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ABSTRACT

A PUBLIC RECREATION PLANNING MODEL
BASED ON CURRENT RECREATION THEORY

The basic question facing recreation planners is: how much and what kinds of recreation opportunities should public agencies provide? This thesis attempts to answer this question by examining recreation theory in order to determine just what it is that public recreation is expected to accomplish. Early recreation theories, while they provided an answer in the form of nationwide standards, were found to be too simplistic. More recent theories, particularly those based on humanistic philosophy or "recreational need", are too open ended to give any qualitative or quantitative guidance to the public recreation planner. In order for it to be worthwhile for society generally to provide recreation opportunities, society generally must benefit. For this reason, theories based on the individual (humanistic theories) are unsatisfactory as a sole basis for recreation planning.

It appears that it is not possible to take a purely positivistic approach to recreation planning at the present time because too little is known about what recreation (or its absence) does to an individual to be able to determine how much is enough. It is concluded that until such time as the
necessary information on the effects of recreation is forthcoming, normative approaches employing community values will be necessary.

In the first part of the thesis a recreation planning model is developed. The model begins with community values, as expressed through public participation, in the form of goals. The goals are then converted via objectives into facilities and programs. The recreation opportunities thus provided produce personal satisfactions and social benefits. The latter are compared with the original goals to determine the effectiveness of the recreation program (program evaluation).

In Part II the Planning Model is compared with current recreation planning practice, as exemplified by the Vancouver (B. C.) Master Plan for Parks and Recreation. The following significant differences are noted:

1) the model is devoted to fulfilling long-term goals while the Master Plan emphasizes meeting demand for facilities and programs

2) the model relies on citizen input for direction while the Master Plan places greater emphasis on professional judgment

3) The Model requires a commitment to program evaluation and ongoing planning while the Master Planning process is oriented toward the production of a single end product.

These differences imply that implementation of the Planning Model will require a significant amount of effort on the part of the community in terms of choosing the right planning techniques, committing sufficient resources, and developing the necessary political will power. It is hoped that recreation planners will find the Model sufficiently compelling
intellectually to go to the effort that its implementation will entail.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ......................................................... ii
Table of Contents ............................................... v
List of Tables ................................................... vii
List of Figures ................................................... viii
Acknowledgement ................................................ ix

PART I: THE THEORY OF RECREATION PLANNING ............. 1

CHAPTER 1 Introduction & History .......................... 2
  Introduction ................................................... 2
  Background .................................................... 5

CHAPTER 2 Theories of Recreation .......................... 13
  The Development of Current Recreation Theory .......... 13
  "Early" Theories .............................................. 15
  Behavioural Theories ....................................... 16
  Humanistic Theory .......................................... 16
  Social Psychology Theory ................................... 18
  Recreationists' Theories ................................... 19
  Recreational Need .......................................... 23
  Recreational Demand, Satisfaction, & Benefits .......... 26
  Building the Model ......................................... 27

CHAPTER 3 Planning Principles ............................. 31
  Goals and Objectives; ....................................... 33
  Evaluation .................................................... 35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Demand</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 4 Summary and Discussion of Part I</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II: THE PRACTICE OF RECREATION PLANNING</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 5 The Content and Process of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Master Plan for Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Analysis</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Analysis</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Plan Formulation</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval and Implementation</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 6 A Comparison of the Planning Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Vancouver Master Planning Process</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table I: A Classification of Selected Types of Recreation Standards ........................................... 9
Table IIA: Planning Types and Purposes ................................. 56
Table IIB: Planning Processes Appropriate to Various Types of Planning .................................. 57
Table III: Comparison of Model and Master Plan .............. 86
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. A Diagram of User Resource Relationships ..........8
Figure 2. Planning Model - Step 2 ..................................29
Figure 3. Planning Model - Step 3 ..................................30
Figure 4. Planning Model - Complete .................................61
Figure 5. Master Planning Process .................................73
Figure 6. Planning Model - Complete .................................82
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Kevin Pike and Pieter Rutgers of the Vancouver Parks Board, to Brian Johnston of the Department of Recreation, University of British Columbia, and to Barbara Hendricks for their assistance and constructive criticism during the preparation of this dissertation.
PART I

THE THEORY OF RECREATION PLANNING
"No profession can advance when there is too great a gap between theory and practice."*

Introduction

The most basic question facing the public recreation planner is: "how much and what kinds of recreation do people need?" Without a standard of provision, the planner is hard put to justify his recommendations to the decision makers and the decision makers have no concrete guidelines for the allocation of scarce resources to recreation. The question of need for recreation can be answered only by reference to recreation theory; i.e., how much recreation is necessary depends on the purpose of recreation. And purpose is derived from theory. The first section of this thesis is concerned with the theories and philosophy underlying recreation and their effects on planning for parks and recreation, while the second section compares the planning model derived in Section I with an actual recreation plan.

* Sapora, AV, quoted in Pelegrino, DA\textsuperscript{63}
The theory underlying the provision of urban parks and recreation has undergone significant changes in recent years. Whereas in the early years parks were created to provide an outlet for the constructive use of leisure time and energies of urban dwellers, recent theories speak of designing recreation experiences to permit the fulfillment of an individual's potential. The earlier theory was developed by members of the parks and recreation profession while the later approach has developed out of research done by sociologists and psychologists.

The "rural atmosphere and constructive activity" school of thought that prevailed during the first half of the century developed traditional standards for the provision of park space, such as the space per population standard of 10 acres per 1,000 persons. While such standards were recognized as being arbitrary, there was a conceptual link between the "need" of everyone for a minimum amount of fresh air and activity and a nationwide standard. In an era when the purpose of parks was seen as being limited to these two simple functions, a quantitative planning approach which regarded all persons as having identical needs was compatible with theory.

However, with the advent of the new theories based on the uniqueness of each individual in his recreational needs, the planners were cut adrift from general standards. What is proposed in the remainder of this treatise is to examine the response of recreation planning to this challenge in the following way:
Part I

1. Undertake a brief historical background review of the development of the parks and recreation movement
2. Review the literature on recreation theory, particularly as it affects planning
3. Review the literature on recreation planning, to determine its current theoretical basis and methods
4. Prepare a public recreation planning model which reflects current recreation theory

Part II

1. Review the 1982 Vancouver Parks and Recreation Master Plan
2. Critically examine the planning model in the light of current planning practice, as exemplified by the Vancouver Master Plan

Because of the size and complexity of the field of recreation planning, the discussion will be limited to urban parks and recreation and will not include consideration of feasibility or project plans. Parks are considered from the point of view of their function as sites for recreation (in the wide sense); their contribution to city form and environmental protection is excluded.

In tracing the theoretical and practical steps involved in determining how much and what kinds of recreation should be provided, a number of planning concepts and methods will be introduced. Following a definition, the advantages and
disadvantages of each method will be discussed by way of demonstrating its suitability for the purpose suggested.

Background

The municipal park movement in North America can be said to have begun with Frederick Law Olmsted's prize winning design for New York City's Central Park in 1857. A decisive factor in winning the competition was Olmsted's underlying social philosophy of the purpose of parks: "...a specimen of God's handiwork that shall be to them, inexpensively, what a month or two in the White Mountains, or the Adirondacks, is to those in easier circumstances."* This philosophy and the landscape architecture that went with it soon spread to most of the major cities on the continent. Vancouver responded with the establishment of Stanley Park in 1887. The philosophy was well expressed in the minutes of Toronto City Council in 1859: "In the first place [parks] furnish to the wealthy places of agreeable resort, either for driving or walking, and free from the heat and dust of an ordinary road...thus enabling them to enjoy the inestimable blessing of the free open air of the Country - so conducive to the promotion of health and morality."5

Unfortunately, the working classes of the time lacked the carriages for driving, the time for walking, and the presence of parks in their crowded neighbourhoods. In recognition of this

* FL Olmsted, quoted in Burton, TL, et al13
fact, the playground movement began in the early 1900's reaching Vancouver in 1912 with the establishment of playgrounds at McLean Park. The reasoning behind the playground movement was two-fold:

1. Opportunities for wholesome recreation are an individual's right
2. Their prevention of social disorders such as delinquency and drunkenness

The planning methods which characterized these early beginnings could only be classed as ad hoc and incremental acquisition. However, as early as 1906, minimum standards of park provision did begin to appear, such as "2 acres per 4,000 children in playgrounds" and "one athletic field for each of the four sections of the city." The justification for this particular provision was that "the athletic field is essential to the well-being of older boys and men and forms the strongest rival of the saloon and other evil influences in the community." Thus the use of nationwide standard of recreation provision is seen to be linked with the health and morality concept of parks and recreation from an early date.

With the passage of time, standards became much more sophisticated and in 1965 the (U S) National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) offered the following classification of standard ratios:

1. Recreation space per population, e.g., the 10 acres/1,000 population adopted by the NRPA
2. Recreation space per area, e.g., 10% of an area to be subdivided should be in recreation and open space, or there should be a playground within 1/4 - 1/2 mi playfield within 1/2 - 1 1/2 mi district park within 1 - 3 mi regional park within 3/4 - 1 hr

3. Recreation space per user need, based on:
   - density of population
   - type of urban development
   - housing structures
   - patterns of economic development

The user need method of standard development referred to in item 3 above was exemplified by the National Advisory Council on Regional Recreation's "User-Resource Recreation Planning Method," published in 1959 and depicted in Figure 1. Gold (1973) offers a more comprehensive classification of standards as demonstrated in Table I.

Standards probably reached their zenith in 1969 with the NRPA's publication of "National Park, Recreation, and Open Space Standards." In it park planners are admonished that standards were to be considered 'guidelines' and to represent 'minimum' values. In addition they should meet the following criteria:

- reflect the needs of the specific area being served;
  i.e.,
  time-distance from parks, demographic profiles, socio-economic factors, cultural and ethnic characteristics, geographical
Figure 1

A DIAGRAM OF USER-RESOURCE RELATIONSHIPS*

A IDENTIFY RECREATION USERS AND RESOURCES

Analysis of Recreation Interests and Activities results in Formation of User Groups (based upon similar recreation experiences and resource requirements), which have Certain Social and Economic Characteristics which are used to

B ESTIMATE RECREATION DEMAND AND SUPPLY

of Requirements of User Groups of Potential Resource Types which are related through the use of Recreation Planning Guides Landscape Interpretation and Design Recreation Costs and Benefits to

C PROPOSE A RECREATION PLAN

For the Region or Planning Area

* U. S. National Advisory Council on Regional Recreation Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General orientation</th>
<th>Specific type</th>
<th>Measurement units</th>
<th>Illustrative examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation use</td>
<td>Population ratio</td>
<td>Area/population</td>
<td>1 acre neighbourhood park/1000 pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation demand</td>
<td>Area/user group</td>
<td>1 acre playground/600 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of area</td>
<td>Area/planning unit</td>
<td>10% of planning unit area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation development</td>
<td>Facility to site</td>
<td>Units/acre</td>
<td>16 picnic tables/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility placement</td>
<td>Distance bet. units</td>
<td>Picnic tables 50 ft. apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility to activity</td>
<td>Units/user group</td>
<td>1 softball diamond/10,000 pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility size</td>
<td>Area/facility</td>
<td>3-5 acres neighbourhood playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying capacity</td>
<td>User to resource</td>
<td>Users/site</td>
<td>400 people/mile of trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User to time</td>
<td>Users/time/site</td>
<td>50 people/mile of trail/hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation program</td>
<td>Activity to population</td>
<td>Activity/population</td>
<td>1 arboretum/10,000 pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership requirements</td>
<td>Leaders/activity</td>
<td>2 leaders/100 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation management</td>
<td>Supervisors to users</td>
<td>Staff/population</td>
<td>1 supervisor/1000 users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance to site</td>
<td>Degree/area</td>
<td>1 laborer/10 acres playground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gold, SM*
location, and climate
- be reasonably obtainable
- be acceptable and usable
- be based on sound principles and all available information
- stand the test of time

Thus, the traditional standards approach to recreation planning and the 'fresh air and wholesome activity' theory that went with it are seen to have persisted formally, though considerably modified, until 1969. However, despite the two revisions just referred to, the promotion of nationwide standards in the parks and recreation literature appears to have ended with the 60's.

Beginning with Herbert Gans in 1968, recreation planning by standards came under increasing attack on the basis of the new theories which were being proposed regarding the meaning of leisure and recreation. Gans challenged the claim that recreation per se invariably promoted mental health, citing the absence of any reliable empirical studies of the relationship between outdoor recreation, mental health and mental illness. He saw the recreation movement as an attempt of the middle class to convert the lower class city dweller to the patterns of their culture. His view of the connection between recreation and mental health was not as a means to an end, but rather that satisfying leisure behaviour is a part of the good life and therefore a constituent of mental health. Satisfying leisure behaviour, in his view, was best produced by making available those recreation facilities which will appeal to people's
leisure predispositions. This theory and its implications left no room for nation-wide standards.

Others, including the NRPA, have catalogued the shortcomings of nationwide standards as follows:

1. The area/population ratio does not take local factors into account
2. The area/per cent ratio doesn't measure development or effectiveness of location
3. The user needs method has not been demonstrated to be practical at the neighbourhood level
4. The standard is perceived as an end in itself
5. Arbitrariness, implying unproven value judgements
6. Supplier orientation
7. Facility orientation
8. Not oriented toward community goals
9. Little concern for user behaviour
10. Can't be used to set priorities
11. They allow no opportunity to apply innovation, imagination, demonstration, research, or the application of new insights
12. They do not motivate the public into the planning process
13. Benefits are not optimized
14. They do not promote public support of recreation
15. Internal inconsistencies between the service radius and population served (NRPA
Standards

They reflect current levels of provision, which may have no relation to adequacy.
User preferences are not accommodated.
There are no provisions for accessibility.
They are unrealistically high and not reasonably attainable.

Practical evidence of the difficulty with the application of nationwide standards is seen in the vast difference in provision of open space in different areas, ranging from 285 acres per 1,000 population at Glace Bay to 0.7/1,000 in Vanier City and Cote St. Luc. These widely varying ratios developed during a time when the accepted minimum standard was 10 acres per 1,000 population.

While some of the objections to standards are on technical grounds, by far the majority revolve around the incompatibility of standards with the current concepts of the functions of open space and recreation. Whereas the concept of 'fresh air and wholesome activity' was seen to apply equally to huge segments of the population, current theories imply that recreation is a very personal phenomenon and is therefore antithetical to the concept of national standards. In other words, how can the same nationwide standard apply to towns or even neighbourhoods with differing age compositions, social conditions, housing densities, or community resources when the emphasis of recreation is on the uniqueness of the individual? The current theories of recreation will be explored in the next section.
CHAPTER 2

THEORIES OF RECREATION

"a theory is a set of interrelated principles and definitions that serves conceptually to organize selected aspects of the empirical world in a systematic way"*

The Development of Current Recreation Theory

As stated earlier, in order to know how much and what kind of recreation to plan for, it is necessary to know what it is that recreation is expected to accomplish. Since virtually all the current authors have rejected the fresh air and activity theory for providing recreation, it is now necessary to examine what they have replaced it with. Therefore, this chapter is concerned with the current theories, concepts, philosophies, and definitions of recreation and its companion, leisure.

A sound theoretical basis for recreation is desired by those concerned with the basic scientific investigation of recreation as much as by those concerned with its planning. As Hendee says

"To the extent that theory and concepts are not developed, leisure data will fail to

* Murphy, JP
contribute understanding to human behavior in general, and specific interpretations and predictions to leisure settings will be limited as well."

Others have written expressing concern over the maturity and state of development of recreation theory as follows:

"The lack of a unifying theory on leisure is seen as a stumbling block to any productive leisure studies."

Since, as Hilmi states, theory is

"a conceptual framework which allows for observation, description, and mainly explanation; secondarily to predict and control"

most new theory is being developed by research scientists in the fields of sociology and psychology rather than by recreation specialists. In fact, the difficulty with developing a unifying theory underlying recreation may be the variety of disciplines undertaking the research.

Given the desirability of and the difficulties with developing a theory of recreation, the views of recent authors on the subject will be examined. First, the development of recreation theory will be followed chronologically from the 1950's to the 1980's as the early concepts were superseded by behavioural, humanistic, socio-psychological, and value-oriented theories. Then, because of their prominence in the literature, the concepts of 'recreational need' and 'recreational demand' will be discussed separately. The end product of the chapter

---

* Hendee, JC
** Hilmi, I, quoted in Pelegrino, DA
*** Ibid.
will be a graphic model of recreation theory derived from what are, in my opinion, the most useful aspects of the previously described theories.

"Early" Theories

The views of recreation and leisure popular during the 50's and 60's, while reasonably precise, lack much of the essence of leisure identified in later concepts. The most common conceptualizations of leisure held during that period were:

1) free time (Brightbill, 1960; Clawson, 1964), or
2) a form of activity (Dumazedier, 1967)

Other more restrictive concepts of the meaning of leisure proposed during the same period include the following:

1) an outlet for surplus energy
2) a necessary refreshment after labour
3) practice for later life
4) living of a series of cultural epochs of civilization
5) a safety valve
6) a form of self expression
7) compensation for non-fulfillment in other spheres (e.g., work)
8) activities which are undertaken because of their familiarity or novelty
9) a working out of problems (psychoanalytic theory)
10) a means of achieving physical, psychological, and/or social balance
Theories of Recreation

During the 1960's psychologists began to examine leisure and recreation from the behavioral point of view. Representative of this approach are the writings of Driver and Tocher, which described recreation as an experience or a state of mind. These authors postulated that: recreation is an experience that results from recreational engagements, recreation engagements are self-rewarding, and that recreation involves personal and free choice and occurs during non-obligated time. On a personal level they saw the recreation experience as having as its object the pursuit of a personal goal or the satisfaction of a need. On a social level they viewed recreation as a social service, "an important and necessary input to maintain the integrity and promote the growth and development of society". Other tenets of these writers were that leisure is the antithesis of work, and that pleasant expectations and recollections are an intrinsic part of the leisure experience.

Humanistic theory

Gans, along with other humanists, approaches the concept of

---

* "Behavioral approach: human behavior and events in leisure settings influence the choice of how, where, and when people use their free time." (Gold, S35)
** Driver, B, & SR Tocher
*** Humanism: "a philosophy that...regards man as a natural object, and asserts the essential dignity and worth of man and his capacity to achieve self-realization through the use of reason and scientific method" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary, G & C Merriam Co., Springfield, Mass., 1966)
leisure, mental health, and recreation strictly from the point of view of the individual, as can be seen from the following excerpts from "People and Plans".  

1) mental health depends on the ability of an individual to move toward his vision of the good life  
2) satisfying leisure behavior is a part of the good life  
3) therefore, recreation facilities which help to make leisure satisfying are necessary for the achievement of mental health  
4) to provide recreation facilities which will lead to satisfying recreation behavior it is necessary to find out what the people want now and to offer innovative facilities to determine what else they might prefer  

Similar views have been offered by Weiner and by Murphy:  

"the focus [of recreation] seems to be on the individual and in creating a total environment in which the human can flourish according to his own interests and capabilities, to meet his individual needs as he copes with the tensions of a high density life"*  

"Recreation is to serve as a means of human fulfillment."**  

"The value of recreation is its ability to satisfy needs which arise within the individual."***  

Gray and Greben, writing in 1979, describe recreation in the following humanistic terms:  

"Recreation is an emotional condition within an individual human being that flows from a

---

* Weiner, M, quoted in Murphy, JF
** Murphy, JF
*** Ibid.
It can be seen from the preceding quotations that the terms leisure and recreation are used more-or-less interchangeably from author to author. However, these authors agree that there are certain things that recreation and leisure are not confined to:

1) an activity
2) a period of time
3) a means to an end, or
4) a panacea for social ills.16

Social Psychology** Theory

Authors, such as Iso-Ahola,3 involved with applying the principles of social psychology to leisure and recreation, concentrate on the dynamic relationships between the individual and his social environment during the course of leisure. Neulinger57 stresses that perceived freedom and intrinsic motivation are essential to leisure experience while Ragheb & Beard64 perceive of leisure as providing satisfactions according

---

* Gray, DE, and S Greben32
** "Social psychology stresses the individual as a participant in social relations and emphasizes the social influence process underlying the relationships." (Hollander, quoted in Iso-Ahola, SE43)
"an attempt to understand and explain how the thought, feeling, and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of others" (Allport, quoted in Neulinger, J57)
to the following scheme:

(leisure) attitudes —> (leisure) satisfactions —> happiness

Their studies show previous satisfaction as a major determinant of leisure choice, having a predictive ($r^2$) value of .49 with respect to choice of hobbies, .42 with respect to cultural activities, and .34 with respect to sports activities.

Recreationists' Theories

In recent publications, authors from the recreation field frequently have synthesized or abstracted elements from the previously listed sociologic and psychologic theories. For example, Carlson et al.\textsuperscript{16} speak of an "holistic" conceptualization of leisure which includes activity, free time, and a state of mind. Gold has attempted to sort out the concepts of recreation and leisure as follows:

Leisure -
"any portion of an individual's time not occupied by employment or in pursuit of essential activities"

Recreation -
"any leisure time activity which is pursued for its own sake, or what happens to a person as a result of a recreational experience"
"[It] is what happens to people in terms of image, achievement or satisfaction and can occur at any time and in many places."

\* Gold, S\textsuperscript{35}
Finally, Chubb & Chubb offer this all-encompassing, arch-humanist definition:

"recreation [is] any type of conscious enjoyment. It can take place at any time and at any location. It may include activities that are normally thought of as basic bodily functions, activities that are considered physiologically abnormal, or even activities that damage objects, the individual or society. The only criterion is whether or not the participant perceives the activity as recreational"*

This definition could be shortened, without loss of precision, to: if it feels good it must be recreation!

***

Up to this point the trend is seen to be to consider recreation increasingly as a personal matter. Beginning with the generally applicable ideas of time and activity, recreation has subsequently been conceptualized first as a response of an individuals to their environment (behaviourism) and subsequently as a response of the individuals to their own attitudes and satisfactions. This progression is reflected in Cheek's view of the individual having three roles:

1) the individual as a member of a social group
2) the individual as a social person
3) the individual as a being**

For purposes of research, the first role would fall to the sociologists, the third role to the psychologists, and the

* Chubb, M, & Chubb, HR
** Cheek, NH
second role might be best investigated by the social psychologists.

In any case, it becomes increasingly difficult to provide recreation services based on recreation theory as one progresses from serving social groups to individuals and from satisfying group wants to individual desires. Perhaps it is in part in response to the lack of direction offered by humanistic theories that some of the most recent literature contains statements such as:

"To preach the sanctity of self-fulfillment in an increasingly interdependent society does not solve anything; to hide behind the jargon of 'enabling everyone to reach his/her full potential' leads us nowhere."*

"The central problem of virtually all recreation forecasting to date is that it has failed to take account of, or come to grips with, the notions of individual and societal values...If one believes that the ultimate goal of individual and societal values...forecasters must deal directly with values."**

and "it is important to focus on leisure values"***

Unfortunately, in their zeal to liberate leisure from the work ethic and class domination, the humanist writers also removed the social values which had been used to justify the expenditure of public funds on recreation.**** The last three

---

* Bregha, F
** Burton, TL
*** Bregha, F
**** While the statements of the humanist writers can be said to apply to recreation generally, they do not have a useful application to public recreation planning, which is the subject of this thesis.
quotations would appear to bespeak a reversal of the trend toward utter permissiveness in recreation philosophy which was so prevalent in the literature of the 70's. If, as recommended by Burton, research is redirected toward fundamental studies of the values of recreation to individuals and to society, the answers to the questions of how much and what kinds of recreation may yet be forthcoming. These answers will, perforce, be based on values and thus beg the question "whose values?" Here again, research is needed into what different forms of leisure do to us, and how human development can be advanced through recreation. While this combined philosophical/sociological/psychological approach is beset with many problems, it would appear to have far more to offer than the view that recreation should be pursued because it is good per se. For, as Bregha observes, "We do not desire leisure because we consider it good - rather we consider it good because we desire it."*

While awaiting the results of research into the effects of different forms of leisure on individuals and society, and awaiting the transformation of this information into leisure theory, what should be the philosophy underlying the provision of public recreation? Johnston's "A Rationale for Municipal Leisure Services"*5, which offers an ethical justification for the redistribution of income implicit in any publicly funded recreation programs, provides a basis for answering this

* Bregha, F7
question. He states that the public funding of recreation which not everyone uses, like the funding of schools which not everyone uses, "can only be justified on the basis of some indirect type of benefits for those not directly subscribing to the service".* In other words, it is not enough to subsidize recreation because those who are using it like it; we must be able to make a reasoned argument why the particular form of recreation being subsidized is providing indirect benefits which help achieve social goals.

These goals and the values that lie behind them can be every bit as pluralistic as the leisure preferences which have been advocated as a basis for planning by the humanistic recreation planners. The practical difference between goals and preferences is that goals can also be used to ethically justify expenditures on the provision of recreation opportunities which contribute to achieving the goals. Given the present state of knowledge, difficulties will be encountered in operationalizing some of the goals; however, the lure of funds made available for programs which can be justified on the basis of social goals should stimulate considerable effort in that direction.

Recreational Need

Arriving at a rationale for the provision of recreation opportunities would be greatly simplified by invoking a basic need for recreation. However, there is little agreement among recreation researchers as to whether man indeed has a need for

* Johnston, B*5
recreation. On the one hand there are writers like Iltis who state

"it seems likely that we (humans) are genetically programmed to a natural habitat of clean air and a varied green landscape like any other mammal. To be relaxed and feel healthy usually means simply allowing our bodies to react as evolution has equipped us to do for 100 million years" *

while Gans responds with

"it has never been proved that a lack of recreation or open space ever caused mental or physical stress"**

and Chappelle continues

"If you interpret need to mean necessity for human living then I believe that [considering recreation as a necessary part of human life] is clearly invalidated by observation of contrary human behavior."***

Authors expressing views between these two extremes frequently utilize classifications of need in explaining the relationship of recreation to human needs. The most frequently used classification is that of Maslow, who proposes the following ascending levels of needs:

- physiological
- safety
- belonging
- esteem
- self-actualization****

* Iltis, HH, OL Loucks, & P Andrews, quoted in Mercer, D
** Gans, H, quoted in Mercer, D
*** Chappelle, DE
**** Maslow, quoted in Driver, BL
As soon as one level is satisfied, the individual seeks to satisfy needs at the next higher level. Recreation's contribution falls within the highest level. Unfortunately, the concept of self-actualization gives little qualitative or quantitative direction to the provision of recreation opportunities, as previously noted by Burton.

Mercer has applied a classification to recreation need which incorporates several of the approaches to recreation described earlier.

1) normative need (standards approach)
2) felt need (humanistic approach)
3) expressed need (consumption)
4) comparative need

He concluded that the planner should take all four categories of need into consideration when developing recreation policy. While his is a useful classification of need, as the term is used by contemporary theorists, it does little to settle the dispute over the existence of a basic need for leisure and recreation.

Other uses of the term "recreational need" include 1) the deficit between supply and demand and 2) the following list published by Weiner.

growth and maturation (physical, psychological)
physical fitness
skill and talent development
stimulate development of creativity
promote environmental enjoyment
opportunities for sport
character building
reducing personal, family, group or community
tensions
re-creation for meeting daily pursuits
strengthening interpersonal relationships and
identities
emotional stability
positive channeling of as societal behavior into
community accepted endeavors
promote community activity and involvement
meet individual crises

While these have been labeled "needs" by Weiner, in my view they
are closer to potential values or to a set of objectives which
a community might wish its recreation program to stress. The
objectives chosen from this list would be derived from community
goals which in turn would be based on community values.

The Concepts of Recreational Demand, Satisfaction, and Benefits

Much of the recent recreation literature is concerned with
why people choose (demand) the recreation pursuits they do.
This concept of "demand" is equivalent to the economists' "consumption" and is to be differentiated from their demand
curve, which represents the amount of recreation consumed over a
given price range. Recreation demand and preferences result
from motivations which in turn represent anticipated
satisfactions and benefits. Campbell uses satisfactions to
Theories of Recreation refer to the immediate personal pleasures and benefits to include those more enduring improved conditions accruing to society generally. He then connects these several concepts as follows:

objectives→facilities→activities→satisfactions→benefits

Building the model

These interconnected concepts form the core of the model of recreation theory which is to be developed during the remainder of this chapter. The first step in developing the model is to close the loop, indicating that the benefits derived fulfill the objectives, in the following way:

objectives→facilities→activities→satisfactions→benefits

(fulfillment)

Having established the basic nucleus of the model, the relationships of goals, values, and evaluation can be worked in. The objectives would be established on the basis of democratically determined social goals. The social goals in turn would reflect community values. Community values would also determine which (personal) satisfactions produced (social) benefits. The fulfillment of objectives is measured by
evaluation. The resulting model, as developed to this point, has the form shown in Figure 2.

Recreation consumption is conceived of as being outside of this cycle and interconnected with it through the steps of participation and satisfactions. The recreation consumption cycle also includes the steps of perceptions, attitudes, and motivations (see Figure 3). While similar in many respects to the models of Bannon\(^3\) and Burton\(^10\), this diagram differs in that it explicitly recognizes the role of community values in determining the goals of the municipal recreation function. The source(s) of values and the assessment of fulfillment of objectives will be discussed in later chapters. The next chapter will consider the theory underlying planning as it relates to recreation.
FIGURE 2
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CHAPTER 3

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

"perhaps the controlled 'ad hocery' system in which we work provides some guard against the excesses of either rational evangelism or ideological polemics or academic 'objectivity' in assessing anything as complex as the social impact of recreation development."*

Apart from the tongue-in-cheek remark quoted above, there is little support for the abandonment of planning for recreation.**

Barton & Malcolm*** offer the following definition of planning:

"Planning attempts to allocate resources (human, physical and financial) among competing uses in an efficient and effective manner. It is an ongoing process which provides a framework within which choices and decisions can be made. Planning connotes policy-making and present and future problem solving involving short and long term approaches. It sometimes attempts to induce change while at other times it strives to maintain orderly development and the status quo".***

To those who are repelled by the cold, calculating nature of planning exercises based on economic efficiency, Gray & Greben offer the following reassurance:

"Critics argue that much planning is antihuman and in many cases they are right. It is easy to lose social, cultural, and

---

* Campbell, CK, 1
** Admittedly, 'muddling through' approaches very close to non-planning despite the cloak of respectability it gained following the publication of Lindblom's article. 58
*** Barton, C, & R Malcolm 4
psychological values in the overwhelming desire to maximize economic efficiency. The answer to the criticism is not to act without a plan; that approach creates its own tyranny. Rather it is to devise a planning method that permits social cost-benefit analysis. Lacking such a system, we are turning control of our social enterprises over to the accounting mind.\[*\]

Having defined (for purposes of this paper) what planning is, it is proposed next to look at how planning takes place. The planning model which results will be compared with the previously constructed recreation model (Figure 3) to determine how they relate, and where the important points of juncture are.

A review of a number of recreation planning texts and articles\[^3,4,10,48,59,60,78,93\] results in a composite list consisting of the following planning steps.

1) terms of reference / process design (4)**
2) data gathering / determination of supply and demand (8)
3) data analysis / identification of issues (6)
4) setting of goals and objectives (7)
5) development and evaluation of alternatives (5)
6) action plan (8)
7) implementation (8)
8) review / evaluation (3)

These steps are paraphrased by Crompton's marketing approach\[^2\], which describes recreation planning as a set of

\* Gray, DE, & S Greben\[^3\]
** The number in parentheses represents the number out of eight publications examined which particularly mentioned that specific step.
marketing activities, namely:

1) gathering market intelligence
2) selection of client groups
3) development of objectives and program strategy
4) marketing strategy
   - product
   - price
   - distribution
   - promotion

The aspects of recreation theory most central to the planning process, as determined by comparing Figure 3 with the composite list above, are seen to be goals, objectives, and the fulfillment of objectives (as measured by evaluation). A discussion of the planning steps associated with these three concepts follows.

Goals and objectives

"competing needs for urban services require urban planners and administrators to sharpen their goals, if they are to compete with other agencies for funds in an era of scarce resources"*

The above quotation gives sufficient practical reason why recreation planners should be interested in goal formulation and utilization. Gold goes on to say that with the abandonment of arbitrary standards as a basis for evaluation, recreation agencies will now be required to justify their budgets on the

* Gold, S^35
basis of rational measures of performance. Since traditional cost-benefit analysis is not readily applied to recreation evaluation, assessment of performance will require some measurement of goal achievement. For this reason, he argues, careful attention to goal definition is necessary — platitudes will not do.

Goals are defined as the ends to which a design trends. They are abstract, universal, and lasting conditions toward which society should be directed, or directions or values to be sought. Objectives, on the other hand, are attainable ends and are capable of measurement. Using these definitions, standards can be employed as means to define objectives, as long as they are not allowed to become ends in themselves. Policies, programs, and practices are means used to achieve the ends specified by the goals and objectives.

To be effective, goals and objectives should do the following:

1) state an overall purpose
2) indicate an awareness of the effect of that purpose on other purposes
3) provide a definite target that reflects the overall purpose and whose attainment appears feasible
4) infer a course of action

Young then lists the following steps in the goal setting process:

1) establishment of the perimeter(s) of concern
2) establishment of the range of choice
3) technical examination of the range of potential goals
4) establishment of the goals as policy

And finally, these criteria are offered for converting the goals to objectives:

1) fulfill the letter and the spirit of the related goal
2) be specific
3) suggest a means of attainment
4) be feasible

Prepared in this way, goals and objectives form a rational starting point and consistent direction for recreation planning while remaining flexible in the face of day to day contingencies. That is to say, policy plans prepared from goals and objectives have a flexibility lacking in master plans. "They can provide a variety of guides to physical development without the [legal] restrictions associated with physical plans or maps."* At the same time, goals and objectives can be used to derive standards of social benefit to the community. Programs and facilities which effectively fulfill social objectives can be judged worthy of inclusion and/or subsidization in a municipal parks and recreation system. The process of comparing objectives to performance is covered by the study of evaluation.

Evaluation

"If the field [of recreation] is to justify

* Gold, S14
its claim for support it is obvious that it will be increasingly necessary to document its values and outcomes."*

Evaluation, described by Theobald as being the keystone to the delivery of leisure services, is the subject of a number of texts and articles, both in the educational and recreational fields, among others. For purposes of this discussion, evaluation is defined as the determination of "the worth, effectiveness, or outcomes of a program, facility or administrative structure".**

Following this definition, evaluation performs a variety of functions. According to Hatry & Dunn evaluation serves to:

1) provide current information on how recreation services are meeting recreational need
2) provide a baseline from which future progress can be measured
3) estimate the future effectiveness of current recreation programs
4) estimate the budget
5) help prepare community plans for land, facilities, and capital investment
6) provide an annual status report
7) deal with questions from the public

And Theobald lists the following additional uses of recreation program evaluation:

1) to demonstrate to others that the program is worthwhile

* Kraus, RG, & JG Curtis
** ibid.
2) to determine whether or not a program is moving in the right direction
3) to determine whether the needs for which the program was designed are being met
4) to determine the costs of the program in terms of money or effort
5) to justify past or projected expenditures
6) to support program expansion
7) to compare different types of programs in terms of their relative effectiveness or effect.75

There are four broad categories of approaches to evaluation: experimental, facilities measurement (standards), satisfactions and benefits, and goal fulfillment18,29. Unfortunately, evaluation in an experimental context is seldom possible in the course of leisure service delivery. The drawbacks to standards have been listed previously (see Chapter 1) and Theobald notes these additional problems which are encountered when evaluating against arbitrary standards:

1) standards change
2) the value judgements used to set the standards are obscured
3) unproven judgements reduce the content validity
4) evaluation is often limited to those criteria that can be easily measured75

Satisfaction/benefit checklists are offered by Murphy56, Fisk & Hatry30 and van der Smissen85 and include such user satisfactions as accessibility, variety, avoidance of
crowdedness, and safety, and social benefits indicators such as crime and delinquency rates, community health, and effects on the local economy. Recreation satisfaction measurements have their drawbacks too, among them being subjectivity, difficulty with assessment and measurement, variations in satisfactions derived between individuals and at different points in time, and lack of comprehensiveness.

Following the scheme depicted in Figure 3, goal achievement assessment appears to be the most rational form of assessment of the four approaches just considered. The goals describe what it is that the community wants from its recreation expenditures. Since considerable effort will likely have gone into preparation and objectification of the goals, it would be a waste of effort and possibly counterproductive if a separate list of desired satisfactions and benefits were prepared.

Not surprisingly, however, the use of goals for evaluation does have its practical difficulties. For example:

1) the goals are often hazy
2) programs move not only toward official goals
3) elements of the program are not separated out
4) causes of program malfunction are not identified

To minimize these problems, Weiss recommends the following stepwise approach:

1) formulate the goals to be used as criteria
2) choose among multiple goals on the basis of usability
   importance
compatibility

3) investigate unanticipated consequences
4) measure outcomes
5) measure program inputs and intervening processes
6) collect the necessary data
7) compare with objectives

Scriven points out that pure pay-off evaluation, as opposed to evaluation of the entire program, fails to distinguish between deficiencies in performance, deficiencies in goals, and deficiencies in the examinations employed. In addition, pay-off evaluation fails to provide useful information while the program is in progress. In response, Stufflebeam has developed a format for separate evaluation of the four different aspects of programs - context, input, process, and product - which he has acronymically titled CIPP.

Several evaluation methods have been developed from systems and/or organizational theory: e.g., Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT), Critical Path Method (CPM), and Planning - Programming - Budgeting System (PPBS). In order to assure that evaluation was carried out, PPBS, a goal-based, budget-oriented planning system, was made mandatory in U.S. Federal Administration offices during the late 1960's. Its withdrawal as a required program some five years later was in recognition of the problems inherent in a rigidly and universally applied complex evaluative mechanism as well as the resistance to change by administrators accustomed to line item budgeting.
In summary, for the evaluation of a service as varied in space and time as leisure services, checklists are too superficial and systems models are too complex. Goal achievement, by virtue of its flexibility, can steer clear of these extremes.

Recreation "demand"

Although absent from Figure 3, recreation demand warrants serious consideration for two reasons: 1) the topic of recreation demand forecasting has consumed such a large portion of recreation research efforts 2) it is important to have a detailed knowledge of recreation spaces and facilities demanded when deciding which of several alternatives is to be implemented in order to achieve a particular goal. This section first looks at attempts to plan for recreation by means of demand forecasting. The discussion then moves to prescriptive forecasting and to the use of demand as a means of goal achievement.

"Predicting recreation consumption and relating it to supply is the Achilles heel of recreation planners."*

"Vigorous research is needed to develop models of the economic demand for outdoor recreation that will make possible inclusion of sociological and demographic aspects by analysing the dependence of the number, quality, and distribution of recreation experiences sought on the

* Chubb M, quoted in Shafer, EL, & G Moeller
The above quotations from 1969 and 1971 reflect the preoccupation with the economic demand for outdoor recreation as well as the preliminary state of the art of the time. A sizeable literature was produced as economists grappled with the subjective, non-market, diverse, and ill-defined aspects of recreation. This section will briefly examine the recreation demand literature by criticising the individual methods and concluding with an assessment of the usefulness of demand generally in determining the provision of recreation facilities.

There are a number of approaches to the forecasting of recreation demand. A composite list follows:

1) economics (demand schedules)
2) projections
   trend extrapolation
   socioeconomic variable extrapolation
   "soft" techniques
   Delphi
   scenario writing
3) modelling
   gravity and inertia models
   systems models

A brief description and criticism of each of these techniques

* U. S. National Academy of Sciences
Economic approaches:

As stated earlier, economic demand must be distinguished from consumption. Consumption is an historical statistic which records the amount of use a facility or facilities receives during a certain period of time, while demand also reflects future conditions and thus can be used in forecasting. Gold develops the concept of demand by separating it into three types expressed, latent, and induced (induceable).

Expressed demand produces a certain level of consumption, utilizing existing facilities. Latent demand is that which would be expressed if sufficient opportunities were available, while induceable demand is that portion of latent demand which can be exploited by encouraging people to change their recreation patterns.

One of the chief failures of forecasting recreation demand on the basis of extrapolating present consumption is that it doesn't take latent demand into account. Working with recreation demand is further complicated by the fact that recreation is a non-market commodity. This non-market nature derives from a number of characteristics of recreation, namely:
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1) it is a public good*
2) indivisibility
3) spillovers, externalities, and unappropriable third party benefits
4) merit wants (gratification should be separable from ability to pay)
5) the exorbitant cost of collecting user fees

The non-market nature of recreation means that a demand analysis requires imputed prices. Methods developed for this purpose include:

1) market benefits method
2) market price of fish method
3) travel cost method

The first method, which calculates the gross expenditures on recreation, results in inflated figures because many of the expenditures are merely transferred from some other form of consumption. For example, the money that is spent on food for a camping trip only replaces the money that would be spent on food at home and does not represent a new cash flow stimulated by recreation. Evaluating a fishing trip on the basis of the commercial value of the fish caught implies that food values were all that were obtained from the experience. The travel cost method uses the travel costs incurred by a recreationist as

* a public good is a good which, once supplied, is generally available to all (one man's consumption does not detract from another's ability to consume)
a proxy for price and has been applied to both forecasting and evaluation. It has been further extended by Pearse by means of the concept of consumers' surplus. Though it is the most promising of the economics-based techniques for recreation forecasting, the travel cost method has the following drawbacks:

1) it assumes that the only variations in the cost of a visit are in the cost of travel
2) it assumes that the cost of travel to a specific site from a specific area is constant among individuals
3) it lacks a sound theoretical foundation (the demand equations are not explicitly derived from a model of consumer behaviour)
4) it doesn't recognize the physical characteristics of the site

Projections:

Extrapolation of existing rates of consumption is useful only in short term management situations as it assumes that neither the supply nor the rate of consumption will change during the study interval, and it doesn't take account of price, supply, demographic factors, non-users, or necessary experience. Prediction based on the effects of multiple socioeconomic variables has been extensively studied, but the strengths of the predictions have been variable and often low.

"Soft" techniques, like the Delphi method and scenario writing, are valued not so much for their ability to accurately predict the future as they are for their ability to sensitize
planners to the range of possibilities. Their greater comprehensiveness results from their consideration of demand-shaping forces not considered by other methods, e.g., psychological, institutional, and environmental.

Gravity and inertia models jointly consider distance and effectiveness, while systems models consider a wide range of variables and their interactions. Systems models, although theoretically the most accurate and beneficial, have failed to achieve their potential and are little used because of "the expertise, expense, and data base necessary to make them effective planning tools".

In addition to all these individual failings, the previously listed methods of recreation forecasting have two fundamental flaws in common: they assume 1) that it is possible to predict future events on the basis of present knowledge and 2) that all recreation desires should be satisfied. In place of these passive forms of forecasting, Burton recommends prescriptive forecasting. Rather than selecting one of several predicted futures, using recreation behaviour as the dependent variable and sociodemographic factors as the independent variables, he recommends starting from values and then seeking to achieve the kind of recreation future we want. When spending public money on a service, such a goal-oriented approach would

* Gold, S

** Tisshaw, et al., respond to this criticism by stating: "Future prediction is only useful if looked at with the understanding that it is not an instrument of 'truth', but a tool to minimize reactive planning."
seem most appropriate. Thus, once again, we arrive back at values as being at the focus of recreation planning.

In a goal-oriented approach to recreation planning, demand forecasts are not used as a "shopping list" for projects to be implemented. This is not to say that demand studies are unnecessary. In order to achieve recreation goals, participation is necessary and in order to be assured of participation, it is necessary to know the recreation preferences (demand) of the community. Thus, recreation demand is an important aspect of the planning model. The difference is that in the model demand analysis is a means to the end of goal achievement, whereas in the traditional planning methods the determination of recreation demand is usually an end in itself.

Values

Values serve as the source of goals and thus are the ultimate basis for the choice of leisure activities, both individually and collectively. Burton offers an additional argument in favor of the use of values to determine the direction of recreation programs. He says that although sociodemographic variables have acted as fairly reliable indicators of public values in the past, the stable relationship between values and sociologic variables appears to be breaking down. Therefore, values should be used directly for recreation planning forecasting, since "only values have the necessary breadth and stretch in social time and space to provide a stable
Each individual's values are equal and there is no single "correct" value. As a result, the use of values has been condemned on the basis that by incorporating one value instead of another, one individual or a group may be favored over another. However, since values underlie all our decisions, they cannot be avoided and it is better to deal with them frankly and explicitly. In addition to varying from person to person, values vary from time to time. The shifts in recreation values over time are expressed in Reich's three consciousness levels:

I  before 1945  inner directedness; the self made man
II  1945 - 1960  other directed; adopts values set by group
III  after 1960  leisure society; humanistic philosophy

Since values are so variable, it is necessary to determine whose values are to be used in determining the goals of the recreation programs: the agency staff's, the park commission's, or the community's? A great deal has been written about adhering to the values of the professional staff, because of their training and sophistication in recreation matters. Balmer & Williams ask rhetorically of recreation professionals:

"Are we required to work with contemporary values as measured by our political leaders, or should we assume a more desirable set consistent with both our

* Burton, TL, 12
** These value shifts are readily traced in the recreation literature quoted in chapters 1 and 2.
Unfortunately, a conflict of interest is likely to arise if agency staff values are to dominate. It is a well documented feature of organizational behaviour that agency officials value the survival of their organization as much or more than they do the services they were commissioned to provide.*

The recreation commission, being a politically elected or appointed board should be better able to represent the community's recreation values. In theory, their survival depends on votes, not on the existence of an agency. However, in the party system, a situation requiring an allegiance divided between client and organization again arises. While an elected representative's constituents may want him to vote one way on an issue, his survival in the party and the party's survival as a government may require him to vote the other way. Also, since values are shifting so rapidly these days, elected representatives and their appointees are often in the position of following the people, instead of leading them. Therefore, having eliminated recreation professionals and elected representatives as the source of the values underlying the community recreation goals, it is necessary to seek another source of values and a mechanism for their expression.

The one remaining source is the community, and the mechanism they chose has come to be known as "public

** Balmer, K, & DS Williams, quoted in Beres, LR
participation." Public participation was introduced into recreation planning during the 1960's as strident demands for citizen involvement signalled widespread unhappiness with government generally, and recreation planning specifically, being carried out strictly "from the top down." Public participation, although it has been a part of the recreation planning scene for some 20 years, like most planning methods has failed to solve all the problems it set out to solve and has created problems of its own. The next section will examine the advantages and problems associated with citizen involvement, and will attempt to show how the problems can be overcome to the point where public participation is a viable means of incorporating community values into recreation plans.

Public Participation

"as the public has become more knowledgeable, more vocal, and more critical of decisions of government, [the question whether it should be consulted] has all but disappeared. The general public must be consulted"*

From this thesis' perspective, public participation derives its importance from being central to the determination of the goals which will direct the entire recreation program. Having rejected the civil servants' and the politicians' values as not being sufficient to determine recreation goals, one is left with

* Doell, CE, & LF Twardzik^2*
having to extract an appropriate set of goals and objectives directly from the population, based on their values. While this process, known as citizen participation, is complicated both politically and logistically, it has great scope for development and warrants the effort necessary to overcome its practical drawbacks.

Crompton\textsuperscript{a2} views public participation as a means of implementing his 'marketing concept' of recreation planning. Looked at in another way, the marketing concept is a means of describing what public participation tries to do, in business management terms. Wright defines public participation as

"the involvement of citizens and citizen groups to affect decision-making at all stages of the planning process toward the fulfillment of agreed upon goals"*

This definition points up the dual level of application of the public's values to recreation planning: 1) in the development of (agreed upon) goals, and 2) in the implementation of those goals. In actual fact, the bulk of the public participation literature is concerned with functions not related to goal setting, as indicated by the list below. These 'other' functions are viewed as valuable bonuses by those who perceive of public participations's raison d'etre as being goal derivation.

Of the numerous functions that have been ascribed to public participation in recreation planning, Burton et al. list the

* Wright, JR, et al\textsuperscript{a3}
following:

** 1) it provides decision-makers with some understanding of public opinion, preferred community goals, and values
2) it provides additional information which may not have been considered or identified by planners
3) it can achieve the most responsive policy and programs through public participants making the trade-offs that are necessary
4) it can be a source of new ideas and imaginative alternatives
5) it results in a more knowledgeable community which will be supportive in implementation of policies and programs*

A similar rationale for public participation is listed by the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation60. Hester lists the advantages of user participation from a recreation site designer's point of view:

** 1) provides a design more related to a balance of user values
2) provides a setting in which a range of values and preferences can be uncovered
3) provides for a democratic climate and individual responsibility
4) creates an awareness of the design process which the participant can apply elsewhere

* Burton, TL, et al13
** items in which values are considered
5) dispels the idea that nobody cares
6) deals realistically and openly with conflicts and resolves them through positive complementarity*

Lutzin & Storey point out the insurance value of public participation:

"The mere existence of a plan having broad citizen involvement is the strongest possible weapon against political influences which would thwart or dilute all or part of the plan." **

Finally, Hendee, Clark, & Stankey refer to the negative effects which could ensue from the absence or inadequacy of public involvement

"The failure to solicit public participation aggressively and innovatively can result in loss of agency stature, damaging public criticism of agency programs, and continuing antagonistic situations between the agency and some of its clientele." ***

These quotations indicate that public involvement has much to offer. Nevertheless, numerous concerns have been voiced by both citizens and professionals about its value. The problem most frequently mentioned by planners is that citizen involvement makes decision-making more time-consuming, more complicated, and more costly, diverting energy from the concerns that they were originally commissioned to deal with. Contributing to this concern on the part of civil servants is the professionalism which arises from their technical training.

---

* Hester, RT.
** Lutzin, SG, & EH Storey
*** Hendee, JC, et al.
A natural result of professionalism is the rejection of uninformed opinion, and with it the expression of the legitimate needs, values and expectations of the citizenry. Such an outlook on the part of civil servants keeps them perpetually in a defensive position with respect to the clientele they are serving.

Just as some bureaucrats feel there is too much public involvement, others, together with members of the general public, believe there is too little. Arnstein writes that anything less than full citizen partnership in decision-making is tokenism. Others have voiced fears that citizen participation will become mere citizen input, or output, or that the public's views will not be given sufficient weight during the evaluation phase. Another question is that of non-participation and whether one should recruit the 'silent majority'. While the value derived from such a recruitment is in doubt, it is necessary to ensure that the non-participation is on the basis of unexpressed mild preferences rather than a lack of information, administrative indifference, or political inefficiency.

Previously referred to is the problem with the "quality" of citizen input. Government administrators have claimed that it is biased and unduly reflects the views of vocal minorities. Citizen input is also characterized as being emotional rather than factual. The public, on the other hand, has on occasion been left with the feeling that anyone disagreeing with the bureaucracy is immediately branded as being
emotional. Other issues facing public involvement include the relative weighting of different forms of public input, institutionalization sapping the vitality of the movement, and the fact that the corporations and agencies can finance their input out of operating expenses while the public must pay most of their expenses with after-tax dollars.

Some answers to the above concerns

In this section an attempt will be made to show that, given acceptance of public participation in principle, most of the problems just listed can be sufficiently mitigated by technical or administrative means and that there is no need for a pessimistic or defensive attitude toward involving the public. To begin with, both sides should see citizen involvement as benefitting them. Once recreation planners see that involving the public is in their self-interest and the public can be convinced of the administration's sincerity, the way is open to effective communication.

For the recreation manager, the increased short-term costs of involving the public can be offset in the long run by avoiding costly corrections and embarrassing reversals of policy. Public participation can also be viewed as an opportunity for the manager to cultivate a constituency and mold a climate favourable to public policy. At the same time that the public is informing the manager of issues of concern to them, he can be informing them of technical matters.
One of the most intensively researched and developed aspects of public participation is the various forms it may take. It was recognized early on that open public meetings were not the answer to all citizen involvement situations and in particular the matter of data gathering. While public input is important at all stages of the planning process, it is most extensively used at the data gathering/determination of supply and demand stage. In order to obtain a full range of views from all interested parties, a wide variety of data gathering techniques have been developed, including referenda, public hearings, public meetings, advisory groups, interviews, questionnaires, workshops, role playing, expert panels (including Delphi), gaming, and group interaction. As an aid to knowing which format to choose for which type of planning, Burton et al. have made the analysis tabulated in Tables IIA and IIB.

Also available are several matrices which evaluate public participation methods against various technical and conceptual criteria. Mak summarizes her evaluation by recommending that involving the public is best accomplished by using a combination of techniques that balances the strengths of one against the weaknesses of another. She goes on to recommend that techniques be used sequentially, beginning with those that are the most flexible and inexpensive and using those results to investigate the options for the next stage.

Two problems frequently voiced by recreation planners are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning horizon (yrs)</th>
<th>Type of planning</th>
<th>Type of end in view</th>
<th>Main purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>Goal planning</td>
<td>goals</td>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 25</td>
<td>Development planning</td>
<td>objectives</td>
<td>strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 10</td>
<td>Comprehensive planning</td>
<td>targets and priorities</td>
<td>identification or formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>tasks</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* adapted from Burton, TL, et al.\textsuperscript{13}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program planning</th>
<th>Comprehensive planning</th>
<th>Development planning</th>
<th>Goal Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote or referendum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large public meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert panel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*adapted from Burton, TL, et al., 13*
1) the input they receive from the public is biased and unrepresentative, and 2) the input is emotional and of low technical quality. With regard to the first problem, studies by Sadler showed that, in the cases studied, the views expressed at public hearings were the same as those held by a random sample of the general population.

Concerning the second problem, technical methods have been developed to reduce the counterproductive effects of emotionalism, which is a natural outgrowth of conflict situations. Wagar & Folkman recommend:

1) establishing the facts surrounding an issue as a prelude to any debate
2) encouraging site-specific input
3) airing the issues in small groups at an open house prior to public meetings

Daubert advises handling controversial issues by a method he calls Conflict Management. The essence of his approach is to separate the controversy into 1) conflicts over content (the facts) and 2) conflict over relationships (between the two parties in the conflict). He finds that when the difference between content and relationship is recognized and the issues are kept separate, useful communication is facilitated.

Institutionalization of the environmental movement by government sponsored public involvement programs is less to be feared by the public when they realize that, should the need arise for renewed confrontation, a 'new generation' of public interest groups is free to spring up.
To avoid the previously listed pitfalls and others, Hendee et al. urge strict adherence to the following criteria. Effective public participation should have the following attributes:

be explicit
be visible
be available for review
summarize and display input
-describe nature and extent of public expression
-classify sources of input by location and special interest
-record both direct (e.g., letters) and indirect (e.g., petitions) input
-provide for continuity, summary
-respond to general and specific expressions of values
be traceable through collection, analysis, and evaluation
show accountability for decisions shown
be handled skillfully and professionally
-range of alternatives and the consequences of each alternative shown
-effective communication, records
demonstrate weighting of input (unavoidable)
include both quantity and quality input (all input expresses values)
no vote counting

public input does not dictate the decision

ensure continuing input

especially where a change in values is suspected

If the above criteria are fulfilled and forms of public participation appropriate to the situation are chosen, the result should be a set of recreation goals mutually acceptable to the citizens, agency officials, and elected representatives.

Summary

When the concepts of goal derivation, values, citizen participation, evaluation, and demand forecasting are added to the previously developed recreation model (Figure 3), the result is the model shown in Figure 4. Although the recreation planning cycle is still central to the model, it has been divided conceptually by the diagonal line into those aspects associated with personal demand and those aspects associated with social goal achievement.

Such a division implies that the recreation demand cycle can function on its own, without the addition of social benefits, goals, or objectives. In fact, recreation planning based on meeting demand forecasts goes no further than that. Also, the personal demand approach would appear to be sufficient to accommodate humanist principles, behavioural theory, and the nationwide standards approach.
FIGURE 4
PLANNING MODEL - COMPLETE
However, the contention of this thesis is that in order for recreation planning to be effective and equitable, personal demands require the overriding guidance of social goals. In this way the unavoidable choices between which recreation facilities will be provided and which will not will be guided by the community's values rather than by pressure groups or political expediency.
The objectives of Part I have been 1) to extract from the recreation literature a theory which will serve as a basis for answering the question "how much and what kinds of public recreation should be provided?" and 2) to derive a recreation planning method consistent with that theory. The following theories were examined:

1) the fresh air and constructive activity theories of the early park and recreation movements
2) behavioural theory, which relates the recreation response of individuals to their recreation environment
3) humanistic theory, which stresses the personal nature of the recreation experience, and
4) recent theories developed by recreation specialists, which combine elements of the previous three classes of theories

Although these theories do serve to organize and explain selected aspects of observed recreation behaviour, most of them do not, in my opinion, provide a useful and equitable foundation on which to base the provision of publicly funded recreation opportunities.
To recapitulate briefly, the early theories of recreation and leisure are seen as being too simplistic to encompass all the aspects that should be reflected in a recreation planning method. These early methods are associated and theoretically consistent with recreation planning on the basis of standards. Both general standards and the theories underlying them have been generally rejected as they do not take into account the differences between communities with respect to demography, social factors, recreation opportunities, or community resources.

Research based on behavioural theory has provided a great many insights into the recreation responses of different segments of the population. The vast literature on demand forecasting falls into this category. While the understanding of recreation behaviour that these studies have provided has been of great use to planners, they have not answered the basic question underlying municipal recreation, namely, which recreation programs and facilities should be provided with public money?

The application of humanistic theory makes rational funding and planning of public recreation even more difficult. According to the humanists, each individual is to be provided with an environment in which he can achieve his fullest potential. This sentiment, while very noble, does not offer the municipality much qualitative or quantitative guidance with respect to recreation planning. The type of planning activities likely to
be fostered by such an approach are recreation preference surveys and being politically pressured by special interest groups. Since it is not yet possible for everyone to have all the recreation opportunities they might like, how is one to determine who gets how much? Humanistic theory provides neither an answer to nor a mechanism for answering this question.

Referring to Figure 4, the theories and concepts so far discussed in this chapter are confined below the diagonal line and are centered around the individual and his attitudes, preferences, motivations, demands, and satisfactions. Social benefits, goals, and objectives have yet to be considered and planning has yet to be rationalized in terms of social goals. Such vague goals as "providing everyone with the opportunity for self-realization" and "satisfying public demand" cannot be used by themselves to ethically justify the expenditure of public money on recreation. Attempts to demonstrate a basic need for recreation have been inconclusive.

Therefore one must invoke social goals or indirect benefits to society in order to be able to justify the existence of public recreation and to direct its planning. However, while using societal goals is conceptually attractive, it runs the risk of bias in the selection of whose goals to pursue. For reasons previously explained, the planners' goals will not do and the elected representatives' goals have been perceived as insufficiently responsive to those of their constituents.

It is therefore suggested that society's goals be expressed
through the process of public participation. In contrast to conventional lobbying, public participation gives all citizens an equal opportunity. The process of citizen involvement has been undergoing progressive refinement during the last 20 years and many of the problems it faced initially can now be avoided. Mechanisms for getting the most out of public participation are outlined in Tables IIA and IIB (pages 56 and 57).

Assessing and using society's values in the determination of recreation goals does require some realignment of the planner's role in recreation planning. Instead of basing the quality and quantity of public recreation opportunities provided upon his perception of what the public wants, he consults the public directly and frequently throughout the planning process. In this way recreation facilities and programs are linked firmly to society's values through public participation and the formulation, objectification, and implementation of goals. Under this scheme, the planner's role is no less vital, and certainly no less challenging and demanding of his expertise than when he relies upon his experience to determine how much and what kinds of recreation should be provided.

Recreation planning functions thus fall into two equally important categories, the formulation of goals and the implementation of goals. During the formulation phase public involvement skills are required, while during the implementation phase the planner relies on his technical knowledge and experience to draw up (a) program(s) which will best meet the prescribed goals and fit in with the recreation preferences and
resources of the community.
PART II

THE PRACTICE OF RECREATION PLANNING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PLANNING MODEL

IN THE LIGHT OF CURRENT RECREATION PLANNING PRACTICE
PART II

THE PRACTICE OF RECREATION PLANNING

The model developed in the preceding chapters has been based on the "thought" literature, i.e., literature dealing with recreation concepts rather than recreation plans. Therefore, in the remainder of the thesis, the model will be examined in the light of current recreation planning practice as exemplified by the recently published Vancouver (B. C.) Master Plan for Parks and Recreation. This plan was two years in preparation and involved the full-time participation of professionals from the fields of planning and recreation as well as private consultants and other in-house professionals. The comparison will be based on the two published documents describing the Master Plan\(^{82,83}\), supplemented by interviews with the Master Planning staff.

Chapter 5 begins with a description of the content of the Master Plan and concludes with an analysis of the process used in its preparation. The final chapter, Chapter 6, compares the Planning Model and the Master Plan and discusses their differences.
CHAPTER 5

THE CONTENT AND PROCESS OF THE VANCOUVER MASTER PLAN FOR PARKS AND RECREATION

I. Content

The Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation Master Plan is a comprehensive document. It has appeared in a complete form (approximately 400 pages) and in the form of a 75 page Capital Plan designed for submission to the citywide Centennial Capital Plan. An abbreviated version of the Master Plan for distribution in connection with an anticipated plebiscite is in preparation.

The Master Plan was designed to "determine what Vancouver citizens want in their park and recreation system, the changes required to meet future needs, and how these changes can be effected in an effective and efficient manner."* In keeping with this goal it records extensive public consultation, research into trends in the provision of parks and recreation and socioeconomic factors affecting those trends, analysis of supply, demand, and deficiencies in the provision of services, and recommendations as to how those deficiencies might best be

* Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation
met during the period 1983 - 1986 in terms of policies, projects, and financing.

However, rather than being organized in such a process-oriented format, the report is arranged along the lines of the services provided by the Board, i.e., leisure and recreation (13 activities), urban open space (land acquisition, park development, and civic beautification), support services (maintenance, food concessions), and finance (capital program and sources of funding).

The report presents this information both from a citywide perspective and, in a separate section, in more detail from a neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood viewpoint. While this two-fold approach results in duplication of material, the neighbourhoods section does respond in more detail to the rather extensive public consultation which took place.

II. Process

The Master Planning process by which the data were selected, analysed, and evaluated is not described in great detail in either of the two Master Plan publications. Therefore, the description of the process which follows, as well as being derived from the Master Plan and the Capital plan, is supplemented to a considerable degree by interviews with the Master Plan staff.

The development of the Master Plan, like most planning processes, followed a recursive course. Keeping this in mind,
the most practical place to start the discussion of the process is with Public Input. Citizen Input took two forms: 1) general goals for parks and recreation and 2) requests for specific park additions, facilities, or programs. The requested projects were analysed in terms of the quality and quantity of the existing supply and then organized into a series of Requested Projects. The Requested Projects were evaluated on the basis of criteria which were in turn derived from goals. Those projects which best fit the criteria formed the basis of the Master Plan Recommendations, the end product of the planning process. The relationships between the various steps of the planning process are illustrated in Figure 5. In the following paragraphs each of the steps will be described in more detail.

Public Input

Citizen input was in the from of briefs and surveys:

Briefs were received from
A) Community Centre Associations and affiliates
B) community interest groups and organizations
C) sporting groups
D) civic agencies
E) individuals

Surveys consisted of
A) Vancouver Residents Survey
B) Stanley Park Users Survey
C) Community Centre Users Survey
D) Goals for Vancouver Survey
Figure 5
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While the surveys were for the most part conventional, a few words about the Vancouver Residents Survey and the Goals for Vancouver Survey will make the quality of the public input easier to assess. The briefs require no further explanation.

**Surveys**

The Goals for Vancouver and the Vancouver Residents Surveys were carried out in a similar manner. The first step in each case was the formation of a focus group of interested persons (Goals for Vancouver) or statistically randomly selected citizens (Residents Survey). Issues relative to goals or to parks and recreation identified by the focus groups were converted into a questionnaire which was distributed to a statistically valid sample. In this way bias was minimized.

**Demand Analysis**

The information on participation rates was then modified in terms of sociodemographic factors and recreation preferences together with anticipated trends, given the undeveloped capacity for population growth within the existing Vancouver zoning bylaws. The result was projected demand (participation) figures for the various activities.

**Supply Analysis**

The aspirations for parks and recreation expressed in the public input were examined in light of the existing supply of Parks Board services. The supply was analysed quantitatively and qualitatively through a number of technical reports:

a) Citywide recreation facility inventory
b) Park and playing field quality assessment

c) Recreation facility quality assessment

d) Stanley Park forest study

e) Stanley Park circulation and access study

f) Service Yard study

g) Provision of parks and recreation in B. C. Place (A Position Paper).

These studies were used to determine the most efficient way to fulfill the demands put forward in the briefs and surveys, in terms of the variety and accessibility of recreation opportunities. The end result of the analysis was a list of recreation opportunities which could not be supplied by rescheduling, encouraging the private sector, or by any means other than direct provision by the Parks Board. This appeared as a list of Requested Projects.

Goals

The goals were derived from two sources:

I) Parks Board Goals and objectives

Goal - To assure adequate leisure opportunities and a pleasant urban environment

Objectives -

1) to provide cultural, intellectual, physical and social recreation activities for all segments of the population

2) to encourage the provision of adequate recreation facilities and programs by public and private agencies

3) to assist individuals and groups to develop leisure opportunities

4) to encourage an adequate supply of parks and open space with aesthetic natural and recreation value for the benefit of citizens and the enjoyment of visitors

5) to foster street beautification

II) Goals for Vancouver
Chapter 5  
Vancouver Parks Master Plan

a) The city as a stage

1) Natural setting: maintain access to and enjoyment of the natural setting which is perceived as one of the principal components of the quality of life in Vancouver

2) Views: views of the mountains and water should be protected

3) Landscaping: include trees, flowers and natural greenery as part of the landscaping in all parts of the city

4) Parks and open space: (a) ensure adequate park acreage on good sites to provide for parks of a neighbourhood, local, district, waterfront, and regional character to satisfy outdoor recreational and amenity needs
   (b) provide for innovative park designs or park amenities in all public open space, such as linear parks, mini-parks, street landscaping
   (c) maintain existing and new parks to a standard in keeping with the desired image of Vancouver

5) Waterfront access: enable Vancouver residents to enjoy more fully their natural heritage of sea and river by increasing waterfront access in areas where it is restricted

b) Leisure in the City

1) Access to natural areas: facilitate access to and enjoyment of the natural areas of the Vancouver area, Vancouver Island and the mainland of B.C., for residents of the city of Vancouver

2) Recreation: (a) adopt a comprehensive approach to public recreation programming and facilities which unifies their function in developing and improving the physical and mental fitness of all ages and cultural groups, with maximum voluntary input and responsible citizen involvement
   (b) co-ordinate or integrate the management of public recreation facilities and programs

Evaluation and plan formulation

After the public and technical demand and supply input had been assimilated and analysed, the next step in the Master Plan was to divide the requested projects according to the following scheme:

a) projects for implementation during 1983 - 1986

b) future projects (after 1986)
c) other projects not recommended

The way in which this separation was carried out varied with the aspect of the system being planned, i.e., park development, facilities, land acquisition, or civic beautification.

Parkland acquisition:

In the case of neighbourhood park acquisition, the previously established goals formed the basis of the following evaluative criteria:

a) neighbourhood park requirements, as based on demand characteristics
   - age structure
   - housing type
   - mobility of population
   - ethnic makeup
   supply of outdoor recreation opportunities
   - amount
   - type
   - variety
   - accessibility
b) per capita provision of parkland
c) parkland/residential density ratio
d) potential population growth

Citywide averages were determined for these criteria (a - d) and projects were selected which would help to bring relatively underserviced neighbourhoods closer to this level. Similar appropriate goal-based criteria were used for the evaluation of citywide and waterfront parks, playing fields, playgrounds,
tennis courts, golf courses and civic beautification. Throughout the evaluation process favourable consideration was given to those projects which would meet expressed demand and provide a balance of park and recreation opportunities in terms of variety and distribution.

The criteria used for establishing land acquisition priorities for city-wide and waterfront parks were similar to those used for neighbourhood park acquisition. However, the small amount of undeveloped land remaining and the high price of developed land in Vancouver perforce made availability and affordability important criteria. Criteria used in the evaluation of park development projects were the number of people served per dollar invested, whether or not a similar service was available locally from a commercial source or a community service organization, and the variety of opportunities* present in the park under consideration.

Facilities development:

The criteria employed for the evaluation of requests for expenditures on facilities were:

1) program capability - the ability of existing facilities to accommodate a standard basic level of service
2) community need - leisure services catering to the particular recreation preferences of the neighbourhood
3) leisure demand - participation rates and requests from organized groups

* Generally speaking, the provision of playgrounds, playing fields, and passive landscaped areas.
approval and implementation

The plan contains recommendations for both park and recreation policies and for capital projects. The capital projects were developed into a four year capital program which was included both as a chapter in the Master Plan and as the separate publication Capital Plan 1983-1986. Both the Master Plan and the Capital Plan were referred back to community organizations for their comments and the reaction of the general public was sought in a series of public meetings. The revised documents will then be forwarded for approval endorsement by the elected park officials. The Capital Plan will also require endorsement by City Council and by the electorate in a plebiscite.

In summary, the Master Planning Process began with public input which consisted of 1) identification of users, 2) participation rates, 3) long range goals, and 4) project requests. The project requests and participation rates were analysed in terms of recreation trends and the existing supply of park and recreation opportunities. The resulting list of requested projects was evaluated in terms of criteria based on public goals and staff expertise and a list of Recommended Projects was derived.

Particularly during the apportioning of expenditures between the different aspects of parks and recreation (park
development, facility development, land acquisition, and civic beautification) the staff were assisted by the use of a Decision Matrix.* In using the matrix, each project was compared to every other project and the favored project in each instance was given a "+". The projects were then ranked in order of the number of pluses. The results of such technical manoeuvres were tempered with professional judgement.

Although the public was extensively involved in the early stages of the plan the latter portions were undertaken almost exclusively by the professional staff until the public's reaction to the plan's recommendations was sought.

* Copyright 1974 by GL Morrisey, MOR Associates, Buena Park, Calif.
CHAPTER 6

A COMPARISON OF THE PLANNING MODEL AND THE VANCOUVER MASTER PLANNING PROCESS

The first portion of this chapter will be devoted to comparing the Planning Model developed in Part I with the process used in deriving the Vancouver Parks Board Master Plan, while the second portion will be taken up with a discussion of the differences between the two methods.

The two planning processes can differ in several ways:
1) the presence or absence of a component
2) the relative emphasis placed on the various components
3) the way in which the components are used in the planning process

The comparison between the two methods will take place along these lines.

Presence or absence of components
Comparing the completed form of the Planning Model (Figure 6) with the diagram of the Master Planning Process (Figure 5, following page 73) demonstrates that nearly all the steps in the Planning Model can also be found in the Master Plan. Two significant exceptions occur: 1) Objectives, and 2) (Program) Evaluation. Removing evaluation breaks the Planning Model cycle
FIGURE 6
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and converts it into a linear process. Removing Objectives from the Planning Model changes the relationship between Goals and Facilities & Programs from direct and primary to indirect and secondary.

Differences of emphasis

Perhaps the most striking difference in component emphasis in the two methods is between Citizen Participation and Professional Judgment. In the Planning Model community values are expressed directly via Citizen Participation throughout the planning process, whereas in the Master Plan citizen input is filtered through the judgment of the professional staff except during the goal setting phase.

Differences in component utilization

The most significant differences with respect to component utilization concern the different uses to which demand and goals are put in the two methods. The Planning model begins with goals and subsequently analyses demand to determine the best way to achieve the goals. The roles are reversed in the Master Plan, which begins with demand and uses goals to evaluate demand.

Combining differences in presence or absence of components, component emphasis and component use, the most significant variations between the two planning methods are:

1) The Model emphasizes fulfilling goals while the Master Plan emphasizes meeting demand

As mentioned in Part I, it is the presence of overriding social goals which sets the Planning Model apart from most planning methods, which are focused on meeting demand. Although
goals have a significant role in the Master Plan, their use there is secondary, and is as an aid in evaluating demand. This is in contrast to the Planning Model, where goals are primary and the role of demand is in the service of goal achievement.

2) Public participation has the major role in directing the parks and recreation program in the Planning Model while the Master Plan places greater emphasis on technical studies and professional judgement.

The starting point of both the Master Plan and the Planning Model is Public Participation. The difference between the two is that the Planning Model uses citizen involvement continuously throughout the planning process, e.g., in converting goals into objectives, in selecting projects to fulfill the objectives, and in determining how far the social benefits derived from the projects go toward fulfilling the objectives. In the Master Planning process, in contrast, Public Participation is confined to the beginning and end of the process. The intervening steps are carried out by the staff, with the result that there is more professional judgement and less public consultation.

3) The Master Plan is a one-time effort while the Planning Model includes ongoing evaluation of program effectiveness.

One of the most striking differences between the Model and the Master Plan revealed by comparing Figures 5 (page 73) and 6 is that the Planning Model is cyclical while the Master Planning process is one-directional. The cycling back of the output of the Model via program evaluation is absent from the Master Plan. The result is that the Master Planning Process ends with the production of the Vancouver Master Plan. Although the need for
The similarities and differences between the two planning methods are summarized in Table III.

The fact that the chosen example of current recreation planning practice differs from the Planning Model in these important respects raises questions concerning implementation of the Model. In essence, there are three major unproven concept areas in the Model and there are three possible barriers to their implementation. The concept areas are

1) a strict goal-based approach to planning
2) ongoing public involvement, from goal formulation to program evaluation
3) a commitment to ongoing planning based on program evaluation

The possible obstacles to these innovations to the standard recreation planning process are

1) lack of suitable techniques
2) lack of resources or expertise in the community
3) lack of political will

Goals

A goals-oriented approach to city planning is up against all three of the previously listed barriers. Few cities have attempted strict goal-based planning and fewer still have succeeded. In what is perhaps one of the most ambitious attempts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>PLANNING MODEL</th>
<th>MASTER PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Present throughout</td>
<td>Primarily limited to input phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>Public values paramount</td>
<td>Professional judgment could overshadow public values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>Recommendations derived primarily from goals</td>
<td>Goals used during evaluation of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>Essential to the precise expression &amp; accomplishment of goals</td>
<td>Used occasionally (neighbourhood park criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL SATISFACTIONS</td>
<td>Contribute to demand</td>
<td>Contribute to demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL BENEFITS</td>
<td>Used in program evaluation</td>
<td>Used in evaluating which of the requested projects will be recommended for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>Used in determining how best to achieve community goals</td>
<td>Used as the basis of the Plan's recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLY ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT &amp; EXPERTISE</td>
<td>Used to assist the public in converting community objectives into facilities and programs</td>
<td>Used in determining which of those projects requested will be recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM EVALUATION</td>
<td>Essential to Model</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF MODEL</td>
<td>Cyclical, ongoing</td>
<td>Linear, with a single, final product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III**

**COMPARISON OF MODEL & MASTER PLAN**
to derive a goal-centered plan for a municipality occurred in Dallas during the 1960's. By 1975 27% of the goals had been achieved and moderate or substantial progress made on 28% and 43% respectively. Nogradi reports that out of 21 Canadian community recreation departments studied, only 2 employed specific, written goals. From the small proportion of municipalities using goals to determine policies and plans, it can be assumed that the technology of goal-based planning is at an early stage of development, despite Young's illuminating articles on the subject. With respect to the possible insufficiency of community resources in this context, Niniger reports that taxes in Dallas tripled following the institution of the goals program. The lack of political will to carry through with a full-scale goals program can be seen in Vancouver where the Goals for Vancouver were received by Council but never formally adopted. It appears that the decision-makers do not want to be tied down by specific written goals.

Continuing Public Involvement
As discussed in Chapter 3, the technical problems associated with citizen participation can usually be solved by the selection of the right method for the right situation. The problem of availability of resources for citizen participation can be alleviated in part by careful selection of techniques. It appears that the main obstacle to ongoing public involvement is a lack of political will. Therefore it will be necessary for the proponents of public participation to convince the community and its leaders of the advantages of ongoing citizen involvement, properly carried out, before the success of the
Planning Model can be assured.
Continuous planning and program evaluation
The institution of program evaluation closes the loop and converts the planning process from linear to cyclical and from a single product process to an ongoing one. Here again the technical methods are relatively well developed and should prove no obstacle. However, the community needs to be convinced that the benefits of program evaluation would be worth the costs before they would be willing to devote the necessary additional resources.

The preceding paragraphs indicate that there are a number of significant unanswered questions regarding implementation of the planning model. It is hoped that those responsible for the planning of recreation facilities and programs will find the Model sufficiently compelling in theory to go to the trouble that its use will entail.
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