Because land use control had an enormous impact on land values, the chances of graft were considerable. Reformers attempted to eliminate this temptation by minimizing discretion. Planning regulations were formulated to establish in advance the conditions under which changes in land use would be allowed.19

This heritage has led to "a simple minded premise of a world in which planners lay out optimal courses to selected goals, bureaucracies translate these courses into action, and implementation follows as neatly as building construction follows a blueprint."20

Where traditional planning focused on physical designs, more recent 'action planning'21 focuses on social-economic-ecological concerns which includes deliberation and choice as pervasive, ongoing activities... not to be identified as distinctive phases prior to action; they are--inseparately--a part of it."22 Reinforcing action planning, "the common denominator of all effective planning is that it must be 'actionable' and as such must be an integral part of an organization's decision-making and
managerial processes... Planning, in this light, is a process by which scientific and technical knowledge is joined to organized action.

Where planning has striven to be comprehensive and to focus on the preparation of a master plan, "a single document that presents a tidy blueprint for the sometime future," the emphasis is shifting to a "process and program oriented activity."

"Planning is now viewed as a continuous process of moving towards provisional goals rather than the delineation of an ideal end state to be achieved at some future date... The planner now emphasizes a variety of middle-range or short-range programs, continuously moving and redefining targets."

With the emphasis of the process changing away from the production of "end states", toward actions and programs,

"...cities are asking planners not to hide themselves in planning commissions which exist often as ivory towers erected by civic leaders who consider themselves above politics; instead they are demanding that planners become active advisors to city hall, so that they can participate in the day-to-day decision-making process."

Complicating the planner's position in the decision-making process are the bureaucracies which earmark larger cities. Nowadays, most cities have planning departments to carry out the appropriate activities related to the functioning and future of the community. Depending on the specific city and its bureaucratic organization, planners often find themselves in a position of either being isolated as the only people producing plans for the community, or being so encumbered with others producing plans
that no agreeable solution or direction can emerge. The isolation planners suffer from often stems from the bureaucratic structure within which they plan. The danger here is that by "being isolated as the only plan maker in the community, public agencies as well as the public itself may have suffered from incomplete and shallow analysis of potential directions."\textsuperscript{29} Not only is incomplete and shallow analysis a danger of bureaucratic planning, but so is staff frustration and eventual demoralization. "In the case of the New York City Planning Department, the personal dominance exerted by the chairman over the staff limits its role to the area of 'housekeeping' activities. The antiprofessionalism, the lack of accountability in the Community Renewal Program, and the frequent use of consultants have resulted in the demoralization of the staff and the diminution of professional work."\textsuperscript{30}

Another complicating reality for planners is the fact of life that politicians are ultimately responsible for decision-making. Planners deal with the process of planning and implementation, while politicians intervene to make a decision. While planners have in the past tried "...to insulate planning from the sordid political system, the politician has always been the 'link' between plans and implementation. In order to assure planners plan for 'action' rather than plans, isolating them from the politics of decision-making, serves only to make decisions the barrier rather than the link between planning and implementation. In reality, planning "...invites political and social values to be examined and debated."\textsuperscript{31}

With planning moving away from the production of ideal end-state master plans toward process aimed at activity or implementation, the planner finds himself in a much more complex demanding position. Where, in the past,
the planner could plead no responsibility for decision-making or implementation, now he finds himself to be a responsible participant in the ongoing process. He is now a participant joined by the politician and citizen, sharing responsibility at all stages of the planning decision-making-implementation process.

**POLITICS AND DECISION-MAKING**

The question is not whether planning will reflect politics, but whose politics will it reflect. What values and whose values will planners seek to implement.³²

In the case of planners who work for a bureaucratic department, city council is their primary client because it is the final policy making authority in municipal government.³³ The result is sometimes planning not for the public or community good, but for the politicians. This is not to say politicians do not have honorable ends in mind, but in reality,

local elected officials are pre-dominately part time public servants, involved primarily in their private business activities, and with little expertise in government. In addition, they tend to be people who are local in origin, rooted deeply in traditions and economic circumstances of the past.... In addition, studies of the behavior of political leaders in local government suggest that they are strongly indisposed toward the making of decisions involving conflict within the community. Case after case analyzing local development decisions reveals public officials seeking to avoid making tough decisions, to avoid confronting issues before it is absolutely necessary to confront them, and, where decisions must be made, to defer to "experts" or to other levels of government or to delegate responsibility to nongovernmental...
groups which can reach some sort of a consensus. Local government is particularly sensitive to pressures from local groups. Development decisions often involve threats—either to the property rights of some residents or, more dangerously, to their image of the community in which they live. Either kind of threat is likely to evoke the most impassioned responses from directly affected factions of the population. Local elected officials are poorly equipped to respond to these pressures. They must necessarily value the current applied pressures more highly than the less specific sentiments of the rest of the public or the long-run needs of the community. Their very tenure in office depends upon such an evaluation. Only within narrow limits do they have the possibility or the power to delegate decision-making to others less vulnerable to local particularisms and short term concerns.

As a consequence of these characteristics of the public decision-making process large numbers of urgently needed decisions are put off indefinitely.  

This process of avoiding decisions involving conflict hinges totally on the individual decision-maker, as "almost every decision with which they are faced involves so many diverse groups making different demands that final disposition of the issue is impossible. The best that can be expected is that some kind of compromise can be arranged which will work, at least for the present, so that other conflicts can be resolved."  

The significant point which arises here is that "since each decision is a compromise solution and no group receives what is really wanted, each decision has within it the seeds of future conflict."
Politicians then, much like planners, find themselves in a position over which they have little control. Where the politician influences the planner, the public influences the politician. It must also be realized that an unbiased value-free decision-maker can not exist, as "values are inescapable elements of any rational decision-making process."^37

Of importance here is that "appropriate policy.....is determined through a process of political debate. The right course of action is always a matter of choice, never a fact;"^38 and that

no matter how competent and well intentioned, a decision-maker can never make an important decision on grounds that are not in some degree arbitrary or nonlogical. He must select from among incompatible alternatives each of which is preferable in terms of a different but defensible view of the public interest.39

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

....people are usually the objects rather than the subjects of civic action: they are acted upon by others, but rarely do they themselves initiate action....city-wide civic and political forces seek to police them, vote them, and redevelop them.40

People who are objects rather than subjects of civic action have no input or influence over the planning of their community. They find themselves in a position of being limited to pure adaptive actions and completely dependent on forces beyond their control. John Friedmann terms such people 'reactive' and contrasts them with 'active' people, who have a capacity to pursue autonomously definite ends.41
Prior to the movement of recent years, toward citizen involve-
ment, citizens have little or no input or role in the planning-decision-
making process. Public participation was considered inefficient and time
consuming by planners, who also believed that people did not know what
they wanted and that they as trained technicians knew better of people's
needs than the people did.\textsuperscript{42} As a result, planners and elected officials
identified the "public interest"; a "course of action which best serves
the public as a whole."\textsuperscript{43} This assumed that a community's goals could
be "measured at least roughly as to importance and welded into a single
hierarchy of community objectives."\textsuperscript{44} It also seemed that the public
believed the planner possessed special abilities for determining their
interests, and had a marked responsibility for their interests.

Where planners are called upon to
arbitrate public conflicts the public
defers to the professional's judgement
as if it were authoritative and based
upon some final principles.\textsuperscript{45}

Of importance here is the belief in a unified public interest.
"Planners....have been distracted by the pursuit of consensual goals that
would maximize the illusive general public interest. As a result, goals
defined by the process are so broad that they are of almost no use in
making day-to-day decisions about development."\textsuperscript{46}

Not only have planners been distracted by the search for a unified
public interest but that such consensual goals are non-existant. Wheaton
suggests that "there is no general public interest which exists in some form
of continuing state about which consensual goals can be articulated in any
meaningful way. Rather, the public interest should be reagarded as a
highly dynamic complex of varied interests." In other words, a unified public interest almost never exists in the real world, and as a substitute for citizen involvement or input it becomes little more than a political goal.

Let us turn our attention from the public interest to the realities of involving citizens in the planning-decision-making process. "The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you. Participation of the governed in their government is, in theory, the cornerstone of democracy—a revered idea that is vigorously applauded by virtually everyone." In the past, citizens have seldom participated directly in the formulation of plans. Any participation came after plans were partially or entirely developed, and involved at best a limited segment of the community.

...citizen participation has traditionally occurred after the fact and has involved only a few 'key' members of the community.

Adding to the situation is the fact that planners have not been able to maintain the interest of the general public over extended periods of time. This however is probably due to the dilemma of citizen involvement that "planning must and should precede action, although action is necessary to secure the interest of citizens and thus the support of their participation. Planning is unreal action. The involvement of citizens in something which is not real is, at best, very difficult to achieve."
Complicating the issue even more is the fact that citizen participation very often becomes a competition among citizen organizations, each attempting to get its particular values reflected in the plan. This diversity of interests raises the question of whether decision-making should be the result of "rational reasoning and factual research or the end consensus product of intergroup pressure."

In spite of the problems involved in citizen participation, it can be agreed that it is necessary, and must occur prior to the drawing of plans. Participation occurring after plans are complete is not in fact participation, but reaction.

The question of how citizens should be involved in the planning-decision-making process is one which must be answered only in the context of an actual situation. To philosophize one area's participation strategies onto another area is to impose artificial restrictions on involvement, and can serve only to inhibit and influence the resulting input. Participation should be shaped with the participants, and should be aimed at establishing goals and plans acceptable to the community, not at the justification of decisions already made.

RESUME

Keeping in mind that "one generation's utopias (often) turn out to be purgatories for future generations", the aim of a planning-decision-making process should be to fulfill the needs of the present population, while preserving some flexibility for future populations. This flexibility needs to be present not only in physical structures, but also in the process we use to plan-decide-implement urban development.
With the basic focus of planning evolving from 'end state' master planning to continuous process planning for action, the traditional role of the planner has changed. No longer is the planner able to remain isolated from politics and decision-making, if in fact he ever was, outside of his own mind. The new role of the planner is one based much more on communication and participation; communication with his 'client' and with any and all other actors in the planning decision-making process; participation in the process of planning, to plan with citizens and decision-makers rather than for people. The nature of planning and the extent to which these emerging trends are evident in the False Creek planning process will be analyzed in the case study of Chapter III.
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CHAPTER III

CASE STUDY AND ANALYSIS
Chapter III is divided into two parts; Part A, The Significance of the Autumn of 1967, and Part B, The Case Study and Analysis.

Part A looks briefly into some of the more significant factors which contributed to the change in policy philosophy on the part of City Council from industrial to recreation-residential land uses. The Autumn of 1967 is significant because it was the beginning of the end of industrial intention on the part of city officials.

Part B is an in-depth case study of the False Creek planning decision-making process, from the Spring of 1968 to April, 1974. The case study is divided into four periods; Spring, 1968 to Autumn, 1970; Autumn, 1970 to May, 1972; June, 1972 to November, 1973, and; December, 1973 to April, 1974. Each period of the case study will be followed by an analysis-discussion of what has taken place during that time. It is in these resume discussions that the four main questions asked at the beginning of this study are investigated. Point form summaries are also presented at the end of each period of the case study.

PART A: The Significance of the Autumn of 1967

The Autumn of 1967 in the historical perspective of False Creek represents the critical time when policy for an industrial Creek began to die, and serious thoughts of residential-recreation developments rose to the public eye.

In the Autumn of 1967, Vancouver City Council was faced with what appeared at the time anything but a decision of paramount importance. The situation on hand consisted of several leases of land around False Creek
expiring, deteriorating conditions in the Creek, less than total use of the land bordering the Creek, and a desire on the part of City Council to assure the concerned False Creek businesses of tenure, thereby allowing them to expand or upgrade their facilities.

In a motion at Council on October 24, 1967, Alderman Ed Sweeney, himself an owner of a business located on False Creek moved

THAT WHEREAS the City has been advised of the concern of certain industries located on land leased in the False Creek industrial area as to the continuance of their leases;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT it is Council's policy at this time, that the land abutting False Creek be retained as an industrial area.¹

While the motion was not carried unanimously by Council, it was carried, establishing what was intended to be a long-term policy retaining False Creek as a high-quality industrial area.

In the Council discussion of Alderman Sweeney's motion, consideration was given to possibilities of False Creek being an intensively developed secondary harbour, or a major recreational area for city wide use²; however neither of these ideas received serious attention, especially not the thought of recreation-park space in False Creek.

As a direct result of City Council approving a long-term industrial policy for False Creek, the Parks Board, on October 30, 1967, stated that a vote should be held to determine the future of the Creek.³

While the Parks Board sought the means of a public vote on the Creek's future, Vancouver newspapers carried stories of the public, citizens of Vancouver, wanting recreational development in False Creek.
In an effort to have City Council rescind their policy favouring industrial use of the Creek, Parks Board Commissioner Mr. J.E. Malkin proposed a 1,000 foot wide landscaped shoreline park area around the entire Creek, with three 400 boat marinas and a bird sanctuary.

In order to fully appreciate and understand the situation which existed in the autumn of 1967 it is necessary to look a few years into the past and see where the idea of recreation-residential development of the Creek gained recognition and momentum.

As the City moved slowly toward plans for better industrial use of False Creek there existed what can be termed a low-key movement favouring a change in False Creek use away from industry, toward residential and recreational activities. The movement had several players of differing significance, a few of whom are discussed below.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, after being accused by the City planning department in March, 1964, of withholding land from the general industrial market and keeping large chunks of land for a few industries instead of making small parcels available, began to assess its land as to its most profitable use. Mr. Fred Joplin was the C.P.R. representative in touch with False Creek and while it was not evident until a couple of years later, he began considering all possibilities for the C.P.R. land.

With a growing realization on the part of the C.P.R. that rail yards were not the 'best' use of their land, the C.P.R. began laying the ground work for Marathon Realty, their newly formed real estate, planning and developing branch, to enter the Creek picture in 1968. At this time, Mr. Joplin publicly stated that the C.P.R. was open to any progressive
scheme for False Creek. Mr. Joplin also stated that it was up to the City to take the lead in developing the False Creek area.

In March, 1966 Alderman R. Williams publicly took the position that industry should be moved from False Creek in favour of parks and possible high-rise housing.7

Noteworthy here is the fact that while industrial plans were being prepared by the planning department during the early to mid 1960's, Mr. Barry Chaster, then a member of the City Planning Department, was working on 'other' uses of the land surrounding the Creek. His investigations focussed on open space as the 'best use' of the lands. Mr. Chaster envisioned an extension of English Bay around the shoreline of False Creek.8

Another member of the recreation-residential movement was a professor from the University of British Columbia's Geography Department named Dr. Walter Hardwick.9 Having studied the sawmills of False Creek as part of his doctoral work, Professor Hardwick had found that the sawmills, which tend to be unsightly, generally stayed in False Creek because they were on long-term leases affording very low land costs. Professor Hardwick was also involved in debates on the future of the downtown area, which led him to the belief that industry did not seem to be the best use of False Creek. At the same time, a colleague of Professor Hardwick, Professor E.R. Higbee, began pushing the concept of the executive city.10 As part of this concept Professor Higbee, in a report to City Council in November, 1967, suggested that proper development of False Creek would stress the creation of an environment attractive to the construction of office buildings and high-rise apartments.
While Professors Hardwick and Higbee campaigned from the Geography Department of U.B.C., Professor W. Gerson had a class of his architecture students study the possibilities of False Creek.

In the spring of 1966 these students along with Professor Gerson proposed that False Creek become a major amenity area, to provide the necessary related services to the downtown core and surrounding urban area.

Vancouver architect Mr. Warnett Kennedy was another active advocate of a change in policy for False Creek. Mr. Kennedy felt that the City could no longer afford to allow False Creek to remain an industrial centre, and that more revenue would come in to the City by moving residential and recreational facilities into the area.

The Parks Board, after considering the future of False Creek for a time, in February, 1967 resolved to develop long-term park and recreational objectives for the False Creek area.

While not all members of the movement advocating a change in False Creek away from industry have been discussed, enough have been mentioned to illustrate that such a movement did exist basically academic in nature and that it ran parallel to the City's industrial plans for the Creek until the autumn of 1967.

It was the autumn of 1967 that saw the City's industrial push cross paths with the residential-recreation movement, the impact of which will be discussed in Part B of this chapter.

Table 8 summarizes the events from the mid 1960's to the autumn of 1967.
### TABLE 8

**RESUME: MID 1960's - AUTUMN 1967**

| TRENDS | - controversy over Creek's future  
         | - move from industrial to residential, recreational, commercial thoughts |
| REPORTS | - see period resume for early 1960's to mid 1960's in Chapter I |
| MAIN PLAYERS | - City Planning Department  
                - Council  
                - Vancouver Parks Board  
                - Marathon Realty  
                - Professors Walter Hardwick, Ed Higbee, and Wolfgang Gerson from U.B.C. |
| RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS | - residential-recreational movement through the mid 1960's questions industrial future of the Creek  
                         - Council adopts long-term industrial policy for the Creek in October, 1967  
                         - considerable public reaction results  
                         - Parks Board wants public vote on the Creek's future  
                         - Planning department recommends Council reconsider its industrial policy  
                         - Council votes to reconsider industrial policy in favor of possible park, office, and apartment development in March, 1968 |
| SCOREBOARD | - new found concerns  
                      - reassessment of directions  
                      - long term industrial policy |
| COMMENTS | - Council adopting the long-term Industrial policy in October 1967 brought to the fore questions on False Creek's future which had not been asked around City Hall |
This period follows on the heels of the Autumn 1967 discussion, and begins as a continuation of it.

While the Parks Board continued to campaign for a public vote on the future of False Creek and for recreation development in the Creek, the City planning department was assessing the Creek situation in light of Council's October, 1967 industrial policy. The results of the planning department's considerations came before City Council on March 26, 1968. The report recommended that Council reconsider its October, 1967 policy advocating the maintenance of False Creek as a high quality industrial area. Other points presented in the report included; that it may no longer be valid to think of False Creek as a secondary harbour, something done in the 1930's, 1950's and 1960's; that much of False Creek is underdeveloped; some industries may be forced to leave the Creek if industries offering higher economic returns could be found; and that "uses like extensive ornamental parks, office towers and residential uses would be difficult to introduce into this area of False Creek without large scale redevelopment".

Council accepted in principle the planning report and then voted to re-examine the industrial policy set out in October, 1967. It was also decided at this time that False Creek would be considered part of the downtown area, with any future actions hinging upon the policy plan being prepared by the planning department for the downtown area.

The motion adopted by Council stated;
that the Director of Planning be instructed to prepare statements on revised goals and policies for False Creek and that these be contained in the proposed policy plan for Downtown now being prepared by the Long Range Planning Division for submission in stages to Council. It will then be circulated to interested parties for comment and will take account of the views expressed herein.

On April 30, 1968, in a communication to City Council, the Parks Board supported the planning department's March 26, 1968 report, and requested that the Parks Board be included in any future planning of False Creek. The Director of Planning, Mr. Graham, agreed to meet with the Parks Board.

While the future of False Creek was being reassessed as part of the Downtown plans, the City and the Provincial Government were carrying on informed discussions concerning the exchange of City owned Burnaby Mountain lands and Provincially owned False Creek lands located on the south shore between the Cambie and Granville Street bridges.

In early negotiations there was disagreement as to the value of the lands, especially on the value of the False Creek land.

It is interesting to note at this point, that Alderman Marianne Linnell and the Director of Planning, Mr. Bill Graham went to considerable lengths to ensure that the City received 'top dollar' for the Burnaby Mountain land. Linnell and Graham went so far as to attend a Burnaby Council meeting and express intent on behalf of the City of Vancouver to apply for rezoning of the City's land from 'cemetary use' to 'residential-commercial use'. This move was made to demonstrate the true value of the land in
light of the possible exchange of it for the Provincially owned land on
the south shore of False Creek.

In a communication to Vancouver City Council in May, 1968, the
Provincial Government noted that appraisers for the City and Province were
in agreement on the value of the City owned land, but that differences of
opinion existed over the False Creek land value. The Province stated it
was prepared to negotiate the value of this land.21

City Council referred the matter to the Board of Administration
with directives to arrange the necessary negotiations.

Then, in August, 1968, the City Planning Department presented
its report on Downtown Vancouver22 which was requested on 'high priority'
in the autumn of 1967. In this report, eleven 'key issues' were posed.
One of these 'key issues' was directed at False Creek, and asked the
following question:

A great deal of Downtown land around
False Creek is not very intensively used.
What is the best use for this land, in
the long run? Industry, Apartments,
Parks, or other uses.23

Further into the report questions were again asked concerning
False Creek;

....what should the future of this
land be?...will a changing pattern of
port development make waterfront land
now occupied by industry available for
other uses? Are inefficient industrial
operations pre-empting land that should
be developed other ways? Is False Creek
an essential part of the harbour complex,
or should this area be used for other
purposes such as parks and apartments?24
Underlying the information and questions of this report seemed to be the assumption that change, no matter the kind, was the best thing for False Creek.

The rundown condition of the Creek and the lack of noticeable action remedying the 'sick creek' in past years, meant the people of Vancouver were ripe for change in False Creek. The Downtown report asked for ideas, opinions, suggestions for change, and provided the first opportunity for the public to voice their opinions on the Creek.

While the response to the Downtown report was in the order of eighteen submissions considerable comment was made concerning the future of False Creek. The Downtown issues report also marked the first time the new three-step proposal-citizen input-response system of planning formally adopted by City Council in September, 1968 was used. (This is explained in footnote 27 and will appear later in this chapter when used for planning False Creek).

Through the summer of 1968 the City was still faced with the problem of trying to plan an area it did not own in False Creek. However, negotiations were continuing over the exchange of City owned Burnaby Mountain land for the Provincially owned south shore lands of False Creek. The situation to this time consisted of little action either by the owners of Creek land (mainly the railways and the City) or the City, and a considerable amount of talk, especially by the City.

Finally, on November 19, 1968, agreement was reached over the land values of Burnaby Mountain and the False Creek lands. City Council accepted these values and moved that the exchange of lands be as of
January 1, 1969, if possible. With the exchange of lands officially in sight, the City was about to gain the opportunity to 'do' something in False Creek. The south shore land between the Cambie and Granville Bridges was ripe for development where the City's land east of Cambie Street was not. The opportunity would be the City's to leave the 'all talk no action' dilemma which they had been caught in for many years.

Less than a month after the City and the Province had agreed in principle to exchange the lands, thereby giving most of the south shore of False Creek, between the Cambie and Granville Street Bridges, to the City (map 9 indicates the major land owners), the Canadian Pacific Railway announced a $185 million apartment housing complex for their land across from the City's on the north shore of False Creek.

Almost in the same breath, the Canadian Pacific Railway suggested swapping their 'old' Shaughnessy Golf Course land for the City's recently acquired land on the south shore of False Creek.

A "Province" newspaper editorial in December, 1968 discussed the land swap proposed by the C.P.R. in such a way as to question the way Vancouver City Council set up development priorities. In essence, the editorial suggested that if the City was going to determine False Creek's future and not the C.P.R., the City should rezone the C.P.R. holdings on the north side of the Creek, and adjust the taxes accordingly. The editorial further stated that City Council should then rezone its south shore holdings for apartment development and offer it to the highest bidder.

Combining the situation of Council being questioned as to who was making the decisions in False Creek, the City or the C.P.R., with factors pushing a change in Creek policy from harbour and industrial to
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residential and park, such as growing public pressure, more attractive economics offered by residential development, and the development of an alternate location for some False Creek industries at Roberts Bank, pressures began to mount on the planning department and especially the Director of Planning, Mr. Graham, to 'start the ball rolling' in False Creek.

In December, 1968, the planning department produced a report inviting citizens and groups to participate in the planning process. The report was the first stage in the process of preparing a City Plan. The report was also the first since the City acquired land on the south shore of the Creek, and stated that the "improvement of the False Creek Area" was an existing objective of the City.

Where the August, 1968 Downtown report suggested change for False Creek, the December, 1968 "City of Vancouver Plan - Part I - The Issues" report suggested changes away from industrial use.

The City's economy is changing: service employment is becoming more important, and industry relatively less important. Also, City land prices are increasing beyond what most industries can afford...it is doubtful whether all of False Creek should remain in industrial use. False Creek is a problem industrial area.

The report goes on to say that:

The demand for apartment-zoned land could be met by rezoning more of the conversion districts in the Inner Area, including part of False Creek.
False Creek has inherent potential for park purposes because of its central location in the Inner Area, its waterway, and the relatively low value of buildings that would have to be removed.\textsuperscript{40}

and for final descriptive flavour the report soliciting public views noted that

False Creek, with its dilapidated buildings and open storage areas, separates Downtown from the rest of the City by a ring of visual squalor.\textsuperscript{41}

The public response to the December, 1968 report was much the same as the response to the August, 1968 report. The public wanted change, especially toward park-recreation oriented type developments.

January, 1969 brought a new City Council, the same as the old one except for the inclusion of a representative of the academic community, Dr. Walter Hardwick, of the Geography Department at U.B.C. This was significant as it began the movement away from a Council dominated by an industrial point of view.

In a February 8, 1969 newspaper article\textsuperscript{42} the C.P.R. was credited with stating they would begin construction of a $22 million hotel complex on their north shore Creek land between the Granville and Burrard Street Bridges on September 1, 1969.

On February 11, 1969, Deputy Superintendent W.C. Livingstone of the Park Board appeared before City Council and urged the Mayor and Aldermen to be progressive in their attitude toward beautification of False Creek, so that the inner-city waterway could ultimately be used for park and
recreation. Mr. Livingstone further asked Council to provide without charge, as soon as possible, a 400 boat marina in False Creek.

In mid April, 1969, Marathon Realty, the C.P.R.'s real estate, planning and development arm, proposed a $250 million housing and marina development on 190 acres of their land on the north shore of False Creek. The proposal was a much as surprise as Marathon's first proposal in December, 1968, and would house 20,000 people in 11,000 mostly high-rise units. This plan was monumental in nature and reflected architect Mr. Zoltan Kiss' large scale style of design, as well as the general 'train of architectural thought' existing during the times.

In presenting the massive proposal, Mr. J.D. Mooney, the General Manager of Marathon Realty, proposed changing the name of False Creek to Edgewater Park, and to this end suggested a public contest.

While the Creek retained its name, and no development began immediately from Marathon Realty's most recent plans, awareness of possibilities for the Creek grew. The C.P.R. through Marathon Realty had begun to push the City towards action on the Creek. The City, on the other hand, stated that development of City owned land on the south shore of the Creek would not begin for about four years, as many leases do not expire until December 30, 1970.

The City was, however, beginning to move on the Creek at this time, as Mr. D. Hayward, Assistant Director of Planning in charge of Advanced Planning and Research was preparing a set of development concepts on False Creek, for public reaction.

In light of this, the City was content to wait, a game Marathon Realty was beginning to learn.
Many like a calm before a storm, very little happened for a couple of months. A suggestion by Alderman H. Wilson to have areas of False Creek designated for disposition of excavated material from Vancouver construction sites, was referred to the City Engineer for consideration.\footnote{48}

The Parks Board reacted to Marathon Realty's April, 1969 proposal by stating that the density should be decreased from 20,000 people to 10,000 people and the park area increased to at least 50 acres.\footnote{49}

An informal reply to the Parks Board suggestions by Mr. J.D. Mooney of Marathon Realty made the point that these changes would make the project uneconomical.\footnote{50}

The situation as it existed moving into the summer of 1969 showed; Marathon Realty planning residential-recreational development for their Creek land; the City Planning Department drawing up concepts for public reaction on the future of the Creek as well as generally thinking of the Creek as unsuitable for industry (as suggested in the December, 1968 City of Vancouver Plan report); and public opinion moving toward a change from industrial to park development for False Creek.

In spite of the general movement which has just been stated, City Council voted to extend the lease of Vancouver Iron and Engineering Works (VIEW), a major industry in False Creek, which was at a financial loss, and in fact bankrupt.

The motion by Alderman Bird
that the City Council advise
Vancouver Iron and Engineering Works
that the City would be prepared to re-
new the VIEW lease for a period of five
years after expiry of the present lease
in 1970, subject to terms satisfactory
to the City, with an option for renewal
on an annual basis for a further five
years at the City's discretion assuming
that the City becomes owner of the
site.51

The motion carried seven to three with Aldermen Calder, Hardwick
and Philips voting against it.

It was also resolved at this time

that other False Creek lease
extensions be reviewed individually
by the Director of Planning for
report back to Council.52

Having stated their position on the VIEW lease, City Council
went about their regular business, occasionally discussing leases and
filling of the Creek.53

Then, on September 23, 1969 the Board of Administration submitted
the following Park Board resolution concerning the VIEW lease.

....the Board urge Council to
reconsider the lease extension and
draw Council's attention to the fact
that the Board presented a plan for
dark development of False Creek on
February 11, 1969 which was referred
to the Standing Committee of Council
on Planning, Development and Trans-
portation, and further, that in
February, 1969 the Board resolution
was sent to City Council requesting
a marina site in False Creek.54
In response to the Park Board resolution moved by Alderman Rankin was carried;

That the Park Board resolution be received and the Board advised that when the general question of use of land and water areas in False Creek is under study by the Council, the Park Board will be given an opportunity of presenting its views.

During October, the issue of the VIEW lease became more prominent. Public reaction began to mount, as the realization of what an extension of the VIEW lease would mean became more apparent.

VIEW is the financially beset carcass of a once booming company whose empty buildings and idle cranes have become, in the past two weeks, a symbol of the whole problem of False Creek development—a planning vacuum.

It has become a symbol of the city machinery's inability to provide information fast enough to allow proper judgment of both private needs and public good.

And in a broader sense, it is a casualty of a historic shift in thinking on what should be done with the Creek.

A Calgary based firm, Canadian Hydrocarbons Limited had picked up the option to purchase VIEW, dependent on being able to obtain a ten year lease. Remembering that in July, 1969, Council had approved in principle a five year lease for VIEW, a ten year lease did not on first glance seem too far removed. Times were changing, however, and in November, 1969 the issue of lease terms and planning for False Creek came to a head, over VIEW. City Council was split on what to do, Canadian Hydrocarbons was cautious and unsure, the City Planning
Department was busy working on development concepts for the Creek, and the public, especially groups such as the Community Arts Council, and the Citizens Council on Civic Development, were actively campaigning against any extension of industrial leases in False Creek.\(^{57}\)

Both Canadian Hydrocarbons and City Council began receiving numerous letters against any extension of the VIEW lease.\(^{58}\)

The controversy on City Council centered around Alderman Phillips, Calder, and Hardwick strongly objecting to any lease extension for VIEW, because it would jeopardize redevelopment plans for False Creek. Speaking of the VIEW lease, Alderman Calder stated that:

\[\text{VIEW is a key property. If you give VIEW a 10-year lease you can't do anything there--how can you develop the area if the worst offender remains?}\] \(^{59}\)

On the other hand, Mayor Campbell, Aldermen Linnell and Rankin campaigned for the jobs and tax revenue VIEW represented to the City. In Mayor Campbell's words:

\[\text{There isn't a nickel of City money available for False Creek development, VIEW is going to sit there for five years anyway and cost us half a million dollars in rent and taxes. What's more 300 or 400 could have been employed, many of them men out of work since the plant shut down.}\] \(^{60}\)

In the heat of the debate, on November 10, 1969, the Calgary firm withdrew their application for a five year extension on the VIEW lease.

This was not the end of the issue however, as debate within Council and citizen protests continued.
On November 15, 1969, five days after the Calgary firm withdrew their VIEW lease extension application, a newspaper article quoted Aldermen Phillips, Calder, and Hardwick as blaming Mayor Campbell for much of the VIEW situation.

The opposing Aldermen blame Campbell for much of the controversy. They say he refused to hear the planner at Monday's meeting on VIEW although the planner was prepared to give them a preliminary report on long-awaited False Creek Development proposals.

In addition, the mayor went against an earlier agreement to wait for the report and against senior staff recommendations that leases be restricted to five years.

To this, Alderman Walter Hardwick added that

To make a decision when a nine month City staff report on alternatives was nearly ready is folly...we need to have policy, not the Mayor throwing sand in the gears.

The controversy continued into December, 1969, with growing involvement on the part of citizens.

On December 16, 1969 City Council received a petition signed by approximately 380 persons, on behalf of the Fairview Slopes area, protesting the decision of City Council to further extend the VIEW lease and requesting a public hearing on the matter.

The Fairview people were striving to preserve the residential nature of the Slopes, in the face of numerous commercial activities which were rapidly infiltrating the area.
Coincidentally, Canadian Hydrocarbons cancelled their plans to revive the VIEW plant, on December 16, 1969, the same day the Fairview petition reached City Council.

The issue which had split City Council and aroused public reaction, no longer existed. Mayor Campbell's closing remark was that;

The deal is dead—and VIEW will be a dead monument to the obstructionists on City Council.65

VIEW was indeed dead, though the memory of it was to live on, and in one sense fulfill Mayor Campbell's prophecy. VIEW did in fact become a dead monument, and until its final and total demolition in the Summer of 1973, haunted the City's efforts to plan False Creek.

With the VIEW controversy dominating Council's time, newspaper headlines, and the public's interest, the long awaited planning department report on development concepts for False Creek, though presented in November, 1969, did not gain much attention until January, 1970, when it was formally released for public comment.

On November 13, 1969, the report was presented to the Standing Committee of Council on Planning, Development and Transportation, and shortly afterwards to Council for information. City Council then asked that "concerned citizens, acting in their own right, or as part of an organization or group, be invited to express their opinions on these alternative development concepts."67

Along with the development concepts report, the planning department presented reports on the phasing of development, and the planning procedures for the Creek. The development phasing suggested that the
City owned land on the south shore of the Creek between VIEW and Johnston Terminals could be available for marketing by 1973 with completion by 1976.

The proposed change in planning procedure was from the three part method of reporting on planning matters, to a modification of this method which would shorten the process and lessen the need for detailed documents. (The two procedures are discussed briefly in footnote 69).

With the new planning procedure, the development phasing, and the absence of the VIEW controversy, a new optimism seemed to develop on City Council. The die-hard thoughts of an industrial Creek seemed to dissappear in favour of changes toward residential-recreational uses. A motion by Alderman Phillips on January 7, 1970 illustrates this change. Alderman Phillips moved

\textit{THAT, if and when the City's land on False Creek is developed for residential purposes, provision be made in the planning of the area for the inclusion of a significant amount of low cost, Public, Private and senior citizens housing.}

The motion carried without too much debate.

While information discussions on Granville Island had begun as far back as March, 1968, little visible progress or changes had been made. However, with Council's new found visions for the Creek, Granville Island, complete with wall-to-wall industry, presented itself as a somewhat incompatable neighbour to residential development on the City owned south shore lands. Concern began to grow, and was reflected in the newspapers, as City Officials asked the National Harbours Board to study the Island's
future and not renew industrial leases on the island for long terms.\textsuperscript{72}

The first part of 1970 saw the City take their first truly positive step towards redevelopment of False Creek, with the public distribution of the concepts report. In historical perspective a couple of very significant seeds were planted by the False Creek Development Concept report. One was that residential and recreational uses were definitely possible in False Creek; the other was that "economic, physical, social and aesthetic benefits can be achieved by the redevelopment of False Creek."\textsuperscript{73} Most significant here is the statement that economic benefits can be achieved through redevelopment of the Creek. What appeared a simple statement in 1970 has become an unwritten assumption in 1974, where any development of False Creek must stand more or less on its own economic feet.\textsuperscript{74}

After being granted a two week deferral for presentation of the report on submissions to the development concepts,\textsuperscript{75} the Director of Planning, Mr. Graham, presented the planning department's report on the submissions to Council on March 17, 1970.\textsuperscript{76}

From a response of thirty-six groups and individuals, (including citizens groups, business associations, civic boards and commissions, and individuals) a definite anti-industrial feeling existed concerning the future of the Creek. It was also clear from the general comments that the public (people who responded) was in favour of recreation or park type development of False Creek. Some support for residential and commercial development was evident, though not as dominant as the public's tendency to favour park-recreation uses.\textsuperscript{77} (See footnote 77 for highlights of the submissions).
Following consideration of the report on submissions to the five concepts, City Council, on April 14, 1970, formally resolved that concepts one and three would no longer be considered options for False Creek. This move eliminated any industrial possibilities for the future of the Creek. Further to this decision, Council instructed the planning department to work on overall plans for Concepts two, four, and five (concept II, Residential-Recreational uses, concept IV, Residential Commercial and Recreational uses, and concept V, Recreational and Residential Commercial uses) and report to Council with information on transit, family accommodation, transportation, etc.

With Creek planning settling in to a less controversial status, and the Creek's future moving away from industrial uses, a lull settled over False Creek. VIEW had been defeated, citizens had been consulted through the five concepts report, and directions had been set for planning the Creek's future.

May 26, 1970 saw City Council request a report on the phasing of development in False Creek.

The Board of Administration in conjunction with the planning department brought forth a staging report near the end of July, 1970. The phasing was for an early 1973 construction start on Stage I the City owned land between Willow and Alder Streets on the south shore of the Creek; Stage II the redevelopment of Granville Island; Stage III the development of the area west of the Granville Bridge; and Stage IV the development of the Johnston Terminals land on the south shore near the Cambie Street Bridge.
With redevelopment of the Creek set to begin in approximately three years and the City seemingly committed to residential-recreational development of the Creek, the problem of who should draw up the plans for the Creek arose. The question of whether False Creek should be planned 'in-house' (by the planning department) or outside City Hall, by consultants under the guidance of the City, arose. As for the 'in-house' route, the planning department did not have adequate staff. It was questioned at this time whether the City could assemble the necessary expertise to develop the Creek. Certainly the City lacked the ability to develop land, as it had never done so in the past. Insofar as using consultants was concerned, the city bureaucracy (senior planning staff, City Commissioner, and City politicians) felt that consultants offered more expertise and flexibility than the City could employ or use for False Creek; could save considerable time as the City would have to search for staff; and offered the City an opportunity for a new approach to planning False Creek, as the City in past years had not demonstrated the ability to plan and develop the Creek in any way.

The conclusion of this debate resulted in the decision that overall Creek policy planning would be done in house under the direction of Mr. Dick Hayward, and that detailed planning for the City owned lands of area 6 would be handled by a consultant.

It is interesting to note here a point made in a newspaper article on August 7, 1970 that people had been discussing redevelopment of False Creek for over 30 years, only six months earlier city officials felt it would be another 25 years before the Creek could be redeveloped, and now the City planning department saw redevelopment beginning in three years.
After the decision was made to use consultants for planning False Creek, the Assistant Director of Planning in charge of Civic Development, Mr. Harry Pickstone, was given the task of searching out consultant groups which could possibly handle the job of planning False Creek. Mr. Pickstone did not advertise publicly for consultants, but personally notified the major consulting firms who might be interested in and capable of handling the job. The aim here was to find a diversified group of consultants who could cope and plan in accordance with the spectacular opportunity the Creek offered, and create a new, exciting and innovative type of environment. Mr. Pickstone then interviewed nine consulting groups who had expressed an interested in planning the Creek, and asked them for detailed proposals of how they would handle the job. A short list of three consultant groups evolved, from which Thompson, Berwick, Pratt, and Partners emerged as the 'chosen' group. Thompson, Berwick, Pratt, and Partners (T.B.P. & P.) were selected because they seemed to be slightly further advanced in their thinking of False Creek, and had gone to greater lengths to find expert opinion and advice on the Creek. It is interesting to note here that T.B.P. & P. were architect consultants by trade, and were in essence branching out into the area of total planning. At the same time it seems the City interests represented by Assistant Director of Planning, Mr. H.W. Pickstone were wanting a design in the architectural sense for False Creek, rather than a plan.

Thus between April, 1968 and the autumn of 1970, the major thrust was the consultation with citizens and the redirection of thought toward a residential-recreational Creek. This period is summarized in Table 10.
TABLE 10

RESUME: APRIL 1968 - AUTUMN 1970

TREND
- residential-recreational future assured
- City looks for ideas on what to do in False Creek

REPORTS
- 1968 False Creek Report (to Council)
- 1968 Downtown Vancouver: Part I, The Issues (included the Creek)
- 1968 City of Vancouver Plan: Part I, The Issues (included the Creek)
- 1969 False Creek: Development Concepts
- 1970 Report on Submissions, Replies to the False Creek Five Concepts

MAIN PLAYERS
- City Planning Department
- Marathon Realty

RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS
- False Creek considered part of the downtown area
- City exchanges its Burnaby Mountain land for Province's Creek land (south shore between Granville and Cambie)
- Marathon Realty proposes high density housing for north shore of Creek
- Vancouver Iron and Engineering Works debate raises industry vs. park-residential development for the last time, in the autumn of 1969
- City produces five concepts for Creek development, circulates these to the public, and uses response to help plan Creek's future
- City studies possibilities of changing use of Granville Island

SCOREBOARD
- residential-recreational direction set
- policy of no industry

COMMENTS
- time without formal decisions
- slow death of industry with non-committal motions toward residential-recreational development
- City lacked crystal ball on Creek's future
PERIOD ONE DISCUSSION

The Planning Decision-Making Process during this period was a series of isolated steps. Planning was carried out to help Council make decisions without consideration of whether or not the proposals were implementable. Council constantly requested goals and policy statements from the planning department. The pitfall here is that without translating these goals and directions into actions, the planning was largely unimplementable. Additional studies always had to be carried out to establish the means of implementing the goals. This process was very traditional planning for decisions, where planning and implementation were separated by a decision, rather than linked by it.

At the opposite end of the process, Council was tending to make decisions based on "past days" policies. Extension of the VIEW lease in 1969 was consistent with policies of the early 1960's when False Creek was planned to remain an industrial area; it was not, however, a demonstration of "insightful leadership" in light of the public's demonstrated desire for change in the Creek, and the planning department's reports suggesting the same.

The role of the planner during this period was bordering on the "action planning" concepts later enunciated by Friedmann. While remaining a technical advisor to Council by conceptualizing futures for the Creek, the planner twice asked the public what they would like to see around the Creek, and prepared alternate concepts for public comment. Following the public response to the alternate concepts, the planners communicated the public's recommendations to Council.
The influence of the politician during this period was important more for the lack of direction provided than for the leadership. The situation can be generalized to the majority of Council members making decisions based solely on past policies with little or no regard for the future directions which were evolving. Only a minority on Council vocally pressed for change.

In the face of a growing movement away from industry in False Creek, Council chose to approve the extension of an industrial lease (VIEW) for five years. On the surface this was a very minor decision. In reality it represented a blunt rejection of the public responses to planning department reports solicited for Council. It also represented a step back toward solidifying an industrial future for the Creek. In the face of the City acquiring land on the south shore of the Creek, and the planning department's advice to seek "better" uses for Creek lands, Council did not take the "lead" that their position afforded them the opportunity to. Instead they chose, as many Councils before them, to proliferate the status quo in Creek action, while talking of change. Council's influence during this period was minimal to non-existent in so far as striving toward a non-industrial Creek, though the presence of several Aldermen who were pressing for consideration of other options no doubt provided some support to planners and citizens.

Involvement of Citizens in this period of False Creek planning was select and limited, yet very significant. The message of change away from industry in False Creek turned out to be a very difficult one for Council to grasp. Beginning in August, 1968 when the public was asked for ideas
and suggestions for the future of the Creek in the Downtown Report, the public responded in favor of change. Again, in response to a December, 1968 report on Vancouver Issues, people wanted change away from industry toward park-recreation uses. Both of these occasions were suggestion/idea collection in nature where the public's views and opinions were solicited.

Then, during August through October, 1969, following a Council resolution to extend the industrial lease of VIEW, a broad range of citizens actively protested to Council. This involvement, while being reactive, saw petitions, newspaper articles, and general public opinion in opposition to continuation of industry in the Creek.

The point to be made here is that twice people were asked what they felt the future of the Creek should be, twice they responded in favor of change away from industry, yet still Council saw fit to extend the industrial lease. The citizens of Vancouver by voicing strong opposition to the lease extension did influence the owners of VIEW, Canadian Hydrocarbons, to cancel their future plans in False Creek. January, 1970 saw the City ask people to choose from five alternatives they preferred for the future of the Creek. The public response in March, 1970 was consistent with previous responses, against industry, favoring change. The involvement of citizens during this period, Spring, 1968 to Autumn, 1970 can be generalized into the following table:
TABLE 11

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN PERIOD ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968 - AUGUST</td>
<td>Downtown Report</td>
<td>Suggestion, Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - DECEMBER</td>
<td>Vancouver Issues Report</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 - AUTUMN</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - JANUARY</td>
<td>False Creek Issues Report</td>
<td>Reactive-Response to Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also significant during this period was the move the City made to establish a formal, identifiable planning process which involved the public. (Footnote 27, Chapter III outlines the process). The intent was for public comments to be solicited on major planning reports prior to Council making a decision.

PERIOD TWO: AUTUMN 1970 TO MAY 1972

On November 17, 1970 City Council after considering a report on Consultants from the Director of Planning, approved the appointment of a group of consultants headed by Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners to:

a) extend the work of the Policy Plan as a framework within which the development of City lands between Burrard and Cambie can be carried out.

b) prepare the Development Plan for the City owned land between Burrard and Cambie Streets.
c) prepare detailed material including bidding documents for the first stage of City development between Willow and Alder Streets.\textsuperscript{90}

While the planning department worked out the precise terms of reference and fee structure for the consultant work on the south side of the Creek, Marathon Realty appeared in the newspapers, much as it had before, with news of their plans for the north shore of False Creek. This time, Mr. David Mooney, General Manager of Marathon Realty Limited, while speaking to U.B.C. Commerce students and alumni at a Bayshore Inn gathering, stated that Marathon hoped to begin construction of their False Creek development by the end of 1971. Mr. Mooney further stated that he anticipated no delays or problems getting approval from the City for the scheme.\textsuperscript{91}

The first phase of the Marathon scheme consisted of 2,000 residential units mostly in high-rise apartment buildings. Remembering that Marathon's earlier plans had met with considerable negative response due to their scale and density, it seems at first glance, that Marathon was pushing what no one wanted. This was not the case, however, as Marathon had just completed a survey of the West End,\textsuperscript{92} an area similar to their proposed False Creek Development.

Marathon had set out in April, 1970 to find out what people who would likely live in their development needed and desired. In the words of Marathon Realty:

\begin{quote}
A vital part of the planning process for Marathon's False Creek development was the determination of prospective tenants' needs and desires. Realizing that the initial stage of the development would probably attract
\end{quote}
the typical West End resident, Marathon decided to undertake a study of the residents attitudes toward West End living. It was felt that the study would provide Marathon with demographic and behavioural data to allow for more effective planning in the proposed False Creek project.93

To carry out the study, Marathon hired Professor J.D. Forbes, R.F. Kelly, and M.A. Goldberg, from the Faculty of Commerce at U.B.C. Armed with the results of their West End survey, Marathon proceeded toward the construction phase, enjoying a new found confidence. They had disproven the myths that the West End population was unstable, full of swingers, and highly mobile, by proving the contrary to be the case. They found that to the resident population, the West End was not an objectionable place to live. In other words Marathon had found the market and were intent on producing a marketable-profitable product.

Looking back to the City side of the Creek, on January 12, 1971 City Council formally approved terms of reference for the consultants T. B. P. and P. to carry out the 'preliminary phase' of the work.95 The terms of reference for the preliminary phase of work were to:

....consist of the assembly of information and data including work already carried out by the City and other organizations, the design of the complete study and a critical path control procedure and establishing a liaison with other groups and individuals carrying out related work during this phase, but the main purpose is to establish a framework for the full study, its cost and its timing.97
It was further agreed that the consultant costs for the preliminary phase of the study would not exceed $25,000 and should be completed by the end of February, 1971.

To fully understand the process centering around consultant planning in False Creek it is necessary to step back to November, 1970 for a moment. When City Council approved the idea of consultants for False Creek, headed by T.B.P. & P., Mr. Harry Pickstone, Assistant Director of Planning who had been responsible for finding consultants proposed the establishment of the False Creek Study Group. This group was established in November 1970 and consisted of C.E. Pratt, P.M. Merrick, R.J. Cave, and R.C. Mann of T.B.P. & P., H.W. Pickstone of the Vancouver Planning Department, and consultants R.B. Walkey, G.W. Brawn, K.H. Gillespie and Hans Blumenfeld.

The intent behind the establishment of this group was to involve the client (City of Vancouver, represented by Mr. H.W. Pickstone) with the consulting professionals, and assure the general direction pursued by the consultants would be in accordance with general intentions City Council and the Planning Department held for the Creek. The Study Group was the guiding vehicle for consultant work in False Creek.

The group began discussing the possibilities and problems of False Creek in November, 1970, and was well into the study by January, 1971 when Council formally approved the consultant terms of reference.

On March 22, 1971 the consultants T.B.P. & P. submitted through the False Creek Study Group, Progress Report #1 to the Assistant Director of Planning in charge of Civic Development, Mr. H.W. Pickstone.
Mr. Pickstone prepared a short report for the Board of Administration and passed the two reports on to the Board of Administration for presentation to Council.

While progress Report #1 was making its way through the City Hall channels to City Council, the Provincial Government approved the sale of 12.3 acres of Crown land on the north shore of False Creek east of the Cambie Street Bridge, to Marathon Realty Limited.

The approval was simply the formality of closing the deal, as negotiations and arrangements had been under way for some time. Vancouver City Council had dealt with the matter September 1, 1970 when they approved the Board of Administration recommendation:

That the Provincial Director of Lands be informed that the City welcomes the transfer of title provided that it is the intention of Marathon Realty Co. Ltd. to develop the land so transferred for residential, commercial, and recreational purposes and with the request that a public waterfront access easement be registered against the titles of the lands so transferred, such easement to be drawn in terms satisfactory to the Corporation Counsel and the Director of Planning and to be effective on the redevelopment of the lands.

The City had been assured in February, 1971 that "Marathon Realty has agreed to provide a continuous waterfront pedestrian walkway (excluding any frontages required for marinas) at the time redevelopment is carried out." The Director of Planning and Civic Development reported at that time that the pedestrian waterfront walkway could be secured through
an easement registered against the title of the property and would be a condition of necessary rezoning.

Also of significance during the time City Hall was processing Progress Report #1, was the City Council meeting of March 26, 1971. Discussion stemmed from a letter dated January 28, 1971 addressed to the Mayor and Members of Council, from the Chairman of the Parks Board. The letter contained a Park Board resolution:

That as the Park Board is an elected Board, and should be in on the planning and development of the south shore of False Creek, the Planning Department be requested to meet with the Park Board to discuss the proposed development, and further request the Planning Department for the terms of reference supplied to architects for the False Creek development.

Upon receiving the Park Board resolution in January, 1971, Council had referred it to the Board of Administration for consideration. Two months later, on March 26, 1971, the Board of Administration returned a recommendation from the Director of Planning and Civic Development to Council that

....the Park Board be informed that the Superintendent of Parks, as a member of the Technical Planning Board, is kept in touch with the planning as it develops and that it seems more appropriate for the Park Board to be brought into the picture when the report has been presented to Council rather than before.

Also of significance during the period of City Hall's processing Progress Report #1 was Marathon Realty presenting another proposal report for their land on the north shore of False Creek. Where their April, 1969
proposal had been for 20,000 people, this proposal was for 14,000 people in 7,000 highrise and 2,000 low rise units included an elementary school, 150,000 square feet of commercial space, a 500 boat marina, and 25 acres of public park. The report made the point that

....in-depth studies have demonstrated that we have the opportunity to create a unique residential community for 14,000 people in a variety of housing types. Market demand is such that this can be accomplished over 10 years. The project is technically feasible and has won enthusiastic public support.112

Toward the end of the Marathon report, in a section called "Implementation and Timing", three statements can be isolated which indicate a great deal of optimism existed within Marathon over development of their land on False Creek.

Technical studies have confirmed the feasibility of building a residential community in False Creek.

Market studies indicate high demand for accommodation close to the City core and competitive areas are almost full.

No major problems stand in the way of an immediate start of the proposed first stage and steady growth is anticipated after that at a rate of about 1,000 units per year.113

Then on April 20, 1971 Progress Report #1 came to City Council, and the Director of Planning and Civic Development's report on the consultant work from the Board of Administration was passed, setting aside a total of $270,000 for consultant work in planning False Creek.114
terms of reference suggested by T.B.P. & P. in their March 22, 1971 Progress Report #1 for Part II of the work were accepted by Council.

May, 1971 brought Progress Report #2 from the consultants, through the False Creek Study Group and into the City Hall channels. As described by T.B.P. & P., Progress Report #2 was "a comprehensive comment on the Long Range Planning Policy as suggested by the City Planning Department and constituted an interim report on progress toward Report #3." Progress Report #2 was received and accepted by City Council on June 29, 1971.

Also of note at the June 29, 1971 City Council meeting was Council's discussion of Granville Island as being the "keystone" to development of the False Creek basin and their approval of stepping up negotiations with Ottawa to get control of the Island.

Early August, 1971 saw Marathon Realty in the media's eye once again, unveiling the first stage of their False Creek development originally put forth in April, 1971. It was suggested that application for rezoning the area would be made in the Autumn of 1971 with construction beginning in 1973. The first stage would cover 43 acres midway between the Cambie and Granville Street bridges at the foot of Davie Street, with buildings covering 13 acres, parks 12 acres, roads 9 acres, and a marina 9 acres.

In September, 1971 the consultants T.B.P. & P. submitted Progress Report #3 to the City through the False Creek Study Group. The report entitled False Creek Proposals contained thirty recommendations aimed at establishing a broad development pattern for the False Creek Basin. (See footnote 121 for these recommendations).
Among the recommendations put forth in the report were proposals to maintain the existing water area acreage, limit the residential population of the Creek to 30,000 persons, and the inclusion of Vancouver citizens in planning the Creek's future. Specifically, recommendation #30 stated that

All or portions of the content of this report should be circulated widely to the citizens of Vancouver and various methods to obtain feedback from the proposals and ideas therein should be initiated.122

During September, 1971, while the T.B.P. & P. Report #3 was moving through the City Hall channels, the planning department produced a report entitled Proposed Policies for the Redevelopment of False Creek. The report was the planning department's follow-up to the five concepts report and submissions, and was requested by City Council on April 14, 1970. It must be remembered that while both of these reports were dated September, 1971, neither was 'publicly' released then.

The planning department report was based on

....previously established policies by the City; findings from various studies on False Creek; reported False Creek Concepts 2, 4, and 5; public replies to these concepts and subsequent discussion of the same.123

There are two significant aspects concerning this report which bear pointing out. The first aspect is the timing of the report. It seems very questionable why the planning department would be drawing up policy guidelines for the Creek when the City was spending approximately a quarter
of a million dollars for consultants to do the same work. Reflecting on this however, and realizing from past examples the time sequences of reports passing through City Hall channels, the planning department report was apparently delayed by the Technical Planning Board and surfaced the same time as T.B.P. & P. Report #3 strictly through coincidence.

The second aspect of considerable importance will surface in historical perspective, and that is the statement that the planning department report was based on, among other things, previously established policies. Many of the previously established policies were aimed at creating an industrial False Creek. A prime example was the policy which set out a revised harbor headling creating a shipping channel and turning bays geared to industrial development and which was treated as a given by the City planning department.

It should also be noted here that the consultants T.B.P. & P. had access to the City planning department report in draft form, and used it as an input to their Progress Report #3.

With the two September, 1971 reports on False Creek policy guidelines en route to City Council through the established channels, Council business proceeded as usual.

In a Director of Planning and Civic Development report through the Board of Administration to City Council on September 21, 1971, a letter from Mr.W.S. Harvey of False Creek Marinas Limited to the Mayor and Alderman, dated August 21, 1971, asked for an opportunity to present a proposal for the construction and operation of a major public small boat marina. Mr. Harvey further stated in his letter that he had applied on
March 25, 1971 to lease the Giroday Sawmill site and had not received a reply. City Council, in dealing with this matter, concluded that the application to create a marina in False Creek was premature because consultant work on the Creek was not complete.

It is interesting to note that Council refused to allow a public marina development in False Creek, (which was compatible in nature to future plans for the Creek), on September 21, 1971 because plans for the Creek were not far enough advanced, then on October 5, 1971, just over two weeks later, and prior to either of the September, 1971 reports reaching them, Council approved completion of the Quebec-Columbia Connector, (which was industrial in nature, planned to service an industrial False Creek).

In a motion put forth by Alderman Hardwick that

> ...the Council re-affirm its 1962 policy in regard to the Columbia-Quebec Connector....

two conclusions were carried. These conclusions were;

1. Completion of the small filling in process and proposed at the east end of False Creek should proceed, since the City is legally committed to this. Furthermore, the effect in reducing total water area is small and termination of filling at this stage would leave small bays which would be very difficult to keep clean.

   Completion of this filling will clean up backwaters in the east end of the Creek and permit the cement company to construct its conveyor so that it can continue its operations as per the 1962 agreement with the City.
2. Since no construction of the Columbia-Quebec roadway is scheduled until late 1972, well after completion of the current studies by Consultants on False Creek, there is no need for Council action at this time. After the reports of the Consultants are in, the matter will be brought before Council again.130

Though City Council realized the need for overall planning and coordination of redevelopment in False Creek, they did not have the information base on which to make 'meaningful' decisions. Their decisions were based on information and agreements of the early and mid 1960's, as is illustrated with the decision to complete the Columbia-Quebec connector. As to Council's decisions on the Creek's future, they could do little more than avoid making decisions. The result was a game such as played at City Council on September 21, 1971 and October 5, 1971, of putting things off or making decisions distant enough to seemingly afford a future opportunity for reconsideration.

The October 5, 1971 Council meeting also saw the beginning of debate and City actions to stop people from polluting False Creek any more than it already was. A Board of Administration report to Council singled out Scott Poultry, Meyer Franks, Western Bridge, C.P. Transport, and Bay Lumber Company as polluters of the Creek. 131

It was felt that all but Meyer Franks, a barrel cleaning operation, would either be leaving the Creek or controlling the pollution problem in the near future. There was considerable debate as to what should be done about Meyer Franks, which had been warned several times in the past to clean up their operation, and had promised to do so. It was decided that their
business licence for 1972 would not be renewed.

On the 19th of October, 1971 Alderman Hardwick formally inquired at Council as to the status of the September, 1971 False Creek reports. The Director of Planning and Civic Development replied that the planning department report and the consultants report were expected in the near future.

The coming of November, 1971 brought the beginning of a debate over filling parts of False Creek. A newspaper article by Mr. Hall Lieren was the first public indication of inconsistencies in the planning of False Creek. Mr. Leiren in his article noted that two reports on future Creek development were soon to be released by the City.

It is understood the consultant report will recommend a halt to filling in the Creek, that it be developed as a people-oriented waterfront resource. However, a planning department source had leaked the information that the City report will recommend at least some filling be done but not completely out to the harbour headline.

The article went on to discuss how the harbor headline was moved further from the shore a few years earlier when an industrial future was planned for the Creek. This made more water area available or vulnerable to filling. The situation as it exists, points out Mr. Leiren, is that City officials say the situation has changed now that the intention is largely to make False Creek residential. They say there is no intention of filling in right up to the harbor headline.

However, it is worth noting that the City has not made any application to the Federal Government to have the harbor headline restored to its original position.
To add to the controversy the Marathon Realty Phase I proposal included filling in 29 acres of Creek water. At the same time the City was planning to fill in 3 acres of Creek water in completing the Columbia-Quebec connector. Mr. Lieren quoted Mr. Bill Curtis, Deputy City Engineer as saying in relation to the connector filling that

....three acres represents a very small portion of the 260 acres of water....Failure to complete filling would leave a small bay which would accumulate debris due to poor tidal action.

A reply to Mr. Curtis' statements came in Mr. Leiren's closing comment that

....as long as planning and engineering officials continue to think in terms of 'mud flats' and debris traps, rather than thinking of the Creek as an irreplacable waterfront resource, they will continue to think in terms of a nuisance that would best be eliminated.

In dealing extensively with Mr. Leiren's article, the intent was not only to set out the beginning of a controversy, but to show how a newspaper article can make a very strong case for or against something. In this instance the question of why the situation appears as it does must be asked, a question we have reflected on earlier in this chapter. It must also be noted that articles such as Mr. Leiren's carry enormous influence on public opinion and subsequent actions-reactions to the City and the City's plans. So great is this impact that it must be considered a part of the planning-decision-making process in False Creek.

At the November 23, 1971 Council meeting Alderman Bird referred to the filling in of False Creek and complaints which had been received
as a result. Alderman Bird felt that Council should take the necessary action in order to control the filling situation of the Creek. 139

In a discussion of the fill situation, the Corporation Counsel explained the legal position, where the owner of the waterfront land can apply to the owner of the water lots, the Federal Government in some cases, the Provincial Government in other cases, for a permit to fill in the water lot to the harbor headline. The City has no legal control over the granting of permits to fill water lots in False Creek.

On November 26, 1971 the City released to the public T.B.P. & P. progress report #3 on proposals for False Creek.

To the City Council meeting on November 30, 1971 the Board of Administration sent the following report:

In accordance with Council instructions regarding reports of outside consultants, it is noted that a report entitled "False Creek Proposals" has been received from the False Creek Study Group. This will be report on to Council in the near future. In the meantime, a copy of the consultant's report is made available to each member of Council to give maximum time for its study. 140

Council received the Board of Administration report for information; the September, 1971 consultants report had reached City Council.

Early December, 1971 saw the public release of the City Planning Department's September, 1971 report on proposals for the redevelopment of False Creek. Remembering that this report had been requested by City Council some eighteen months prior, took into account considerable past policy, an surfaced coincidentally the same as the T.B.P. & P. proposals report, it should not have been compared to the consultants report as though it held
the same status. A prime example of how the report was misinterpreted, and how newspapers can present a deceiving picture, was a series of newspaper articles in early December, 1971.

The articles stated that planners foresaw extensive filling of the Creek, continuous industrial development over the next 30 years, and that the planning department advocated filling in the Creek one week and no filling the next. All that in fact happened was the planning department, after seeing the consultant's report, decided to take a stronger stand on filling in line with what T.B.P. & P. were recommending.

One could question, however, the wisdom of the planning department releasing the report in light of T.B.P. & P. report #3.

The City, wanting to move toward actual redevelopment in the Creek, began searching for a means to achieve the residential-recreational-commercial ends envisioned.

To this end, City Council, on December 7, 1971, adopted four procedural recommendations on False Creek, along with the policy that the Standing Council Committee on Planning and Development consider the entire False Creek matter, including six functional recommendations put forth by the Board of Administration. (See footnote 143 for the six functional recommendations).

Included in the Board of Administration report dated December 2, 1971 was the Director of Planning and Civic Development recommendation that

...after having heard the views of the Planning Commission, the Parks Board, and the School Board, the Standing Committee on Planning and Development review the reports and recommend to Council acceptable policies to guide immediate and future development in False Creek.
With the acceptance of the procedural recommendations, a motion put forth by Alderman Hardwick was carried requesting the Director of Planning and Civic Development

....to report further on a method by which the City could gain control of the filling of future water areas, including, if necessary a revision of the Harbor Headline.145

On December 16, 1971, Council's Standing Committee on Planning and Development began discussions on False Creek as directed by City Council, and on December 21, 1971 presented a set of recommendations to Council.146 (See footnote 146 for these recommendations). The essence of the standing Committee's report was to outline more specifically, than had been done in the past, certain tasks and responsibilities in need of attention. Such things as the amount of open space, the population density for the Creek, possibilities for a development corporation, a design for Area 6, the maintenance of the water area, soliciting landowners' views around the Creek, and dealing with the railway situation appeared on the priority list of tasks.

On January 18, 1972, City Council established a special council committee on False Creek, as a result of a Board of Administration recommendation of December 7, 1971

THAT Council establish a special committee to discuss with the railway companies the matter of noise abatement, operating schedules and other factors considered detrimental to the quiet of the adjacent residential areas.147
and the Standing Committee on Planning and Development recommendation

That Council establish a special committee to discuss with the railway companies the removal of the line in the area. 148

The committee was made up of three Council members, Alderman Hardwick (chairman), Alderman Broome, and Alderman Sweeney, and was given the task of dealing with and negotiating for removal of the rail lines around False Creek. (See footnote 149 for the terms of reference of the committee). The terms of reference were open to revision by the committee itself, with the underlying intent that the committee would assist with redevelopment plans and help Council form policies for False Creek.

The committee evolved from Alderman Hardwick, supported by the City Manager, Mr. Sutton-Brown, suggesting such a committee be established, to Mayor Campbell. Using the rational that if the committee "bombed" in planning False Creek the opposition, Alderman Walter Hardwick would get the blame, and if it succeeded, Council as a whole would benefit, the mayor approved establishing the committee.

Responsibility for producing policy guidelines for Creek development was placed squarely on the shoulders of the newly established Council Committee, and it was to this end that Alderman Hardwick (chairman of the committee) turned his attention. Remembering that the Standing Committee on Planning and Development was, on December 7, 1971, instructed by Council to produce acceptable policy guidelines after consulting the Vancouver City Planning Commission, Parks Board and School Board, and that the Special Council Committee in taking over the responsibility for
producing policy guidelines was obliged to consider the opinions of the Commission and Boards, the first part of 1972 saw the Parks Board and the City Planning Commission actively studying False Creek. It was March, 1972 when signs of the Commission's and Board's efforts in studying False Creek began to reach City Council.

On March 7, 1972 a Parks Board request to be heard in delegation by City Council concerning space in False Creek for marina was referred to the Special Council Committee on False Creek after the Director of Planning and Civic Development reported that the consultant's report and the City planning department's report allowed for approximately 1,000 marina berths in the long term and that

> Decisions on the location, timing, method of development and operation of any permanent marinas in False Creek cannot be made until the consultant work is completed.\textsuperscript{152}

On March 7, City Council unanimously carried a motion asking the C.P.R. not to sign a 20 year agreement with B.C. Hydro for operating rights on the south side of the Creek and the Kitsilano Trestle, until Council's Special False Creek Committee had had an opportunity to discuss and make known their position on the term of the operating agreement.

As the Parks Board campaigned for marina space in the Creek, so they began campaigning for the inclusion of larger amounts of park area than were presently being planned. More specifically, Park Board Commissioner J. Malkin publicly criticized the lack of 'large' park open spaces and the proposed housing density.
On March 28, 1972 Council's Special False Creek Committee presented to Council, development guidelines for False Creek, based on previous studies, citizens replies to the development concept proposals and revisions of the Proposed Policies report from T.B.P. & P. of September, 1971. The guidelines were intended to "outline future development and redevelopment in the area and to influence development in a predictable way." Put another way, the report reflected the Committee's objectives to produce a policy document, have it passed by Council, and set up a system for planning and developing False Creek. City Council accepted the Committee's guidelines for information and adopted them in principle establishing a much needed yardstick on which to base decisions and set directions. (See footnote 157 for the policies adopted in principle).

While numerous requests and statements for more park in False Creek had appeared at various times, the thought of the City's 85 acres being 'all' park began to grow. The Parks Board in early April, 1972 had taken the position that all 85 City owned acres should be park. This stand seems to reflect the traditional Park Board stance of asking for more park area than they and everyone else feels is necessary feasible.

Toward the end of April, 1972 came the long awaited False Creek Study Group--T.B.P. & P. Report #4 and 5. Report #4 was a more detailed and concentrated projection of the previous report (Report #3) and will serve as a Policy Plan for the City owned land on the South Shore.
Report #5 was termed a call for proposals from the development industry for the implementation of physical planning and construction of a project strategically located on City land.

On May 16, 1972 the Consultant's Report #4 and #5 was received by Council with the resolution that

....the Vancouver City Planning Commission, the Special Committee on False Creek, and the Department of Planning and Civic Development prepare as quickly as possible a digest of the report for wide public circulation.

The consultant report made fifteen recommendations, representing a composite of the resolutions of Report #3, the proposals of Report #4, and the strategies of Report #5, aimed at creating a new, exciting urban environment for Vancouver.

While Report #4 and #5 had been making its way through the City Hall channels to Council, the question of the City needing an economic consultant had arose. Alderman W. Hardwick and City Commissioner Gerald Sutton-Brown had apparently discussed the issue at great length, and Alderman Hardwick had contacted Mr. D. Stucliffe, who had been Development Manager with Dominion Construction in B.C. for several years. Alderman Hardwick had talked with Mr. Sutcliffe in regard to economic consulting for the City as far back as November, 1971. Decision on an economic consultant was not pursued at that time beyond this stage. Instead another need was perceived within the planning department, and that was for development officer for False Creek. City Council, on April 25, 1972, approved a new senior position within the Planning and Civic Development Department.
specifically for the False Creek development, and as was noted in the Board of Administration report, April 21, 1972, to Council,

The individual filling this position should not be a planner but should be someone who has experience in the development business and has the ability to carry forward the work done by the Advance Planning and Research Division and the Consultants into actual development on the ground.\textsuperscript{161}

With the submission of the last consultant report the City began moving toward implementation procedures.

In an article in the \textit{British Columbia Business Journal}, Mr. D. Mann of T.B.P. \& P. discussed the consultants perspective on False Creek. It is significant to note that in response to the question of what should the False Creek Basin look like, Mr. Mann answered

\begin{quote}
In a nutshell it must be physically and physiologically clean like the suburbs; plus it must be socially and psychologically potent like the urban core.

The first criterion ensures biological survival; the second criterion ensures human survival.\textsuperscript{162}
\end{quote}

In the way of this 'honorable' end combining the 'best' of two worlds into one 'super' environment Mr. Mann identified two kinds of central problems, which as if predictive forces have come to be paramount in False Creek.

The first involves the fact that when economic issues are considered together with social issues, resolutions are bound to favor the former because we have time tested methods of dealing with money. We have not yet developed a methodology for dealing with social values.

The second kind of problems involve not what you do, but how you do it. To summarize these secondary issues--there are four: overcoming inertia of incumbent industrial use;
maintaining constant involvement with the public large; site preparation; development phasing and control. This latter point, phasing and control, is the critical factor of success. Phasing must be supersensitive to market conditions—control must be quality environmental control.163

For the remainder of this case study, it is worthwhile keeping these two kinds of problems in mind so as to appreciate with clairvoyance many of the occurrences. Thus between the Autumn of 1970 and May, 1972 the major thrust was the preparation of the consultant reports. Table 12 summarizes this period.
TABLE 12

RESUME: AUTUMN 1970 - MAY 1972

TREND:
- new image for False Creek
- moving from thought to conceptual policy

REPORTS
- 1971 Progress Report #1 - T.B.P. & P.
- 1971 False Creek Development, Marathon Realty
- 1971 Progress Report #2 - T.B.P. & P.; An Interim Report Towards a Development Plan for False Creek
- 1971 Progress Report #3 - T.B.P. & P.; False Creek Proposals
- 1971 Proposed Policies for the Redevelopment of False Creek
- 1972 Guidelines for False Creek Development
- 1972 Progress Report #4 & #5, T.B.P. & P., False Creek Proposals

MAIN PLAYERS
- Consultants Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners
- Marathon Realty
- City Planning Department
- Special Council Committee re: False Creek (Jan. 22)
- Alderman Walter Hardwick

RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS
- City hires Consultants
- Marathon Realty revises plans
- Consultant Reports #1 - #3
- long awaited Planning Department report confuses the issue
- Council approves completion of Columbia-Quebec connector
- Council establishes a Special Committee to prepare guidelines for Creek redevelopment
- City adopts policy guidelines from Special Committee for False Creek
- review process set in motion to take concepts and create plans for implementation

SCOREBOARD
- Creek direction definite
- basic policies set to include housing, park, marina etc.
- review planning process set in motion
COMMENTS - having chosen the consultant means of planning False Creek, the City received the reports and adopted policies - Council went through a period of making decisions without information

PERIOD TWO DISCUSSION

The planning decision-making process during this period can be divided into two basic phases. The first being the time when Council was waiting for the consultant reports to be completed and the second being the time when Council was beginning to initiate actions as a result of the consultant reports. The second phase was also a period of confusion arising from the planning department preparing a report which was not consistent with the consultant report directions Council was beginning to act on.

The process in the first part of this period (up to December, 1971) was typified by Council avoiding most decisions concerning the Creek. The reasoning for this was simply that Council, knowing the consultant reports were being prepared did not want to make decisions until alternate futures for the Creek were outlined.

In most part Council adhered to the avoiding decisions policy except in the case of the Quebec-Columbia connector. In this instance, on October 5, 1971, prior to either of the September, 1971 consultant or Planning Department reports reaching Council, they approved the completion of the connector. This approval of an industrially conceived and oriented road, even without the September, 1971 reports, was against the grain of planning for a residential-recreation Creek. The pitfall which character-
ized period one of this case study, where Council made decisions based on yesterday's policies, in spite of today's intent, continued into period two as Council demonstrated a lack of leadership and strength.

The second phase of the process during this period stemmed from consultant report #3. The report set out proposals aimed at creating a residential-recreational future for the Creek. Council, acting on the Director of Planning and Civic Development's recommendation began reviewing the policy report at its Standing Committee on Planning and Development, with the intent of determining acceptable policies to guide immediate and future Creek development. These considerations led to the establishment of a Special Council Committee on False Creek in January, 1972. The establishment of this Special Council Committee marked the first step in a series of organizational structure changes which led to planning for action as opposed to planning for decisions resulting in further planning. This fact is emphasized by Council setting up the Committee to produce guidelines so development could begin. Diagram 13 outlines the organizational structure for this period. These two phases of the planning decision-making process during this period were focussed on the politicians since they were the only active participants in the process. Outside the formal City process the consultants were writing their reports. The planning department was basically watching over the consultant workings and forwarding the reports to Council. They were also, however, preparing a report on the Creek which by this stage of the process was a negative rather than positive contribution to the process.
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The visible role of the planner and the planning department during this period was generally that of an administrative watchdog over the consultants. Behind the scenes that role was very different. Stemming from a request Council had made in April, 1970 for follow-up policies to the Development Concepts report of January, 1970, the planning department had continued to produce overall policies for the Creek while the consultants produced plans for area six. On the surface these two thrusts seem compatible and both necessary. The consultants used a draft copy of the planning department report as input to their reports. However, communication from the consultants to the planning department apparently did not occur. As a result the consultant and planning department both reported simultaneously in September, 1971, presenting different and incompatible policies. The planning department report, prepared by the long range planning division was based on previously established directions and was inconsistent with emerging directions being put forward not only by Council, the consultants and citizens, but also by the Assistant Director of Civic Development of the planning department who was part of the consultant team. It appears that where changes in policy occurred quickly, as they had through this period of Creek development, the planning department had difficulty responding and keeping pace. Where the planning department should have adjusted their planning for the Creek, they seem to have been unable or unwilling to recognize the fact that parts of the policy statement they were producing was no longer required or that it presented inappropriate directions.

The influence of the politician during this period was controlled by the information Council received to aid them in their decision-making.
During the early stages of the consultant workings Council received no previews or preliminary reports to aid them with interim decisions. This was due to the fact that the Board of Administration was filtering information and reports for Council. The City Commissioner, prior to the establishment of the Special Council Committee on False Creek, would hold smaller items which did not require decisions or action until a significant report or issue arose which warranted Council's time. This lack of information being passed through the process served to isolate the politicians. Friedmann in his discussion of transactive planning attributes much of the lack of plan implementation to the lack of communication between actors in the process.

In the later stages of this period when Council established the Special Council Committee on False Creek the communication problem was overcome and the resultant influence of the politician changed markedly. The political decision-makers by becoming involved in more of the planning aspects of the process were participating in information exchanges at the committee level, which afforded them the opportunity to deal with the Creek in more detail. The direct result of more participation in the process and better information exchanges were more informed decisions on the future of the Creek. Diagram 13 outlines the organizational structure which existed at that time, and illustrates the working relationship which was beginning to develop between the planners and the politicians.

The key to this period was the initiation of a constant information flow to and from the politician, which began to increase the politician's influence in and/or on the process.
The involvement of citizens during this period was minimal. Citizens were indirectly involved in Creek planning through Marathon Realty's study which confirmed a desire in people for inner city housing.

Insofar as citizens involved with the City, the only reference to the public came with the completion of the consultant reports. Council directed the planning department to prepare a brochure outlining the major points of the consultant work for wide public distribution.

PERIOD THREE: JUNE 1972 to NOVEMBER 1973

With the complete series of consultant reports in hand City Council directed the Special False Creek Committee to proceed with Granville Island and the railway issue, as well as "Investigate tangible ways and means of opening up space in the area for the public this summer." At the same time, Council directed City Staff, specifically the planning department, to report within 90 days on:

1. Establishment of a development program including proposals to secure developer performance.
2. Establishment of a staging plan with alternatives for those components which are not directly within control of the City.
4. A financing and income outline to include the desirability of leasing or selling the land.
5. Marketing proposals for the first stage.

On June 20, 1972 a report dated May, 1972 from the Vancouver City Planning Commission was presented to Council and referred to the Special Council Committee on False Creek for consideration. The report supported the concept of residential-recreational mix in the Creek to an eventual
population no greater than 30,000 people.

With the City Planning Commission, the Consultants T.B.P. & P., and the City Planning Department supporting housing in False Creek, only the Parks Board advocated no housing. On the Special Council Committee Aldermen Hardwick and Broome favoured housing on the City owned land, while Alderman Sweeney felt all 85 acres should be park. This park vs. housing debate replaced the long time industrial vs. residential-recreational debate, and was still alive and prominent in 1974.

After Council decided on the general direction of False Creek redevelopment, the trend moved toward action. The Federal Government announced through Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford a cost sharing program for studies on False Creek. Specifically the Federal Government announced that

C.M.H.C. is providing a $20,500 grant to assist the B.C. Central Credit Union with their feasibility study of a mixed residential-commercial-recreational complex on 10 acres of land on the south side of False Creek near the Burrard Bridge.

The Urban Affairs Ministry is funding the development of plans that will extend and support City of Vancouver plans for False Creek redevelopment.

The Federal Government is reviewing legislation regarding support for the relocation of railroad crossings.

With the Federal Government pledging support, the Credit Union put forth the third commercial-residential-recreational proposal, for area 10-of False Creek. Marathon Realty through these times maintained a low key approach of waiting for the City to decide on basic policies before pushing for actual development. The City, since being presented the
consultants Report #4 and #5 was deciding how to review and implement the reports. To this end the Parks Board on July 18, 1972 in a letter to Council dated July 6 asked Council to "engage a planning consultant to review the False Creek plans."

Also on July 18, 1972 a Department of Planning and Civic Development report to Council on the public pamphlet council had requested two months earlier, in May, stated that

This matter has been discussed at length by the chairman of the Special Committee and the Director of Planning. It was concluded that because of the nature of the work and because of the present very heavy workload on the department, the only realistic way to publish such a document was to retain outside help.

To this end, Council approved $9,000 to cover printing costs. The important point here, however, is that regardless of the reason, production of the public pamphlet which was requested 'as quickly as possible' had not even begun a full two months after Council had instructed the City Planning Commission, the Special Committee on False Creek, and the Department of Planning and Civic Development to prepare the pamphlet.

Early August, 1972 saw the leak of the 'in-house' debate over whether or not to create a special agency or development corporation to handle redevelopment of the Creek. City Commission Gerald Sutton-Brown and Planning Director Bill Graham argued that the redevelopment should be handled 'in-house', while City Planning Commission Chairman John Leckie and False Creek Committee Chairman, Alderman Walter Hardwick argued for a special agency.
The lengthy debate of issues such as this reflect the uncertainty which existed within City Hall concerning False Creek, and how to handle its redevelopment.

Over the course of the summer, the Federal Government, was reviewing legislation which would provide support for relocating railway track in areas such as False Creek and had indicated that such support would be forthcoming. In light of this, City Council authorized its Special Committee to select consultants to undertake Part I of the proposed railway study, at an expenditure not to exceed $10,000.

Staffing of the False Creek project became an important issue at that time. Mr. Don Hickley had been assigned to False Creek in July, 1972 with instructions to come up with plans for development from the T.B.P. & P. reports. Mr. Hickley was at this time the City representative on a joint study of Granville Island sponsored by the Federal Government. Shortly after being put in charge of False Creek Planning, Mr. Hickley hired a planner, Mr. Gordon Shanks, to assist him.

Together they began to tackle the False Creek problem, and together they realized the task was much too big for two people. The result was the request to Council for additional staff to form a special False Creek planning team.

The Director of Planning and Civic Development on October 3, 1972 presented a progress report on the Creek to Council. Very significant was the recommendation for an increase in planning staff, to form a Planning Team for False Creek. Council approved the hiring of five new planners specifically for False Creek.
Another recommendation approved was

That the City Engineer be instructed to investigate methods of obtaining Federal or Provincial assistance through a Winter Works or other similar program for a clean-up of City owned lands in Area 6 and 10 in False Creek and any other preparatory work that might be suitable.

There are two important facets to Council directly requesting involvement in False Creek from the Engineering Department. One is the City beginning to discuss the question of funding redevelopment of the Creek, looking specifically at Winter Works and railway relocation money available from the Federal Government. The other important point here is that in light of the newly approved positions in the planning department's False Creek Team not having been filled, the planning department did not offer sufficient staff to handle the tasks; therefore the engineering department was called upon, and for the first time in several years the planning department, was not the only civic department involved in False Creek redevelopment.

The engineering department became an active participant in the Creek process, with Deputy City Engineer Mr. Bill Curtis in charge. The planning department, especially the advanced planning and research division, was losing control of long range planning for the Creek, not only to the engineering department, but also to Mr. Hickley, a reality which did not sit well with that division.

At the same time as Council was instructing the engineering department to pursue the funding issue, City Council formally approved the
funds for the planning department's staff to handle redevelopment of False Creek. Don Hickley was formally named False Creek coordinator, to head the new staff.

As a result of Council's deliberations and news coverage which stemmed from them, general public interest in the Creek began to grow again. The Vancouver Composite Committee, made up of representatives of various volunteer community organizations sponsored boat tours of the Creek as part of their annual series of programs dealing with development of the City. More than 400 people took advantage of the water tours to see the Creek first hand.

Following these tours, held on the Thanksgiving weekend in early October, False Creek was the subject of a Channel 10 Plan Van show. This program was sponsored by the Community Planning Association of Canada, an organization of individuals concerned with planning.

During the same week False Creek was the topic of a Judy LaMarsh open line radio show. Considering the boat tours, the television program and the open line show, the future of False Creek was gaining considerable public awareness and interest. (The author was involved in this series of activities).

Toward the end of October, 1972, the Granville Island Committee, consisting of officials from the Urban Affairs Ministry, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the National Harbours Board, and the City of Vancouver released, through Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford, the Granville Island Report. This report dealt with the industrial realities of the Island, such as the lease terms, and ended by proposing the Island be an urban park.
With Granville Island being Federally owned, winter works money and railway relocation funds being Federally allocated, the importance and presence of the Federal Governmental was beginning to become more evident; a presence which while remaining somewhat low-key could well be the most critical quantity in redeveloping the Creek. For without Federal funds and cooperation, not only could the City not afford to redevelop the Creek, but it could not change the industrial nature of Granville Island.

Almost lost in the works at City Hall, the public pamphlet requested in May, 1972 by Council was receiving finishing touches, soon to be released to the public.

The situation in the Autumn of 1972 consisted of the planning department handing False Creek to Don Hickley to transform the general concepts and plans into specific policies and directions; the engineering department with Bill Curtis seeking winter works money from the Federal Government for a seawall which had not at this point been planned to coordinate with other possible Creek land uses.

In the 1972 Civic Election False Creek became an election issue with the eventual winning party TEAM using a platform of promising to building in False Creek within two years. It is noteworthy here that TEAM was very much a reform party based on ideals such as citizen participation and local area planning. The roots of TEAM seem to have been based in the academic world, as four of the TEAM candidates elected were U.B.C. professors.
On November 7, 1972 a communication from the Parks Board was presented to Council, requesting that a member of the Parks Board be appointed to the False Creek Committee. In spite of the fact that Park Board officers are elected just like Council, a motion by Alderman Wilson was carried,

THAT a member of the Park Board be invited to attend meetings of the False Creek Committee on an ex officio, non-voting basis.179

Once again the Park Board had officially been effectively denied a formal say in planning False Creek.

In mid-November, Marathon Realty suggested a scaled down plan for residential development along the north shore of False Creek. Where Marathon had suggested 20,000 people in April, 1969, 14,000 people in March, 1971, they now proposed 9,000 people. The scaling down of the development was a result of Marathon eliminating any land fill of the Creek waters, an issue which had met with opposition in earlier Marathon proposals.

One day in December should be the resume title of False Creek happenings in December, 1972. The day was December 19th, at which time City Council received Part I of the Railway Study, the long awaited public pamphlet, and an engineering department report on funding for seawall development. The railway study report was in the form of a brief prepared by Acres Consultants on behalf of the City for presentation to the Canadian Transport Commission. The intent was to secure funding from the Commission for an in-depth study of the rail situation. The public
pamphlet requested in May, 1972 as a digest of T.B.P. & P. Report #4 and #5 for public information and distribution, was presented to Council, with the suggestion that the Executive Coordinator of the Vancouver City Planning Commission, Mrs. Hilda Symonds be placed in charge of contacting organizations, organizing meetings with the public, collecting feedback on the pamphlet, and preparing a summary report of public reaction. The pamphlet was received and Mrs. Symonds placed in charge of the feedback process. The engineering department report on funding for False Creek redevelopment dealt specifically with monies available to construct a seawall. Council accepted the report and instructed the City Engineer to pursue the issue.

The new year, 1973, brought a different Council and promises of action in developing False Creek. The TEAM dominated Council had used as one of its election platforms "building something" in False Creek. The call was for action.

Two TEAM members elected, Mayor Phillips and Alderman Hardwick, were among those who, as early as November, 1969, supported redevelopment of the Creek to residential-recreational uses.

The first actions the new, somewhat inexperienced Council (seven out of eleven were rookies) took, which had marked impact on False Creek were the firing of City Commissioner Gerald Sutton-Brown and Planning Director Bill Graham, within a month or so of one another. The firing of Sutton-Brown changed the entire power-decision making structure around City Hall, a topic which will be discussed at the end of this period.
While the new Council was getting its feet wet, Don Hickley was assembling the False Creek Planning Team. A site office was approved on the City owned south shore of the Creek, from February 1, 1973. The Team consisted of Neil Griggs, a planner; Gordon Shanks, a planner; Ed Roffey, an Urban Land Economist; Pat Lau, an architect; Craig Campbell, a landscape architect; and False Creek Coordinator Don Hickley, an architect. The aim was to establish a well-rounded, multi-disciplinary team, capable of reviewing T.B.P. & P. work. The False Creek Team's terms of reference were basically to review the T.B.P. & P. reports, and outline a plan for the City owned land of Area 6. It should be remembered here that the planning team was new to the False Creek issue, and in essence had to spend considerable time orienting themselves prior to carrying out any actual planning.

While the team was being assembled, Council heard reports and discussed the seawall and Area 10 between the Granville and Burrard Street Bridges. City Council, on January 16, 1973, voted to allocate $1.25 million toward building a seawall in Area 6 if the Federal Government would come up with the other $2.25 million needed.

The Special False Creek Committee held a closed-door meeting in mid-January to hear a report on Area 10 from the consultants for the study, T.B.P. & P. The use of the area was outlined as mixed residential and commercial with water orientation.

Later in January the long awaited public brochure outlining the consultant proposals was presented to Council. The brochure was released to the public in mid-February.
City Council on January 30, 1973, noted that the Special False Creek Committee had written to the National Harbours Board requesting that no existing leases be extended, and recommended

that a formal approach be made by the Mayor to the National Harbours Board requesting that the land now under lease to Francis Millerd & Co. be turned over to the City for a nominal sum for development as a park and/or open space.\footnote{186}

By February, 1973 the False Creek Team was assembled, and on February 21st began a five day orientation trip in San Francisco. The orientation trip was aimed at providing the Team with first hand information on developments in San Francisco which are very similar to possibilities in False Creek.

On February 27, 1973 City Council reinforced the March, 1972 policy of no more log booming west of the Cambie Street Bridge. This action came in the face of an application by Mr. Eric Sonner, president of Bay Forest Products, for a 5 year lease on the log storage area mid way between the Cambie and Granville Bridges, on the north side of the Creek. Only one week earlier Mr. Sonner had received approval in principle of the lease from the Special False Creek Committee. \footnote{188}

Also on February 27 Council unanimously approved the motion that notices to vacate be given to tenants of the VIEW buildings as of June 15, 1973, West Coast Salvage as of October 31, 1974, and Clays Marina as of October 31, 1973. \footnote{189}

A further action taken by Council in February was to approve sharing the cost of a Local Initiatives Project to clean up around False
Creek, at an expense to the City of $51,537. (This grant helped create False Creek Park, a temporary people place used for the public program in the summer of 1973).

While Council was moving to approve guidelines and plans for the Creek as soon as possible, and the planning department was assembling the False Creek Team, the Vancouver City Planning Commission was busy with the task of holding meetings and setting out a public involvement program for False Creek. One such meeting was held on February 15, 1973 in the auditorium of the Vancouver Real Estate Board as part of the "on-going" public program.

The advertised purpose of the meeting was to discuss ways in which the people of Vancouver might be encouraged and assisted to participate in the planning of False Creek.190

By March, 1973 the False Creek Team was beginning to catch up on the False Creek situation, and in a meeting March 16th with the Special Committee on False Creek agreed on the following objectives for the Team.

a. Develop basin guidelines to a general level.
b. Formulate a basin plan based upon agreed guidelines.
c. Develop sub area guidelines for each sub area to a level whereby they can be operationalized as development criteria.
d. Formulate sub area plans based upon basin and sub area guidelines and the uniqueness of the sub areas.191

It serves well to remember these objectives for the False Creek Team as considerable controversy arises later in 1973 concerning the success or failure of the Team. About the time False Creek Team began to settle into its tasks, a new, important variable appeared in the person of
Mr. Doug Sutcliffe. Apparently Alderman Hardwick's Special Committee had, through discussions with Mr. Sutcliffe, arranged for him to act as per diem consultant on development matters until October, 1973, when he would take over redevelopment of the City owned land in Area 6 as the City's development consultant. This move cast shadows over the position of False Creek Coordinator held by Don Hickley, as Doug Sutcliffe seemed to represent 'big brother' overseeing the process.

At this point in time, planning for False Creek was in the hands of the False Creek Team, with some specific consultant tasks being handled through the engineering department. Attention began to focus on the problem of involving the public in planning False Creek. The Vancouver City Planning Commission was outlining a public program, as mentioned earlier, some citizen feedback was coming to the Special Committee and the False Creek Team. However, none of these avenues really involved people to an extent acceptable to the citizens themselves. To remedy this situation, the Planning Commission, on request of City Council, set about selecting citizens to form a review panel for False Creek plans. The aim here was to choose citizens with some specific expertise which would benefit the review of Creek plans. At the same time plans were being laid by the City's Social Planning Department, a separate department from the City Planning Department, to conduct an "active" public involvement program around a public space being created in Area 6. Social Planning's program included an on-site information office, displays, recreation events and such; things aimed at attracting the public to the City owned land, and exposing them to the possibilities which exist. Throughout the Spring, these two public involvement programs were being set up, independent of each other and from the
False Creek planning team.

While the City was spending considerable time discussing marinas on their side of False Creek, Marathon Realty presented a marina proposal for 393 boats to the Special False Creek Committee and to Council, and received approval in principle.

Toward the end of April, word came from Ottawa that the City's application for $2.3 million for the False Creek seawall had been approved. Shortly afterward it was announced that work would begin in December, 1973 on the seawall. This was prior to final planning decisions on the uses and shape of Creek development being made.

As could be expected from the City's intention to involve citizens in planning the Creek (Vancouver City Planning Commission setting up a review panel and Social Planning a public program) public reaction, comment, and activity concerning False Creek began to grow. Influencing public opinion and leading the way in situations offering a hint of controversy newspapers, in this case the Vancouver Sun, came down critically without understanding the situation. Specifically an article in the Vancouver Sun by Hal Leiren raked TEAM Council members over the coals for a lack of action, specifically citing Council's indecision as hindering False Creek redevelopment by holding up Marathon Realty's marina development. The article placed blame for this on the False Creek Team which in the words of Mr. Leiren "seems pathologically afraid of sticking its neck out on anything. So far it has done little but recommend more studies". In retrospect it is fair to state in defence of the Team that first they had only been involved in the Creek a couple of months, and that secondly they
were hired to review T.B.P. & P. reports over a period more in line with six months, not to make recommendations on development permit applications. Also active at this time, the False Creek Citizens Coalition mainly residents of the Fairview Slopes, made presentations to the Special Committee, signalling their desire for involvement.

During this period the False Creek Planning Team reported directly to the Special Council Committee on False Creek. This was a change from the procedure of reporting through the planning department and the Board of Administration.

June brought a False Creek progress report from the Planning Team, outlining what had happened and would be happening in the Creek. The report was intended also to "provide perspective to the Guidelines report soon to be released."

Prior to the Guidelines report, came an announcement from the Federal Government that responsibility for development of Granville Island has been transferred from the National Harbours Board to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This move effectively saved the City from having to deal with the National Harbours Board, which had been a formidable task in the past, and painted a future for the Island which promised to be compatible with the City's plans.

Then came the False Creek Policies and Actions report from the False Creek Team. It was greeted by a headline of "Report muddies the water", and raised questions concerning the amount and type of housing as well as the income mix of future residents of the Creek. The report was intended to "provide the basis for, and lead to actual development". It included a review of previous work, an outline of policies
for adoption or consideration and indications of actions which should be taken. Upon presentation to City Council on July 3, 1973 heated debate arose over what housing mix was appropriate for all lands comprising the False Creek Basin. Alderman Harcourt (a young, socially concerned "storefront" lawyer) favoured a mix stressing middle and low income groups, Alderman Bowers, a professor of engineering at U.B.C., favoured a mix patterned after that of the Greater Vancouver area, while socialist lawyer Alderman Rankin favoured low income and/or "working" people. No decision was made on housing mix at the July 3rd meeting. The Vancouver City Planning Commission was requested to get views from the public and report back to Council by September 15, 1973. Council did approve at this meeting, a standard of 5.81 acres of parkland for each 1,000 population throughout the Creek Basin.

July, 1973 saw the opening of an "instant park" on part of Area 6 as the focal point of the Social Planning Department's public program. The program was just beginning to create interest when the staff coordinator was fired for going beyond her terms of reference and trying to gather citizen input to alter the False Creek Team's planning.

It was not so significant that the coordinator was fired, but that the publicity which ensued was in large part negative. Over the course of the summer the entire program suffered from a lack of understanding of the planning issues unique to the Creek, and a lack of information to give to the public.

In light of the debate over housing or park for the City owned Area 6 lands and the recent Council discussion, the recently defeated and now minority on Council Civic Non-Partisan Association (NPA) publicly took
the position that no housing should be built on City owned land between the Cambie and Granville Street Bridges along the south shore of False Creek. The NPA stated that the lands should be "designed and planted as the finest public park and gardens in the Western World."  

As the summer progressed, so the demolition of the once very controversial VIEW buildings progressed. Recalling the Autumn of 1969, the then Mayor Campbell stated that VIEW would become a dead monument to the obstructionists on City Council. Almost as if Campbell had the power to make VIEW such a monument, the abandoned (partially used for minor activities) structure over the years became a symbol of the City's inability to do anything in False Creek. The feeling among City Officials was that until VIEW was gone the City could not proceed in False Creek redevelopment. It is not surprising then, that the VIEW structures caused one final controversy in their last moments. The essence of the final debate was one of trying to preserve at least one of the large structures, and use it for a market place or other people activity. Needless to say, because the structures were symbolically "evil" to the City, and protests came very late in the game, (after contracts were let etc.), they were torn to the ground, in the name of progress, action, and redevelopment of False Creek.  

In another corner of City Hall the Planning Commission through Executive Coordinator, Mrs. Hilda Symonds, was pursuing the Council directive to establish a Review Panel for public discussion on the residential section of the land use portion of the False Creek Policies and Actions Report. Where the Planning Commission was directed to have the public review residential policies, the False Creek Committee was similarly directed to establish, in consultation with the Planning Commission and the
Parks Board, a Review Panel for Open Space. No matter what the original resolutions, the Planning Commission set up both review panels, one to review and recommend open space amounts for the Creek, and the other to determine a desirable income mix and implementation strategy for that mix. (See footnote 204 for the list of people on each panel). It should be noted that these review panels were not originally designed to be "general" citizen participation, but rather were seen as an opportunity to have select specialists from various disciplines comment on and contribute to the False Creek plans. From mid-July to mid-September the panels met amongst themselves, and with the False Creek Team, in a process of working (verbal) inputs to plans being drawn up.

While the review panels carried on, the Social Planning Department's public program continued, centering around the newly created, temporary park in Area 6. Part of the activity at the park was an Opportunities For Youth funded "Image Survey" conducted by U.B.C. Architecture students under the direction of Stan King. By using a visual medium of sketches, approximately 1,000 people made known their preferences for False Creek. The end result of this work was a report resume-interpretation of the findings. Some of the most popular images included cycling, outdoor concerts, lunch in the park, waterside market, farmers market, marina and sailing, and lagoon boating.

While the City found itself wrapped in housing debates, review panels, public programs, seawalls and such, B.C. Central Credit Union and Marathon Realty were actively trying to work out final plans suitable to the City. The problem was that the City did not have its complete set of basin guidelines and sub area plans, and therefore was on one hand stalling these
these two developments while on the other hand trying to encourage them. Add to this the efforts of CMHC to phase industry out of Granville Island and you have a situation where numerous isolated energies present themselves, working to improve and develop sections of the Creek. While the City listened to the participating agencies, the reality of the situation offered little more than frustration.

Lost in the excitement and confusion of the summer was the City's activities on the Fairview Slopes. Remembering that T.B.P. & P. had strongly recommended the Slopes and Flats become one community, the City had hired a U.B.C. Planning student (the author) to assess the problems, set out the necessary background information, and make recommendations aimed at facilitating revisions to the CRM-2 and CRM-3 residential-commercial mix zoning. The Slopes at this time suffered from a problem of diminishing numbers of houses, more commercial buildings, and politically aware and active residents. During the summer, a second planning student was assigned to the Slopes. The two students spoke with the majority of the business establishments, and many of the resident people in outlining an information base, critical issues, concepts for development, a sketch plan and recommendations. However, no actions were taken at this time to remedy the Slopes problems.

With the end of the summer came the end of the VIEW buildings and the Social Planning Department's Public Program. Still active were the Review Panels, the housing debate, the False Creek Team, and the engineering department's seawall planning.

Marking the end of the summer was a seminar on False Creek in which Mr. Brahm Wiesman, Acting Director of the Community and Regional
Planning School at U.B.C. set out in his address, two scenarios;

In one he said a developer might come along and promise a Hilton Hotel, a 40-storey office building, a discount store, Canada's largest automobile showroom and a 500-berth marina in exchange for development right to the City land. If that scenario doesn't develop, he said, there will be increasing pressure for False Creek to be turned into merely open space for parks....207

Professor Weisman's second scenario of pressures for open space was to become more than simply an academic statement, as the controversy which was to arise in the Spring of 1974 over park versus housing would attest to.

On August 28, 1973, Council unanimously approved that the Parks Board

....operate a marina on the south shore of False Creek adjacent to sub-area 6 and that the Parks Board be requested to appoint a consultant on marina design to start work with the False Creek Team at the earliest possible moment.208

Recalling that City Council on July 3, 1973 postponed making a decision on housing in False Creek until September 15, 1973, in light of considerable debate, it is not surprising that a major controversy erupted at the end of September, 1973 when Council's special False Creek Committee had not presented the False Creek Team's plans for area 6 to Council for final decisions.

A game of pass the hot Creek potato was played, as is evidenced through newspaper articles alone. (See footnote 209 for a few references).
September brought an end to the activities of the Planning Commission's Review Panels. Since the review panels were made up of citizens with expertise in housing and open space the intent was for the panels to have a 'working' input to the planners during the summer. The panels went to considerable lengths in discussing housing and open space in False Creek, though they never really tackled the residential section of the Policies and Actions Report, as Council had requested of them. The Planning Commission pushed for a consensus report for a final output from the panels. This was contradictory to the basic nature of the panels assembled. People were chosen for their diverse interests and expertise, indicating that their ultimate conclusions might never be expected to form a consensus. The fact that the panels really did not provide the anticipated input tends to indicate that they fell over the traditional False Creek stumbling block of lack of direction and in this case perhaps guidance.

The final judgment on the citizen involvement activities of the City over the Summer of 1973 was somewhat cool, with the review panels 'tripping off' into philosophical discussions, and the on-site public program of Social planning suffering from a lack of knowledge and understanding of False Creek.

Throughout the Fall of 1973 the engineering department, in cooperation with the False Creek Team designed a seawall for area 6, which led to considerable discussion over how the seawall could be built before plans for area 6 were complete.

October brought a series of reports from the engineering department to City Council, concerning the seawall. Authority to tender prices, stockpile material on site, apply for further grants from the Federal
Government for dredging marina sites, and finally, unanimous approval of the location and design of the seawall.

With November came word that final Creek Basin policies and development plans for area 6 would be coming to City Council on November 20th. In light of this the Vancouver City Planning Commission submitted a report representing the public opinion they had found over the summer, and which they had fed to the planners as a working input, to Council less than a week before the planners reports were to be submitted. The first recommendation in this Planning Commission report stated that

The False Creek Basin should be primarily established as a public place, rather than a series of private neighbourhood enclaves.

and that Area 6 should be

a major open space with low-rise public use structures.

While the intent of this report was unquestionably good, its timing served only to make it appear that the planners had drawn up plans without the Planning Commission input, and that City Council was making a decision without the information they had requested on July 3, 1973. The Planning Commission did meet once with the False Creek Planning Team earlier in the process, as a working input to Creek planning.

Then, on November 20th the planning reports on area 6 came before Council, and without the usual amount of confusion and indecision received unanimous approval. The Basin policies were now a "set". Area 6 plans offered four development alternatives, the second of which, a family residential scheme with a significant open space, was recommended by the planning
team, and accepted by Council. As well as adopting a plan for area 6, Council directed Doug Stucliffe to "prepare detailed procedural plans for the physical, social and economic development for the first stage" of area 6 development, and for the Director of Planning to "make application to rezone the lands involved in the first phase of the development".

One week after Council had approved plans for area 6, Council approved a trunk sewer line and water main to service the proposed development.

By the end of this period the City owned land of area 6 in False Creek had policies, a plan, and the makings of a seawall and marina. This period between June, 1972 and November, 1973 is summarized on Table 14.
TABLE 14
RESUME: JUNE 1972 - NOVEMBER 1973

TREND
- concept policy to development guidelines
- park vs. housing controversy for City land
- trend toward action

REPORTS
- 1972 False Creek Progress Report
- 1972 False Creek: A Public Information Report
- 1972 Granville Island Study
- 1972 False Creek Railway Study: Part I
- 1973 False Creek Proposed Land Use Planning for Area 10
- 1973 False Creek Soil Study
- 1973 False Creek Progress Report
- 1973 False Creek: Policies and Actions
- 1973 Fairview Slopes Summer 1973
- 1973 False Creek Image Survey
- 1973 Report on False Creek Development
- 1973 False Creek Policies
- 1973 Area 6: the development opportunity

MAIN PLAYERS
- Alderman Walter Hardwick and Special Council Committee
- Mr. Don Hickley, City Planning Department
- False Creek Planning Team (February, 1973 on)
- Mr. Bill Curtis, City Engineering Department
- Marathon Realty and B.C. Central Credit Union

RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS
- Engineering Department leaves advisory role, taking on active role in Creek redevelopment
- Don Hickley enters Creek picture to take concept reports toward specific policies and directions
- Marathon Realty scales down residential proposal to 9,000 people
- City produces public pamphlet
- new Council elected
- firing of City Commissioner Gerald Sutton-Brown and Director of Planning, Bill Graham
- assembly of False Creek Team
- consultants outline plans for Area 10
- City hires Mr. Doug Sutcliffe as consultant full-time as of October, 1973, per diem till then
RESUME: JUNE 1972 - NOVEMBER 1973 CONTINUED....

RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS CONTINUED....

- Planning Commission runs review panels
- Policies and Actions debated by Council, final decision on housing put off
- Instant park in False Creek with public involvement program
- Protest over demolition of VIEW
- Council approves final basin policies and Area 6 plans.

SCOREBOARD
- Basin wide policy guidelines complete
- Much concern, striving for direction and action

COMMENTS
- Push for development came in light of considerable uncertainty over what should be done with City land
- The park vs. housing debate never settled, especially in the eyes of the public
- Too much concern for action by politicians
- Danger exists of 'moving too fast' into development. A new problem for False Creek
- Lots of 'token' non-fruitful citizen foo-for-rah
PERIOD THREE DISCUSSION

The planning decision making process during period three focussed heavily on action but did not achieve the interactive level of planning Friedmann refers to as transactive planning. While the implementability of plans is the main aim of action planning the interpersonal relationships of the planning process as a continuum is the focus of transactive planning.

During this period it cannot be questioned that achieving action was the focus of the process. The politicians, having been elected on a platform of building in False Creek within two years, moved quickly to create a workable planning process. The False Creek Team was established, the Director of Planning and the City Commissioner were fired and a development consultant was brought into the scene. The organizational structure of this period is outlined in Diagram 15.

Was it the changes in the organizational structure or was it something else which moved False Creek quickly through planning and into the implementation phase of the process? The traditional City Hall channels of bureaucracy were abandoned in favor of assembling all the resources necessary to deal with False Creek in a mini-process. In the 1973 Creek process, plans were produced by the False Creek Team and related directly to the Special Council Committee on False Creek. Where input was required from other bodies the Council Committee acted in a coordinating role. The key element here is that with the Council Committee coordinating the process, and being intent on action, any input which was not necessary for action was effectively by-passed. Examples of this are the Social Planning Department's public information program and image survey, and the Planning
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Diagram 15 False Creek Organizational Structure 1973
Commissions review panels and public program. Taken one step further, not only were some actors in the process by-passed but the actors included in the process were not directly linked. The False Creek Team and the Development Consultant worked on the Creek, reported directly to the Council Committee, but did not work together. It is this lack of all the actors being involved, and the lack of communication between the various actors in the process which illustrates why the False Creek process was not an example of Friedmann's transactive planning.

However, with the intent of this process focusing on implementation, the False Creek process was a good example of planning for action. It was the TEAM commitment to action which focussed enough necessary energies to make False Creek appear as a smooth running efficient process. The reality of the situation was simply that the political domination of the process was sufficient to achieve action where no action had occurred for thirty years prior.

The role of the planner and the planning department during this period of Creek development shifted from the administrator-watchdog role discussed in period two, to a more active role as interpreter and plan developer. The significant aspect of the planner's role during this period was the specific terms of reference under which they functioned. The planners were directed to produce actionable plans. This reflected very closely the general orientation of the process toward achieving action as opposed to concepts or directions.

One very encumbering aspect of the planning team's role was the close involvement of the Special Council Committee on False Creek. Following the planning team's production of draft policies and actions the
Council Committee members spent two days at the site office reviewing and altering the plans.

This period shows the difficult position planners are placed in during a period of rapid change. Council, shortly after being elected to office, partially on a promise to develop the Creek created a special planning team. Before the team could be assembled, let alone assess and develop policies for the Creek, Council, wishing action had moved ahead of its advisors by making decisions which later added constraints to the planning process. The decision to build the seawall prior to finalizing area 6 plans is a case in point. Clearly, traditional and time consuming bureaucratic planning procedures appear inappropriate in periods of rapid change, as this period was.

The influence of the politician during this period was an important aspect of False Creek development. Where the politician participated in the process as a decision-maker in period one; and where he began to participate in planning aspects of the process toward the end of period two; the politician became the dominant force in the process during period three. During this period changes in the organizational structure created a situation where the politician through the Special Council Committee on False Creek had a subgroup of a department (the False Creek Team) reporting directly to that Council Committee. The traditional channels through the Director of Planning and the City Commissioner were no longer used for False Creek items.

Members of Council, through the Special Council Committee on False Creek in effect became the planners, legislators and administrators for False Creek.
While this involvement of the politician was the main factor to plans being actionable in 1973, it also served to place considerable question and controversy on the credibility of plans which were produced. This does not suggest that plans produced were not good, but that if planners and other participants in the planning decision-making process do not feel a professional job has been done in the production of plans, then the plans become statements of action for actions sake in the mind of the planner. In addition, they may receive less than enthusiastic support from staff directed to implement plans produced this way.

The political influence during this period, while facilitating implementable plans, dominated the process to the extent of forcing action for actions sake.

The involvement of citizens in this period was characterized by various activities either involving citizens or informing them. Following the series of consultant reports the City had received on the Creek, and prior to the public brochure outlining the consultant proposals being released, various citizens and citizen groups began a process of self-education. Very little information concerning the Creek had been presented publicly for a considerable period of time. Many citizens wanted to know what was happening. The boat tours, the open line radio show and the television program, all of which took place during mid-October, 1972 began to fill the information void. The next citizen action was the release of the brochure outlining the consultant report proposals. The brochure was released in December, 1973 along with instructions from Council that the Vancouver City Planning Commission should organize meetings to discuss the Creek proposals with the public and receive any comments which may result.
These meetings were held but generally turned out to be an inadequate vehicle to response to the consultant proposals. The results of this shortcoming was the establishment of two citizen advisory panels to review the proposals. While the intent of these citizen advisory panels was good the citizens who ended up participating were generally professionals who had some relationship to the subject being discussed. These panels then were very select citizen involvement, and certainly not general public response to the consultant proposals.

While the review panels were proceeding the City's Social Planning Department initiated a public information program to familiarize Vancouver residents with the Creek and the plans the City had for the lands surrounding it. This program saw the creation of a temporary park in area 6, aimed at drawing people to the site. Public activities such as walking tours, band sessions and education meetings were held on site. An image survey was conducted at this time for those who visited the Creek to determine what physical image or form people preferred around the Creek.

All of these activities did serve to heighten the public's awareness of the Creek. In fact the information-education program began to raise many people's desires to participate in the formulation of plans. A good example of this was the citizen protest which stemmed from the City moving to demolish the VIEW buildings as had been planned for considerable time.

The key realization for this period of the case study is that while the Social Planning Department was busy educating people, collecting feedback and encouraging people to participate, the False Creek team was formulating the policies and actions plans. In effect, the public's ideas
were being conveyed to agencies and departments not directly involved with the planning and development process.
PERIOD FOUR: DECEMBER 1973 to APRIL 1974

Following the approval of plans for area 6 two questions remained unanswered. The first one was financing; how could the City find the necessary funds to build on its land? The second question was administrative; what structure would be necessary to implement area 6 plans?

The funding question came before Council on December 7, 1973. The Director of Finance and Mr. Stucliffe recommended that:

The Minister of Housing be requested to petition CMHC on the City's behalf to authorize a loan of up to $10 million for the development of City-owned property in Area 6 of the False Creek Basin.220

Council approved unanimously the recommendation, along with a request that the Corporation Counsel look into the City's authority to borrow the stated funds.

Lost in the rush of activity toward development were three facts. First, Mr. Doug Sutcliffe became a full time development consultant for area 6 of False Creek on October 1, 1973; second CMHC, in late November, created a mini-park on two-thirds of an acre on the eastern tip of Granville Island adjacent to the City's area 6 development site; and third, that the decision was made on November 20, 1973 to dissolve the Special Council Committee on False Creek as of the end of 1973.

With the basin wide policy guidelines complete, and Doug Sutcliffe pushing for development of area 6, based on the concept plan adopted by Council on November 20, the False Creek Planning Team was disbanded. In its place the construction/development oriented False Creek Development Group under the Direction of Mr. Sutcliffe was established.
During this time the idea of enlisting three design teams to prepare plans for area 6 arose. The thought was for these teams to compete in preparing the designs, with the best one being implemented.

Ending the year, construction began on the area 6 seawall, and the Federal Government approved the City's application for a $10 million loan to aid redevelopment of the City's land in area 6.

Reflecting back for a moment, Marathon Realty was busy preparing their phase I development on the north shore of False Creek, and were actually involved in creating their marina just west of the Cambie Street Bridge.

January, 1974 was much like the calm after the storm, or in another sense the calm before the storm. Having survived the late 1973 controversies and problems, planning and development of the Creek appeared to be running smoothly. While the Special Council Committee on False Creek had been dissolved, chairman Alderman Walter Hardwick was still involved with the Creek as chairman of the Standing Council Committee on Civic Development. The Development Consultant, Mr. Doug Sutcliffe, was also made responsible to this committee.

February 5, 1974 brought a problem to City Council via the Director of Finance in the form of the City not having the authority under the Vancouver Charter to borrow $10 million from the Federal Government. After hearing the report, Council voted unanimously to have the Director of Legal Services and the Corporation Counsel prepare appropriate amendments to the Charter, for submission to the Provincial Government for approval.
February also brought the resignation of Craig Campbell, who had been landscape architect for the False Creek Team, and had designed the area 6 seawall. The significance of Campbell's resignation was not the actual resignation, but the minority report he submitted to the City and newspapers at that time. The report accused the City of deceiving the public and generally making "a blunder of classic proportion." Needless to say the newspapers thrived on the report (see footnote 223) and the "critics at large" continued their attack on City planners and officials.

Progress toward development was not to be deterred however, as on February 5, 1974 City Council approved three comprehensive design teams to draw up within two months plans for developing 38 City owned acres on the south side of False Creek. Council also approved a 20 member citizens' advisory panel to make recommendations on the latest phase of Creek development, and a procedure for public involvement in the selection of a design concept and identification of people interested in living in False Creek. Footnote 226 outlines the procedure the Development Consultant recommended and which was adopted by Council.

Throughout February and March, there came considerable questioning of the City's wisdom in building housing in area 6. So great was the public outcry that Council decided to hold a public meeting in the Council Chambers on April 2, 1974 to hear briefs on the City's plans. The meeting was held and the controversy of housing versus park stole the show. While the City had progressed from concept to requesting design teams to prepare housing plans, the public continued to press for park.
While discussions of park versus housing continued, the City had reached a definite milestone in Creek development. Plans for a residential recreational community/environment were being implemented on the City owned land of area 6 in False Creek. The emphasis had definitely shifted away from planning toward physical building. It is this shift in emphasis which marks the end of the case study which has focussed on the planning process. The period between December, 1973 and April, 1974 is summarized on Table 16.
### TABLE 16

**RESUME: DECEMBER 1973 - APRIL 1974**

| TRENDS | - hints of implementation  
|        | - City searching for financing  
|        | - full speed toward park versus housing development |
| REPORT | - 1974 Three design team reports for area 6 |
| MAIN PLAYERS | - Doug Sutcliffe, City Development Consultant  
|             | - Marathon Realty and B.C. Central Credit Union  
|             | - Engineering Department  
|             | - Consultant Design Teams |
| RESULTS AND HAPPENINGS | - Engineering Department begins construction of seawall in area 6 |
|                       | - Engineering Department begins finalizing trunk sewer and water lines in area 6 |
|                       | - Marathon Realty builds a marina |
|                       | - City moves to amend City Charter in order to borrow $10 million from Federal Government for redevelopment of area 6 |
|                       | - considerable public controversy over City's plans for area 6, along with publicity over False Creek Team member quitting |
|                       | - three design teams prepare plans for area 6 |
| SCOREBOARD | - some actual development |
|            | - no final plans |
|            | - much controversy |
| COMMENTS | - critical moment has arrived when City should spend time honestly and sincerely dealing with the public |
|          | - need for constant vehicle to handle citizen input and information |
PERIOD FOUR DISCUSSION

The planning decision-making process during this period began to withdraw from the total action orientation of period three. The Special Council Committee on False Creek was dissolved and the False Creek Planning Team was disbanded. This did not indicate a return to the traditional isolated stages of the pre-action oriented process but rather that orientation of the process had shifted from planning to development (implementation). The implementation organizational structure of 1974 is outlined in Diagram 17. The basic planning decision making process while involving different committees and groups was similar to the 1973 process outlined in Diagram two. The relationship where the False Creek Planning Team reported directly to the political committee level remained unchanged, other than the fact that the Planning Team was replaced by the Development Group.

At that point in time any plans which were necessary for area 6 development were produced by the development group. This meant that only actionable plans were produced by the people charged with the responsibility of implementing those plans.

The process while still focusing on action was concerned more with development during this period as the base planning had been completed.

The role of the planner and the planning department during this brief period in early 1974 was reduced to that of a spectator where the City owned lands of area 6 were concerned. Any planning decisions required for area 6 were studied by the False Creek Development Group and forwarded through the Standing Committee on Planning and Civic Development to Council.
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The role of the planning department for the areas aside from area 6 moved to a conceptual level similar to the days of much planning and no action anywhere in the Creek. The challenge for the planner in the remainder of the Creek is to maintain the positive thrust and residential nature of area 6 planning and development.

The influence of the politician during this period shifted toward that of a more traditional decision-maker who makes decisions on the information presented him by his staff, as opposed to the initiator, planner, administrator who participates in all aspects of the process. Evidence of this stems from the Special Council Committee on False Creek which dealt only with the Creek being dissolved in favor of a standing Council Committee which dealt with more issues than simply False Creek. Also, once physical development had begun in the Creek TEAM's election promise to the citizens of Vancouver had been fulfilled. The need for action to continue at such a rapid pace was no longer nearly so politically urgent.

The involvement of citizens in this period of Creek development focussed on citizens questioning the wisdom of housing in the Creek. The ad hoc protesting led to special meetings being arranged for citizens and Council to discuss the issue. While this was occurring, development was continuing in area 6. Any changes in plans had to be channeled through the Development Group who, realizing the need to involve the public, set out a very specific program of citizen participation and a citizen advisory panel. The intent was to focus any involvement on action rather than questioning past decisions.

Since this was only beginning at the end of this case study the
effectiveness of such a process could only be speculation. However, since development was the development group's terms of reference, there would be little room for citizen influence simply by the nature of the development process. Involvement of citizens is generally more possible and positive during the plan formulation rather than during the actual construction.
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RECOMMENDATION #1. The present area of water should be maintained. If it is necessary to fill any area, a similar area should be excavated to an equal extent.

RECOMMENDATION #2. The City should proceed in discussions with interested parties with the aim of securing control over the extent of the water area in the False Creek Basin.

RECOMMENDATION #3. The general description of land use as shown on the maps and tables on page 25 should be adopted.

RECOMMENDATION #4. The total eventual residential population of the basin should be within the limits shown on graphs on page 28, and should not exceed 30,000 persons.

RECOMMENDATION #5. Optimum land use should be determined before land value is assessed.

RECOMMENDATION #6. It should be recognized that land values will vary (according to the ability of the users to pay) in areas where land use intensity is a constant.

RECOMMENDATION #7. Controls should be designed to ensure some income groups are not 'forced out' by natural inflation of real estate value.

RECOMMENDATION #8. The temptation to secure short term cash benefits by encouraging 'high rise' speculation should be resisted.

RECOMMENDATION #9. Front end costs should be financed by ensuring long term high quality environment such that residents will be willing to spend a higher percentage of income for shelter.

RECOMMENDATION #10. Commercial and office activity should be encouraged in designated areas to help realize economic benefit to the basin and the City at large.

RECOMMENDATION #11. Quality environment should be incorporated in all parts of the development as proximity to the Core of the City in itself will not ensure economic success.

RECOMMENDATION #12. While terminal facilities may or may not impede ideal long range development, truck traffic will impede desired results in the first phases of south side development. Attention should be focussed on this problem.
RECOMMENDATION #13. Negotiations should begin with the railway companies with a view to planning for noise abatement, eventual route changes and conversion of some of the trackage to a form of local transit.

RECOMMENDATION #14. Automobile distribution systems in the False Creek Basin should be designed to respect a graduation of traffic intensity, thereby serving the recommended population without destroying the quality of life and the cohesiveness of the communities in the area. The range of intensity at community and neighbourhood scales should be from very quiet to very busy.

RECOMMENDATION #15. The final success of the effort to rebuild False Creek will be dependent upon adequate transit systems from both sides to the downtown area. Consideration should be given to the incorporation and integration of a local system which encircles the Creek.

RECOMMENDATION #16. In order to create a viable pedestrian domain, the development in the Basin should follow the recommendations of 3.21 Pedestrian Web Connects Urban Nuclei and 3.24 Pedestrian Paths Are Expanding Loops.

RECOMMENDATION #17. Continued efforts should be made to reduce, and ultimately remove, log booms from the False Creek Area.

RECOMMENDATION #18. A space on Granville Island, and a major open space at the east end of the Creek should be created as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATION #19. To ensure a variety of urban public spaces throughout every development, spaces should be integrated by means of linear park spaces connecting activity centres.

RECOMMENDATION #20. Negotiations should begin with railway officials regarding noise abatement; continued pressure should be brought to bear to relocate industrial use; continued efforts should be maintained to remove log storage in the Creek; and industrial waste dumping should be more diligently controlled.

RECOMMENDATION #21. Development policies should either encourage intensive development immediately adjacent to the bridges at sufficient scale to reduce the overwhelming effect of the bridges, or remove future development far from them.

RECOMMENDATION #22. In shaping the water area of False Creek, large bays should be located between bridge spans, rather than under or close beside them.
RECOMMENDATION #23. Small marinas should be encouraged in False Creek. They should be limited in size, dispersed along the water's edge and be restricted in their water coverage and use of the shoreline. Service facility for boat maintenance should be encouraged in the westerly end of the Creek. Boathouses should be forbidden in the Creek.

RECOMMENDATION #24. With reference to the Fairview Slopes it is recommended that an interim development procedure should be adopted until the consultant's work in the subsequent reports can be accommodated into a Policy Plan for the area. Specifically:

1. Change existing zoning in Area 7 from present industrial designation to low intensity residential occupancy; e.g. duplex and/or low density 2-storey row house designation.

2. Pursue the planning of the area as a whole, based upon the recommendations above for household distribution and population intensity (much of this can be done during the forthcoming work of Report #4).

3. Pending the completion of the framework planning, proposals which exceed the adopted new zoning should be judged on an individual basis. The assessment should be made by the extent to which such proposals successfully respect the concepts expressed in this report.

4. Adopt at its completion, the framework plan and declare a concept of physical community which will guide future development in the area.

RECOMMENDATION #25. The Slopes/Flats (Areas 6 and 7) should support a residential population range of between 12,000 and 13,000 persons, and between 6,000 and 7,000 households. Approximately 13% of the households on the Flats should be family households, and about 8% of the households on the Slopes should be family households.

We are also able to recommend the following land use proportions:

Area 6: (The water to 6th Avenue)
45.5 acres Res.; 3.0 acres Comm.; 21.0 acres Park;
4.0 acres School

Area 7: (6th Avenue to 8th Avenue)
42.3 acres Res.; 2.8 acres Comm.; 9.2 acres Park.

Area 8: (8th Avenue to ½ block south of Broadway)
8.3 acres Res.; 30 acres Comm.
RECOMMENDATION #26. The area on the north side of the Creek, between Burrard and Granville Bridges should be developed with accommodations and activity typical of an interchange area. Specifically, commercial, office, ferry, shopping and hotel facilities should be encouraged.

RECOMMENDATION #27. In Area 2 on the north side of the Creek (between Granville and Connaught Bridges) there should be 45.3 acres of residential use, 2.2 acres of commercial use, 11.0 acres of public park, 4.0 acres of school as required, and about 10 acres of circulation space. The range of family accommodation should be from 2% to 6% (the lower limits being feasible only if families have no young children), the range of population should be between 6632 and 7396, and the number of households between 4174 and 4875.

RECOMMENDATION #28. Special intensive study of the area east of the Connaught Bridge on the north side should be undertaken as soon as possible. The purpose of the study should be to determine possible land use in adjacent areas so that compatible use can be designed in the subject area.

RECOMMENDATION #29. Consideration should be given to the formation of a False Creek Development Corporation.

RECOMMENDATION #30. All or portions of the content of this report should be circulated widely to the citizens of Vancouver and various methods to obtain feedback from the proposals and ideas therein should be initiated.
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The six (6) functional recommendations are as follows:

(1) THAT Council accept the principle that the present area of water should not be materially diminished and request the Director of Planning and Civic Development to report further on a method by which the City could gain control of the filling of further water areas including, if necessary, a revision of the Harbour Headline.

(2) THAT the design of Area 6 (Fairview Flats) proceed immediately on the basis that the water area is not materially dimished and generally taking account of the 'patterns' contained in the Consultants Progress Report #3; and which the densities recommended by the Consultants for the first stage of development.
(3) THAT the Director of Planning and Civic Development bring in final recommendations to Council on the matters of the amount of open space and population density having heard the views of Council after receiving this report; this to be treated as a matter of urgency and bearing in mind the difference between the Consultants' Report #3 and the Policy Plan.

(4) THAT Council establish a special committee to discuss with the railway companies the matter of noise abatement, operating schedules and other factors considered detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of the adjacent residential areas.

(5) THAT Council receive the recommendation of the Consultants relative to the formation of a False Creek Development Corporation and direct the Consultants to report back in more detail. (Implementation of development proposals is the responsibility of the Assistant Director, Civic Development).

(6) THAT Council do not approve the Consultants' recommendation #24 for the interim rezoning of the Fairview Slopes and request the Director of Planning and Civic Development to report in detail on the partial rezoning to CRM-1 outlined in the Planning Department comments on recommendation #24 on Page 7 of Appendix I and as one of the alternative courses of action recommended previously.
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The Standing Committee's recommendations:

(a) that the Director of Planning and Civic Development report back to Council as soon as possible on the feasibility of adding Area 10 to the Consultants' terms of reference.

(b) that the request of False Creek Marinas Limited for the lease of the property commonly known as Girody Saw Mills be tabled pending the possible report by the Consultants on developmental proposals for Area 10.
(c) that the Board of Administration, the Director of Planning and Civic Development and the Consultants proceed with the development of an informational sheet and that such informational sheet be forwarded to land owners and land occupiers in the False Creek Basin requesting their comment.

(d) that the Planning Department be advised that Council approve in principle of the concept of the City of Vancouver setting standards for the development of City-owned lands for developers to respond to and instruct the Director of Planning to report back on the implications of the implementation of this proposed policy.

(e) that Council accept the principle that the present area of water should not be materially diminished and request the Director of Planning and Civic Development to report further on a method by which the City could gain control of the filling of further water areas including, if necessary, a revision of the Harbour Headline.

(f) that the design of Area 6 (Fairview Flats) proceed immediately on the basis that the water area is not materially diminished and generally taking account of the 'patterns' contained in the Consultants' Progress Report #3; and with the densities not greater than recommended by the Consultants for the first stage of development.

(g) that the Director of Planning and Civic Development bring in final recommendations to Council on the matters of the amount of open space and population density having heard the views of Council after receiving this report; this to be treated as a matter of urgency and bearing in mind the difference between the Consultants' Report #3 and the Policy Plan including the wide "see through".

(h) that Council establish a special committee to discuss with the railway companies the removal of the line in that area.

(i) that Council receive the recommendation of the Consultants relative to the formation of a False Creek Development Corporation and direct the Consultants to report back in more detail. (Implementation of development proposals is the responsibility of the Assistant Director Civic Development).
(j) that Council do not approve the Consultants' recommendation #24 for the interim rezoning of the Fairview Slopes and request the Director of Planning and Civic Development to report in detail on the partial zoning to CRM-1 outlined in the Planning Department comments on recommendation #24 on Page 7 of Appendix I and as one of the alternatives course of action recommended previously, such report to take into account the wide "see through" principle.
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The terms of reference for the Special Council Committee on False Creek.

1. absorb the functions of the Special Committee on Granville Island.

2. absorb the functions of the Special Committee on False Creek Consultants' Progress.

3. meet with the railway companies to seek the removal or relocation of the rail lines paralleling 6th Avenue; investigate other transportation problems and other roles.

4. deal with comments requested by Council December 21, 1971, after they have been presented to the Standing Committee on Planning and Development.

5. initiate discussions with property owners on the coordination of development in the False Creek study area.

6. assist in reviewing proposals for redevelopment of City land in such form as they may be received after the adoption by Council of policies which will stem from the consultants and Board of Administration reports on False Creek.

7. recommend amendments to these terms of reference as experience proves advisable.
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157. The development guidelines adopted in principle by City Council on March 28, 1972:

1. GENERAL

Future sub-area development should be judged against the following general guidelines:

Land Uses: residential, commercial, recreational. Industrial uses may be considered in relationship to central city requirements.

Environment: to be improved through new forms of design and mixture of compatible uses related to adequate open space.

Type of Development: comprehensive design to ensure viability without prejudicing development in adjacent areas.

Transport: an adequate street system to serve all expected traffic requirements within the area, to provide for future mass transit facilities, and to provide linking with adjacent areas.

Pedestrian Circulation: continuous throughout areas with separation from vehicular traffic wherever possible.

Shoreline: shall be accessible to the public and should be given an irregular alignment to permit widenings of the water basin for creation of bays, views and useable water frontage. All shoreline should be permanently stabilized when redeveloped.

Views: heights and bulk of buildings to be arranged to permit views for project residents, while also permitting optimum views of the Downtown profile and North Shore mountains from other adjacent City locations.

Public Open Space: to be designed sufficient in area, size and continuity to provide openness between building complexes, and to serve the area population.
Density: acceptance of any proposal shall be dependent upon the overall design meeting the criteria outlined above. The net density of each of the residential clusters of the approved design shall have the density specified in the criteria for the specific sub-area.

II. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Total Eventual Residential Population of all the sub-areas should not exceed 30,000.

The Population mix should not unduly emphasize on class or age group.

Residential Development should be grouped to afford a minimum area occupied by streets and provide ample open space between building complexes. May include studio, one, two, three and more bedroom units, in townhouses, garden apartments and multi-storey buildings.

Residential Buildings may incorporate other uses, such as local commercial, community facilities and day care centres.

III. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Commercial Development in family residential areas should be of district and local character as required. General commercial development may be permitted in other areas. Commercial development, including marinas, may be integrated with compatible uses.

IV. WATER AREA

A Water Area at least equal to that existing in January, 1972 in each Sub-area should be maintained. If some filling is required, an equal area should be excavated.

Marina Facilities should be limited in numbers, size and capacities in order to not overcrowd the Creek.

V. OPEN SPACE

Public Open Space: in the planning area it is intended that neighbourhood, community and public parks be provided relative to the population.
Public open space should be dedicated in each development in the amount of 2.0 acres per 1,000 of population. This public open space should not include areas of school grounds, marinas and open water, but may include all land used for neighbourhood and community parks.

Private Open Space shall be provided around all buildings in addition to the Public Open space and shall be at least equal to the yard and light angle requirements of the corresponding appropriate sections of the Zoning and Development By-law.

Public Open Space, if possible, should be continuous throughout the development permitting as much pedestrian separation from vehicular traffic as possible.

Public Waterfront Access: should be retained around the entire Creek and around Granville Island so as to connect the English Bay Beach area with Vanier Park. Such open space may include pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths and sitting areas.

VI. POLLUTION CONTROL

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

No discharge of pollutants shall be permitted.

Proposed uses causing either noise or air pollution should not be permitted.

VII. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

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

All Major Rail Facilities should be removed as soon as possible.
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204. **FALSE CREEK REVIEW PANELS**

   (1) **HOUSING**

   **MR. JOHN CUMING**
   Associate Manager, Property Investments, Great-West Life Assurance Company.

   **MR. JOHN D'EATH**
   President, Canadian Freehold Properties; National Vice-President, Community Planning Association of Canada; Vice-President, Downtown Business Association; Vice-President, B.C. Red Cross.

   **PROFESSOR WOLFGANG GERSON**
   Professor, U.B.C. School of Architecture.

   **MRS. ROSEMARY HAMILTON**
   Assistant Director, Social Policy and Research, United Community Services; Director, United Housing Foundation; Director, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

   **MR. JAMES HOUSTON**
   President, Community Builders.

   **MRS. ANN JARRELL**
   L.I.P. Project Coordinator for "Crossreach"; Resident of Fairview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DR. ROBERT KELLY</strong></td>
<td>Urban Sociologist, Faculty of Commerce, U.B.C., Director of the I.I.P.S. Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS. ANN McAFFEE</strong></td>
<td>Doctoral student, Community and Regional Planning, working on social implications of housing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. JOHN POOLE</strong></td>
<td>President, Dawson Developments Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. P.R.U. STRATTON</strong></td>
<td>Honorary Treasurer, Vancouver Housing Association; Director, B.C. Housing Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. TERRANCE TANNER</strong></td>
<td>Architect, Chairman, Greater Vancouver Chapter, Architectural Institute of B.C.; Chairman, Royal Architectural Institute, Task Force on Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2) OPEN SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS. COLIN BAKER</strong></td>
<td>Housewife; member of Civic Arts Committee, Community Arts Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. JOHN BULL</strong></td>
<td>Long time chairman, Parks and Open Spaces Committee of the Board of Trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. DAVID COX</strong></td>
<td>Member, Coast Floating Homes Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. MICHAEL CRAMPTON</strong></td>
<td>C.B.C Producer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. DARRYL FOREMAN</strong></td>
<td>Architect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. LARRY KILLAM
President, Town Group Realty Limited, Gastown.

DR. JOHN NEILL
U.B.C. Faculty of Agriculture; Fellow of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects.

DR. RICHARD SEATON
Environmental Psychologist, U.B.C. School of Architecture.

MR. JACK SHADBOLT
Artist.

MR. GERALD THOMSON
President, Building Owners' and Managers Association of Canada; Vice-President, B.O.M.A. International; President, Downtown Business Association, member of boards and committees of several community groups.

MRS. REBECCA WATSON
Former Parks Commissioner; Honorary Member, Save Our Parklands Association; Honorary Governor, Botanical Garden Association; member of several community groups boards or committees.
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The procedure for Public Involvement in the selection of a design concept and identification of people interested in living in False Creek, as outlined by the Development Consultant, Mr. Doug Sutcliffe.

1. Our schedule calls for the three design concepts with plans, models and perspectives to be completed by the 22nd of April.

2. The Citizens' Advisory Panel will provide advice to the design teams during the development of the three design concepts.

3. The three design concepts will be explained at Council 23rd of April to be attended by the Citizens' Advisory Panel, City staff, Park and School representatives, City Planning Commission.
4. The Citizen's Advisory Panel would be requested to prepare and submit to the Development Consultant evaluations including recommendations on the three concepts, for forwarding to the Director of Planning by 21st May.

5. Following the Council meeting 23rd April, the models and appropriate descriptive material of the three concepts will be displayed over a four week period at various locations around the City, during which time individual citizens will be invited to review the concepts and record their opinions. The Development Consultant will collect and summarize these opinions and submit them to the Director of Planning by the 21st May.

6. Following the Council meeting 23rd April, the Park Board, the School Board and the Vancouver City Planning Commission will be invited to evaluate the three concepts and submit their evaluation and recommendations to the Director of Planning by the 21st May.

7. Following the Council meeting 23rd April, the Director of Planning will commence an internal evaluation of the three concepts following the normal process with the Technical Planning Board, Design Panel etc. This review should be complete by 21st May.

8. Following the 21st May the Director of Planning will summarize for report to Council the internal and external inputs as described above.

9. The various recommendations and inputs will be reviewed under the chairmanship of the Director of Planning by a five person group consisting of the Director of Planning, an Architect, the Development Consultant and two others representing the development and engineering fields.

10. The Director of Planning will submit the report of the group described in 9. together with his report described in 8. to Council, to be considered by Council on 11th June.

11. Vancouver City Council taking into account the reports from the Director of Planning and any other relevant material will make a decision as to the concept which will be advanced for public hearing.
12. It is anticipated that the public hearing will be called and a decision reached on rezoning before the end of June.

13. It is anticipated that the CD1 zoning by-law will have some controlled flexibility, as for example the division of building areas into uses.

14. It is hoped that applications from Marathon and Area 10 can be advanced to the public hearing at the same time.

Source: Minutes to Standing Committee on Civic Development, February 5, 1974
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CONCLUSIONS
CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSIONS

Recent planning theory typified by Friedmann's work on transactive planning suggested that modern planning, while aiming toward implementability of plans, focuses on communication in such a way as to change knowledge into action through an 'unbroken sequence of interpersonal relationships'. The theory further suggests that interpersonal communication can overcome the traditional pitfall of planning, decision-making and implementation functioning as separate isolated phases of the planning process. If such were true, then situations where planning aims toward decisions which result in further planning should not occur.

In looking at False Creek it appeared at the outset of this study that the three main actors of the planning decision-making process (planners, politicians and citizens) were involved as participants in a modern transactive planning process (as outlined by Friedmann in his book Retracking America) during the period of 1968 to 1974. Furthermore it seemed that in order to change the nature of the Creek and to achieve physical implementation where little had occurred for thirty years prior a new and improved planning process was necessary. It was the outward appearance of a new process and the feeling that such a process must have been evolving, since the traditional one had proven less than successful in the Creek, that provided the impetus for this study.

While changes did occur in the aim and roles of the actors in the planning decision-making process during the period of this study, the changes were not the result of a new planning philosophy and/or process, but rather a demonstration of the impact of increased political
involvement in and influence over the planning process.

This chapter outlines conclusions for each of the basic questions presented in the introduction.

Question 1. How did the False Creek planning decision-making process which evolved between 1968 and 1974 reflect the theory and practice of planning?

Conclusion 1. While the focus of the False Creek planning decision-making process did shift toward action, and a greater degree of communication was achieved in that process, the process was not an example of modern interactive or transactive planning.

There is a basic shortcoming in the False Creek process which became apparent throughout this case study and which separates the Creek process from modern interactive or transactive planning. While the process focussed on action and involved communication, it was not built on and functioning around that communication. The interpersonal communication which would have had to be in the form of dialogue between planners, politicians and citizens was basically a series of related monologues. Related in that they all focussed on False Creek, monologues because discussion and mutual participation in the process was lost in the political
commitment to build on the City owned lands of area 6, which dominated the process by 1973.

Where a new organizational structure had emerged, by 1973, to help facilitate action in the Creek (Diagrams 13, 15 and 16), the structure did not encourage or in fact allow dialogue to occur between the planners and politicians and the citizens. The 1973 structure isolated citizen involvement into a situation where input was channeled through two bodies, the Social Planning Department and the City Planning Commission, neither of which were active participants in the planning decision-making process. This resulted in citizen energies having little or no impact on the process during this time.

Communication between the planner and the politician appeared closer to dialogue yet tended to be political monologue. With the election of a TEAM dominated Council for 1973 the opportunities for dialogue while appearing to increase in fact decreased. The close relationship between the False Creek Planning Team and the Special Council Committee on False Creek meant little more than the politicians had become actively involved in the process as planners and administrators as well as decision-makers.

With the politician controlling planning as well as decision-making and with citizen involvement having been channeled into a peripheral role, that which appeared to be a new planning process was in fact an example of political manipulation of the planning decision-making process.

Question 2. What was the role of the planner in the process?
Conclusion 2. While the production of plans was carried out in a new team oriented approach, the impetus behind this change was not a new role of the planner nor of the planning department.

Where at the outset of this study it appeared that a new planning process was evolving in False Creek, it was evident throughout the case study that this was not the situation. While the role of the planner varied in False Creek, in the final analysis the role remained unchanged. Diagram 18, False Creek Realm of Action 1967-1974, outlines the role of the planner and illustrates the relationship between the planning department and the creation of plans for the Creek, especially for area 6.

As is evident in Diagram 18 there were two distinct streams of planning which existed during this period. One stream working in the planning department on concept plans for the entire Creek, and the other working closer to the political level to initiate action on the City owned lands of area 6. The overall Creek concept stream grew from the City's decision to change the nature of the Creek and moved through the production of alternate concepts and into the preparation of a refined concept for the Creek. This stream of planning was quite traditional and dealt with planning as a logical progression of steps.

The area 6 stream grew from the City acquiring land in area 6 and moved through concept plans and into action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFICATIONS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>REALM OF ACTION</th>
<th>CITY COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974 planning Creek plans overall need for</td>
<td>planning Creek concepts for area 6 plans</td>
<td>planning Creek range over</td>
<td>Long range alternatives for Creek lands buyers</td>
<td>City Council decision to change Creek nature of decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area 6 consultants group to development</td>
<td>planning Creek plans implement elected TEAM</td>
<td>planning Creek range over</td>
<td>planning Creek range over</td>
<td>planning Creek range over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The important distinction between the two Creek thrusts occurred in 1971. The overall concept stream became dormant and the area 6 stream continued toward action. By 1973 the area 6 stream had evolved into a politically controlled action oriented process which reported directly to a Council Committee. This left the planning department in the position of being 'spectators' where area 6 was concerned.

Question 3. What influence did the politician exert over the process?

Conclusion 3. The influence of the politician was the single most important and dominating factor which created and carried out the move to action planning.

The politician was not only the major motivating force behind redevelopment in area 6 of False Creek but also the administrator who controlled preparation of the plans. As Norton E. Long stated in his article "Planning and Politics in Urban Development" the question is not whether planning will reflect politics, but whose politics will it reflect? While Long referred to the fact that politics is a part of all planning it does not serve to suggest that politics being part of a planning process is a bad thing. In fact quite the contrary is true. However, in the case of False Creek it was the extreme to which the elected decision makers politics dominated the move to action that became a 'problem'. This situation resulted in unilateral actions where multi-
lateral ones would have been more appropriate. What had appeared to be the emergence of a new planning process turned out to be an example of how the carrying out of an election platform promise by an elected party can control the entire planning decision-making process.

Question 4. How have the citizens of Vancouver been involved?

Conclusion 4. Citizen involvement in False Creek was more constructive and influential prior to the move to action planning where it was forced into a peripheral role with minimal relevance.

Between 1968 and 1970 citizen participation in the planning of False Creek occurred in the form of genuine input through a process of reports and responses. This form of participation, while being limited in its scale and impact, was fed directly into the planning decision-making process. The ideas of Vancouver residents during this period aided the political decision-makers in changing the nature of the Creek. Table 19 resumes the citizen involvement throughout this study.

With the move to planning for action in False Creek came what appeared on the surface to be more avenues for citizens to partake in Creek planning. In effect what was happening through 1973 could best be described as therapeutic involvement; 'involvement' which made people feel better but which had little or no impact on the planning process. The fact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period and Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Type Of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD 1 1968 August</td>
<td>Downtown Report</td>
<td>Suggestion Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Vancouver ISSUES Report</td>
<td>Suggestion Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 Autumn</td>
<td>V.I.E.W. Controversy</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 January</td>
<td>False Creek Issues Report</td>
<td>Response Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD 2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD 3 1972 October</td>
<td>Boat Tours/TV Program/Radio Program</td>
<td>Self Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Public Pamphlet On Consultant Work</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 February</td>
<td>Public Response Meetings</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Review Panels</td>
<td>Select Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Public Information Program</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Image Survey</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>V.I.E.W. Controversy</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD 4 1974 February</td>
<td>Housing vs Park Controversy</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Citizen Panel</td>
<td>Select Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Procedure For Public Involvement</td>
<td>Token</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 19 CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT 1968 TO 1974**
that citizen energies were being channeled through two bodies (the
Vancouver City Planning Commission and the Social Planning Department)
having, at best, a peripheral role in the process meant there existed
no actual avenue of involvement. Not only that, the citizens were
being misled into believing that they were helping to plan the City,
when in fact they were accomplishing very little.

Question 5. Have 'internal' forces of Vancouver
citizens, planners and politicians
or 'external' forces of societal
trends shaped False Creek?

Conclusion 5. The development philosophy of False
Creek has and still does reflect
societal movements external to the
Creek.

Eric Trist explains these movements as a "drift" toward post-
industrialism. From the late 1800's, when False Creek was subjected to
the railroad, to the early 1960's, the Creek was a monument to the
industrial ethic which had evolved over the prior two hundred years.
Financiers and industrialists were the politically influential establish-
ment shaping the Creek. Natural resources were treated as inexhaustible
and pollution was perceived within safety limits. Culture stressed
quantity, achievement, and independence with organizations being mechanistic and competitive. Planning was a combination of comprehensive master plans and short term reaction to crisis. False Creek developed around the idea of industrial growth and its societal values. Then, as concern for quality increased, especially concerning the natural and urban environment, so the fear that natural resources were exhaustible and pollution was beyond safety limits grew. The first evidence of this in False Creek appeared in the late 1950's when citizens began pushing the City to clean up False Creek. Thoughts turned to less-pollution "high-class" industries. "High-class" industries represents a movement away from the goods and goods related services of industrialism toward the tertiary and person related services of post-industrialism. The major change in Creek philosophy came when the financial-industrial establishment which had for many years dominated City Council was replaced by the scientists and professionals of post-industrialism. Cultural values such as self-actualization replaced achievement, inter-dependence replaced independence, organizations were viewed as organic with collaborative relations instead of mechanistic and competitive, and planning focussed on mid-range plans, anticipating crisis, instead of short term plans responding to crisis. The industrial quantity emphasis was questioned, with housing and open space becoming more acceptable alternatives. While post-industrialism fostered social consciousness, it also accented another process, "namely the permanent presence of a large, heterogeneous and growing class of disadvantaged individuals unequipped to meet the higher requirements now obtaining as a condition of entering, or maintaining a position in, the changed occupational structure, and...trapped in poverty."
In response to the growing number of people disadvantaged, because they are unequipped, or because of inflationary trends in society, an intellectual movement to help these people has evolved. Politicians, due to their social conscience or to good politics spearhead this movement. Establishing policies for False Creek led to considerable debate over the provision of housing and related community facilities for people with lower incomes. Another post-industrial movement which has crept into debates on False Creek is the concern for ecology. This includes preservation of the natural physical environment, and maintenance of open space for 'healthy' human existence. In False Creek the open space ecology-health movement remains somewhat middle-class, conflicting with the needs of disadvantaged people for housing and community facilities. Both post-industrial movements are present however, and are continuing to influence the future shape of False Creek, just as the industrial movement shaped the Creek in past years.

FINAL COMMENTS

This study strove to gain insight into the planning decision-making process by comparing a case study of a planning process to a theoretical planning process identified as 'Transactive Planning' by John Friedmann. In Friedmann's theory planners, citizens and politicians interact to plan and implement mutually desired actions.

In False Creek it appeared that all actors were not participating at a significant level of influence and therefore that transactive planning was not present. More specifically, during 1973 the politician played a
dominant role in the process, often to the exclusion of citizens and
with minimal input from City planning department staff. As Friedmann
suggests, where any one actor or group of actors creates, administers
and judges the process there is an inherent danger of oversight and
single interest in the process. History will judge whether or not such
oversights have occurred in False Creek.

Perhaps more important than discovering that False Creek does
not represent an example of transactive planning is the question that
in light of the fact it was not present in False Creek, is it likely
to be present anywhere? Should planners be striving toward interactive
planning or not? It is undisputable that planning should aim toward
action, which interactive planning does. It is also beyond question
that planning is based on the needs, hopes and expectations of planners,
politicians and citizens. The main drawback of interactive planning is
not so much a problem of the theory but a problem with the ability of
people to apply it. Interactive planning depends on the three main
actors establishing very close working relationships, and participating
with the political, professional or interest group pressures rather
than for them. The key problem here is the actors ability or inability
to participate without succumbing to the pressures placed on him, or
becoming defensive regarding his area of expertise. Friedmann's theory
breaks down at this point. If for no other reason, Friedmann's theory
is just that, a theory. In practical terms his faith in people to
participate and communicate, while being undoubtedly desirable,
requires a new expertise to implement.
It would seem then, that while False Creek did not turn out to be an example of transactive planning, this should not in itself be considered negative. Case studies of the planning process, such as that experienced in False Creek, provide additional evidence of the roles and responsibilities of the actors and of the actions required to implement a complex planning process.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSIONS


4. Ibid. pages 9 and 10.
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**APPENDIX I: ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.N.R.</td>
<td>Canadian National Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.R.</td>
<td>Canadian Pacific Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.A.</td>
<td>Non-Partisan Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.B.P. &amp; P.</td>
<td>Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.E.A.M.</td>
<td>The Electors Action Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.B.C.</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.I.E.W.</td>
<td>Vancouver Iron and Engineering Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

PRINCIPLE ACTORS FALSE CREEK PLANNING

DECISION - MAKING PROCESS 1968 to 1974

This appendix is divided into two parts; one outlining groups and the other individuals who participated in the case study (Chapter III) of this thesis.

A. GROUPS

Advanced Planning and Research

Occasionally called Long Range Planning, this division of the City Planning Department was responsible for preparing conceptual plans for the City. This division is presently termed overall planning.

Board of Administration

This is the staff body or department which coordinates City administration for Council. City departments generally report to Council through this body. During the early 1970's Mr. G. Sutton-Brown was City Commissioner, head of the Board of Administration, along with Mr. L. Ryan.

City Planning Department

This is the City department responsible for the preparation of policies and plans for the City. This department is distinct from the Social Planning Department.

False Creek Development Group

The staff group assembled under the direction of Mr. Doug Sutcliffe in early 1974 to facilitate physical construction on the City owned lands of Area 6.
False Creek Planning Team
The planning group assembled in February 1973 under the direction of Mr. D. Hickley (architect) to interpret the concept plans for Area 6 produced by Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners. Included in the planning team were Mr. G. Shanks (planner), Mr. N. Griggs (planner), Mr. E. Roffey (urban economist), Mr. P. Lau (architect), and Mr. C. Campbell (landscape architect). The team was disbanded by the end of 1973 following completion of their task.

False Creek Review Panels
Established in mid 1973 to review the housing mix and open space recommendations for Area 6. The panels consisted of select resource persons who possessed some expertise or knowledge of subjects in question.

Marathon Realty
The real estate and development branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway (C.P.R.).

National Harbours Board
This is a department of the Federal Government responsible for administration of harbours and other waterways such as False Creek and Burrard Inlet.

Non-Partisan Association
This is a political party at the civic level, which is generally associated with conservative business interests.
Social Planning Department

This department is responsible for preparing the City's input into cultural and social programs. It is distinct from the City Planning Department.

Special Council Committee on False Creek

A Council Committee formed in 1972 under the chairmanship of Alderman Walter Hardwick to prepare guidelines for Creek development.

Standing Committee on Planning and Civic Development

This is a standing committee of Council which deals with issues such as planning and development.

The Electors Action Movement (TEAM)

This is a political party at the civic level, generally considered to be "academic reformist" in nature.

Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners

The Vancouver consulting firm chosen in 1971 by the City to prepare plans for Area 6.

Vancouver City Council

The official elected body for the City of Vancouver which governs through powers established in the Vancouver Charter. Council is comprised of a Mayor and ten aldermen.
Vancouver City Planning Commission

This commission consists of citizens appointed by Council to advise them on City planning matters.

B. INDIVIDUALS

Titles reflect positions held during the case study of this thesis.

Mr. B. Curtis
Deputy City Engineer

Mr. B. Graham
Director of Planning

Mr. W. Hardwick
Alderman (TEAM)

Mr. D. Hayward
Associate Director of Advanced Planning and Research

Mr. D. Hickley
Assistant Director of Planning and Civic Development

Mr. D. Mann
Consultant Planner with Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners
Mr. H. Pickstone
Deputy Director of Planning

Mr. D. Sutcliffe
Development Consultant for False Creek

Mr. G. Sutton-Brown
City Commissioner
APPENDIX III: VANCOUVER CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS 1958-1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Aldermen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1961

Mayor
A.T. Alsbury

Aldermen
E.G. Adams
R. Atherton
F.M. Baker
B.A. Emery
F. Fredrickson
M.E. Linnell
J.S.C. Moffitt
W.G. Rathie
W.A. Street
H.D. Wilson

1962

Mayor
A.T. Alsbury

Aldermen
E.G. Adams
F.M. Baker
W.O. Banfield
A.E. McB. Bell-Irving
T.J. Campbell
B.A. Emery
F. Fredrickson
M.E. Linnell
W.G. Rathie
H.D. Wilson

1963

Mayor
W.G. Rathie

Aldermen
E.G. Adams
W.O. Banfield
A.E. McB. Bell-Irving
H.S. Bird
E.J. Broome
T.J. Campbell
B.A. Emery
F. Fredrickson
M.E. Linnell
P.J. Lipp
1964

Mayor  W.G. Rathie

Aldermen  E.G. Adams
         A.T. Alsbury
         A.E. McB. Bell-Irving
         H.S. Bird
         E.J. Broome
         T.J. Campbell
         B.A. Emery
         M.E. Linnell
         P.J. Lipp
         H.D. Wilson

1965

Mayor  W.G. Rathie

Aldermen  E.G. Adams
         W.O. Banfield
         A.E. McB. Bell-Irving
         H.S. Bird
         E.J. Broome
         T.J. Campbell
         B.A. Emery
         P.J. Lipp
         R.A. Williams
         H.D. Wilson

1966

Mayor  W.G. Rathie

Aldermen  E.G. Adams
         A.T. Alsbury
         R. Atherton
         H.S. Bird
         E.J. Broome
         P.W.N. Graham
         M.E. Linnell
         H. Rankin
         E.C. Sweeney
         H.D. Wilson
1967-1968

Mayor

T.J. Campbell

Aldermen

E.G. Adams
A.T. Alsbury
R. Atherton
H.S. Bird
E.J. Broome
P.W.N. Graham
M.E. Linnell
H. Rankin
E.C. Sweeney
H.D. Wilson

1969-1970

Mayor

T.J. Campbell

Aldermen

E.G. Adams
H.S. Bird
E.J. Broome
B.K. Calder
W.G. Hardwick
M.E. Linnell
A. Philips
H. Rankin
E.C. Sweeney
H.D. Wilson

1971-1972

Mayor

T.J. Campbell

Aldermen

E.G. Adams
H.S. Bird
E.J. Broome
B.K. Calder
W.G. Hardwick
M.E. Linnell
A. Philips
H. Rankin
E.C. Sweeney
H.D. Wilson
1973-1974

Mayor
A. Philips

Aldermen
F. Bowers  
W. Gibson  
M. Harcourt  
W.G. Hardwick  
M.E. Linnell  
D. Marzari  
G. Massey  
V.S. Pendakur  
H. Rankin  
J.J. Volrich
APPENDIX IV: PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

The following personal interviews were conducted in January-February, 1974 in researching this study:

Curtis, Bill, Deputy City Engineer, Vancouver Engineering Department
Griggs, Neil, Coordinator False Creek Team, Vancouver Planning Department
Hardwick, Walter, Alderman, City of Vancouver
Hickley, Don, Assistant Director, Planning and Civic Development, City of Vancouver
James, Murray, City Clerk's Office, Vancouver City
Linnell, Marianne, Alderwoman, City of Vancouver
Lowden, Jim, Planner, Marathon Realty
Mann, Dick, Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners
McAfee, Ann, False Creek Review Panels
Pickstone, Harry, Deputy Director, City of Vancouver Planning Department
Shanks, Gordon, False Creek Team
Sutcliffe, Doug, Development Consultant for False Creek, City of Vancouver Planning Department
Symonds, Hilda, Executive Coordinator, Vancouver City Planning Commission
Webster, John, Planning Director, Marathon Realty
Wiesman, Brahm, Acting Director, Community and Regional Planning School, U.B.C.
Wilson, Halford, Past Alderman, City of Vancouver