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ABSTRACT

This thesis addresses the issue of representation in planning for neighbourhood improvement. A literature review indicates that critics have argued that citizen involvement establishes a forum for a vocal minority rather than a representative cross section of the community. This research demonstrates the potential for citizen involvement to foster a representative community consensus and it uncovers methods by which this can be assured by a neighbourhood planner.

Representation in citizen involvement is explored so that the planning profession can defend this important, yet costly, process. The issue is clarified for the planners who view the idea of participatory democracy as utopian, yet, still advocate it.

Two case studies of the citizen committee approach are undertaken. The elements of the approved neighbourhood improvement programs are examined in relation to the characteristics of the committee, the process undertaken in carrying out the planning task, and the role of the planner.

While the location of committee member homes within the neighbourhood influenced the content of the plan, a positive basis for representation was found in various
aspects of the planning process and not in the make-up of the committee itself. The role of the planner was instrumental in broadening the perspective of committee members by ensuring that many different approaches to citizen involvement were used to dilute committee member biases. In one of the case studies, the planner broadened the make-up of the committee by holding public meetings at various places throughout the neighbourhood so that the planning process could be brought as close as possible to all the people. In that case, the committee evolved a universalistic point of view from an initial strongly particularistic one. These factors all had a demonstrable effect on the plan. Meanwhile, the planner evolved an understanding of the values of committee members which was necessary to facilitate the preparation of meeting agendas satisfactory to all. A partial model for the role of the planner is developed to facilitate a representative process involving mutual learning.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem:

The legitimacy of citizen involvement in planning has often been questioned. For example, the Vancouver Director of Finance argues that citizen involvement "can create an internal battleground between . . . groups . . . (who are trying to) . . . avoid their fair share of something" (see section 4.3). While citizen involvement can offer a sense of popular support to the planner's recommendations to elected officials, the citizen groups that become involved in a planning process are often questioned on the basis of representativeness since the prospect of participation appears to attract involvement from a limited portion of the community.

Another part of this problem is the failure of the planning profession to develop a satisfactory methodology to examine the representativeness of those citizens involved in a planning process.

1.2 Objective:

To enable the planner to improve the representativeness of a planning process two steps must be taken. First a methodology must be developed which can measure the extent to which people throughout a community influence the plans produced. Second, a set of guidelines must be developed to promote representativeness in the
planning process. This thesis addresses both of these issues in the context of planning for neighbourhood improvement.

1.3 Approach:

Understanding the goals and history of citizen involvement is a prerequisite to developing a methodology for evaluating the representativeness of a particular participating group such as a citizen planning committee. An intensive literature search on the role of citizen involvement in decentralized urban planning is presented in Chapter Two covering both the phenomena of citizen involvement and the citizen committee approach to policy development.

Chapter Three develops a process oriented methodology for use in two case studies. Their general setting in Vancouver, British Columbia is described in Chapter Four.

The case study is described in detail in Chapter Five. Analysis of representativeness is undertaken using the process oriented methodology. The application of existing methodologies found in the literature is also attempted.

Finally, Chapter Six compares the findings generated by the new methodology with the findings generated by an existing methodology. An overall assessment is made and a set of guidelines is proposed for ensuring representativeness. The performances of the planning process in the two case studies is then evaluated.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Goals for Local Area Planning:

This section focuses on the promises of Local Area Planning as seen in the planning literature and examines previous attempts at evaluating local planning processes.

The literature has been devoted mostly to what this paper refers to as decentralized local area planning. The terms used to refer to this type of institutional arrangement have been local area planning, neighbourhood planning and community planning (Needleman, 1974).

Rationales for Decentralized Local Area Planning: Decentralized Local Area Planning is distinguished by the use of a site office, along with a staff addressing problems in the area in a process that incorporates citizen input. This approach to planning follows a general rejection of city-wide initiatives or initiatives made without the assumption of the neighbourhood as an integrated system (Needleman, 1974). It is undertaken on the basis that issues in the local area can be viewed independently.

The literature proposes several political goals achieved through Local Area Planning. The following is a partial list:

It establishes

1. a clearer definition of land use or social service policies and their relations to minority groups (Davidoff, 1965; Friedmann, 1973);
2. a greater sensitivity to the particular needs of different city areas (Kasperson, 1974; Anderson, 1976; Anderson, 1977; Schmandt, 1973);
3. a more equitable delivery of public services in which allocative decisions between the different parts of the city are made more explicit (Kasperson, 1974b; Anderson, 1976, 20);

4. better, more accessible citizen participation due to the more understandable and comprehensive nature of local issues (Kasperson, 1974b) resulting in . . .

5. a faster feedback process through the involvement of the consumers of a public service in policy making and reviewing (Kasperson, 1974b);

6. territorial power bases which challenge existing elites (Kasperson, 1974b; Kotler, 1969; Schmandt, 1973; Fraser, 1972);

7. popular support for established political representatives through the sensitization of politicians to vocal public opinion (sic) (Anderson, 1976); and

8. the alignment of planners with public opinion, creating a convincing package for the politician, and enhancing the influence of the planner as well as that of the citizen (Needleman, 1974).

These rationales are sometimes interdependent, and sometimes they are apparently contradictory. For example, goals number six and seven are contradictory. While Anderson and Needleman saw benefits for politicians in Local Area Planning, arguing that it is to the politician's advantage to sensitize himself to popular public opinion, Fraser and Kotler saw in decentralization and citizen participation a reduction in the level of political discretion available to the politician. While the politician's level of discretion may be reduced by local area planning, according to Anderson and Needleman, this would only pertain to a few popularized issues. With an increased public rapport, the politician's decision making discretion may even be enhanced. In a similar light, Kasperson feels that certain
forms of decentralized municipal services which do not involve a substantial delegation of discretionary powers (which are labelled deconcentration rather than decentralization) strengthen the central authority by bringing it closer to the periphery (Kasperson, 1974c).

While Kotler and Fraser both assumed political power to be a 'zero sum' commodity in which one party's loss is another party's gain, Anderson and Needleman find three parties which should potentially benefit simultaneously from decentralized planning decision making, i.e. citizens (goal 5), political representatives (goal 7) and planners (goal 8).

The interdependence of goals for Local Area Planning is illustrated by the centrality of goal 4. Goal 4, "more accessible citizen participation", makes goals 5-8 possible. The importance of this link between Local Area Planning and citizen participation is underscored by two important planning theorists: Paul Davidoff and John Friedmann. While both of these authors seek to promote citizen participation by decentralizing planning, they also anticipate a means to a whole new planning process, or in Friedmann's case, a new political process oriented to facilitating user needs and the needs of those otherwise affected by planning decisions.

Davidoff sees Local Area Planning as essential for generating an ideal called "plural planning". Plural planning would award direct participatory powers through
interest groups. The assumption is that different value positions must be incorporated into the planning process because the total societal welfare must be viewed in terms of an essentially bifurcated social system. Davidoff proposes that different interest groups expressing different value positions should prepare alternate plans that serve their own interests, and the role of the planner should be changed to one of advocate for client interest groups similar to the role of lawyer representing clients. Local area planning is mentioned in the following passage by Davidoff:

> From the point of view of effective and rational planning it might be desirable to commence plural planning at the level of city wide organizations, but a more realistic view is that it will start at the neighbourhood level. Certain advantages of this outcome should be noted. Mention was made of tension in government between centralizing and decentralizing forces. The contention aroused by conflict between the central planning agency and the neighbourhood organization may indeed be healthy, leading to a clearer definition of welfare policies and their relation to the rights of individuals or minority groups (1965, 334).

Friedmann sees a role for local area planning in attaining a system of "societal guidance" called "transactive planning". This view is different from Davidoff's since it assumes that the planner must also contribute to his clients' level of technical understanding of their problems when he serves them. He proposes that planning take place within a process of mutual learning between planners and citizens. Friedmann feels that this necessitates an end to the division between planning and action, i.e. plan
making and plan implementing, so that citizens and planners can better evaluate their assumptions and technical expertise (Friedmann, 1973).

The necessary organization for such a learning-participatory society would be hierarchical. Thus the basic planning unit must be local in order to give each citizen the opportunity to make direct inputs into the decision making process. Friedmann feels that "participant planning" is the most important form of planning (Friedmann, 1973, 203). To expedite participation, "task oriented working groups" are proposed. Group dynamics factors require that these have no more than twelve members and that they be temporary and issue oriented in nature. However, this decentralization must be balanced by integration into the larger society, and Friedmann adds that working groups should be connected to each other in what he calls a "cellular structure" where representatives from different groups meet to collate decisions and make decisions affecting the areas of jurisdiction which are too large for direct representation. Friedmann believes that if people were to be given an ongoing opportunity to participate in public policy making, such as they would have under the "societal guidance system", a participation rate as high as 30% should be expected (Friedmann, 1973).

Although these normative theories of planning have fundamental differences, both Friedmann and Davidoff believe that decentralization will encourage participation by citizens in planning, whether they act through interest groups or through tiny task oriented groups of citizens banded together
to deal with a problem which affects them. Both authors feel that goal number four for Local Area Planning is important.

2.2 Role of Citizen Participation

Much of the attention given to citizen participation in the literature concentrates on local area planning of the decentralized type (Breitbart, 1974; Carney, 1977; Cole 1974; Fraser, 1972; Hyman, 1969; Jensen, 1974; Mogulof, 1970; Frisken and Homenuck, 1972; Davidoff, 1965; Friedmann, 1973a, 6; Friedmann, 1973b, 203; Granatstien, 1971). Another direction in the literature is to examine citizen participation toward the planning and administration of social services (Alinsky, 1943; Ontario, 1971; Head, 1971). Both of these directions contend that decentralization is a fundamental element in enabling and promoting participation by citizens in public affairs (see goal 4, section 3.1). Some more recent contributions to the literature do not assume citizen participation is reliant on decentralization. They have examined efforts at citizen participation at a regional level (Cornejo, 1975; Perryman, 1975; St. Pierre 1977). Some of the literature goes so far as to deny the relationship between participation and decentralization (Perryman, 1975; Gusking, 1971, 54). Finally, the more academic social scientific literature deals with participation as it affects democratic theory (Cole, 1974, 10 - 20).
Some concepts for analysing citizen participation include the process and product distinction. In an article written in 1969, Hightower categorizes planning theory into theories of process and theories of phenomena. Process theories are non-substantive theories which contribute to decision making, eg. evaluation methods (optimizing techniques, cost benefit analysis and public program budgetting) and methods for operationalizing and integrating values as valid criteria (including both utopian ideals and approaches for client involvement such as the "collaborative approach" by Godschalk and Mills (Hightower, 1969, 327). Since that time, the concept of decision making process has been used with more connotations of client value identification methods. Friedmann defines process to mean:

... the manner in which a moral community agrees to conduct its public business, which includes not only the process of arriving at decisions on laws, policies and programs but also the processes of carrying them out. In the broadest sense, therefore, process refers to the allocation and uses of power (Friedmann, 1973a, 6).

The concept of product, on the other hand, is used primarily to describe the outcome of the decision process.

Section 2.1 introduced goals for Local Area Planning. However, it was found that Local Area Planning is often seen as a means to the end of citizen participation. What, then, is the purpose of citizen participation? The following four goals have been identified in the literature:

1. more egalitarian plans (Friedmann, 1973a, 6),
2. improved social/political awareness for all members of society (Friedmann, 1973b; Burke, 1968; Martin, 1973).

3. more social integration as people are forced more into considering the implications of public policy on other interests (Ontario, 1972; Martin, 1973).

4. increased attachment to the whole political system, so that people will become more involved and responsible (Martin, 1973).

Of the anticipated benefits, only a few relate to the improvement of product, i.e. the policy which is the outcome of the planning process. Goals 2, 3 and 4 for citizen participation and goals 6, 7 and 8 for Local Area Planning (those goals that relate more to participation in the latter set, from section 2.1) are benefits independent of product. There appear, then, to be two different categories of goals for citizen participation, e.g., task oriented goals and process oriented goals (Perryman, 1975, 73). Evaluating whether citizen participation can more effectively achieve certain task oriented goals becomes less important in cases where participation is viewed as a right or necessary condition for human development (Perryman, 1975, 73). In such cases, it becomes a question of how well the process achieves its substantive goals relative to other approaches using citizen participation. Whether or not the product can be better without citizen participation can never be determined because of the absence of any criteria for answering such a question.

Goal number 1 appears to be the most important overt purpose of most proponents of Local Area Planning. However,
the goal, and whether it can be attained appears to be a matter of faith in some of the theoretical literature. Exploring the variable appears to produce certain methodological problems. For example, how is it possible to explore equity when it entails a difficult to quantify variable such as opportunity for political expression rather than an economic resource?

Goal number 3 for citizen participation is similar to what Cole calls the "sociological view" of participation (Cole, 1974). This refers to a large amount of academic thought which concludes that structures for the participation of citizens in policy making are needed to counteract the rise of bureaucracy and impersonal relations, and effects from the erosion of certain institutions like the family, job, church and community through which individuals can relate to one another, form alliances and take political initiatives (Cole, 1974, 2).

The second and fourth goals are related to what Cole calls the political view of participation. This generalizes on a group of modern thinkers who are concerned about the psychological effects of participation and the development of a deeper sense of responsibility in individual citizens who must have their perspectives broadened beyond "the narrow confines" of private life (Cole, 1974, 3).

The trend in the social scientific literature is to view participation within the strict confines of democratic theory rather than to entertain product or policy concerns such as Local Area Planning problems. Since modern
democratic theory has been opposed to participation for fear it would result in arbitrary mob rule, it has favoured representative democracy (Cole, 1974; Jensen, 1974, 16ff). The arguments proposed by modern post war liberal theorists such as the sociological and political views introduced above are a complete reversal of the democratic theories. They have been attributed to the current period of mass literacy and multimedia communications (Cole, 1974; Carney, 1977).

Unlike the modern democratic theorists, not all the advocates of participation see a conflict between participatory democracy and representative democracy. Writers who see local politics in a pluralistic light are more likely to see these two as mutually supportive. While elitists see local politics as a struggle between the "ins" and the "outs", pluralists see participation as a means of facilitating the use of "rules of operation" in which individuals or groups can make demands on the existing political system. Hence, those who see in participation a transfer of power from elected representatives to the powerless see local politics as elite dominated and forsee a difficult structural change as participation alters the level of power of elites (Frisken, 1972, 65 - 66).

Pluralists, on the other hand, are more likely to perceive benefits from participation as a Toronto alderman exemplified when he suggested that participation increases the power that the representative derives from his office by reducing the likelihood of his/her being defeated over
an issue (Jaffery, 1972, 59).

2.3 Historical Perspective on Local Area Planning:

In North America, modern decentralized Local Area Planning originated in the United States where it was introduced as a result of federal involvement in Urban affairs during the 1960's (Hallman, 1973; Farkas, 1971). Clear evidence of this type of planning did not come about in Canada until projects like the Trefann Court project in Toronto (Anderson, 1977), or perhaps the Strathcona effort in Vancouver, both taking place in the late 1960's and early 70's. Both of these began as locally initiated self help community development efforts for change in the neighbourhood which were organized with the assistance of an external organizer. Historically the development of decentralized Local Area Planning can be traced back to community development and community organization efforts in both Canada and the United States.

2.3.1 Community Efforts:

The "representativeness" of citizen participation efforts in the distant past has often been questioned. For example, the New England town meeting is now seen as elitist and dominated by exclusive cliques (Jensen, 1974, 1). The function of citizen participation in urban renewal programs throughout North American has been called one of public relations since involvement was restricted to businessmen, planners and leaders of civic groups (Jensen, 1974, 2).
The literature appears to trace modern citizen participation, as practised in Local Area Planning programs, back to various community efforts ranging from non professional, internally induced community self help programs to professionalized, institutionally assisted community organization.

Community self help includes the organization and operation of community interest groups from within, including ratepayer associations and tenant associations.

They have existed since 1904 in Toronto (Ebers, 1972, 66) and for a similarly long period in Vancouver (Vancouver Urban Research Group, 1972, 61). Traditionally, they served to "formulate small and specific requests" to city hall such as the installation of a new road sign. Such groups were organized without the skills of a professional community organizer who has been trained for that function. The apparent success of this category of organization has been explained by the typically high level of political influence among certain group members (Lorimer, 1972, 197).

In his book, James Lorimer identifies new, "noisy" organizations that are typified by confrontation tactics and which arise in response to civic proposals such as an urban renewal project or freeway which threaten the future of the communities they represent. Lorimer identifies the following stages in the radicalization of community groups:

1. the group makes demands from council and when these are unheeded, they voice these to the media making them into public issues,
2. the group is labelled as unrepresentative and/or the government reacts by either co-opting factions or establishing rival groups using social service agency community organizers,

3. various neighbourhood groups form coalitions and create an organized political machine to oppose council, often fielding their own candidates (Lorimer, 1972, 197-200).

Community development and community organization efforts involve the organization of community action with the help of community organizers that animate and coordinate a group of people to represent their own interests. The community groups that Lorimer examines include those assisted by community organizers as the following section indicates:

Sometimes a fledgling group gets a community organizer who works with them to get the group going. On occasion organizers arrive on the scene and start organizing a local group where no one in the area had taken that step itself (Lorimer, 1972, 192).

Community development is defined as "a social process in which human beings can become more competent to live and gain some control over local aspects of a frustrating and changing world". Unlike community organization, community development does not involve the formulation of political demands for a more favourable share of social and economic resources, but the organization of changes in the community through independent collective action, such as clean up campaigns and learning situations for acquiring better ways of working and developing a social order to arrest the deterioration of neighbourhoods (Biddle, 1965, 34-35, 81-82).
The story of the development of citizen participation in the United States must consider important contributions in the administration of the American Point Four program of the post World War II period in which this technique was used (Kasperson, 1974b, 17). Rural community development programs such as the Point Four Program and certain Tennessee Valley Authority Programs (1930's) made more contributions to our knowledge of citizen participation in North America than early urban programs (Kasperson, 1974b, 16 - 17).

Both community organization and community development are oriented toward community self help. Hence, the importance of participation in both fields. A fine line appears to exist between the two types of activity. Consequently, an active agent like Saul Alinsky has been called both a community organizer and a community developer (Biddle, 1965; Freedman, 1977). Biddle refers to community organization as more oriented to social service programs calling it a branch of the social work profession along with group work and casework (1966, 223).

An American example of this type of program is the Grey Areas Program of the 1950's which dealt with the urban problem of slum dwelling in slum areas. This was a $20 million program funded by the Ford foundation which sought to reduce substandard housing and reintegrate members of "slum cultures" into the "Mainstream of Americal life and culture" in selected areas of six large American cities. Participation was used in developing programs to better
address social needs as residents saw them. This program made a significant contribution to subsequent government programs during the "war on poverty" period of the 1960's including the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and programs by the office of Economic Opportunity such as the Community Action Program (Kasperson, 1974b). An example of a Canadian community organization effort funded by the federal government is the Company of Young Canadians.

Community organization has often conjured an image of inducing conflict in the political process, of outside agents moving into the community, heightening the expectations of local residents and organizing the opposition to the status quo. Many of these connotations originated from Saul Alinsky, a professional community organizer who established the Back of the Yards project in Chicago in which he mobilized citizens to pressure politicians into improving their working class neighbourhoods (Kasperson, 1974b, 17).

The basic organizing unit in Alinsky's community organization is the "People's Organization", which is a conflict oriented association of community residents working in their interests together, or in Alinsky's terms, to "fight for those rights which ensure a decent way of life". Alinsky emphasizes that in the war against "social evils, there are no rules of fair play" (Alinsky, 1946, 153 - 156). The basis for participation in Alinsky's community organization is the role of what Alinsky calls
indigenous leadership which is necessary to identify the values and interests of the people in the community (Alinsky, 1946, 87).

While not all community organization follows this conflict based model, some references to community organization in the literature assume as much (Freeman, 1977). An example of community organization efforts which did not completely conform to this model is the American government funded Community Action Program.

The enabling legislation for the Community Action Program required "maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and of the groups served" (Kasperson, 1974b). This decentralized social services program provided employment programs, human resource development programs and motivation programs. The heavy emphasis placed on participation and self help has been interpreted as an oversight and political blunder in that President Johnson, who was responsible for introducing the legislation, only became aware of the "maximum feasible participation" clause afterwards, and did not favour it (Kasperson, 1974b; Moynihan, 1969).

Subsequent to the passing of legislation, the Office of Economic Opportunity interpreted "maximum participation" as involvement of the poor in areas served in planning, policy making and program operation. Their role was balanced in equal proportion with established agencies and city leadership groups, thus leaving out entirely representation by established municipal governments (Kasperson, 1974b).
American Decentralized Local Area Planning:

The Model Cities Program was another American federal program for inner city residential areas which featured citizen participation. This one, however, also had provisions for improving the neighbourhoods physically as well as socially in a comprehensive package of local improvements. Bending to pressure from conservative municipal governments, control of this program was delivered to city governments, and citizens were given an advisory function (Kasperson, 1974b, 22). Instead of "maximum" participation it substituted "widespread" participation which required:

1. an organizational structure to involve residents in program planning and administration,
2. leadership acceptable to residents,
3. sufficient and adequate lead time,
4. technical assistance,
5. financial assistance,
6. employment of locals throughout the process (Kasperson, 1974b, 22).

Although the organization structure for citizen involvement in the Model Cities Program was an advisory body in a de jure sense, an analysis of projects in the western United States revealed that all the projects in that area had achieved de facto veto power in less than one year (Kasperson, 1974b, 23). Most of this power was attained through confrontations over prerogatives and procedures resulting from high expectations for the Community Action Program and the civil rights movement. The
subsequent disappointments over the results of both of these led the urban poor to make even greater demands on this new program (Kasperson, 1974b, 23; Hamilton, 1973, 251). This was the first program to introduce a substantive level of participation into comprehensive local planning and development, according to some American authors, whereas previous programs had only extended this feature to the planning of specific social services (Kasperson, 1974b, 23; King 1971, 36).

In addition to the participation aspect, new programs appeared to concentrate on the rehabilitation and retention of existing inner city residential neighbourhoods rather than redevelopment of inner city transitional neighbourhoods. The fact that citizen involvement became popular at the same time as neighbourhood rehabilitation is understandable. The strengthening of the community through collective decision making works together with the strategy of neighbourhood physical rehabilitation toward a common goal to lengthen the life span of neighbourhoods and their constituent housing.

Firstly, the public outcry for a greater say by citizens affected by redevelopment produced opposition groups that often evolved, as governments began to make concessions, into participatory planning committees during the 1960's and early 1970's. It also called into question the legitimacy of the planning profession (Needleman, 1974, 29) that forced a redefinition of the concept of "public interest" by such planning theorists as Davidoff (1964) and Friedmann (1973) (see section 2.2).

Moreover, with a redefinition of the "public interest"
concept in the direction of a citizen involvement base, the planning profession contributed to a high level of community control by citizen committees (Needleman, 1974). In the Model Cities Program, Kasperson argues that instead of citizen committees being coopted by city officials, as had been expected, the reverse happened when city planners were coopted and sided with the committees, becoming "bureaucratic guerrillas" or "neighbourhood advocates" in adversary situations (Kasperson, 1974b, 29).

2.3.3 Local Area Planning in Canada:

Many of the forces leading to citizen participation and decentralized planning in Canada were the same as those that operated in the United States. However, Canada's more authoritarian political culture (Anderson, 1977) and its less volatile racial situation (Anderson, 1977) resulted in less urban violence here during the late 1960's. Only urban renewal and freeway construction appear to have been significant in creating the level of public dissatisfaction necessary to encourage public inputs into planning (Anderson, 1977; Fraser, 1973).

As a consequence of this and various jurisdictional differences between Canada and the United States affecting the powers of different levels of government, institutional arrangements for local area planning in Canada are less comprehensive than American ones. To illustrate, the Model Cities
Program in the United States integrated under a single administrative structure various sub programs dealing with crime and delinquency, day care, economic development, housing, transportation and urban renewal (Model Cities Service Centre, 1971). Moreover, the American programs paid for the operating costs of these projects over a five year period as well as for their capital costs.

By contrast, Canadian programs are exclusively concerned with housing and residential development. The Canadian federal program called the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) is intended to compliment another program for housing rehabilitation (RRAP; see Barnard, 1973). As a result, the Local Area Planning Division in Vancouver seems concerned about the inability of Local Area Planning to resolve social issues in Vancouver (Beasley, 1977). In fact, this is because local area planning does not have the jurisdiction nor the funding to meet these needs in Canada. This section has served to illustrate the unique circumstances of local area planning in Canada and a more detailed review of Canadian programs is found in chapter 4.

2.4 Decentralization and Citizen Involvement:

The American literature implicitly assumes and sometimes it explicitly states a relationship between decentralization and citizen participation (Kotler, 1969; Perryman, 1975, 71). The assumption underlies
a bias for direct participation which is only possible when the planning jurisdiction is small enough to enable every interested and motivated citizen an opportunity to play a part. Another assumption in the literature is that participation and decentralization are necessary conditions for each other and that they both achieve the goal of enhancing a community identity and developing a feasible scale for direct participation (Perryman, 1975, 71).

These assumptions have not gone unchallenged, however. Some of the literature has concluded that local government is not really democratic at all (Leemans, 1970, 19), particularly when compared to national levels of government. Madison argued that local and state governments are more prone to rule by faction when compared to national levels of government (Kasperson, 1974c, 33).

Why is an elite more likely to participate in local public affairs? Firstly, participation in planning should be seen as a component of political participation, and empirical studies have established a high level of correlation between political participation and awareness and socioeconomic status (Kasperson, 1974a, 8). Since participation in public decisions probably requires more
political awareness than mere voting, perhaps there is a danger that decision makers will be less representative in democracy-by-participation than in democracy-by-voting.

Secondly, voter turnouts in this country show that people tend to participate more in elections for higher levels of government (provincial and federal) than they participate in local elections. Perryman claims that this reflects the controversial nature of issues dealt with by higher government (eg., health care, urban growth, poverty and housing; Perryman, 1975, 72). Hence the generalization that the more local the issue, the less interest it sparks.

In the absence of compelling issues that appeal to rich and poor alike, Local Area Planning is likely to appeal to the politically ambitious and the more politically aware who may see participation as a stepping stone to public office, and who simply know more about less publicized local public issues. These people are likely to originate from higher socioeconomic groups.

Moreover, the geographical basis for the decentralization proposed in most of the literature (with the possible exceptions of Ackoff and Friedmann) on local area planning would create the problem of having to define community boundaries on the basis of inconclusive and arbitrary criteria. The assumption of geographical criteria is often a questionable one since it excludes other forms of interest groups (eg. women, Indians and the poor living outside neighbourhoods identified as typically underprivileged) (Perryman, 1975, 73; Kasper, 1974).
This point of view would lead to the advocacy of a sectoral basis for defining local planning rather than a geographical basis.

In addition to these problems with the goals for local planning are the externalities in decentralization and participation such as parochialism of the community in response to wider issues. If wider issues are those issues that most interest and concern citizens, these could remain unresolved if each neighbourhood refuses to undertake its responsibilities and pay the costs toward resolving these issues (Perryman, 1975, 71).

Also, decentralization built around homogeneous neighbourhoods could create "ghettos" which would prevent social integration. For example, selecting neighbourhoods along ethnic lines may, in some instances, exacerbate ethnic conflict (Kasperson, 1974c, 34).

2.5 Previous Evaluations of Local Area Planning:

Empirical Studies of Local Area Planning in the past have taken the form of case studies, policy reviews by government bodies, and comparative studies.

2.5.1 Case Studies:

Two case studies are considered in this section, including Kaplan et al (1973) and Fraser (1972).

Kaplan, Gans and Kahn (1973) examine the model cities program in three American cities. Nevertheless, the study is not entirely a comparative one, and the authors describe each project as a separate case study. The methodology
for the study of the Seattle project includes an examination of two categories of phenomena in the planning process: content and process. The evaluation is presented under the following headings:

1. relationship between content and process,
2. achievement of coordination,
3. achievement of citizen participation,
4. achievement of innovation, and
5. level of technical assistance (Kaplan, Gans and Kahn, 1973).

They conclude that the planning process did not follow a model dictated by the federal agency because professionals and citizens did not work well together. While staff kept speeding the process so as to meet deadlines, citizens felt that the pace was too rapid. Citizens also complained that professionals took liberties in writing up proposals agreed to in committee; this may also have been related to the former problem in that the speed of the process may have resulted in misunderstandings between the two groups in the community. As a final result, the level of citizen involvement declined until it was virtually non-existent towards the end of process. According to the authors, this reduced the level of innovation (section 4 of evaluation) in the final product.

On the positive side, Seattle became the first community to receive implementation grants because:

1. agreement on principles was sought before detail,
2. high priority was given to speed in lieu of quality in decisions in light of the close deadlines that had to be met, and

3. the mayor was willing to delegate as much power as legally possible without reducing his level of support for the project (Kaplan et al, 1973)

Writing early in the development of Local Area Planning methods in Canada, Graham Fraser contends in his book that Trefann Court was a successful Local Area Planning project because it demonstrated that citizens groups were capable of more than criticism and rejection of plans, and that they could work together in preparing their own plans. A community group was welded together and a planner was hired to provide technical assistance in this project. Due to pressure from higher levels of government, the city was forced into not contradicting or overriding proposals made in committee, and although the plan was prepared under different conditions than the Seattle Model Cities Plan, this committee achieved a great deal of autonomy as well. The author felt that the problem of legitimacy was resolved by:

1. the involvement of a planner "consulting informally with the people on a day to day basis", and

2. by a detailed social survey worked out by the people on the working committee (Fraser, 1972, 261).

Nevertheless, there was clear danger of well organized groups dominating the process in this project. Tenants and property owners had previously been at odds over the need for urban renewal while expropriation had been an
active threat. After the committee was established and rehabilitation had been made into a major principle of this effort, tenants chose to leave planning to the other actors in an effort to speed the process and also because they were unable to "come to grips with the detailed problems which had to be solved" due, according to the author, to their longlasting reliance on bureaucrats to make decisions for them (Fraser, 1972, 261 - 261).

2.5.2 Comparative Research in Local Area Planning:

Cole points out the shortcomings of case studies and policy evaluations for improving citizen participation. He suggests that a comparative framework for analysis be developed so that the success or failure of each effort at incorporating participation in the process can be measured by the norm (Cole, 1974, 16). He claims that most of the case study research has been normative in nature and that a uniform scheme of categorization is necessary (Cole, 1974, 16 - 20).

Cole's scheme of quantification is the index called "level of participation" which is a measure of citizen control on the dimensions of intensity and variety of participation. Each city has one score on the index which is based on the performance and services offered by all the programs available in it. The study inventories most American cities with populations greater than 50,000. Variety is measured by the presence of 1) neighbourhood councils, 2) little city halls and 3) multiservice centres;
program intensity was measured by whether or not citizens had control over 1) plan approval, 2) budget revue, and 3) staffing (Cole, 1974, 24). The index is used both as a dependent and an independent variable in this study (Cole, 1974, 80).

Cole examines participation both in terms of quantity and quality. The "level of participation" did not correlate with ethnic variables in this study, nor with most socioeconomic variables, although income of cities studied did seem to be positively correlated with level of participation slightly (Cole, 1974, 45). City size, however, appeared to be positively correlated with the level of participation (Cole, 1974, 73).

Regarding the quality of participation, Cole found that the cities with the highest levels of participation tended to have the least representative participants demographically. Moreover, those same cities had the highest incidence of politically motivated participants, ie. participants motivated for personal political appointment or the political advancement of their ethnic group rather than the immediate social and economic goals of their neighbourhood community. Also, unrepresentative participation was positively correlated with a failure to achieve goals, ie. an inability to reach consensus, increased public trust in city officials, or improve public awareness of the program with time (Cole, 1974, 96 - 97).

Focussing on particular planning efforts, there was no congruency in any of the cases between the planning
participants and the community at large in socioeconomic characteristics such as high school graduation, completed number of school years and median income (Cole, 1974, 91).

Cultural and socioeconomic variables such as the above are only one measure of the level and quality of participation. Socioeconomic and cultural congruency between participants and the community, called descriptive representation, simply describes the similarity between participants and citizens in their external characteristics, and only suggests differences in their planning values. It does not measure the actions or values of the participants for comparison with community values to determine how accurately the participants represent the community. The latter approach constitutes what Cole describes as substantive representation (Cole, 1974, 20).

Cole's findings appear unfocussed and his highly quantified approach results in a poor in-depth understanding of the deterministic factors underlying representation. A failure to adequately explore substantive representation is evident, and it results from the inability of his methodology to examine the motives of the participants in reaching policy conclusions.

Using a sociological approach, Martin Needleman explores the role of the local area planner and his relationship with other actors that he becomes professionally involved with, including members of the local community, the remainder of the planning department, the remainder of the civic bureaucracy and the city council. His infor-
mation comes from extensive interviews with local area planners in several unidentified American cities. Needleman describes the local area planner as a local advocate who must fight municipal government from within in order to represent the interests of the citizens in his area; hence the title of "guerilla" in the bureaucracy (Needleman, 1974).

The following are examples of typical problems in local area planning identified by Needleman. Firstly, he concludes that the planner must deal with the fact he is identified with city hall and the stigma which arises from that. This is particularly important in light of the ombudsman role which Needleman identifies in local area planners. Another problem that is related to citizen participation is the fact that the local planner must straddle the line between giving the impression that he is effective in bringing about positive change, and consequently made responsible for any decisions by the city which have been harmful to members of the community, or, alternatively, denying responsibility for those decisions and being treated by the public as irrelevant in bringing about changes in other subjects. A third important problem common to the planning process is deciding how to deal with the situation whenever a consensus cannot be reached.

Much like Needleman, Grant Anderson (1976) explores the role of the local planner in the context of other roles in the local planning process. He examines the
relationship of planners to 1) professional politicians, 2) academics and intellectuals, 3) resident amateurs, 4) development interests, 5) other civic planners and 6) other civic departments.

Anderson found by interviewing planners involved in local planning in Toronto, Vancouver, Hamilton and Winnipeg that local planners do not completely represent the people in their communities. Although he does not find that local planners are not equipped by their training to represent local interests, he does establish that they are intimidated by the greed and short-sightedness of citizens, and that a lack of consensus commonly forces the planner to act for the general interest, either by seeking solutions that serve the greatest good or by acting for city-wide interests instead. However, certain variables like the level of apathy affect the level of satisfaction of the planner in his role, and apathy is less prevalent in local areas that are threatened by large projects (Anderson, 1976, 170ff).

Anderson feels that local area planning does not meet all the goals of decentralized planning and participatory democracy. However, local area planning does educate people regarding the functions of government, and it provides them with a forum for expressing their concerns. It also makes government more sensitive to their concerns (Anderson, 1976, 215 - 216).

These more modest expectations have also been the
conclusion of other evaluations of Local Area Planning efforts (Hruza, 1972, 209). Hruza argues that this type of feedback mechanism is needed in planning for social change in public service agencies due to the rapidly changing circumstances of today's society (Hruza, 1972, 159). Hence, while Local Area Planning does not meet the expectations of participatory democracy theory or the theory of advocacy planning, it does meet important needs.

2.6 Conclusions

Since representation is seen as a difficult variable, conflict resolution has been seen as an alternate indicator of project success. Consequently, what to do with conflict and the lack of consensus has become a crucial issue in studies of the planner's role in Local Area Planning. One assumption that could be used to justify the use of this factor as an indicator of project success is that it plays an important role in the functioning of the feedback process of Local Area Planning.

The literature offers some techniques for preventing conflict used in different projects. In Seattle, the planners sought agreement in principle before agreement in detail in all matters. In Trefann Court, the organizers were aware that one group was underrepresented while another group dominated the process, but did not upset the status quo for fear of arresting progress. There is a feeling, then, that the planner can manipulate consensus or compromise using strategy.
However, as Needleman and Anderson show, not all the planners dealt with groups that could make compromises, and they often had to make decisions for themselves using their own criteria. Hence, the problem of conflict resolution is divided into conflict prevention and dealing with unresolvable conflict.

Some literature sources have dealt with the issue of representation as it affects internal conflict, i.e., within the participating body, and they deal with representation as it effects trust in municipal officials. Cole (1974) concludes that descriptive representation, or the median similarity between participants' socioeconomic characteristics and those of the community they represent\(^1\) is correlated with the above conflict problems.

That the legitimacy of the role of local area planning and citizen involvement is questioned by other city departments is an important issue in the literature (Needleman, 1974; Anderson, 1976) particularly in the more recent literature. That issue is external conflict, or a conflict between the local citizen body and other city departments. The earlier literature (late 1960's and early 1970's) saw local area planning as a response to the extraordinary political controversies of the times. This means that the earlier literature concentrated on internal conflicts between interests within the participating arena. An example is the conflict between homeowners anxious to

\(^{1}\)As measured by the median number of school years attended, the proportions having completed high school and/or median incomes.
preserve their homes and neighbourhoods on one side, and public assistance recipients and merchants anxious to see redevelopment and public housing on the other side as in Fraser's (1971) book, *Trefann Court*.

One common conclusion in the literature is that participants in Local Area Planning may often be unrepresentative of the people in their communities. This serves to contradict the beliefs and assumptions of many strong advocates of Local Area Planning (Davidoff, 1969; Fraser, 1972; Friedmann, 1973b). However, that this issue remains somewhat unresolved testifies to the value laden nature of this subject. Much of the problem lies in shortcomings in the concepts used. Descriptive representation is an insufficient indicator by itself and substantive representation can never be represented satisfactorily. This is because a parallel can never be made between the types of decisions made by participants after making the necessary compromises in this type of planning process and the types of decisions which the rest of the community would have preferred with an incomplete knowledge of the necessary compromises.

A major reason for the literature's inability to deal with this topic lies in a failure to generate an adequate methodology for examining representation. Citizen involvement and planning are both processes and both descriptive and substantive representation are static indicators of that variable. The generation of a process-oriented methodology for analyzing representation is required.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Purpose:

To better evaluate local area planning projects with regard to the issue of representation in existing forums for citizen involvement, a new process oriented methodology is required. It has become necessary to generate information using this methodology to:

1. facilitate analysis for the current debate within institutional circles over the potential of local area planning to adequately represent a wide portion of neighbourhood communities.

2. facilitate a feedback process in which local area planners can evaluate their own performance in areas where they can affect the level of representation.

In order to further facilitate the development of a feedback process, the areas in which the planner manipulates representation must be discerned, and a general framework for maintaining representation must be developed. The research reported in the remainder of this thesis is oriented to the development of both the representation evaluation methodology and the planner's role in maintaining representation.

Representation shall refer to the phenomena wherein certain members of the community (participants) act on behalf of the community or a portion thereof in bringing together information or reaching policy agreement toward planning.

3.2 Value Position:

One premise must be openly revealed for this research to be understood. It is assumed that city government is
concerned about the popularity of planning policy from the point of view of the taxpayer. While developers and other outside interests play a dominant role in the economics of urban development, the premise underlying planning has been the need to provide community control over urban development so that the people are not alienated from it.

Therefore, it is assumed that when city government and implementing departments are critical of citizen involvement, it is because those in charge feel it inadequately represents the values and preferences of all the community, and not because they are against policies that are in line with community preferences. However, it is understood that certain city departments which implement city policy are subject to operational constraints not understood by the general public. It is the hope of this researcher that city government will continue to evolve so that the general public will have more direct input to city policy, and at the same time, find better opportunities for understanding the operational constraints of implementing departments.

3.3 Definitions:

The following terms are used extensively in this report and/or they are commonly found in the literature reviewed in the previous chapter. Other terms are defined as they are introduced.

Citizen involvement or participation shall refer to a process in which citizens, who are not elected representatives
form an officially sanctioned body which meets regularly to play an active role in government policy making. For this research, the officially sanctioned body will be citizen's advisory committees which will be described in the next chapter. In certain instances reference will be made to other forms of citizen involvement which will refer to informal contacts between private citizens and planning professionals, involvement in design-ins and neighbourhood walks, non-members attending committee meetings, correspondence from private citizens or organization and participation in community questionnaires.

**Participants** refers to committee members in most instances, but depending on the context, it may refer to those taking an active part in other forms of citizen involvement.

**Representativeness**, using the approach introduced by Cole, shall be divided into two concepts for purposes of analysis.

Descriptive representation is the degree of divergence between social and economic characteristics of the participants and the socio-economic characteristics of the rest of the community. The three indicators of descriptive representation used in this research are level of educational attainment, occupational category, and ethnic background.

Substantive representation is the degree of divergence between the planning priorities of the committee, or its planning decisions and those priorities evident in the community.
While universalism and particularism are used extensively in the planning literature to reflect on the nature of participants, the literature rarely defines them. They are opposite poles in a dichotomy introduced by Talcott Parsons (Parsons and Shils, 1967, 77). In this case, Parsons' cultural dichotomy is used. Universalism refers to the tendency to view an object in the light of general standards rather than in the light of properties that relate to an actor's own status. Particularism refers to the tendency to view an object in the light of properties that relate to the actor's own status rather than according to general standards (Parsons and Shils, 1967, 82). For example, a member of a citizens' planning committee is particularistic when he views a planning decision in terms of how he feels about his own property investment, and he is universalistic when he views a decision directly in terms of existing community values regarding such things as the needs of single parents, the problem of juvenile delinquency or urban design constraints.

The neighbourhood plan is viewed as the final product of this planning effort; a document which proposes a set of goals and a policy framework for development and land use in the neighbourhood. In this case, a neighbourhood plan can be a part of an integrated plan for government expenditures for physical and social improvements in the neighbourhood such as in the Neighbourhood Improvement
Plan. Although the neighbourhood plan is not a legal document until ratified by council, the draft plan submitted to council and the final plan adopted by council are viewed as different stages of the evolving neighbourhood plan.

The definition of planning that is used in this research has been arbitrarily narrowed to include only the development of the neighbourhood plan. Process is defined as the effort undertaken by relevant actors (ie. planners, citizen participants, government participants) to complete the plan. It is acknowledged that the split between planning and implementation is an arbitrary one since after policy decisions are made on the plan and the plan is completed, many more decisions require "planning" or consideration in terms of the facts both as they arise or are researched. However, the production of the neighbourhood plan and the consideration of neighbourhood interests in policy development and the development of tentative recommendations is an important step in facilitating the quick unimpeded implementation of the neighbourhood plan.¹ The process oriented methodology will be exclusively concerned with this important stage of the whole planning phenomenon.

¹This is both an expressed principle found in the N.I.P. guidelines (C.M.H.C., 1973b) and a conclusion reached in Kaplan et al (1973).
3.4 Process Oriented Methodology:

A process oriented methodology is founded on the dynamics of the events that take place during planning. In examining the subject of representation the following question is asked: what measures are taken by which actors in the process to ensure that representation is extended to the maximum?

This is different than other methodologies that have been used to examine representation in the literature. In some cases, researchers have focussed on the underlying characteristics of those actors in the process to determine if there is any symmetry between participants and the community (geographical, socio-economic, ethnic). In other cases researchers sought to ascertain if the plan made allocations to deserving social groups. The former method ignores developments in the planning process which might cause a heightened awareness on the part of the participants resulting in a better product or plan for meeting the diverse needs of the community. The latter method is too subjective and is not sensitive to the constraints in planning, ie. the limited resources and the resulting difficulty of meeting everybody's needs.
Employing insights from the literature, the following factors are seen as fundamental when examining process with a view to representation:

1. the evolution of a universalistic perspective in a core group of participants;
2. evidence that the active actors in the process (e.g., the planners) analyzed of the community with a view to identifying the social segments that must be incorporated into process,
3. evidence of a mix of participation techniques likely to appeal to the different segments of the community.

These elements of process are the basis with which representation can be evaluated in any planning process, either by the active planner, program evaluator or academic. The first of these is derived from Friedmann's concept of the learning process. Friedmann argued that participatory planning can promote human understanding. The subject matter of Friedmann's learning process is construed in this study to be universalism.

Evidence of a mix of participation techniques is important because different participation techniques are likely to appeal to different social and psychological segments of the community. This statement is offered as a postulate concerning the structure of public involvement which is referred to as the "diversity of involvement" postulate.
The assumption could be tested as a hypothesis using empirical indicators of representation. However, representation is a highly subjective phenomenon, and empirical indicators of representation would be very arbitrary. Instead of testing the assumption as a hypothesis and giving it a false degree of scientific precision, the assumption shall be referred to as a postulate which must be supported by certain observations in the case study.

This research develops a process oriented methodology in two phases. First, evidence is sought to support the above mentioned "diversity of involvement" postulate through research findings. The postulate is tested in Chapter 5 by showing that different forms of citizen involvement generate unique and often contradictory conclusions. Second, a general framework for carrying out the methodology presented in this chapter is applied in Chapter 5 using a case study approach.

If the postulate is supported, the case study findings interpreted through the process methodology should indicate the degree of representation achieved in the process. Since the methodology is not quantitative in nature, a judgment must be made regarding the impact of each source of input on the final plan.
The following are therefore relevant in the process oriented methodology:

1. community organization efforts by the staff professions intended to influence representation,

2. other decisions made by the planner which influence process,

3. evidence of research used to formulate an understanding of the different segments of the community,

4. whether or not supplemental citizen involvement techniques were used and how these were co-ordinated with an understanding of the different segments of the community,

5. any evidence of the impact of different forms of citizen involvement in its different forms on the plan produced.

3.5 Case Study Approach:

The case study approach was selected despite Cole's
criticism of that method. Cole charges that the findings from case studies have been too descriptive and that they result in studies that have a normative undercurrent. Nevertheless, Cole's research, which gathers data extensively from a large field rather than focusing intensively on a limited and easy to conceptualize case, tends to obscure analysis by overlooking the complex human motivations and activities that can often explain social events. Moreover, the development of a process oriented methodology necessitates a careful consideration of the entire planning process rather than a limited number of quantifiable variables. Hence the case study approach is essential for this research.

3.6 Scope:

Before the actual case study, its setting is described in chapter 4 which is entitled current institutional arrangements for local area planning. Chapter 4 describes the various other programs subsumed under the Local Area Planning Division in addition to the Neighbourhood Improvement program. It includes:

A. On a municipal level:
   1. the role of Local Area Planning in Vancouver,
   2. the history of Local Area Planning in Vancouver, and

B. On a national level:
   1. the role of NIP/the history of its inception, and
   2. the models for community organization suggested in NIP guidelines.
It is important that these descriptive matters be dealt with at the outset so that the reader will develop his own understanding of the context for the case study situation.

The case study found in chapter 5 is used for three purposes:

1. to find support for the postulate regarding the relationship between representation and diversity in forms of citizen involvement,
2. to apply the process oriented methodology in evaluating two local area planning projects,
3. to apply other methodologies (substantive and descriptive) for purposes of comparing their results with those of the process oriented methodology.

The approach to be used in analysing descriptive and substantive representation is as follows:

Descriptive representation focusses on a few indicators of the social and economic characteristics of the participants and the community to establish the level of symmetry between the two. The characteristics that were available in Riley Park included ethnicity, labour force composition, educational attainment, age and geographical distribution. The available characteristics in Grandview Woodlands were occupational characteristics, approximate age and geographical distribution.

Substantive representation was examined by:

1. comparing the expressed planning priorities of the committee with those of the community, and
2. examining geographical biases which result when
resource allocation proposed in the plan (government capital expenditures) are geographically concentrated in the very areas in which the core group of participants reside.

While the latter explores implied geographical biases, no satisfactory method was introduced in the literature for exploring implied socio-economic biases on the part of the committee.

The applicability of the new methodology, if applied successfully in the case study, will be limited to the type of project empirically examined. This case study involves Neighbourhood Improvement Projects or other projects that have characteristics similar to N.I.P. projects. N.I.P. areas were selected only if the physical state of the neighbourhood had not deteriorated to the point that improvements would be a waste of resources. This means that they must be stable neighbourhoods with limited pressure for redevelopment, limited internal conflict and, therefore, limited conflict between the citizens and city administration. At the same time, N.I.P. neighbourhoods must be lower income neighbourhoods.

N.I.P. projects are also a form of decentralized planning because they directly concern a part of the whole city. Also, the N.I.P. project is affected by the presence of a financial grant, the allocation of which is both one of the issues in the preparation of the plan, and a kind of reward for successfully completing a plan acceptable to city council. Therefore, once the methodology
has been successfully applied it shall be applicable to citizen involvement in decentralized planning efforts in lower income communities with limited political conflict. Moreover, a financial grant for area improvements must be one of the planning subjects. Further study must be undertaken before applying the methodology in different planning contexts.

3.7 Data Sources:

The primary method for researching chapter 4 is documentary analysis. Memoranda and publications of the Vancouver Planning Department and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation* are used. Documentary evidence will also serve in the case study. The sequence of events in the planning process will be summarized from the minutes taken at planning committee meetings. Planning Department reports provide some of the data on the social and economic characteristics of the communities.

Other data on the local areas and the planning committee's and neighbourhoods' social and economic characteristics are gathered from surveys commissioned or endorsed by the committees and carried out by the planning staff or other organizations.

One such initiative was a Young Canada Works project survey of Riley Park in 1977. In addition to the questionnaire results it sought information

*Today known as Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
on the distribution of households among different sub-areas. This background information is used in this study to compare the distribution of households in the community with the distribution of households and businesses represented in the N.I.P. committee. The geographical breakdown of households in Grandview Woodlands was estimated from the enumeration area census information adjusted for overlapping areas by a "windshield survey".

In Riley Park and Grandview Woodlands, information on the occupational composition, age distribution, educational attainment and location of homes of committee members was derived through interviews with the planner and planning assistant. Information pertains to all people who were committee members at one time or other during the six month concept planning stage.

Substantive representation, once again, is explored directly, and through geographical biases reflected in the plan. In Riley Park, committee members were asked to complete an opinionaire on community goals before a similar questionnaire was completed in the community. Hence, the committee was not influenced by the community questionnaire, and the results of both surveys can safely be compared.

Information on substantive representation in Grandview Woodlands was not available as the committee members there did not collect information on their own preferences before receiving information on community preferences.

Data for the process oriented methodology was derived
from the sequence of events that took place in the planning process and follow up questionnaires. The sequence of events in both projects were recorded in the minutes of the planning committee meetings.

Further information was derived from a survey especially administered for this thesis in both Riley Park and Grandview Woodlands. Interviews were held with the various actors involved in the planning process in the case studies. These include the two planners in charge of planning, the two planning assistants and four citizens from the two core groups of participants. The questionnaires were informal in nature, meaning that much of the questioning was formulated in a discursive context and many of the issues discussed arose as a result of the respondents' lines of thinking. The various compulsory subjects in the questionnaire are listed in Appendix 1.

3.8 Choice of Study Areas:

Two study areas were selected with core participant groups called planning committees. Both projects used other forms of citizen involvement as well as the committees. Riley Park completed its planning agenda within the time constraints imposed by city council. Grandview Woodlands did not manage to do this despite its smaller, more manageable committee. These two committees were established at the same time, 1975, and were selected in light of their
similarity in terms of time period and their dissimilarity in terms of process characteristics.
CONTEMPORARY INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR LOCAL AREA PLANNING

4.1 The Evolution of Local Area Planning in Vancouver

Vancouver was first subdivided into a comprehensive set of neighbourhoods in a 1967 report by the United Way (Vancouver, 1973). The 1973 Vancouver report on local area planning established the city's policy during the period 1973 - 1978. That report supported rehabilitation through local oriented planning (Vancouver, 1973). It stated the following objectives for local area planning:

1. to minimize conflict between the city and neighbourhood groups and eliminating the need for confrontation politics by providing opportunities for citizen involvement;
2. to maximize citizen involvement; and
3. to operate within the existing municipal framework, requiring that the bureaucracy become more sensitive to social needs.

During the time period of this case study, the forms of local area planning in Vancouver were listed in a report (Vancouver, 1977a), and they included:

1. Council endorsed area programs: These are initiated by council upon recommendation by the Planning Department and/or a request by area citizens. They are decentralized efforts because:
   1. an area is defined,
   2. a planner and planning staff are assigned,
   3. a citizen's advisory committee is initiated and endorsed,
   4. an area plan is prepared jointly by planners and citizens (Vancouver 1977a). Final decisions regarding the plan are left to council.

2. Neighbourhood initiatives: These are independent efforts by community groups which may not even be connected to the Planning Department. These are usually issue oriented
and the process is often temporary in nature. They are small scale groups that prepare advocacy proposals. An example of this type of group is the Downtown Eastside Residents Association (Vancouver, 1977a).

3. Neighbourhood Improvement Program: In Vancouver, a planner and staff is assigned to each Neighbourhood Improvement Program project for most of its duration. A Citizen's Advisory Committee (Henceforth C.A.C.) is established and a scheme is developed jointly by citizens and planners for submission to council. A sum of money is allocated to the program to pay the planning staff and various capital projects for improvements in the neighbourhood. Depending on the type of expenditure, 50 to 75% of the funds are derived from a National Housing Act fund administered by Central Mortgage and Housing, and from the provincial government. The exact nature of the N.I.P. agreement in Canadian cities determines the portion of the N.I.P. grant which is carried by the provincial and federal (N.H.A.) governments. Also, an N.H.A. loan is available to finance the city's portion (25 - 50%) of the N.I.P. project. In Vancouver, the N.I.P. plan is viewed as a policy document rather than as a group of disjointed proposals for the allocation of funds (Vancouver, 1977a).

4. Planning Department Initiatives Requested by Council: Frequently, the Planning Department undertakes, either through its own initiative or under direction from City Council, projects oriented to single issues or a group of related issues. The planner then finds solutions to problems in consultation with citizens through public meetings or by using previously established citizen groups. Examples of such projects include the Shaughnessy Hospital expansion study (Vancouver, 1977a, 5).

In Vancouver, Local Area Planning has been defined as,

... an attempt to take a very close look at a community within the City in view of its own particular needs and aspirations, and at the same time, to examine those localized concerns within the context of the problems, issues and goals of the City as a whole (Vancouver, 1973, 1).

Hence, the central purpose of Local Area Planning in Vancouver, is not so much as a forum for representation of local interests
to the Planning Department and City government, as the advocacy proponents would have it (see Davidoff, sec. 2.1), but it is a forum for problem solving and conflict resolution in Local Areas using both localized and centralized inputs. This emphasis on coordination rather than confrontation is underscored by certain principles such as the "team approach" concept, emphasizing a coordinated effort by the City bureaucracy, and the "working partnership" approach to citizen participation (Vancouver, 1977a).

The citizen's committee is evident in both N.I.P. and council endorsed local area planning projects. These constitute a core group of participants which require special attention in any case study.

The planning staff in the local area serves as a resource for information gathering and analysis for the advisory committees. The citizens and planners act together in preparing the neighbourhood plan which is submitted to council for final approval.

4.2 Federal Involvement:

While the basic features of the N.I.P. program are discussed in section 4.1, several more points must be made. N.I.P. was introduced as a means of financing urban improvements in residential areas to prolong the life of housing in older, lower income areas (Central Mortgage and Housing, 1973b).

An early consultant report by Barnard and Associates presented in 1973 laid the groundwork for this program.
(C.M.H.C., 1973a). It proposed a process entitled "project management" which included:

1. planning and funding,
2. starting up,
3. construction (implementation), and
4. assessment.

This report proposed that process consist of:

1. management and administration,
2. citizen participation, and
3. monitoring and control.

While project management was not adequately defined, the concept appeared to be very similar to the concept of community organization discussed in chapter 2. The report argued that the citizens must be placed in a key role in carrying out projects in order to commit them to sustained improvements in the future. The role of planning was de-emphasized and the role of implementation was emphasized in citizen involvement in order to sustain public interest. Citizens were expected to take part in technical tasks like preparing cost estimates and conducting daily research as well as finalizing policy decisions. While the ultimate responsibility for technical matters remained in the hands of the project manager, the importance of volunteers in this role appears to give him a larger role in motivational and organizational matters.

The importance of public involvement was underscored when the following ideals were proposed:

1. Existing community groups must be sought and
involved.

2. To an extent determined by the number of community groups, community organization work is important. If a number of community groups are present, and they appear to represent a broad cross section of the community, community organization is unnecessary. If few community groups are present, community organization techniques must be invoked to create one for the purpose of carrying out the project.

3. Early visible evidence of the project must be presented to publicize the project. Examples would include a clean-up campaign or the early construction of a visible public work, such as a community bulletin board.

4. A site office should be introduced so that the distance between the staff and the residents can be reduced.

5. Delays should be avoided in planning and in implementing the project so that interest can be sustained.

6. The manager should direct the planning process to some extent to ensure that the process begins by formulating clear, measurable goals before tackling more problematic implementation strategies in the construction stage (this is identical to the strategy employed in the Seattle Model Cities' Project (see section 2.5)).

While many of the suggestions made in the Barnard report were incorporated in the program, the role of citizen involvement was made less pervasive. A great deal of the characteristics of the citizen involvement effort were left to community discretion. In fact, no specific guidelines were included pertaining to citizen participation in the N.I.P. Operator's Handbook (C.M.H.C., 1975) "due to the wide variety in regional, historical and cultural factors" (C.M.H.C., 1975, I14). General principles, though, were offered in an appendix, and these recommended:

1. that a high proportion of residents have an
opportunity to be informed of, and to comment on, the planning proposals, and

2. that residents have a significant influence on the decision making process so that the concept plan combines the desires of area residents and the priorities of the city at large (C.M.H.C., 1975, 114).

Generally, N.I.P. projects are five years in duration. This includes a six-month site selection stage, a six-month policy planning stage, followed by a four-year implementation stage (C.M.H.C., 1973).

Therefore, while the N.I.P. program was terminated in 1978, some projects are still underway since they have a maximum of four years to implement their proposals. Riley Park and Grandview Woodlands are currently in their implementation stages.
5. CASE STUDY

5.1 Setting:

5.1.1 Riley Park:

Riley Park was designated as a priority local area for NIP funding in 1974. The planning process for a 1.9 million dollar project began in 1975 (Riley Park, 1977, 1).

5.1.1.1 Neighbourhood Characteristics

Figure 5.1 illustrates the boundaries of the Riley Park NIP area. Much of the information used in planning this project, and in this description, pertains to the entire Riley Park Local Area, and only constitutes a general profile of the NIP area. For purposes of exposition, the larger Local Area shall be referred to as the "Local Area", and the smaller NIP area shall be referred to as the "NIP area".

The land use of the NIP area is predominantly residential although it also has a large proportion of commercial and open space land use. There are 3,800 dwelling units in the NIP area, most of which are single family structures (Riley Park 1977, 3). According to the 1971 census 69% of the households in the local area constitute single family detached units, while the city figure is 49% (Vancouver, 1976). However, recent surveys show that 25% of the single family units also have secondary suites (Riley Park, 1977, 3).

The majority of the N.I.P. area is zoned RS-1 (one family) and RS-2 (which allows conversions to suites and
1974 and 1975 - New applications subject to 1977 CHHC fund allocations
1976 - New applications to be considered after April, 1977 in Grandview and after August, 1977, in Riley Park

Figure 5.1
NIP/RAP AREAS

1974 - Kitsilano & Cedar Cottage
1975 - Downtown Eastside & Mt. Pleasant
1976 - Grandview-Woodland & Riley Park
1977 - Proposed Areas - Hastings-Sunrise & Kensington
(M.I.P. Boundaries not yet established by City Council)
townhouses on a conditional approval basis). The only multiple family housing is the 254 unit Little Mountain Assisted Housing project dating from 1954 (Riley Park, 1977, 3).

The commercial facilities are arranged linearly along Main Street and Fraser Street. A recent Planning Department analysis found that the core of local shopping activity serving day to day needs is on Main Street between 24th and 29th Avenue (Riley Park, 1977, 3).

The area is served by three elementary and one secondary school (Riley Park, 1977, 3).

Local Parks include Riley Park, Hillcrest Park, Cartier Park and Prince Edward Park. Mountainview Cemetery serves as an important open space (Riley Park, 1977, 3).

The population in the local area is 12,500. The age distribution (see chart 5.1) shows a marginally younger population than the Vancouver norm since it does not have apartment areas. This factor along with the larger households in the area indicates a disproportionate number of households with children (Riley Park, 1977, 2).

Unlike some East End Vancouver neighbourhoods, there are no large agglomerations of particular ethnic minorities (see chart 5.2) and the area is marked by its ethnic diversity.

5.1.1.2 Participation in the Local Area:

In the recent past, the School Consultative Committee, the Little Mountain Tenants Association, the Community
AGE COMPOSITION OF POPULATION: RILEY PARK AND VANCOUVER

CHART 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 54</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETHNICITY: RILEY PARK AND VANCOUVER

CHART 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Isles</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Pakistani</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese/Spanish</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East European</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Stated</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association, and until recently, the Community Resources Advisory Board, provided forums for citizen involvement in education, social services, housing, and recreation (Riley Park, 1977, 2).

Local and city wide ethnic societies based in this community include the Polish Community Centre and the Welsh Hall.

5.1.2 Grandview Woodlands:

Grandview Woodlands and Riley Park are sister projects in the sense that they took place at the same time and with similar schedules. Planning began in Grandview Woodlands in 1976 and a committee was formed there in November of that year. The project is slightly larger and has a $2.5 million budget.

5.1.2.1 Neighbourhood Characteristics:

Figure 5.1 illustrates the boundaries of the Grandview Woodlands's N.I.P. area and the Grandview Woodland's local area. The N.I.P. area is much smaller than the Grandview Woodland's local area, which includes a large amount of transitional multiple family residential and industrial land use, not permissible within a designated N.I.P. area. Unlike the Riley Park N.I.P. area, the Grandview Woodland's N.I.P. area overlaps another city local area, namely, the portion of Cedar Cottage located south of East Broadway and north of Grandview Highway.

According to the 1976 Census, there are over 13,000 people in the Grandview Woodland's N.I.P. area. There
are over 4,385 dwellings, 56% single family, 18% duplexes and 26% apartments. 56% of the houses are owner occupied. By comparison, 49% of the dwellings in Vancouver as a whole are single family dwellings. Commercial facilities are concentrated mostly along Commercial Drive, although a smaller number of stores on Victoria Drive and corner groceries throughout the area also must be mentioned.

The N.I.P. area is served by at least eight schools, both public and parochial, including Britannia High School, Britannia Elementary, MacDonald School, Templeton Junior High School, Lord Nelson School, Laura Secord School, Grandview Annex, and St. Francis Parish School. The area is served by five major parks including Garden Park, McSpadden Park, Victoria Park, Grandview Park and Templeton Park.

The age distribution showed a marginally younger population than the Vancouver norm in 1971 in the Grandview Woodland's local area. The age composition pyramid shown in chart 5.3 is more comparable to Riley Park's than to Vancouver's.

Chart 5.4 illustrates the area's ethnic distribution. Unlike Riley Park, this local area's ethnic composition shows two strong non British ethnic concentrations, the Chinese and Italian. Of all Vancouver communities, it has the second smallest proportion of residents with British origins (City Planning Department, 1975, 10).

Zoning in Grandview Woodlands is primarily residential.
GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS:
AGE COMPOSITION COMPARED
WITH VANCOUVER

CHART 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grandview Woodlands</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 54</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Grandview Woodlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Isles</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Pakistani</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese/Spanish</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East European</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Stated</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** City of Vancouver. (1975) Planning Department, Grandview Woodlands: An information handbook, 11.
Like Riley Park, most of the area is zoned RS1 and RS2. Unlike Riley Park, a large part of the N.I.P. area is zoned RT2, which permits duplexes and two family housing. Shopping is located along both sides of Commercial Drive and zoned C2 (City Planning Department, 1975, 21).

5.1.2.2 Participation in the Local Area:

This community is extremely well organized with strong media, strong community council and several cultural societies representing ethnic communities.

Unlike Riley Park, this community has a weekly newspaper which makes it easier for the Grandview Woodlands resident to become aware of local events. However, the community has several non English speaking ethnic enclaves. Hence, local planning events are not known nor understood by everyone in the community because of language barriers. Nevertheless, the local English newspaper still plays an important role in disseminating information, and in establishing a community identity, a very basic function which was not performed to the same extent by any agency in the Riley Park area before N.I.P.

Existing formal groupings include the Grandview Woodlands Area Council (which is an association of area residents), the Britannia Board of Management and the various school committees. The area has a firm tradition of involvement by area residents which was no doubt reinforced in recent years by the Britannia Centre planning experience.

The Centre is a large multi-service facility combining
1) schools, 2) library, 3) athletic facilities 4) public information and 5) social services. After years of lobbying by groups in the community, funds were allocated, and a planning process was established for this new facility in 1974. Planning was centred on a committee called the Britannia Planning Advisory Committee (B.P.A.C.), which was comprised of four representatives from the School Board, Parks Boards, and the city, as well as six citizen representatives from Grandview Woodlands and Strathcona (selected by the Grandview Woodlands Area Council).

While the centre of activity for Chinese groups is in neighbouring Strathcona, Italians are well organized by the Italian Folk Society and Circolo Arbizzese, an Italian Mens' Club. The Italian Community Centre is an impressive new structure located just outside the N.I.P. area boundary on Grandview Avenue.

5.2 Planning Products:
5.2.1 Riley Park Neighbourhood Plan:

The concept plan, contained in Appendix 2, includes both recommendations for capital expenditures (see table 5.1) and non capital measures. Of the thirty-nine items in the plan, nineteen were non capital proposals.

Proposed non capital measures included:

1. further negotiation with existing agencies (outside city government) toward specific goals,
2. further research and study,
3. policy goals for physical changes (eg., land use, and,
4. community organization for implementing the plan.
Since the primary costs of social programs are operating expenses (mostly for labour costs), capital allocations only provide for a small portion of the needs of social programs. Nevertheless, the committee hoped to provide for a portion of the community's social needs by meeting the capital costs of desirable social programs. They hoped that this would serve as an incentive for city wide social agencies, e.g., the Neighbourhood Houses Association, to meet operating expenses.

The draft plan contained an organizing strategy referred to, here, as the binodal improvement strategy. Accordingly, the N.I.P. plan was oriented toward focussing the community around certain key recreational areas, i.e., Riley Park, St. George Park and the linkages in between (see figure 5.2). However, neither the binodal strategy, nor the linear walkway were retained for the final concept plan, and there is no evidence in the committee meeting minutes to suggest that anybody but Larry Beasley, the project planner, felt that strategy was necessary.

The events which led to the deletion of the binodal improvement strategy are explored in a subsequent section dealing with planning process. The binodal improvement strategy is mentioned because it led to a strong emphasis on financial provisions for Riley Park, St. George Park and Main Street which is a natural connector between the two parks.
FIGURE 5.2  RELY PARK
PATTERNS FOR STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENT OF THE COMMUNITY

- Existing parks, schools & public open space
- Focus of local park recreation activity
- Major & significant pedestrian connections
- Local Commercial Centre
- General Suburban Commercial
- Convenience Commercial
- Specialized Rec./Leisure Centres
- Tot Play Areas
- Focus for infill multiple housing
- Focus for group commercial parking
- Streets as pedestrian barriers
## TABLE 5.1 CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS IN TWO N.I.P. PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
<th>Grandview Woodlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Programs</td>
<td>$710,000*</td>
<td>$ 90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Improvements</td>
<td>267,200</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>382,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvements</td>
<td>75,750</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Fund</td>
<td>198,010</td>
<td>120,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Area Beautification</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Planning</td>
<td>374,040</td>
<td>252,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Projects</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,985,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,590,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes capital funds for a library, neighbourhood youth centre, community van, roller skates for a proposed rink.
### TABLE 5.2 RILEY PARK: CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

**Allocations for Geographically Unspecified Projects:**

1. Neighbourhood House $200,000  
2. Youth Centre 150,000  
3. Community Van 20,000  
4. Street Improvements 190,000  
5. Storefront Library 100,000  

$660,000.

**Allocations for Projects Located Outside the Activity Nodes:**

1. Pedestrian Light Crossing at 33rd and Ontario $20,000  
2. Cartier Park Improvements 45,200  
3. Brock School Improvements 21,000  
4. Brock Annex 17,250  
5. Wolfe School Improvements 29,000  
6. Riley Alternate School Improvements 5,000  

$137,450

**Allocations for Projects Located Within Activity Nodes:**

1. Riley Recreation Complex $225,000  
2. Roller Rink in Recreation Complex 15,000  
3. Hillcrest Park/Melrose Improvements 75,800  
4. Riley Park Exterior Improvements 68,200  
5. Prince Edward Park Improvements 78,000  
6. Main Street Beautification 170,000  
7. Livingstone School Improvements 3,500  

$535,500.

**Administrative Allocations:**

1. N.I.P. Staff and Office $374,040  
2. Contingency Fund 198,010  

$572,050
5.2.2 **Product: Grandview Woodlands**

The concept plan produced by the Grandview Woodlands N.I.P. Committee forms Appendix 3. It was presented to council shortly after the submission of the Riley Park plan in June, 1977.

Non capital recommendations are contained in a section entitled "Land Use and Development". Policy recommendations were made by committee members on the assumption that the committee could influence city policy for the future. Thirteen non capital policy recommendations were presented in the "Land Use and Development" section under the subjects of:

1. housing,
2. commercial areas,
3. traffic and parking, and
4. recreation.

Like the Riley Park policies, these can be divided into categories including:

1. policy directives,
2. needed policy research, and
3. liaison needed with other agencies and departments.

The plan broke capital expenditures into seven substantive areas, (see figure 5.1), eg., schools, housing, streets improvements. Site specific or project specific breakdowns were made for street improvements and school improvements although not for parks improvements and community social service expenditures. Schools improvements
constituted the largest single category of expenditure of the total (see Appendix 3).

5.3 Process Events - The Development of the Committees:

5.3.1 Riley Park Planning Process:

Theoretically, the committee was to become the focus of the planning process. While council has the final decision making power, it is not likely to challenge decisions which are based on local concerns and values, nor is council on record as having ever challenged recommendations in the concept plan of a N.I.P. committee. At the other end of the decision making process, other organs for public input do not have as crucial a role as the committee's. They provide passive forms of issue development and feedback to be used by the committee in reaching its decision. Meanwhile, the committee is expected to take an active role by grappling with issues, viewing all sides of every matter, making trade offs and reaching policy conclusions.

There was an evolving plan of action by the staff to engage the citizenry. At first the staff worked mostly through existing neighbourhood groups in an effort to make its way into the community.

Existing organizations were used to provide legitimacy to the staff. According to Larry Beasley, the local area planner in Riley Park, the staff spent a month and a half engaged in a "carefully orchestrated process" of entering the area. It spent twenty evenings, during that
period, attending the meetings of organizations like the School Consultative Committees (parent groups), the Community Resources Board and the Tenants' Association.

When the staff was finally presented to the public at a public meeting in late November, 1976, two established organizations sponsored its entry to the neighbourhood. They were the Little Mountain Human Resources Advisory Board, which represented the working class, and the Riley Park Community Association, which represented the middle to upper-middle class.

Organizational contacts, in addition to rendering legitimacy to the staff, played a role by giving community organization advice. For example, one organization, the Little Mountain Community Resources Board, was crucial in advising the staff on the location for the site office. This is an important community organization variable since it is a source of informal and formal contacts with individuals in the community. It effects the project's visibility, appeal, and legitimacy.

The Resources Board advised the staff to locate the site office between 21st and 25th Avenue, on the west side of Main Street, because it was central, on the route to the community centres and parks, within the shopping district, near bus stops, and on the same side of Main Street as the Little Mountain Housing Project. The "project" is the area's only high density as well as low-income housing project. The site selected fitted
these criteria, except the only available store front
was about four blocks south of 25th Avenue.

The site office was established in the fall of 1976
before the staff was formally introduced to the area at
a public meeting, but individuals began meeting there with
the staff. Both the site office and the public meetings
required publicity which was difficult since Riley Park
does not have a community newspaper. The staff generated
publicity the hard way, using pamphlets distributed
extensively throughout the neighbourhood. Existing
community organizations also generated "word-of-mouth"
publicity.

At the next stage, the staff organized a committee
which was to become the organizational centre of the
decision making process. The purpose of the public meeting
held in late November was to lay the groundwork for it.
About 150 people appeared, which was more than anticipated.
Advice from public groups that autumn had led the staff
to expect only 30 people. Approximately 17 - 20 people
signed to join the N.I.P. Committee of which 15 appeared
at the Committee's first meeting.

The first two meetings of the committee were devoted,
among other things, to the development of terms of
reference to define the committee's role, membership,
and operating procedure. Such terms, drafted by Mayor
Volrich while he was an alderman, were offered as a
model with staff alteration to incorporate changes pro-
posed by other N.I.P. committees in the past. The committee made several changes to this draft, after dealing with several contentious issues.

Initial information from the committee showed that they lived in a cluster that excluded over half of the N.I.P. area, comprising the northern and the eastern parts.

Seeking a much broader representation became a goal of the staff and the committee. While in the previous stage, neighbourhood organizations appeared important in giving advice to the staff on matters of organization, at this stage the committee assumed that role. At the first meeting on December 14, a committee member suggested that additional people in the community could be reached if a newsletter was prepared in various languages. Members also showed concern for involving young people in N.I.P. planning. While these matters were dealt with in one manner or other, the geographical representation was dealt with by the staff planner, proposing another public meeting at Sir Charles Tupper School to inform residents north of King Edward Avenue about the program. This was announced to the committee at the January 18 meeting held on January 26, 1977. A committee member gave a brief presentation to approximately thirty people at the meeting, and about ten of them attended the next committee meeting on February 1 as guests. Under the terms of reference, the guests could become members by attending three consecutive meetings and five became members on the
February 15 meeting. This strategy was so successful that another public meeting was held on February 9 at General Brock School which resulted in sixteen guests at the February 15 meeting of which five became committee members. Beasley claims that he was satisfied that these efforts gave representation to portions of the neighbourhood which otherwise would have been left out.

After motivating different citizens to join the committee, the planner assisted the committee in the day to day organization of their task. At first, Beasley recommended a work schedule which outlined the things that had to be done during the six month concept planning stage. Each weekly meeting had an agenda prepared by Beasley in conjunction with the committee chairman. Members claim that they had to inform him one week in advance if they wanted an item placed on the agenda, although most of the agenda was usually left to Beasley and his staff.

In an interview, Beasley indicated that these tasks would have been too time consuming and routine for the committee given their voluntary nature. Furthermore, his goal was to make the committee's task an interesting one so as to develop enthusiasm. Beasley claims, however, that the agendas he prepared were primarily a function of the substantive concerns of committee members.

Beasley was, however, a popular planner and committee showed a great deal of trust in his leadership. In fact, the minutes of one committee meeting indicated that some
members would have preferred seeing him continue as chairman rather than face the difficult task of selecting someone else.

Even after another chairman had been appointed, committee meetings I attended revealed the planner was still not too far removed from the chairmanship role. Soon before the planning deadline, Beasley assumed a role of enforcing the meeting agenda by hastening the members into resolving issues, asking members to terminate discussion and vote on options put forward so that the order of business could be completed.

Beasley also influenced the committee by occasionally helping them to adjust their planning framework. Toward the beginning of the planning process, members decided to form into subcommittees covering substantive areas like schools, commercial and street projects and parks, and a strategy oriented group to integrate the different substantive groups. When Beasley perceived that this approach was slow and that members were dissatisfied, he influenced members into changing their approach.

Beasley opened the April 29, 1976 meeting by stating that it was now time "to begin pulling together all of . . . (the committee's) thinking to date into a cohesive plan for the improvement of the neighbourhood". The staff presented a report on committee accomplishments to date along with a set of options for improvements comprised of committee and staff thinking. The committee was told that
it was now time to individually review the options and to select priorities. The committee readily accepted this structuring of the planning process and thus the subcommittee method was dropped.

When asked how the citizens felt towards the planner's dominant role in effecting changes in direction, Beasley indicated that although he directed the process changes, most were usually preceded by a process of "informal communication". Following meetings participants would tell him if it had been unsuccessful because of the way it was organized. Over a three day period, "10 phone calls" would be received from people dissatisfied with what had gone on, often suggesting alternatives. Frequently however, the staff appreciated problems in the decision process which the committee may not have realized, and, in these cases they would initiate action on their own. According to Beasley, "that's really part of our role. We are 'facilitators'. The important part is that we do not co-opt (the members of the committee)..."

In this case, people complained about the approach because most sub-committees found their work dull. Members had developed many planning interests after four months of involvement, and working on a restricted subject area like streets and sidewalks seemed boring. The strategies subcommittee was the most motivated, and seemed to be the one which attracted the most interest. Beasley adds that he could deal with more issues when the group worked as
a whole because he could benefit more from the collective "brainpower" of the entire group.

When asked in an interview where he drew the line at structuring the planning process, Beasley indicated that he was greatly influenced by what people were prepared to do. Their trust in him depended on his faithfulness to the substantive concerns of the committee. Trust in the staff was crucial to getting co-operation from such a structured approach to citizen involvement. In addition, both the staff and the committee shared a sense of urgency in the task at hand. Fear of losing the NIP grant added to the need for all to co-operate.

According to Beasley,

> What we try to do is to have the citizens feel the same pressure on deadlines that we feel, and then they make the decisions on what they want dealt with... First we got their priorities and that sort of thing so that we weren't just putting something inside our heads... We just put forward this work program. They disagreed with some things. They moved things up, they moved things back, they added things, and all that sort of thing. They changed it but they did it with an understanding of the sort of pressures that motivate us to do it in the first place.

5.3.2 Grandview Woodlands Planning Process:

Much of the impetus for bringing N.I.P. to Grandview Woodlands came from the Local Area Planning Committee which saw it as a means of protecting the area's single family character in the face of encroaching apartment development. The N.I.P. area (see figure 5.1) only included the single family district located east of Commercial Drive and for the most part, south of Hastings Street, but
this did not prevent three Local Area Planning Committee members from taking part in the N.I.P. committee, despite the fact that two of them resided outside the N.I.P. area.

The N.I.P. committee may have been redundant since the Local Area Planning Committee could conceivably have served both functions. When asked why the N.I.P. committee was started, Buholzer claimed that the Local Area Planning Committee made the decision, that committee felt that the different boundaries required it, not only because the N.I.P. area covered a smaller area, but also because the N.I.P. area crosses into another local area, i.e., the portion of Cedar Cottage north of the railway gorge.

According to Buholzer, it was not necessary to undergo a careful process of entering the community before forming a committee since the Planning Department had already established a local presence through the Local Area Planning Committee. This precluded the need for a carefully thought out process of contacting the community. A public meeting was held following a great deal of publicity in the local media. The initial organizational meeting for the committee produced twelve people ready to act as a planning committee.

This turnout seemed small to both the new committee and the staff and both expressed concern over this. One new member suggested that publicity could be sought in the Highland Echo to encourage others to join the committee. Buholzer felt that a few N.I.P. improvements
of a highly visible nature could be approved and implemented quickly to publicize the N.I.P. program in the area. The committee decided at the December 2 meeting to employ part of the N.I.P. fund to immediately develop garbage containers, trees for the Laura Secord School and an information kiosk.

As it happened, the proposals were not adopted by council until after the completion of the concept planning stage because of their low priority on the council agenda. Also, no new members were introduced to this committee throughout the concept planning stage and membership remained stable at between ten and twelve people.

The meetings in Grandview Woodlands were quite informal in the sense that there were hardly structured by the planner.

For personal reasons, one member of the Grandview Woodlands Committee also attended a few Riley Park N.I.P. meetings. This placed him in an excellent position to compare the two planner's approaches.

Jaschke felt that Beasley played a very dominant role in the Riley Park Committee compared with Bill Buholzer, the area planner in Grandview Woodlands.

During the conceptual planning stage, Buholzer would usually spend long periods at committee meetings not speaking, but letting the committee discuss issues as it wanted. Jaschke was surprised to find Beasley single-handedly defining the committee's options, presenting them on a blackboard, and asking the group to decide.
When asked about the role of the planner in the conceptual planning stage, Mary Bosze, a local resident and committee member indicated that he "listened and made notes", he put it all together and prepared reports, he collected information and compiled statistics, he informed the committee about the feasibility and implications of their propositions using both his experience and his knowledge of what had been attempted by other committees elsewhere, and he represented the committee at city hall.

While Beasley was the director in Riley Park, Buholzer was a "listener and a note taker". However, Buholzer himself feels that this role evolved over a period of two months and that, at first, he took a more dominant role in directing the committee until it learned and grew self-sufficient.

5.4 Different Forms of Public Involvement

5.4.1 Riley Park:

Among the alternate opportunities for getting citizens involved in Riley Park was a questionnaire, and the low return on the first one necessitated a second one.

In March 1977, a tabloid style newsletter was issued to every household in the N.I.P. area. It contained information on the nature of the N.I.P. program, the N.I.P. planning committee in Riley Park, the site office, the residential rehabilitation program, an upcoming "community discovery walk" and a two page community goals questionnaire. Community goal options defined by the
N.I.P. committee were presented for consideration in the questionnaire.

Because the first questionnaire was rejected late in the planning process, and the second questionnaire was completed late, the committee undertook a draft plan before the results of the second questionnaire were available.

For the second questionnaire, a 5% random sample was developed, and a high return rate was ensured through follow up by committee members who telephoned sample households near their home to personally request that the questionnaire be answered.

The second questionnaire (table 5.3; also discussed in section 5.5.1) sought community priorities by asking respondents to select six low priority items from a given list. While the results showed a high level of agreement on the importance of youth and crime problems in the area, the second sample rated social problems highly as opposed to physical problems. Three of the five preferred options were social programs and one of the remaining two was a non-physical improvement to retain the N.I.P. committee for dealing with problems (see table 5.3). Curb and sidewalk improvements were rated second and third from the bottom.

Because of the influence of the questionnaire, the final concept plan increased the total allocation for social programs from $595,000 in the draft plan to
### TABLE 5.3  **RILEY PARK: RESULTS OF THE SECOND COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Collective Priority Rating of Suggested Planning Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Unpopular Items</th>
<th>1. solutions to vandalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. a committee to keep in touch with problems in local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. youth program improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. more social problem programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. improvements to existing parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. shopping area improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. more parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. additional curbs, sidewalks, lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Unpopular Items</th>
<th>18. more parks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1 Respondents were asked to select six least important measures.
$710,000 while parks, schools, streets and beautification programs were all reduced. The social needs' allocation swelled with an allocation for library books and for roller skating equipment for Riley Park Arena. Both these allocations reflected the high priority which the second questionnaire had given to youth needs as well.

In addition to public involvement, the planner also affected the substance of the plan. Most notably, the binodal strategy (see section 5.2.1.), according to committee members, was an idea put forth by Larry Beasley to organize spending on physical programs.

Several public meetings were held throughout the planning process. These were the highly publicized meetings held in public schools. In addition, it must be emphasized that the committee meetings were also open to the general public. Non members often influenced decisions made at committee meetings. Two school principals joined the committee's May 31 meeting to help it refine its proposals for school improvements, suggesting ways of implementing proposals and convincing the committee to cancel some of the proposals which they viewed as impractical.

Even private citizens were sometimes effective at altering the plan. Residents living along the right of way of the proposed linear walkway attended the June 7 meeting and spoke against the proposal. The linear walkway was a proposed scheme for beautifying the streetscape and
constructing pedestrian shelters along residential streets between the two recreational nodes outlined in the draft plan. Larry Beasley defended the scheme arguing that the walkway was needed "to connect major community spaces and to provide a clear rationale for selected improvements to some streets". The walkway was a central part of the binodal improvement strategy which Beasley advocated, the major piece of strategy developed in this plan. Committee members, when forced to choose between satisfying these citizens and satisfying their planner, bowed to citizen pressure, and decided that the money could be better used for general street improvements.

The formal public meetings occurred both at the beginning and at the end of the planning process. Early meetings were held to publicize the presence of the committee and to encourage a better geographic balance of representation in the committee (see section 5.3.1.), and not to alter the plan substantively.

Policy was discussed at the May 4 and 5 public meetings when the public was introduced to the draft plan. The general public was allowed another chance to object to the plan at the June 8 and 9 public meetings. The May 4 and 5 public meetings influenced the committee to eliminate proposals in the draft plan for two miniparks and street closures between 18th and 19th Avenues on Quebec Street. These proposals were later discussed at the June 7 committee meeting where members recalled how unpopular they had been at public meetings. It was also noted that the neighbour-
hood needs' survey rated new park space the lowest, and Beasley added that the City Engineering Department was opposed to street closures for park purposes. As a result, the $130,000 minipark proposal was deleted from the concept plan.

Other forms of public involvement included a neighbourhood walk. The neighbourhood walk was held on Saturday, March 19, and attracted over seventy people, including three aldermen, the Director of Planning, an architect and sixteen committee members. Beasley, directed the walk through the N.I.P. area in which participants could see the area problems for themselves. At best, this process had only an indirect impact on policy development as a learning process in which civic officials and local residents could begin to understand local problems and in which local residents could be encouraged to view their neighbourhood as a whole.

5.4.2 Different Forms of Citizen Involvement Used in Grandview Woodlands

The first major source of outside input for the committee was the Local Area Planning Committee. This is discussed in section 5.3.2.

When asked how the Local Area Planning Committee members on the N.I.P. committee influenced the N.I.P. committee, Bill Buholzer felt that they introduced an orientation to family needs and the goal to support the family character in the area. This was a goal which was
initiated and developed within the Local Area Planning Committee, and which is related to preventing apartment construction in the area and its transition from a family to a single person orientation.

While Buholzer felt that the complete ramifications of this goal were not felt until the implementation stage, it may have been reflected in the importance given to school improvements in the allocations made within the plan. 46% of the total allocation after administrative costs are removed went to school improvements whereas the figure for Riley Park was 5%. Buholzer felt that this high allocation for school improvements is unparalleled in Vancouver N.I.P. programs.

The dynamics underlying the high priority given to schools can be traced. Much of it is the result of what Buholzer refers to in an interview as the "travelling road show", the practice of holding committee meetings in schools. He felt that the deficiencies and opportunities in schools were more readily apparent to committee members when they held their meetings there and could see them for themselves. He felt that the priorities in the plan were primarily the result of the location of the meetings, particularly since they were especially influential during the committee's formative second and third months of existence.

The inputs provided from the School Consultative Committees and from the school principals and parents...
of school children underscore the openness of committee meetings. This effort at maximizing inputs from non-committee members seemed to offset the fact that the committee itself was very tiny. In any event, of the ten itemized proposals for improving the four schools mentioned in the plan, five of them were contributed by School Consultative Committee members at these meetings rather than actual N.I.P. Committee members.

Improvements to parks constitute the second largest block of allocations in the plan. Many of the local parks improvements were conceived at design-ins at which local residents would attend a meeting held in the park itself where they would offer suggestions. Of the twenty park improvements contained in the plan, eight were mentioned at design-ins. Since the plan did not provide estimates on an itemized basis, there is no way to compare the combined value of proposals conceived in design-ins with those apparently conceived entirely in the N.I.P. Committee. Representatives from the Grandview Legion Sports Committee attended several design-ins as well as a subsequent N.I.P. Committee meeting in which they reiterated their support for some of the design-in proposals.

The plan proposed six forms of street improvements and beautification. Commercial Drive improvements and residential street improvements were conspicuous by their high costs, $175,000 and $146,000, respectively. The latter proposal was conceived by a committee member and
the committee decided to apply the allocation in the form of a subsidy to the local resident's portion of regular Local Improvement Provisions in which property owners on a block share the expenses for improvements with the city government. Commercial Drive improvements were primarily conceived by committee members acting on their own. The committee complained, according to the minutes of one committee meeting, that local merchants failed to co-operate when invited to a public meeting. A meeting was called, but it was not very well attended. Those few merchants who did attend were primarily concerned with parking problems in the area. No N.I.P. funds were allocated to solving this problem, although the "Land Use and Development" section indicates that the committee will "study" solutions to this problem.

The four remaining proposals in the streets and beautification section were conceived by the respondents in a survey conducted by the Planning Department before the N.I.P. Committee had been formed (Grandview Woodlands N.I.P. Committee Minutes). These include:

1. protective tree planting along the Macdonald and Laura Secord School sites,
2. twenty-four new litter containers,
3. four community bulletin boards,
4. a series of bus shelters.

The total cost of these proposals was $71,000. The three former proposals were submitted to council soon after the first meetings of the committee. The committee had
hoped to establish a high profile for the planning process by developing fast tangible results of the committee's efficacy before the plan was completed. It thereby hoped to increase community involvement in the planning so as to increase community commitment to the improvements. However, because of time constraints these items were not dealt with in council until five months after concept planning was completed.

In their interviews, committee members claimed that the provision of a social needs section in the plan was based on two surveys prepared by Kathryn Gallagher, a University of British Columbia social work student. The first was an account of existing child care programs in Grandview Woodlands which was completed in March, 1977 and the second was a questionnaire of social needs which was also completed that month.

Of the two studies, the social need study was the most important. The sample size for the questionnaire was two hundred and thirteen including the community's "most active" people. Eighty questionnaires were returned. The survey established that job skills, unemployment, language skills and adequate accommodations for families with children were the highest priority items. The survey also confirms that the bulk of the "active members of the community" in Grandview Woodlands agree that family housing is in short supply.

When asked in their respective interviews why the
plan did not address employment related issues, both Mary Bosze and Larry Buholzer felt that these were national or regional problems.

However, the concept plan does address housing directly, which was another issue considered important by Gallagher's survey results. The committee's plan of action regarding the housing problem was suggested by Bill Buholzer. The minutes from the committee meetings reveal that Buholzer was responsible for introducing the idea of a housing co-op or housing society to the committee. In an interview, Buholzer claims that this was the only proposal which he advocated to committee members. According to the minutes, members were concerned about the feasibility of this type of project. Buholzer conceded that the Kitsilano N.I.P. committee had experienced difficulty in establishing its project, but added that the Strathcona Area Housing Society, operating under the Strathcona Property Owners' and Tenants' Association, was more successful. Buholzer had a C.M.H.C. representative attend a committee meeting and describe the kind of project which he had in mind. The allocation for this project totalled $250,000.

The last major form of public input was the committee's questionnaire which was known as the Neighbourhood Needs and Priorities Survey. Buholzer first suggested the need for a survey when he put forth what had come to be the acceptable sequence of measures for entertaining public
### TABLE 5.4  GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS: RESULTS OF THE COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>% OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING HIGH PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Housing</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets Improvements</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors' Housing</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Bus Service</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvements</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Drive Improvements</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for Community and Cultural Use</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Park Space</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for Senior Activities</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Day Care</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
input in N.I.P. projects across Vancouver. Soon, the committee decided to have a questionnaire and beginning at the January 6 meeting, it started preparing one by discussing possible questions. At the January 13 meeting, a committee member reported that assistance in administering the questionnaire had been lined up from Vancouver Technical School students. While the committee established guidelines for preparing the questionnaire, it was decided that the actual preparation was a technical task and it was completed by the staff.

The survey was administered with help from the Technical students in the last week of January, and 36% of the sample returned completed questionnaires, making for an effective 5% sample of the community.

How the questionnaire results were used is questionable, however. On the level of general priorities the respondents rated suggested improvements in the order depicted in table 5.4.

There is little resemblance between the outcome of the survey and the plan. Items that were given low priority in the survey results were exceptionally high priority items in the plan (eg., schools) and high priority items in the survey results were excluded entirely from the plan (eg., traffic and parking, and senior citizen housing). When the survey results were disclosed at a committee meeting, the minutes quote one committee member as saying that the results did not reflect what he had in
mind for the community plan. This comment was not challenged according to the minutes, and no further mention was made of the survey in subsequent meetings.

5.5 Analysis, Descriptive and Substantive Methodology:

5.5.1 Riley Park:

5.5.1.1. Descriptive Representation

The occupational composition of the planning committee members who work was not typical of the labour force of the neighbourhood as a whole (see chart 5.5). The committee was overrepresented in the professional, medical, teaching and managerial categories, and it was underrepresented in blue collar fields such as transportation, processing, construction and primary industry as well as white collar fields such as sales and service.

The committee also differed from the community on the level of educational attainment. Chart 5.6 indicates that 29% of the committee had completed grade twelve or gone beyond this level while the corresponding figure for the community was 12%.

The age distribution of members twenty and older (approximate voting age population) was significantly different from the age distribution in the community (chart 5.7)

Regarding geographical representation, the homes of committee members living within the N.I.P. area and the businesses of other committee members are shown on figure 5.3. It divides the N.I.P. area into seven sub-
CHART 5.5

LABOUR FORCE COMPOSITION:
CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE AND
RILEY PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
<th>Citizen's Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Managerial</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>15 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Service</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>8 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Blue Collar</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1 member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DISCUSSION WITH LARRY BEASLEY: The data from Table 5.1. was combined into 5 basic categories, including "blue collar" (primary, processing, construction and transportation), "sales/service" and "professional/managerial: (professional, managerial, medical and teaching). Chi squared analysis was used to compare the "observed" and "expected" frequencies of the occupation of committee members. Expected frequencies were based on the Riley Park distribution. Results: \( x^2 = (35.2** \text{ d.f.} = 3) \)
LABOUR FORCE COMPOSITION:  
CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE AND  
RILEY PARK  
(continuation)

NOTE: When calculating chi square and determining that the differences between the committee and the community were significant with respect to occupation, the "other" occupational category was left out for methodological purposes.
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:
RILEY PARK COMMUNITY AND
N.I.P. COMMITTEE COMPARED

CHART 5.6

Riley Park

Citizen's Committee

Years of Schooling Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
<th>Citizen's Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 25.6 \quad \text{DF} = 2 \]

significant at .005

SOURCES: Charts 5.2 and 5.3 Vancouver Planning Department: Riley Park N.I.P. Basic Information, 1976 (1971 census).
VOTING AGE POPULATION AGE DISTRIBUTION:
RILEY PARK COMMUNITY AND N.I.P. COMMITTEE COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Riley Park</th>
<th>Citizen's Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 54</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 9.9 \quad DF = 3 \]
significant at .05

SOURCES: Charts 5.2 and 5.3 Vancouver Planning Department: Riley Park N.I.P. Basic Information, 1976 (1971 census).
\[ X^2 = 27 \quad \text{DF} = 7 \]

Significant at :005
areas, and the distribution of households within the N.I.P. area was compared with the distribution of households and businesses represented on the committee (figure 5.4). One sub-area bound by Ontario Street, 29th Avenue, Prince Edward and King Edward Avenues was extremely overrepresented. The sub-area to the south of it was slightly overrepresented while the others were either adequately represented or underrepresented.

5.5.1.2 Substantive Representation:

Substantive representation is examined in two ways. In Riley Park, the initial opinions of the committee members regarding planning needs were compiled in an opinionnaire, and these are compared with the planning needs expressed by the rest of the community in a community questionnaire. Secondly, geographical substantive representation was examined. This reviews the relationship between representation within sub-areas and proposed expenditure in these sub-areas.

The second community questionnaire was discussed earlier in section 5.4.1. of this chapter. As indicated in that section, sampling problems with the first questionnaire influenced the staff to plan this survey. They incorporated a 5% random sample, and to ensure a high return rate, committee members telephoned sample households, using them to return their questionnaire responses. Priority ratings for possible planning measures based on questionnaire results are reported in
Meanwhile, the committee "opinionaire" of its own priorities rated items in the order shown in table 5.5.

**TABLE 5.5  RILEY PARK: RESULTS FROM THE COMMITTEE OPINIONNAIRE**

Rank Order of Priority Problem Areas in Opinion of Committee Members:

- Pedestrian Main Street
- Main Street Parking
- Recreation Centre Improvements
- Neighbourhood House
- Street Trees
- Sidewalks

The two surveys are not absolutely comparable. The community questionnaire asked questions about vandalism and youth programs, and the committee opinionnaire did not. The latter asked questions about hypothetical programs while the former dealt with needs. Nevertheless, some of the programs supported by the committee reflected the needs orientation of its members, and support for certain types of programs reflect the kinds of problems that concern respondents. Using this as a basis, three high priority proposals by the committee are low community priorities, ie., pedestrianizing Main Street, more Main Street commercial parking and sidewalks on residential streets. Hence, the level to which the committee reflected the community's wants before the questionnaires appears to be limited.
Substantive representation in Riley Park is now examined indirectly through an analysis of the geographical disbursement of funds allocated by the plan. This method is different from the above in that it focusses on decisions rather than preferences evident at the outset of the planning process.

The section dealing with descriptive representation specified sub-areas in the N.I.P. area arbitrarily, showing that there was disproportionate representation between sub-areas in the voluntary committee. Carrying this one step further, the level of representation in each sub-area is compared with the amount of site specific spending in those sub-areas on a per household basis (see table 5.7). In the first place, some financial allocations had to be withdrawn from analysis including non site specific allocations, e.g., administrative and planning costs, allocations wherein site selection was deferred (e.g., the storefront library) and provisions affecting a number of neighbourhood sub-areas (e.g., general right of way improvements).

The remaining allocations totalled $772,950 of which $640,000 was allocated to sites in three adjacent sub-areas of the community. Moreover, these are the three best represented sub-areas on the committee, and table 5.7 shows a strong statistical relationship between representation and level of spending in sub-areas.
# TABLE 5.6 RILEY PARK: LOCATIONALLY SPECIFIC N.I.P.

## EXPENDITURES IN CONCEPT PLAN BY SUB-AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SUB-AREA</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements/Riley Park Recreation Complex</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roller Rink in Riley Arena</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hillcrest Park and Melrose Park Closure and Improvements</td>
<td>West of Ontario</td>
<td>75,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Riley Park Exterior Improvements</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>68,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cartier Park Improvements</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>45,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prince Edward Park</td>
<td>Central Northeast</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pedestrian Activated Light at Ontario and 33rd Avenue</td>
<td>West of Ontario</td>
<td>10,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>10,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Main Street Beautification between 24th and 29th</td>
<td>Central Southwest</td>
<td>136,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Northwest</td>
<td>34,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Brock School Improvements</td>
<td>Central Southwest</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Brock School Annex Improvements</td>
<td>Central Southeast</td>
<td>17,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Livingstone School Improvements</td>
<td>Central Northeast</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Wolfe School Improvements</td>
<td>West of Ontario</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Riley Alternate School Improvements</td>
<td>Central Southwest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $772,950

*The pedestrian activated cross walk connects two sub-areas. Both sub-areas were given an equal share of the allocation for purposes of analysis. Regarding the Main Street beautification, the two sub-areas affected by that proposal were given a share proportional to the number of blocks affected in each sub-area.*
TABLE 5.7  RILEY PARK: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SPENDING PER HOUSEHOLD AND A REPRESENTATIVENESS RATIO BY SUB-AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-AREA</th>
<th>SPENDING/HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT/HOUSEHOLD RATIO</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Northeast</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>1:97</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Northwest</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>1:436</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Central Northeast</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1:87</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Central Northwest</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>1:236</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central Southeast</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>1:190</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Central Southwest</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Southwest</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. West of Ontario</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1:52</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\gamma = .79^{**}$, significant at the 5% level.
Problems in Geographical Substantive Representation

Analyzing the geographical distribution of N.I.P. funds and their relation to concentrations of committee member homes within arbitrary sub-areas simplifies a very complicated issue. Sub-areas should be determined using functional criteria. For example, allocations made to schools should be analyzed in terms of their catchment areas rather than arbitrary boundaries. In the case of parks, allocations should be compared with the number of committee members and the number of homes closes to each park. In the case of both parks and schools, their catchment areas would be different. This shows that geographical substantive representation cannot be viewed in generalized terms, and each variable would have to be reviewed separately. In addition to this complication, many intervening variables may affect geographical substantive representation. Substantive representation may be difficult to observe because a strategy proposed in the plan suggests strong rationales for investing in certain portions of the community. In Riley Park, strategy was not a part of the final concept plan, but strategy may have shaped the outcome of the plan because of the binodal concept which emphasized parks and walkway improvements (see section 5.2.1.). As a result parks became a major portion of the final concept plan, and
3 of the 4 parks are within the 3 southwestern sub-areas of the neighbourhood, making these sub-areas well endowed by the proposed N.I.P. disbursements.

Therefore, since geographical substantive representation can be influenced by strategy which has nothing to do with the committees geographical biases, and since sub-areas must be defined differently for each issue, it cannot be applied because of these unwieldy constraints.

5.5.2 Grandview Woodlands

5.5.2.1. Descriptive Representation:

Member occupational characteristics suggest that this committee had a large contingent of professionals and managers (see chart 5.8). Also, the findings suggest that people employed in sales/service, and construction/manufacturing/primary industry were underrepresented. There is not enough data to show that this was statistically significant, however.

No information is available on the educational attainment of the committee, although occupational characteristics suggest that the educational attainment of members may also be higher than those of the larger community.

The ages of committee members diverged sharply with those of the community. Not suprisingly, there was no representation from people younger than twenty-one.
Unlike Riley Park, no representation existed among people sixty-five and older (see chart 5.9). This divergence between participants and the community is not statistically significant, however.

The geographical distribution of committee members is plotted on figure 5.5. Viewing the distribution, there appears to be a concentration of committee members' residences in the southeast of the community. However, there is no real clustering on the map and no significant difference between the distribution of households and the distribution of committee members' residences in this case (figure 5.6).

5.5.2.2 Substantive Representation:

The Grandview Woodlands plan is not amenable to analysis for geographical to substantive representation because some allocations were not itemized according to site as they had been in the Riley Park plan.
CHART 5.8

LABOUR FORCE COMPOSITION:  
CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE AND  
GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Grandview Woodlands*</th>
<th>Citizen's Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Managerial</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Service</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Blue Collar</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: City of Vancouver. (1975) City Planning Department, Grandview Woodlands: An information handbook, 13; Information on the committee attained through an interview with Tom Phipps, the Area planning assistant.

* Information is on the local area and not the N.I.P. area, and only reflects the current characteristics of the N.I.P. area in a rough manner.
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF VOTING AGE POPULATION: GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS AND GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS N.I.P. COMMITTEE COMPARED

CHART 5.9

Grandview Woodlands

Citizen's Committee

Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS</th>
<th>Citizen's Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 64</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.52 \quad \text{DF} = 2 \]

not significant

SOURCE: Data on N.I.P. area collected from Planning Staff files in Grandview Woodlands. Approximate ages of committee members from an interview with Grandview Woodlands planning assistant, Tom Phipps.
Figure 5.5
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For example, a $360,000 allocation for parks is made without specifying which park gets how much. This makes it impossible to ascertain geographic biases in the committee's park planning at this stage.

Unlike park allocations, however, school allocations were earmarked for the different schools involved (see Appendix 3, Provisions of Grandview Woodlands N.I.P. Plan), making this portion of the plan amenable to geographical analysis. Moreover, school expenditures constituted the largest category of capital allocations made for this plan, with 40 per cent of the project money going for this purpose. School allocations also played a larger role in the overall plan than the title of those disbursements would suggest. According to Konrad Jashke, a member of the N.I.P. committee during the concept planning stage, most schools investments were made to provide much needed indoor recreation facilities rather than to provide educational or extracurricular facilities for the schools themselves. And since schools allocations were intended for community recreation purposes instead of for educational purposes, catchment areas designated by park access characteristics are more appropriate than school catchment areas when designating sub-areas. Hence, the sub-areas designated in the descriptive geographical representation section are utilized in this case since they are defined by major arterials which restrict access for children to and from parks. Concentrating on a single issue area and utilizing appropriate functional boundaries for designating sub-areas precludes many of the problems encountered when applying this methodology to
Riley Park.

While the school investments in different sub-areas varied, they were greatly determined by the needs posed by different schools. For example, the northwest sub-area is serviced by Britannia School and Britannia High School. One of these is a recent structure, and the other was recently refurbished. Both are bolstered by a recently developed multi-service community centre in which recreation facilities and social services are combined on one site. This accounts for the absence of schools investment by the N.I.P. Committee in that sub-area. Another factor is the type of schools in a sub-area. The southwest sub-area is fairly isolated by busy arterial streets and has only one small school, i.e., an annex of a larger school located two blocks away, outside the N.I.P. area. Since the annex had no school consultative committee of its own, no investments were made for schools in that sub-area.

Much of the investment in the southeast sub-areas was concentrated in the Grandview Triangle, that tiny wedge between East Broadway, the railway gorge and Nanaimo Street. According to Jashke, this was because the Triangle, which had fewer households than the southwest sub-area, was in desperate need of recreational leisure facilities, since the other neighbourhood playground was inaccessible due to busy arterials.

Nevertheless, there is no statistical relationship between investment per household in school improvements.
and the number of committee members living in a sub-area (see table 5.9). The northeast sub-area, which has the second highest per capita household level of investment for school improvements in the plan, also has the second lowest level of representation in the committee per household. The northwest area which received no school improvements in the plan also has the second highest level of committee representation (table 5.9).

One sub-area received no representation in the committee whatsoever, and was not able, as a result, to articulate its needs. The southwest sub-area received no N.I.P. money for schools improvements, and none of the parks planned for improvement were located in that sub-area. Yet, 1,118 or 11% of the N.I.P. area's households were located there, and there is a demonstrable shortage of parkland in this area and adjacent areas outside the N.I.P. boundaries.

5.6 Analysis of the Assumptions Underlying the Process Oriented Methodology:

The assumption underlying the process oriented methodology states that different forms of citizen involvement are necessary for the neighbourhood community to attain a more complete expression of the values of its many different people. To support the assumption, an attempt will be made to prove that different forms of citizen involvement will produce different substantive results in the planning process. In other words, it must
### TABLE 5.8 GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS: THE TOTAL LEVELS OF SCHOOLS SPENDING BY SUB-AREAS

1. **NORTH OF ADANAC**
   - Templeton School
   - MacDonald School  **Unspecified allocation**
     - $60,000
2. **NORTHEAST**
   - Lord Nelson School  **$125,000**
   - St. Francis School  **$355,000**
3. **NORTHWEST**
   - Britannia School  **NIL**
4. **SOUTHWEST**
   - Grandview Annex  **NIL**
5. **SOUTHEAST**
   - Laura Secord School  **$495,000**


---

1 Allocation made for the adjacent park. Parks allocations not specified by site.
TABLE 5.9 GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPENDING PER HOUSEHOLD AND REPRESENTATIVENESS RATIO BY SUB-AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-AREA</th>
<th>RATIO: COMMITTEE MEMBERS/HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>SPENDING PER HOUSEHOLD FOR SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. North of Adanac</td>
<td>1:750</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Northeast</td>
<td>1:715</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northwest</td>
<td>1:213</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Southwest</td>
<td>0 members</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Southeast</td>
<td>1:223</td>
<td>$431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = .65, \text{ not significant.} \]

be proven that people responding to the same issues in different participation contexts in the same community will respond differently.

In Riley Park, this assumption can be supported very easily. The committee made its preferences well understood on various issues early in the process through an opinionnaire, and their values did not coincide with those expressed by people in other forms of citizen involvement.

The following were the most important forms of citizen involvement, and they produced results which contradicted the committee's stand:

1. community questionnaire (social versus physical priorities),
2. public attending committee meetings (linear walkway), and
3. public meetings (miniparks).

In Grandview Woodlands, however, the different forms of citizen involvement used did not always produce the same degree of conflict. Only the community questionnaire produced substantial opposition to the values of the committee. Known as the Neighbourhood Needs and Priorities survey, it produced results which were not reflected in the decision made by committee members.

In other cases of citizen involvement, there is no evidence that priorities or values contradicted those of the committee. However, inputs produced recommendations which reflected the different perspectives of non-
committee members, i.e., since committee members lacked the expertise of other members of the community. This included Kathryn Gallagher's social need survey administered to two hundred and thirteen of the community's "most active" people, design-ins held in parks and inputs from School Consultative Committee members.

While the opposition voiced to committee proposals was not as great in Grandview Woodlands this may have been a function of the different ways in which the planning processes were designed. In the first place, the amount of information distributed to the community was not as great in Grandview Woodlands. No draft plan was publicized in the community for the general public to respond to, and no public meetings were held to provide a forum for opposition before the concept plan was completed. These seem to be important steps in testing the level of community acceptance of committee proposals.

These findings from both Riley Park and Grandview Woodlands support the view that a large number of different inputs are necessary in the process to express points of view that are not represented in the committee. To restrict citizen involvement to the committee itself would have omitted these points of view. Each form of citizen involvement provided a unique contribution to the process which other forms would have excluded. As a result, the representativeness of citizen involvement can best be evaluated not by analysing the planning
committee, but by considering the numbers of forms of citizen involvement used in the process and their efficacy in shaping the direction of planning.

5.7 Analysis, Process Methodology:

Using data presented in sections 3.2 and 3.3, the process oriented methodology is applied to the two case study projects.

5.7.1 Community Organization Efforts by Staff Professionals to Influence Representation:

The efforts undertaken in Riley Park to increase representation on the committee were considerable. Substantial publicity was derived through leaflets distributed to all households. Beasley showed great concern for the uneven geographical distribution in the committee and scheduled several public meetings in strategic locations in the community. Although section 5.3 shows that the effort was not a perfect success, the meetings greatly improved the geographical distribution of committee representation.

In Grandview Woodlands, Bill Buholzer suggested that the committee make some immediate improvements so as to give the committee a higher profile and image of efficacy in the community. This is a technique recommended in the N.I.P. Operator's Handbook. While four recommendations were made and submitted for council approval, council's timetable prevented them from being adopted and implemented on time to have an impact on the committee's membership during the concept planning stage. Hence,
there was no impact from this organizational effort at
the concept planning stage.

5.7.2 Evidence of Research used to Formulate an Understanding
of the Different Segments of the Community:

All N.I.P. projects were preceded by a research
effort conducted by the City Planning staff. Information
was gathered from census tracts on the socio-economic
characteristics of the community including incomes,
éthnicity, occupation, age breakdowns and housing.
This information and information on land use and zoning
previously collected by the Department were included in
a comprehensive information package given to the local
area planner before entering the community. According
to John Winsor, manager of the Local Area Planning
Division, most of this information was collected by
summer students hired by the Planning Department.

In addition to this, in Riley Park, Larry Beasley
claims that he and his staff conducted an "orchestrated
process" of seeking out groups, learning about clubs,
associations and social service agencies, and generally
establishing a network of contacts through meetings with
these groups.

On the basis of this work, it became the staff's
understanding that the better part of Riley Park was
balanced between low income welfare and poor working
class people living in older single family housing and
in the "housing project" on one side of the scale, and
middle to upper middle class shopkeepers, professionals, self-employed workers, and home owning working class people on the other side of the scale.

Moreover, there is evidence that these contacts and this information was used in designing the process, e.g., in the introduction of the N.I.P. project to the community and the selection of a site office.

In Grandview Woodlands, the staff entered the project with a similar information package to the one used for the Riley Park Local Area Planning project. However, Buholzer denied that a "carefully orchestrated" entry was needed because of the prior presence of the Local Area Planning Committee in that area. Parts of the Grandview-Woodlands N.I.P. area are not included in the Grandview Woodland local area. Moreover, those portions of the N.I.P. area did not have Local Area Planning Committee representation. The portion of the N.I.P. area which is not within the Local Area Planning area did not receive special attention to ensure a broad level of representation from that sub-area. In short, even if a carefully orchestrated entry process had been applied with the creation of the Local Area Planning Committee, it was not geared to introducing the N.I.P. planning process to those portions of the N.I.P. area outside the Grandview Woodlands local area.
5. 7. 3 Evidence that Other Forms of Citizen Involvement were Based on an Understanding of the Community Derived from the Research Effort:

In Grandview Woodlands, the most obvious area in which social research benefitted the participation effort is in the involvement of ethnic groups. Ethnic groups were invited to prepare proposals to meet their particular needs. The Italian groups submitted proposals for bocce courts and unsuccessfully requested that money be spent on the Italian Community Centre located just outside the N.I.P. boundary. While the Italian presence in this neighbourhood is highly visible, deliberate efforts to involve Italian groups and consider their input seriously were promoted by documented information on ethnicity in the neighbourhood.

A more subtle area in which an understanding of community structure influenced process was evident in Riley Park where the staff focussed on existing organizations and leadership in the community to research and solicit important contacts. Learning about and establishing these contacts provided the staff and committee with the amount of publicity and familiarity to make possible the large turnouts at committee meetings. The incidence of letters to staff, outsiders attending committee meetings and informal site office contacts appeared to be greater in Riley Park than in Grandview Woodlands and this may have been because a moře
sophisticated contact network was development in Riley Park. The level of consideration given to social structure when locating the site office probably promoted unsolicited site office contacts as well in Riley Park.

5.7.4 Evidence of the Impact of Different Forms of Citizen Involvement on the Final Plan:

The number of different forms of citizen involvement used in the two projects were quite similar. In addition to the planning committees, both projects used open committee meetings, a site office, public questionnaires and public meetings held at the beginning of the planning process. In Riley Park these methods were supplemented with public meetings to consider the draft concept plan, public meetings held at various locations to broaden the base of a representation and a neighbourhood walk. In Grandview Woodlands planning committee meetings were held in conjunction with School Consultative Committee meetings, and the involvement of the Local Area Planning Committee was relevant. However, the effectiveness of measures taken in the two projects in shaping process is quite different.

The methodology does not provide a guideline for determining a minimum number of citizen involvement techniques. This is partly because of the lack of criteria for making this kind of judgment and because the problem is a situational one defying guidelines. Planners and researchers must decide on their own using their own judgment based on their special understanding of the
community. In this case study, certain observations can be made regarding how one planning process was more representative than the other.

The involvement of School Consultative Committees in Grandview Woodlands resulted in the heavy emphasis on schools in the plan. Not only did it have a clear impact on the plan, but judging by the dominant size of the school expenditures, the School Consultative Committee had the largest impact on the committee's thinking since it was the only group exclusively concerned with schools.

In Grandview Woodlands, there is no evidence that the questionnaire altered the content of the plan. Almost all the high priority items in the plan were low priority items in the community questionnaire results. Moreover, the comment made at a committee meeting that the questionnaire results did not conform to what members had in mind illustrated that the committee was not prepared to seriously consider conflicting strategies to the family needs model.

On the other hand, changes in the concept plan in Riley Park did occur as a result of the questionnaire. Many committee members favoured physical improvements and at the behest of Larry Beasley, physical improvements were developed into a planning strategy referred to in this thesis as the binodal improvement strategy. It became apparent as a result of the questionnaire and public meetings that popular support for physical
improvements relative to social programs was limited.

Clear evidence is shown in the Riley Park findings that the open committee meetings, public questionnaires, and preconcept plan public meetings all had a demonstrable impact on the concept plan. In Grandview Woodlands, only the Local Area Planning Committee clearly affected the content of the plan and the degree of overlapping membership in the two committees resulted in little difference between the prevailing philosophies of the committees. As a result, the N.I.P. committee cannot be viewed as a completely distinct form of citizen involvement separate from the Local Area Planning committee itself.

There is little evidence to suggest that as many radically different positions were present in Grandview Woodlands as were evident in Riley Park. Many ideas were proposed and subsequently contradicted through other forms of citizen involvement in Riley Park including a linear walkway, various street closures, miniparks and school expenditures. Most significantly, the predominance of the school needs orientation in Grandview Woodlands prevented the development of different scenarios in that planning process.

5.7.5
The Planner's Influence on the Process:

The differences in the styles of the two planners may have influenced the representativeness of the plans produced. While Bill Buholzer in Grandview Woodlands was careful to suggest that the committee use the differ-
ent forms of citizen input usually employed in Vancouver local area planning projects, evidence suggests that he failed to use moral suasion to ensure that the committee employ these approaches when time was ripe for implementing them. The foremost example is that committee's failure to use the results of the community needs questionnaire, that project's only effort at considering extensive public input. This may have been related to the relaxed approach Buholzer had towards the committee's deliberations.

Larry Beasley in Riley Park may have defined the options of the committee too closely throughout the planning process, in the opinion of Konrad Jashke from Grandview Woodlands. His efforts at defining scenarios and structuring decisions were important, however, in speeding up the decision processing and forcing committee members to think about their decisions carefully.
CONCLUSIONS

Representation in local area planning in general has been called a false issue. In a conversation, Rhonda Howard, the current local area planner in Grandview Woodlands asked how representation in participatory bodies can become an issue without also focusing on representation in representative bodies for comparison.

This question can be answered very simply. Members of Vancouver's city council are elected at large by those who care enough to vote in elections. They represent all but the most indifferent elements of society. The citizen advisory committee can potentially represent an even smaller minority in municipal politics, the most active of private citizens, i.e., those who participate in committees.

However, local area planning in Vancouver has had a real purpose in making city policies more sensitive to local priorities in a city which does not benefit from ward aldermen to give voice to those local priorities. As important as it is, proponents of local area planning cannot afford to suppress the representation issue because city government departments that have a stake in centralized policy development (see Anderson, 1976; Needleman, 1974) will continue to raise the issue at their expense.

6.1 Representation:

The major conclusion that can be reached from this
research is that the source of representation in the N.I.P. planning process has been the process and not the committee's characteristics. This was demonstrated by focussing on the relationship between the planning process and the product.

Despite this potential for the planning process to supplement the representativeness of the committee with other forms of participation the values of the community cannot all be brought into play no matter how much effort is taken. On the level of geography, unequal representation from sub-areas of the community are reflected in the distribution of allocations between sub-areas. While the hypothesis was not explored, this is likely to be the case with sectoral as well as spatial biases in the committee.

The dynamics of geographical representation, to some extent, defy description. In the first place, unevenly distributed turnouts at organizational meetings may have been a function of the distribution of perceived urban problems in the neighbourhood. Perhaps areas with many perceived urban problems elicited more participation than the more complacent sub-areas?

On the other hand, poor turnouts from certain sub-areas may be related to the culture of poverty problem. People may withdraw from politics in response to the repetitive failure of the political system to provide their neighbourhood with its equitable share of resources
in parks, schools or road and gutter works. The culture of poverty argument is the well utilized rationale of the community organization movement. Alinsky and his disciples argued that the urban poor (or in this case, lower income sections of the city) needed a special professional to give them the knowledge, understanding, organization and high expectations to pursue a more equitable share from the urban political system. The cause of uneven participation is probably situational. It is only introduced here to demonstrate that traditional indicators of descriptive and substantive representation cannot be used in all cases because uneven representation in participatory groups may be the cause of or the result of our perception of urban problems in certain sub-areas.

From the planner's point of view, perhaps unlike that of committee members, all parts of a neighbourhood deserve equal consideration and scrutiny in the allocation of N.I.P. resources and in the development of policy. The selection process for N.I.P. projects including the designation of neighbourhoods deserving of this special assistance, and the selection of precise project boundaries is the stage at which parts of the city are included and excluded from consideration in N.I.P. allocations. Once an area has been selected, the project planner and his staff have a responsibility to ensure that no area within the project boundary is excluded from consideration through citizen participation.
The fact that the sub-area of Grandview Woodlands south of First Avenue and west of Victoria did not have committee members had serious ramifications. This sub-area is clearly lacking in recreation opportunities, and it is spatially detached from the rest of the city and even from the rest of the N.I.P. area, yet it received no N.I.P. allocations in the plan. The sub-area south of East Broadway, which has a comparable size and population received considerable amounts of money for recreation facilities built on school property based on the rationale that it was spatially isolated and lacking in recreation facilities. The difference between the two sub-areas can only be accounted by the fact that the one which received the N.I.P. allocation had three representatives while the sub-area west of Victoria and south of First Avenue had no representatives.

Uneven representation, both spatially and sectorally, may not always be the product of either "comfortable complacency" or "quiet despair", but it may simply be a technical problem. Often, the location of a site office, the location of committee meetings or the location of organizational public meetings may influence membership. For this reason, membership in the committee should be dealt with in a technical manner by the staff.

In this case study, both the second series of public meetings held in Riley Park in poorly represented sub-areas and the "travelling road show" meetings held
together with School Consultative Committees in Grandview Woodlands were well considered efforts at broadening representation in the committee in the first case, and external to the committee itself in the latter case. However, the latter strategy did not effectively meet the challenges posed by the spatial composition of Grandview Woodlands as the total exclusion of a sub-area of that community shows. The fact was that the area south of First Avenue and west of Victoria Drive does not have a school or School Consultative Committee to use as a basis for infiltration utilizing that strategy.

Evaluating the effectiveness of efforts at broadening representation must be a very broad minded process. Even with significant and time consuming efforts, representation within the sub-areas that had any representation continued to be inconsistent. To a great extent "comfortable complacency" must be used to account for the poor representation of certain areas when reasonable effort has been taken to make the distribution of committee members more proportional.

6.2 Assessment of Methodologies:

Descriptive, Substantive and Process Oriented Methodologies all contribute to our understanding of the representativeness of a planning process. The problems associated with the former two methods have been dealt with extensively elsewhere. The critique concentrates on the incompleteness of any analysis based entirely on
the characteristics of the N.I.P. committee and the methodologies' inability to examine the many forms of citizen involvement that are usually supplement to the actual committees' involvement.

The application of the process oriented methodology illustrates that one project exhibited exceptional success at incorporating a large number of diverse points of view in the plan using different approaches to citizen involvement, i.e., Riley Park. The descriptive representation methodology, however found the Riley Park N.I.P. committee unrepresentative on all levels. The substantive representation methodology established that the committee was unrepresentative because it did not express the same opinions as the general public in separate questionnaires. The geographical substantive representation methodology was too difficult to apply in Riley Park because a large number of issues were dealt with on a site specific basis, and it was impossible to specify sub-area boundaries which applied, functionally, in all cases. In short, the process oriented methodology, by viewing the planning process over a period of time, and through the many forms of public input, was the only methodology which is capable of isolating positive directions in representation.
In the case of Grandview Woodlands, the process oriented methodology was superior because its qualitative approach made analysis possible in a case where quantitative analysis was hampered by the small size of the N.I.P. committee.

The major shortcoming of the process oriented methodology is that it does not establish how many forms of input are necessary for any particular planning project. This particular aspect of the methodology is omitted because of the situational nature of this problem. Nevertheless, the methodology generated enough information to adequately evaluate the projects by comparing their performances.

Future research should focus on the development of flexible criteria for evaluating each project in its own right.

6.3 Comparisons Between Case Studies:

These two case studies make it possible to compare the benefits of:

1. dominant or passive approaches by the planner in the planning process, and
2. small or large committees at the centre of the planning process.

However, this study has not been a proper comparative study, and any comparative conclusions can only be suggestive in nature.

Firstly, there is evidence to show that Larry Beasley was forced to assume a more dominant role by the large planning committee. The large committee prevented the rapid development of indigenous leadership. According to one committee member interviewed recently in Riley Park, leadership emerged with time in the year following the completion of the concept planning stage. In Grandview Woodlands, on the other hand, leadership was already present in the committee as a result of the parallel Local Area Planning Committee.

The introduction of planning strategy in the form of unifying principles for action depended on the planner in Riley Park. In Grandview Woodlands, the strategy of preserving the neighbourhoods for families originated with the parallel Local Area Planning Committee and not with the planner.

The strategy was so central to the thinking of those who became the leaders in the community that the N.I.P. committee unquestioningly adopted it as its own. When local input was injected in the planning process from outside the committee which did not conform to the family needs concept, as was the case with the questionnaire results, the input was rejected.
In Riley Park, where strategy was fostered by the planning staff (the binodal improvement strategy), it became secondary to strongly supported particularistic inputs from outside the committee. This was illustrated when the committee decided to cancel the $165,000 linear walkway proposal because of objections posed by residents living in the area of the walkway concerned about possible increased pedestrian traffic and related fall-out.

While Larry Beasley's dominant role was in sharp contrast to the approach used by Buholzer in Grandview Woodlands, evidence suggests that the conditions that he worked under in Riley Park, and which elicited his response are closer to the norm for N.I.P. projects. What separated the Grandview Woodlands project from the Riley Park one was a consensual foundation for selecting issues to which strategy could be addressed. All in the Grandview Woodlands committee agreed that the area had to be secured for the future as a neighbourhood for families, if not exclusively for single family housing as opposed to single person oriented apartments. Much of this grew from a perceived threat that an adjacent apartment district west of Commercial Drive would undermine the neighbourhood's status quo. Under these conditions, the role of the planner is less one of forging consensus from a disparate group of interests as it was in Riley Park, and more one of a low key facilitator and information gatherer.
Since N.I.P. program criteria precludes the selection of neighbourhoods in which redevelopment is expected to rapidly cancel any investments made in rehabilitation, the selection criteria is biased in favour of stable, often complacent neighbourhoods like Riley Park where issues within the participatory planning process are relatively uncontentious and less interrelated.

In Grandview Woodlands, the committee was smaller and easier for the planner to work with. That committee reached its own agreement as to what it wanted from the planning process, unlike Riley Park where the planner had to foster a sense of planning strategy that would give unity to the plan. To this extent, the role of the planner in Grandview Woodlands may have been easier.¹

In fact, the planner's role must have been deceptively easy because certain noticeable omissions are evident on Buholzer's part. Little effort was taken to analyze the make-up of the committee and to seek a better distribution of local residents in the committee and a certain well defined geographical sub-section of the community was left out from representation as a result.

The community questionnaire was another clear omission on the part of those concern in Grandview Woodlands.

¹While his role in N.I.P. may have been easier, the fact that Bill Buholzer was responsible for two projects at once may have made his task as difficult or more difficult than Larry Beasley's in Riley Park, however.
The refusal of the committee to make use of the questionnaire can be viewed as a failure of the staff to enforce a well justified convention on the part of N.I.P. projects in Vancouver, and an illustration of the callous disregard for popular public opinion in the committee.

This evidence suggests that the planner's role in fostering planning strategy and developing citizen involvement outside the committee is just as important when the committee and citizens assume a dominant role in a project.

6.4 The Role of Citizens as a Learning Process:

The development of a universalistic outlook in the planning process was apparently a more acute problem in Riley Park than it was in Grandview Woodlands where the committee quickly inherited a well integrated ideal about the future of their neighbourhood. The Riley Park committee members exhibited a number of different orientations in terms of their planning goals. These included members of social service agencies, community organizations, and certain "socially conscious" members of the community, each with a different idea about the social problems in the community or how to deal with them, and they also included a number of citizens strictly concerned about their area's physical appearance and the
need for physical improvements to tidy the area up. This was not only a function of the larger committee and the absence of a perceived predominant neighbourhood problem, it also arose because of the way in which the committee was recruited from a large number of different organizational meetings held in various parts of the community.

The Riley Park committee nevertheless had to prepare a neighbourhood plan which was couched in a language and a form which could be accepted by council. The plan submitted to council had to convince councillors that it was based on planning principles with the future of the community in mind and that it was not a number of disjointed particularistic allocations. This actually happened and citizens quickly became more interested in discussing strategy and organization for the plan than isolated substantive subjects like housing or parks. This does not mean that they forgot their particularistic goals entirely. Nevertheless, the committee, particularly the uninitiated one, has a commitment, when it submits its particularistic goals into the process, to learn about "planning" from the planner as much as the planner has a commitment to learn the committee's values.

6.5 The Role of the Planner:

The absence of clear program criteria or guidelines in evaluating the performance of the planner in N.I.P.
programs makes it difficult to criticize the performance of a particular planner in a planning process. However, certain requirements appear obvious, including a fairly broad based planning committee at the centre of the planning process, flanked by a good mixture of different forms of citizen input, and a sound level of consultation with implementing government departments. Evidence suggests that these elements in the planning process cannot be left to the committee itself, primarily since the committee usually consists of novices in the planning process. The planner should serve as insurance against the repetition of mistakes of previous projects. To assume that the planner must not contribute unless requested to do so is to assume that the committee has nothing to learn from the planner beyond simple technical information or information on the city bureaucracy. Everyone has a great deal to learn in a planning process, and the citizens cannot benefit to any great extent unless the planner does not hesitate to evaluate their proposals, outline scenarios, and suggest particular alternatives.

A generalized model for the role of the planner in community organization is based mostly on the efforts taken by Larry Beasley in Riley Park. Table 6.1 illustrates the role of the planner in the form of three stages each with several role responsibilities. The planner begins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGES</th>
<th>PLANNER'S ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working through Existing Organizations</td>
<td>1. gathering community information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. attaining local acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a Planning Organization within the Community (Committee)</td>
<td>1. primary organizational meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. secondary organizational meetings intended to generate a more representative group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. committee socialization (re: requirements of the plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. committee socialization (re: planning process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. agreement on a work schedule and procedures for implementing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking and Entertaining Inputs from Unorganized Segments of the Community</td>
<td>1. working with the committee to develop a community questionnaire (extensive source of input).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. working with the committee to develop and implement other sources of inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing a Concept Plan</td>
<td>1. developing selected issues into scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proposing alternative options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. providing additional technical information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working in a community using existing community organizations. The development of a new community organization in the form of a planning committee with considered decision making responsibilities comes with the second stage. With this stage also comes several crucial role responsibilities including one to develop as broad a committee as possible through public meetings, and if necessary, follow-up public meetings to generate broad social and geographical representation in the committee. Most important, to ensure that the planner and the committee works as one, the committee must learn the same pressures and deadlines experience by the planner.

In the final stages in the concept planning level of neighbourhood improvement, the planner and committee must deal with the unorganized portion of the community through mechanisms for public input. However, the approaches used in this respect are empirical since each community poses different challenges caused by its spatial ethnic, social and economic make-up.

Two general categories of inputs are available at this stage, and to broaden the communities impact on the plan, all projects should employ methods which elicit both kinds of inputs. Firstly, extensive public input such as the random sample survey is an opportunity to broaden the scope of the plan beyond pet issues fostered by an existing or aspiring community elite. Secondly, intensive sources of public input gives those who are
strongly committed to their neighbourhood, and yet have neither the time nor level of interest necessary to participate on a weekly basis on the committee, a special opportunity to give in depth issue related inputs. These include participatory opportunities that require a period of voluntary social activity such as the public meeting, design-ins, gaming sessions or neighbourhood walks. And finally, when these sources of input have all had an impact on the committee, it is time for the committee to start making decisions toward a final draft plan, selecting between issues and determining priorities. At this stage the planner has another role in developing scenarios, offering alternatives to those ideas being considered by members and developing options, and generally making the decision process a more aware and conscious one.
7. **POSTSCRIPT**

This thesis probes the policy oriented early planning stage of Neighbourhood Planning proposed in the process guidelines for the Neighbourhood Improvement Program. However, a dichotomy between planning and implementation is always arbitrary, particularly in a grass roots planning environment like Vancouver's Neighbourhood Improvement Programs. The dichotomy was nevertheless used to isolate an area of citizen involvement which is especially important from a planning point of view: arousing public interest for universalistically (community oriented) motivated public involvement.

Since the completion of the policy planning stage, much has happened to substantively alter the content of the plans in both Riley Park and Grandview Woodlands.

For example, in Grandview Woodlands, one project was dropped completely, the proposal to make improvements to St. Francis School. Much of the work of implementing the projects was carried out by implementation committees which included local residents not otherwise belonging to the main N.I.P. committee. Hence, the level of involvement in different geographical areas of the community was increased as different schools generated their own group of parents with particular interests in seeing the planned improvements implemented effectively.

While the quantity of involved citizens was extended, the focus remained in the area of schools improvements with the development of implementation committees in
Grandview Woodlands. No effort was undertaken to broaden the issue perspectives of the committee through such mediums as questionnaires. Undoubtedly, the time for doing this had been during the policy planning stage and not the implementation stage when the committee had a responsibility to concentrate on issue-concerns ratified in the concept plan.

In Riley Park, the latest Six Month Progress Report (March, 1979) showed that community organization was still an ongoing concern there as well. The report shows the committee was explicitly seeking to implement visible projects first so as to encourage additional participation. Also, continued analysis and consideration of local planning issues was still a concern of the committee. Complex N.I.P. projects were being implemented by seeking conceptual development and achievement of approvals-in-principle first. Thus, implementation planning on a project by project basis was conducted using many of the planning process principles emphasized in this thesis' research on local area concept planning.
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APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW OUTLINES
The purpose of interviews was to clarify events and issues discovered in the sequence events derived from meeting minutes (Appendices 1 and 2).

Instead of an interview schedule, all interviews were carried out with an outline for an in-depth discussion. In the informal interview approach, the answers to questions determine to a great extent the nature of subsequent questions. Answers usually require clarification or the manner in which a question is answered uncovers issues requiring follow-up.

Separate outlines were necessary for interviews of planners or planning staff and committee members. Outlines were enforced by "important questions" which stimulated discussion and ensured the completeness of the interview.

A. "IMPORTANT QUESTIONS" FOR PLANNING STAFF INTERVIEWS

The following were interviewed with this interview format:
Larry Beasley - Riley Park planner
Bill Buholzer - Grandview Woodlands planner
Tom Phipps - Grandview Woodlands planning assistant
Kari Huhtala - Riley Park planning assistant

Community Organization:

1. Describe the staff's entry into the community before the N.I.P. committee was formed.

2. Do you think that the planner's efforts in developing the committee constitutes community organization? How were interest groups dealt with at this stage?

3. How important is the committee in the concept planning process?

4. Do you think that the planner has any responsibility to ensure that the committee is representative? How representative is the committee? How do you measure representation?

5. Do you think your committee was large enough? How did committee size affect decision making? What were some of the factors affecting the size of the committee?

6. Once the committee was formed do you think that
your responsibility for community organization was shifted somewhat? Was there any concern over the size of the committee expressed? By whom was it expressed? Was any action taken to induce new members? Why wasn't it effective?

Decision Making Process:

7. Was it difficult to induce involvement for non-fiscal as opposed to fiscal measures?

B. "IMPORTANT QUESTIONS" FOR COMMITTEE MEMBER INTERVIEWS

The following N.I.P. committee members were interviewed:

Patrick Brown - Riley Park
Fred Miller - Riley Park
Konrad Jashke - Grandview Woodlands
Mary Bosze - Grandview Woodlands

Community Organization:

1. How did you perceive the role of the planner at getting people organized for involvement? Planning with citizens? How did he perform in his role?

2. Did you have any particular reasons for wanting to be involved? Specific proposals of your own or at a group you belong to? What was the role of political motivation in members generally?

Decision Making Process:

3. How did your ideas change as the planning process developed?

4. Where did you first learn about this project?

5. How many people were at the first public meeting as the project was organized?

6. How was the committee at dealing with non-fiscal decisions? Were they easier to deal with?

7. What role did city departments/council play in your involvement?
APPENDIX 2

RILEY PARK N.I.P. PLAN
VI. The Neighbourhood Improvement Plan:

On the basis of the N.I.P. Committee’s expanding knowledge about the nature and distribution of local resources, activities and problems, Neighbourhood Improvement Goals have been established for the future of the area. These are related to parks and recreation, schools, social concerns, housing, commercial development and the general appearance of streets. These goals, which have essentially been endorsed by the community in public meetings and through a survey, are listed in Appendix C.

Guided by these Goals, the N.I.P. Committee has adopted a series of recommendations that form the Neighbourhood Improvement Plan. These recommendations also reflect the following principles:

(A) Actions are recommended not only for expenditure of N.I.P. funds but also for a consideration of governments’ policies and for local self-help initiatives.

(B) N.I.P. expenditures are meant to supplement, not replace, normal civic spending programs and should provide an impetus for allocation of supporting funds from other sources to achieve improvements.

(C) Any capital gained in the future on the basis of a present N.I.P. expenditure should be reinvested in the Riley Park Neighbourhood.

(D) A portion of the N.I.P. Grant should be retained for the time being in a Contingency Fund to support improvement projects not well enough defined at present to receive an allocation and other projects whose need becomes apparent during the Implementation Phase.

(E) Tentative N.I.P. Capital Allocations will not be spent until parallel operating funding, if required, is clearly secured.

The Riley Park Citizens' N.I.P. Planning Committee proposes the following Neighbourhood Improvement Actions for consideration by City Council and other affected agencies and groups.

The Committee voting on improvement proposals
**Community Facilities & Services**

**TOTAL N.I.P. ALLOCATION**

**$710,000.00**

**INTENT:**
It is important to expand social and leisure opportunities for teens, seniors, families, cultural groups and community organizations and to provide ways and means for the community to resolve existing and potential social problems (crime, unemployment, troubled youth and families, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. N.I.P. DEVELOPMENT OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE FACILITY**
Create a family place for getting together, leisure activities, community group functions, cultural group functions, diverse & changing programming to deal with social problems and social services outreach.
Emphasis to be on less-structured, informal community-defined programming.
Location to be in the northern part of the community.
Core operating funding and exact programming being investigated. | THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for development of a Neighbourhood House be set at $200,000.00.
THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE develop arrangements for core operations funding in consultation with Civic Staff, the Neighbourhood Services Association and others for report back to CITY COUNCIL.
|
| **2. N.I.P. DEVELOPMENT OF A STOREFRONT LIBRARY FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD**
Books, equipment and furniture to be provided with N.I.P. funds.
Building, staffing and operations to be provided by the Vancouver Library Board subject to investigations of timing, sites, and the nature of local Library needs.
Location to be in the Main Street local shopping area. | THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION to provide books, equipment and furniture for a storefront library be set at $100,000.00 subject to participation by the Vancouver Library Board.
THAT the VANCOUVER LIBRARY BOARD support the establishment of a storefront library in Riley Park subject to further investigations regarding implementation as required.
|
| **3. N.I.P. DEVELOPMENT OF A YOUTH CENTRE**
Create a place for all the young people in the community to get together, learn social and vocational skills, and help one another solve various social problems.
Emphasis to be on informal programming set by the youth participants.
Participation has been offered by the Little Mountain Youth Project.
Location to be in the centre of the community.
Core operating funding being investigated. | THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for development of a Youth Centre be set at $150,000.00.
THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE develop arrangements for core operations funding in consultation with the Little Mountain Youth Project and others for report back to CITY COUNCIL.
|
| **4. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO RILEY PARK RECREATION COMPLEX**
Provide a new common entrance in order to develop a large meeting room (partially dedicated to teens recreation) and additional seniors "home-away-from-home" space.
Make modifications to minimize impact of the Complex on abutting residences.
This N.I.P. Allocation comprising approximately 1/3 of the total funds needed will have to be matched by allocations from the Province, Parks Board and/or other funding sources which are presently being investigated.
Provide immediate funds to develop a preliminary design proposal for consideration by other funding sources. | THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for the N.I.P. share of joint funded improvements to the Riley Park Recreation Complex be set at $225,000.00 and THAT expenditure of $6,000.00 of this amount be approved by CITY COUNCIL for an immediate design study.
THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE, in conjunction with Civic Staff investigate joint funding sources for the Recreation Complex improvements for report back to CITY COUNCIL.
### Community Facilities and Services (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. N.I.P. Development of Roller Skating at Riley Park Recreation Complex</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for purchase of a roller skate collection be set at $15,000.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide 300 pairs of roller skates for a summer roller skating program at Riley Ice Rink.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. N.I.P. Development of &quot;Community Van&quot; Transport</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for development of Community Van Transport be set at $20,000.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase &amp; equip at least 2 vehicles (vans) for community &amp; school use in transporting groups to local &amp; city social/recreation facilities (with provisions for use by the handicapped). Arrangements for operations, maintenance &amp; storage are under investigation with the School Board and community groups.</td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE investigate with Civic Staff, arrangements for maintenance, operations and storage for future development. Report back to CITY COUNCIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Development of Community Liaison Committee with Team Police</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE and TEAM POLICE initiate a Liaison Committee. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide cooperative forum to understand &amp; find appropriate solutions to local police problems (crime, vandalism, street safety, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Development of Block Parent Program &amp; Further Implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch Program</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE, SCHOOL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES, SCHOOL AUTHORITIES and POLICE implement the &quot;Block Parent&quot; &amp; &quot;Neighbourhood Watch Programs&quot;. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a volunteer network of helpers to aid children who are sick, hurt or in trouble. Achieve maximum implementation of Neighbourhood Watch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Community Support for Programs Aiding Troubled Youth</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE request &amp; support the Vancouver Resources Board to station child-care workers in local schools. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute programs in local schools to identify and assist young people who are experiencing problems. Support present youth-oriented services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Establish Employment Preparation &amp; Action Programs in the Neighbourhood</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE initiate discussions with Canada Manpower &amp; others to develop job preparation &amp; action programs. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish classes on how to choose a vocation, apply for a job &amp; function in a work situation. Develop a job referral service out of the Neighbourhood House.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Publicize City Emergency Programs &amp; Facilities</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE initiate discussions with Emergency Service Agencies to undertake local publicity about emergency services. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make emergency services known to all in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Investigate Creation of Community Newspaper</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE investigate starting a local newspaper. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tabloid managed by local residents to distribute local information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks

$267,200.00
TOTAL N.I.P. ALLOCATION

**INTENT:** It is necessary to improve existing park spaces to accommodate a variety of recreational activities, to ensure that park space is safe and pleasant, and to ensure that outdoor recreation opportunities are convenient to all residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO HILLCREST PARK/MELROSE RIGHT-OF-WAY</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Melrose Right-of-Way/Hilcrest Park improvements be set at $75,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Closure of Melrose Avenue was approved by City Council on November 3, 1972. Check traffic situation related to Melrose Avenue and Capilano Stadium. Provide tennis courts, multiple-purpose hard surface play area, benches, garbage receptacles and picnic tables on and around Melrose. Cleanup and landscape Melrose. Renovate fieldhouse residence &amp; facilities (request Vancouver Parks Board to match funds for these renovations).</td>
<td>THAT the VANCOUVER PARKS BOARD allocate funds from the Fieldhouse Improvement Fund of its 1977 Capital Budget to help rehabilitate the Hilcrest Park fieldhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO RILEY PARK (EXTERIOR)</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Riley Park (exterior) improvements be set at $68,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide benches, picnic tables, garbage receptacles, lighting and pathways. Improve play equipment, wading pool &amp; backstop. Augment field drainage works. Create vehicular barriers at James &amp; 32nd Street ends. Renovate fieldhouse facilities (request Vancouver Parks Board to match funds for these renovations). Make modifications to minimize impact of the park on abutting residences.</td>
<td>THAT the VANCOUVER PARKS BOARD allocate funds from the Fieldhouse Improvement Fund of its 1977 Capital Budget to help rehabilitate the Riley Park fieldhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO CARTIER PARK</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Cartier Park improvements be set at $45,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide trees &amp; planting, new backstop, benches and garbage receptacles. Develop creative play area. Repair westerly fence and grass surfaces. Install special safety curbs and walkway along Prince Edward Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO PRINCE EDWARD PARK</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Prince Edward Park improvements be set at $78,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide benches, picnic tables, trees and landscaping, garbage receptacles &amp; lighting. Improve play equipment. Renovate fieldhouse facility and residence (request Vancouver Parks Board to match funds for these renovations). Install special safety curbs along Prince Edward and Sophia Streets and additional auto barriers. Augment field drainage works.</td>
<td>THAT the VANCOUVER PARKS BOARD allocate funds from the Fieldhouse Improvement Fund of its 1977 Capital Budget to help rehabilitate the Prince Edward Park fieldhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. ACHIEVE LOCAL USE OF CAPILANO STADIUM</strong></td>
<td>THAT LOCAL CITIZENS initiate discussions with the Vancouver Parks Board to consider potentials for local use of Capilano Stadium. (No N.I.P. expenditure at this time.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Vancouver Parks Board to develop local uses for Capilano Stadium now and to create local-use facilities when Capilano Stadium is rehabilitated later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Streets and Circulation

**TOTAL N.I.P. ALLOCATION**

$210,000.00

**INTENT:** While the traffic situation in the neighbourhood is generally not a problem, many local streets and sidewalks need physical improvements and cleanup. The truck & traffic problem on Main St. can not be dealt with locally but requires city-wide attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. STREETS &amp; SIDEWALKS UPGRADED THROUGH LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROCEDURES</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS’ N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE coordinate Local Improvement petitioning to upgrade streets and sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate an effort to get petitions signed and projects underway through Local Improvement Procedures to get all neighbourhood streets curbed/guttered, paved and sidewalked. Finished petitions to be considered in order of receipt by the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. N.I.P. STREET IMPROVEMENTS FUND</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for a Street Improvement Fund be set at $190,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds to contribute to improving selected streets/sidewalks after Local Improvement petitioning results are known. High priority to be given to streets abutting schools &amp; open spaces and along circulation alignments that are significant to the neighbourhood. Approach to allocating funds to be determined after Local Improvement petitioning is completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. N.I.P. PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN-ACTIVATED LIGHT AT INTERSECTION OF 33rd AND ONTARIO</strong></td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for a 33rd/Ontario pedestrian signal and associated street improvements be set at $20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide light and associated street improvements to insure safe and convenient pedestrian accessibility from the southern apartment area to the community facilities north of 33rd Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. PROVISION OF BUS SHELTERS</strong></td>
<td>THAT a fair share of bus shelters be provided in the Riley Park neighbourhood through the Commercial Bus Shelter Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bus shelters along major bus routes in the neighbourhood through the Commercial Bus Shelter Program recently approved in principle by City Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. STREET CLEANUP CAMPAIGN</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS’ N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE organize a Neighbourhood Litter Cleanup Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IN CITY-WIDE TRUCK AND GENERAL TRANSPORTATION DELIBERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS’ N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE seek representation on Citizens’ forums considering truck and traffic issues in the City of Vancouver.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTENT:
It is necessary to consolidate, reinforce and make competitive the local retail shopping district on Main Street, to upgrade Main Street as an important social place and to develop a sense of identity for the whole neighbourhood.

### ACTIONS

#### 24. EVALUATE MAIN STREET ZONING
Ensure that zoning reinforces and conserves local retail shopping opportunities on Main Street (between 24th & 29th Avenues) and provides, over time, a separation between local retailing and general commercial activity. This study has been endorsed at a recent Merchants Meeting.

#### 25. N.I.P. BEAUTIFICATION TO THE MAIN STREET LOCAL RETAILING DISTRICT
On Main Street between 24th & 29th Avenues provide improved sidewalk paving, street trees, landscaping, neighbourhood bulletin board, benches, garbage receptacles, pedestrian signs and ornamental lighting. Develop (with merchants) design concepts for retail facade improvements. Develop sidewalk cleanup programs. Landscape triangle at 16th/Main. These actions have been endorsed at a recent Merchants Meeting.

#### 26. INVESTIGATE MEANS OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER PARKING IN MAIN STREET LOCAL RETAILING DISTRICT
Devise solutions to the parking problem on Main Street including merchant-initiated collective parking lots through a Local Improvement Project; establishing 1-hour on-street parking limits; and making existing parking more generally available. These investigations have been endorsed at a recent Merchants Meeting.

#### 27. START A MAIN STREET MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION
Improve the Main Street local retailing district through collective Merchant Action (group sales, group facelitses on buildings, small business counselling, group insurance and security arrangements, etc.) Local merchants have recently struck a steering committee to form a Merchants Association.

#### 28. ARRANGE NEIGHBOURHOOD EVENTS
Organize and hold special neighbourhood events (such as a Riley Park Day, Main Street Festival, Open-Air Market, etc.) to build neighbourhood identity.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

(Those for City Council are shaded)

#### 24. EVALUATE MAIN STREET ZONING
THAT CITY COUNCIL authorize the PLANNING DEPARTMENT to evaluate existing Main Street zoning in consultation with local merchants, residents and others. (No N.I.P. expenditure.)

#### 25. N.I.P. BEAUTIFICATION TO THE MAIN STREET LOCAL RETAILING DISTRICT
THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION to beautify the Main Street local retailing district be set at $170,000.00

THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE work with local merchants to develop design concepts for facade improvements & sidewalk cleanup programs.

#### 26. INVESTIGATE MEANS OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER PARKING IN MAIN STREET LOCAL RETAILING DISTRICT
THAT LOCAL MERCHANTS and COMMERCIAL LANDOWNERS together with CIVIC STAFF investigate means of solving Main Street parking problems.

#### 27. START A MAIN STREET MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION
THAT Main Street MERCHANTS develop a strong Merchants Association.

#### 28. ARRANGE NEIGHBOURHOOD EVENTS
THAT the RILEY PARK CITIZENS' N.I.P. PLANNING COMMITTEE in consultation with the Vancouver Social Planning Department and local merchants, investigate ways and means to hold various neighbourhood events.
## Schools

**$75,750.00**

**TOTAL N.I.P. ALLOCATION**

**INTENT:** It is important to develop and encourage the use of selected appropriate school spaces by the local community for educational, social and recreational purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO BROCK SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change craft rooms and provide craft equipment for community use. Provide gym equipment and storage for community use. Improve play area and landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Brock School Improvements be set at $21,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO BROCK ANNEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop creative playground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Brock Annex Improvements be set at $17,250.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO LIVINGSTONE SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change library/gym areas to facilitate community use. Work with Vancouver Parks Board and Vancouver School Board to develop social and recreational programming out of Livingstone School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Livingstone School Improvements be set at $3,500.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT LOCAL CITIZENS initiate discussions with the Vancouver School Board and Vancouver Parks Board to consider ways and means to develop social and recreational programming out of Livingstone School.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO GENERAL WOLFE SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop multiple use cosom hockey play facility. Provide landscaping and improved play area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Wolfe School Improvements be set at $29,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. IMPROVEMENT TO TUPPER SCHOOL OPEN SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close 23rd Avenue between Tupper School and schoolyard to provide continuous, safe open space. Street closure costs &amp; costs of installation of sports &amp; play equipment and landscaping to be the responsibility of the Vancouver School Board. (No N.I.P. allocation.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT CITY COUNCIL approve the closure of 23rd Avenue between Tupper School and schoolyard for use as schoolgrounds.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34. N.I.P. IMPROVEMENTS TO RILEY ALTERNATE SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide education equipment to meet special needs of the local students. Provide furniture, carpet, etc. to enhance the teaching environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for Riley Alternate School Improvements be set at $5,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing

### INTENT:
It is important to preserve the residential character of the neighbourhood while stopping deterioration; provide for additional types of housing; attract young families to live in the area; and retain a balance of moderate-income rental and ownership opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS (Those for City Council are shaded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>35. DEVELOPMENT OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSING POLICY</strong>&lt;br&gt;It is felt that the housing situation in the area should be investigated in a comprehensive manner, considering among other things: the secondary suite situation; new &amp; existing housing quality; approaches to providing diverse housing type &amp; tenure opportunities meeting local needs; &amp; methods to facilitate housing maintenance.</td>
<td>THAT City Council authorize the City Planning Department to undertake housing policy development for the Riley Park Neighbourhood, in consultation with local residents with recommendations on neighbourhood housing to be submitted to City Council at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36. ACHIEVE RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Provide implementation of the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program as soon as possible.&lt;br&gt;- Investigate ways &amp; means to rehabilitate the Little Mountain Housing Project. Achieve rehabilitation of individual City-owned houses in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>THAT City Council request C.M.H.C. to issue the Riley Park N.I.P. Implementation Certificate of Eligibility as soon as possible so that R.R.A.P. applications can begin to be processed.&lt;br&gt;THAT City Council direct City Staff to investigate the economics of applying R.R.A.P. to City-owned houses in Riley Park for report back to City Council.&lt;br&gt;THAT the Riley Park Citizens' N.I.P. Planning Committee in conjunction with Housing Project Tenants approach B.C. Housing Management Commission to initiate rehabilitation of the Little Mountain Housing Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Administration and Future Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION CONTINGENCY</th>
<th>$374,040.00</th>
<th>$198,010.00</th>
<th>TOTAL N.I.P. ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>37. N.I.P. ADMINISTRATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provide Planning Staff support to coordinate an effective implementation of N.I.P. (in cooperation with area residents) as well as promote R.R.A.P. until June, 1980.</td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION for program administration be set at $374,040.00 as per the budget attached as Appendix D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38. ONGOING CITIZENS PLANNING COMMITTEE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Continue the Riley Park Citizens' N.I.P. Planning Committee to oversee N.I.P. implementation; to initiate citizen action &amp; discussions with government agencies as recommended in this Plan; to move on local opportunities &amp; problems as they arise; to influence city policy; &amp; to respond to proposed development.</td>
<td>THAT the Riley Park Citizens' N.I.P. Planning Committee continue with its present organization and terms of reference to advise City Council on N.I.P. Implementation &amp; represent the community on various planning matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39. N.I.P. CONTINGENCY FUND</strong>&lt;br&gt;Funds to provide for later proposals which could include (but not restricted to): play space in the N.W sub-area; more park or street improvements; low-cost daycare; local uses for Capilano Stadium; etc.</td>
<td>THAT a tentative N.I.P. ALLOCATION as a Contingency Fund be set at $198,010.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

GRANDVIEW WOODLANDS N.I.P. PLAN
NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The N.I.P. Committee's approach to its responsibilities in preparing recommenda-
tions on the allocation of N.I.P. funds has been based on a number of prin-
ciples, which are listed below to clarify the intent of the following recommen-
dations:

- N.I.P. funding should be used to supplement, and not replace,
  normal civic government programs which could directly bene-
  fit the N.I.P. area.

- Wherever possible, N.I.P. funds should be used as "seed
  money" to attract funds for needed neighbourhood improve-
  ments from other sources and programs. The Committee
  intends to encourage the use of local improvement petitions
  for street improvements, the Canada Works Program to pro-
  vide labour for needed park and school improvements, and
  Vancouver School Board grants for development of playground
  facilities at elementary schools.

- At least some highly visible improvement projects should
  be funded, so that highly apparent improvement results,
  and potential benefit in terms of increased public confi-
  dence in the area's future is maximized.

- A significant proportion of the Neighbourhood Improvement
  grant should remain unallocated in the Concept Plan, to
  permit a number of potential improvement projects to be
  explored in more detail and to allow for unanticipated
  costs in priority projects, inflation, and new projects
  which become feasible during the implementation stage of
  the program. This would allow ideas and suggestions from
  new participants to be incorporated into the program at a
  later date, and would encourage such participants' involve-
  ment.

improvements to local schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Secord School</td>
<td>make the school and grounds more usable by the general community and improve recreational opportunities for the students, by improving the playing field, providing a larger gymnasium, and developing a children's playground.</td>
<td>495,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Nelson School</td>
<td>provide a children's playground for school and community use, improve the playing field to the west of the school, and if possible provide independent access to washrooms and changing rooms for after-school use.</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis School</td>
<td>purchase land for, and share cost of, gymnasium for school and general community use.</td>
<td>355,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Macdonald School</td>
<td>provide children's playground, improve gymnasium facility by adding storage space, and provide facilities for serving morning meals to school children (provided that operating funds for such a program can be arranged from another source).</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Improvements to Local Parks

**Garden Park**: improve tennis courts, soccer field and children's play area, repair existing fieldhouse, and provide bocce courts.

**McSpadden Park**: improve soccer field and children's play area, provide landscaping, lighting and tennis courts, and acquire field house or equivalent for washroom and changing facilities.

**Victoria Park**: provide bocce courts, washrooms if possible, children's play area, and minor improvements to increase usability of park.

**Grandview Park**: improve tennis courts, provide creative playground, repair and renovate wading pool and field house.

**Templeton Park**: improve soccer field south of swimming pool, provide lighting in pool area, and provide practice running track.

### Street Improvements and Beautification

**Commercial Drive**: provide funds for basic beautification scheme (trees, pedestrian lighting, benches, litter containers) and stimulate property owners' financial participation in more complete beautification project. (175,000.00)

**Protective Tree Planting**: plant trees at Sir William MacDonald School and Laura Secord School for decorative and protective purposes (approved by Council May 31, 1977). (12,000.00)

**Litter Containers**: provide concrete litter barrels near neighbourhood grocery stores (approved by Council May 31, 1977). (4,000.00)

**Bulletin Boards**: provide community bulletin boards at prominent locations to publicize community centre and other neighbourhood events. (10,000.00)

**Bus Shelters**: provide regular style bus shelters at locations where they would not be provided according to normal City priorities. (35,000.00)

**Residential Street Improvements**: provide a subsidy to encourage the completion of local improvements including curbing of residential streets and construction of sidewalks, with financial participation by property owners. (146,000.00)
### Community Social Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90,500</td>
<td>Provide equipment for child care centres, office space improvements for social service agencies serving the Grandview-Woodland area, and translate, publish and distribute an up-to-date directory of community services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Infill and Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>Stimulate or sponsor a community-based non-profit housing co-operative or society to undertake small-scale infill housing and rehabilitation projects using National Housing Act programs. Acquire and clear land occupied by non-conforming land uses or residential buildings which are beyond rehabilitation, for development of non-profit housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning and Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252,078</td>
<td>Funds allocated to the planning stage of the program (August 24, 1976). (69,546) Provide staff in the City Planning Department to co-ordinate the implementation of neighbourhood improvement projects in co-operation with residents of the area, and promote the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, until June 1980. (182,532)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingency Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120,922</td>
<td>Retain a significant fund to support projects which are needed in the community but not sufficiently advanced at this time to warrant an allocation of funds: including but not restricted to, after-school care and emergency day care facilities, senior citizens' and community meeting space, street improvements to resolve local traffic problems, and additional allocations to projects listed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Land use and development issues in the Grandview-Woodland N.I.P. area are currently being reviewed by the City Planning Department through its local area planning program. This program is dealing with the entire Grandview-Woodland local area, which includes the Neighbourhood Improvement Area as well as more unstable apartment residential zones and industrial districts to the north and west. Planning policies emerging from this program for consideration by City Council will have as their objective the preservation of the family residential character of the Grandview-Woodland neighbourhood; the following specific policy directions have been identified to date to deal with land use and development issues in the N.I.P. area:

Housing

Measures to accommodate slightly higher residential densities, through infill, secondary suites, and carefully controlled townhouse development are being considered. Sensitive use of the Standards of Maintenance By-law in conjunction with the R.R.A.P. program will lead to a general upgrading of residential buildings where this is required.

Commercial Areas

Residential zoning schedules will be altered to permit retention and upgrading of existing corner grocery stores. Commercial Drive and Hastings Street commercial centres will be encouraged to stress their district orientation and to provide pedestrian scale shopping opportunities and amenities. Residential uses will be encouraged on upper storeys along Commercial Drive. Spot district commercial zoning within the residential neighbourhoods will be altered to a designation more compatible with nearby residential uses.

Traffic and Parking

Measures will be investigated to reduce the use of residential streets by non-local traffic where this is a significant problem. Required land dedications (for access to parking and loading areas) behind Commercial Drive and Hastings Street properties will be gradually acquired as properties are redeveloped. Off-street parking spaces in new residential developments will be required, and new residential developments on major traffic arteries (Nanaimo Street, Broadway, First Avenue) will be encouraged to take the problem of traffic noise into account and provide protection for residents. Improvements in bus service on specific routes will be explored with B.C. Hydro.

Recreation

Consideration will be given to the improvement of the accessibility of elementary schools for all age groups, particularly in the "after school" hours. The "community school" concept will be encouraged.

In addition to these specific policies which directly affect the N.I.P. area, it is important to note that the realisation of the principal objectives of the Grandview-Woodland local area plan will determine to a large extent the success of efforts to conserve and strengthen the N.I.P. area east of Commercial Drive. The various residential neighbourhoods in Grandview-Woodland are closely interdependent, and attempts to stabilize and reinforce the family character of the N.I.P. area will falter unless similar measures are successfully implemented around the N.I.P. area in the Britannia Slopes, Wall Street, and Woodland Park neighbourhoods. Shared services and facilities which are particularly oriented to this family community (Sir William Macdonald and Britannia Schools, the Britannia Community Services Centre, and the Commercial Drive shopping area, for example), will not continue their present orientation unless the residential areas around them continue to provide housing opportunities appropriate for a family-oriented, mixed income, multicultural population.