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This thesis provides a long term analysis of strategic regional planning for the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, 1969-1981. However, the very nature of such a long term study exposes research problems that are masked by the traditional, short term or 'snap shot' approach. The first chapter reviews the problems of the traditional approach and argues that the lack of a dynamic, systems oriented approach in strategic regional planning stems from a theoretical gap between grand, i.e., general, theories and empirically testable hypotheses.

In the theoretical framework, chapter two, Faludi's (1973) classification scheme is selected as the most evolved example of a middle range or contingency theory within the ambit of procedural planning theory. Faludi's three dimensions of planning--the blueprint versus process planning styles; the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental planning styles; and the normative versus functional planning styles--are then related to the three basic components of the strategic regional planning system: the type of plan; the type of planning agency; and the type of (ongoing) planning process. The variables that Faludi uses to define these three dimensions are also operationally defined in the context of the Lower Mainland study. Without any a priori hypotheses, the theoretical framework is used in chapter three to descriptively interpret shifts along these dimensions of planning for each of the Lower Mainland study's four time
The events and issues of the Lower Mainland study suggest the existence of a long term planning cycle, one driven by both economic growth and interactions between the components of the strategic regional planning system. In the conclusions to the study, chapter four, this cycle is generalized into a pattern of movements along the dimensions of planning and is offered as an initial hypothesis for exploring strategic regional planning in other locations. It was not possible, however, to directly establish causal relationships between the components of the strategic regional planning system because the movements along the dimensions of planning that were used to measure these components were interpreted as 'averages' based on the conflicting impacts of numerous events and issues. While a long term, systems oriented approach to analyzing strategic regional planning is still valid and required, further research requires a more detailed (direct) and integrated classification scheme or model.
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GLOSSARY

Agencies, Committees And Plans Associated With Lower Mainland Planning

Provincial (Prov)

MOMA Ministry of Municipal Affairs, know earlier as the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MOMAH) and the Department of Municipal Affairs (DOMA)

ELUC Environment and Land Use Committee, a Cabinet Committee with its own Secretariat (Secretariate dissolved prior to updated ORP adoption)

ALC Agricultural Land Commission, initially termed the Land Reserve

ALR Agricultural Land Reserve, initially terms the Land Reserve

LUA Land Use Act, also known as the Planning Act, was proposed as a bill by MOMA, but died on order paper

PRP Provincial Regional Plans, broad brush regional plans as proposed in the LUA

URP Urban Regional Plans, local plans as proposed in the LUA

RCC Regional Coordinating Committee, bodies to oversee regional planning as proposed in the LUA

UBCM Union of British Columbia Municipalities, voluntary association, not controlled by the Province

Lower Mainland (LM)

LMRPB Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, 1949-1969


LMPCC Lower Mainland Plan Coordinating Committee, the future LMPRP as described in the updated ORP

TORSC Terms of Reference Staff Committee, 1974-1976, see RLC and TLC
RLC  Review Liaison Committee, 1976, known earlier as the TORSC
TLC  Technical Liaison Committee, 1977-1983, known earlier as the RLC and TORSC
WG   Working Group, 1978-1980

Regional Districts (RD)
GVRD Greater Vancouver Regional District
DARD Dewdney Aloutte Regional District
CFVRD Central Fraser Valley Regional District
RDRC Regional District of Fraser Cheam
PC   Planning Committee (political)
TPC  Technical Planning Committee (staff)
JTPC Joint Technical Planning Committee, ad hoc meetings between the four Regional District TPCs on the issues of the Update process

Plans
ORP  Official Regional Plan (RD)
OSP  Official Settlement Plan (RD-Electoral Area)
OCP  Official Community Plan (Municipality)
LMORPU Lower Mainland Official Regional Plan Update, full title for referencing all materials produced as part of the Update process
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to review and interpret strategic regional planning for the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. The focus is on the years between 1969 and 1981, the period during which the need for an updated Official Regional Plan (ORP) for the Lower Mainland was recognized and a new plan formulated.¹

While not deliberately concealed, Lower Mainland planning was conducted quietly and largely out of the public eye. The updated ORP for the Lower Mainland was not formulated in a predetermined manner. There was no provincial planning act, providing regulations and guidelines, to direct the preparation of the plan. Nor, did the regional planning agencies responsible for producing the plan have, at the onset, a mutually agreed upon model plan to work towards. In addition, the agency responsible for coordinating strategic regional planning, the Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP), see section 2.5 to 2.7, had no statutory obligation to file an annual report of its activities as did its predecessor, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board (LMRPB), see section 3.2. A review of this period thus

¹ GVRD PD (1980/3) repealed
provides a first time factual documentation of what has to date been a rather obscure and esoteric activity.

The purpose of the thesis, however, is not just to document the events and issues of this period, but to achieve an understanding of their significance. Given the seemingly ad hoc process through which a strategic plan for the Lower Mainland was developed, the question of interpretation in relation to some common point of reference poses a serious problem. This thesis takes a systems oriented approach to the interpretation of strategic regional planning and, in doing so, attempts to lay the foundations for the development of improved theories of planning. In the balance of the chapter, a brief argument is presented to support this new direction.

The broad characteristics of strategic regional planning are defined in the next section to help provide an initial basis for the approach taken to the interpretation of Lower Mainland planning events and issues. Following this, it is argued that the traditional, evaluative approach is flawed and self-defeating because of the inherent conflict between the two primary criteria that underlie all such analyses of planning: efficiency and effectiveness. An empirical basis for this theoretical assertion is then provided through a brief review of English structure planning problems. After outlining the need for a dynamic, systems oriented approach to interpreting strategic regional planning, a summary comparison of both
approaches is presented, and study limitations are noted.

1.2 Working Definitions

1.2.1 Regional Planning

Because of its common place usage, the term regional planning is often treated as long term planning and is used synonymously with the term strategic planning. This is not necessarily so; regional planning is a horizontal activity that involves the coordination of land use decision making, and related issues, between the administrative sub-areas of a single region. While it may involve the formulation of longer term plans, policies, and programs to guide the region's future growth, regional planning can be as simple as ad hoc meetings between the administrative sub-areas, i.e., Regional Districts, to deal with cross boundary issues such as transportation linkages. Regional planning, from this perspective, can be defined as an ongoing process of cooperative decision making on Lower Mainland land use and development issues.

1.2.2 Strategic Planning

The strategic plan is not a set of future decisions made in the present, but a framework for guiding future decisions. Here, Steiner (1979, p. 13) notes that, "The essence of formal
strategic planning is the systematic identification of opportunities and threats that lie in the future." The emphasis in strategic planning is on a long term, systems perspective where strategy (plan) formulation, implementation, and monitoring are seen to be linked together through time in an interactive cycle. With most large organizations being structurally differentiated into at least two tier hierarchies, strategic planning acts as an unifying mechanism.

Strategic planning can now be defined as a goal oriented and optimizing activity where the long term strategy of the organization's upper, managerial level provides a framework to guide the operation of the organization's lower, administrative level and where feedback from operational problems acts to modify the long term strategy of the managerial level. If regional planning is seen as a horizontal activity that involves the coordination of the land use function over space, then strategic planning can be seen as a vertical activity that involves the coordination of the region's upper and lower tiers over time: between the LMPRP and Regional Districts and between the Regional Districts and their Municipalities.

1.2.3 Strategic Regional Planning

The use of the term strategic regional planning is thus a deliberate attempt to emphasize both the horizontal (areal)
and vertical (organizational) aspects of long term land use planning. Strategic regional planning occurs at a particular stage of regionalism, one where the physically well defined region has evolved its structure of socioeconomically interdependent sub-areas, but had not yet gained full autonomy over its own interests from the State, i.e., Province. At this stage, which is typically represented by a 'metropolitan' type of administration, i.e., a federated, two tier hierarchy, there is a balance between what Fesler (1969) terms functional specialization and areal generalization, i.e., the efficiency and effectiveness (equity) of land use planning. Strategic regional planning is thus coterminous with the planning system: the planning documents (instruments), the planning organization, and the ongoing planning process.

The key, a priori, assumption of this thesis is that the federated or metropolitan system offers the best long term balance between the forces of organizational centralization and decentralization. Instead of examining the conditions for equilibrium, this thesis seeks to document and understand the process of adjustment over the long term. The dynamics of the strategic regional planning system is thus the subject rather than object of the thesis. The elements of the strategic regional planning system are more fully defined in chapter 2.
1.3 The Traditional Approach

1.3.1 Evaluation

The traditional approach to reviewing the activities of a given planning agency has been through evaluation where the performance of the agency is measured against a set of predetermined criteria. After evaluating the performance of the planning agency, the reviewer usually provides a set of recommendations: structural and procedural changes to bring the agency into equilibrium or how it ought to behave according to the criteria. These prescriptions, however, only provide a static, 'snapshot' view of the planning agency at any one point in time. As such, the traditional approach is a reactionary one that ignores the long term dynamics of the strategic regional planning system.

Where long term studies of regional planning have been undertaken, an evolutionary approach has typically been employed. In such cases, a 'standard' set of normative criteria is used to define the 'optimal' arrangements for strategic regional planning, i.e., a two tier, metropolitan form of administration, at the start of the study. The evolutionary approach, however, is merely the inverse of the 'snapshot' approach: the former documents progress towards an end stated while the latter measures deviation away from an end state. In both situations, the result is an evaluative
judgement rather than a better understanding of the strategic regional planning system and the knowledge necessary for improved theories of procedural planning.

1.3.2 Criteria

The validity of the traditional approach ultimately depends on the criteria employed. The criteria that are most commonly used include: the time and cost of reaching decisions; the clarity and comprehensibility of the decision making process; the openness and accessibility of the decision making process to those affected by its decisions; the flexibility of the decision making process in accommodating new and unexpected circumstances; and the consistency and equity of the decisions made. Traditionally, these criteria have been obtained from two sources: theories of social democracy, particularly Rauls (1973), and the laws of natural justice as exemplified by the principles of common law. The criteria, once derived and established, subsequently become absolute, the unquestioned standards for determining how planning agencies ought to be structured and how planning ought to proceed.

Easton's (1965) systems approach to the analysis of political life, i.e., government, provides a common basis for exposing the seemingly inherent problems of the traditional approach. As part of government, any planning agency can be analyzed by the relationship between inputs of public support (votes) and
resources (taxes), and its outputs of decisions (laws and regulations) and actions (services). This classification scheme can be used to reduce all the traditional criteria to two basic systems criteria: efficiency and effectiveness. The essentials of Easton's systems approach are illustrated in Figure 1.

Efficiency is a measure of the planning agency's ability to make the best use of its organizational resources; it is the ratio of the agency's outputs to its inputs that determines efficiency. While efficiency is primarily calculated on the basis of time and cost, effectiveness is a function of all the other criteria. Effectiveness is the ratio of the planning agency's inputs relative to its outputs; it is a measure of the electorate's overall level of satisfaction with the planning agency's outputs. With its numerous criteria reduced to two systems based criteria, it can be seen that the traditional approach offers only an external perspective of the planning agency. The traditional approach, measuring only the inputs and outputs to the planning agency and ignoring the agency's internal structure and procedures, can be termed a 'black box' technique.

What quickly becomes obvious in any long term study of a planning agency, however, is that the criteria of efficiency and effectiveness are not mutually exclusive; they interact over time. The two criteria, in many instances, are directly
Figure 1: The Political System

Efficiency (productivity) = \[
\frac{\text{Outputs}}{\text{Inputs}}
\]

Effectiveness (utility) = \[
\frac{\text{Inputs}}{\text{Outputs}}
\]

Source: Fashioned from Easton (1965)
competitive. A planning agency attempting to be effective by preparing a comprehensive plan through an open and accessible planning process is likely to be inefficient in terms of the cost and long period of time required to produce the plan. Where public access to the planning process is denied or restricted to improve efficiency, though, the eventual users of the plan will likely protest that the plan has not effectively dealt with their problems and needs. The political system, in a democracy, is a closed system between the electorate and the government. Thus, the planning agency's effectiveness, in terms of the public's satisfaction with its outputs, will ultimately determine the level of inputs into the planning agency and hence its very existence.

1.4 English Structure Planning Problems

1.4.1 A New Planning System


---

2 GB MHLG (1965)
necessary for the tactical control, i.e., zoning, of land use and development. In operation, fairly rigid short range local plans would be formulated and implemented within the long range, but flexible framework of the structure plan.

Following this, the Government appointed several commissions to study the functions and boundaries of local government. The recommendations of these Committees, which formed the basis for the, Local Government Act, (GB 1972), shared two common features: the general acceptance of the city-region as the natural unit of social geography and the creation of a two tier structure for local government. In 1974, the full provisions of the Act were brought into effect, and the upper tier or county (regional) level was assigned the function of preparing structure plans while the preparation of local plans became the responsibility of the lower tier or district (municipal) level. What had been created was a hierarchical planning system, linked from the national to district level through a common legislative framework.

Structure plans for virtually all of the counties in England were prepared under this new planning system during the 1970's and early 1980's. With numerous reviews of the English structure planning experience having recently been completed, it is now possible to review these reviews and provide a general evaluation of how successfully strategic regional planning performed in a situation where the organizational and
procedural requirements for such planning were comparatively well defined in legislation. The following review uses the two basic criteria of efficiency and effectiveness to summarize English structure planning problems under five key issues.

1.4.2 Regulatory Problems

Structure plans were to consist of three documents: a key diagram and supporting illustration, a written statement, and the Secretary of State's letter of approval. To promote efficiency, structure plans were legislatively prohibited from using base maps to document detailed land use and other information. Bristow (1982, p. 249) however, has noted that, "The attempt to maintain a level of abstraction which gives nonspecificity in the published documents is...not easy to maintain and introduces an appearance of unreality into the process...." In practice, the structure planners did take specific sites and land uses into consideration during the formulation of structure plan policies and proposals, but the 1974 reorganization of local government into two levels complicated the situation.

After the reorganization of local government, notes Solesbury (1983, p. 10), "Counties and districts had vested interests in maximizing or minimizing the degree of detail in structure plans, creating in many cases tussles between them...." These
'tussles' decreased the efficiency of planning at the county level. In certain policy areas, such as that of public housing, the lack of feedback from the district level created extra work for the structure planners. The districts, by withholding information on the use of existing council housing stock and housing programs, made it difficult for the county level to accurately determine the amount of public lands that should be released.

The assignment of site specific development control to the district level reduced the short term effectiveness of the structure plan, and the planners attempts to regain authority decreased the efficiency of planning at the county level. While some counties tried to increase the spatial detail of their structure plans, such attempts were not approved by the Secretary of State. Quantitative controls utilizing area specific target numbers to limit or halt the growth of office and retail space, etc., were similarly rejected. In the 'decision rule' approach that was first developed for West Yorkshire's structure plan, the county planners formulated a set of constraints within which development could take place and produced criteria for development proposals to satisfy in securing county approval. This approach, utilizing the basic principles of strategic planning, was accepted, but as Bristow (1983, p. 250) has noted,

...even here, there are difficulties in deciding just what is the right balance between the
rigidity, and probably the early obsolescence, of tightly drawn policy rules, and the making of them so loose as to be virtually ineffective.

To provide a countervailing authority against the district's acquisition of development control, the counties were given the power to 'call in', i.e., halt and review, those development proposals repugnant to the aims of their structure plans. However, Bristow (1983, p. 250) has noted that, "The political realities of relations between counties and districts are that counties have been loath to use the directive as an enforcement procedure against the districts."

The exercise of the 'call in' authority, which would have damaged the daily technical and political relationships between the two levels, was largely avoided for the sake of efficiency and the need to keep the structure planning process from coming to a complete halt. In some instances, negotiation between the two levels led to conflict and, ultimately, to settlement by the Secretary of State. The net result of such arbitration, of course, was the implicit centralization of planning at the national level and the weakening of the structure plan's effectiveness at the county level.

1.4.3 Content Problems

In a 1979 manual on structure plan form and content, the Ministry Of Housing and Local Government suggested that
structure plans might provide a means for facilitating public input; a forum for discussion between various planning bodies; and a basis for coordinating all development decisions. There existed, notes Solebury (1980, p. 11), "...common expectations that the structure plan might take on a wider role in local authority policy making." Since there were few legislative specifications for the process of preparing structure plans, the county planners were free to devise their own procedures. The combination of high expectations and lack of procedural rules led to a planning process where the early emphasis was on satisfying criteria pertaining to effectiveness rather than efficiency. While procedural restrictions were later put in place, it might be said that the planning process was almost too effective in its responsiveness or flexibility to local circumstances.

The, Town And Country Planning Act, (GB 1971), required that the policies and proposals of the structure plan be supported by 'reasoned justification' in the form of a report of survey. While the survey was to support the approval of the structure plan, the survey was not officially part of the plan and did not itself require approval. The Ministry of Housing and Local Government, in 1970, provided an advisory check list of information that would typically be required to facilitate plan approval, a list that roughly paralleled the subjects listed in the legislation as possible policy concerns of the structure plan. Since much of this information could not be
obtained from published sources, most of the structure plans required time consuming and costly local surveys. Solesbury (1983, p. 17) notes that, "The organization of data into information systems thus became an important preoccupation of structure planning...."

The preparation of expensive, detailed surveys tended to result in the formulation of draft structure plans with an over abundance of goals, objectives, and policy alternatives. As Barras (1981, p. 18) notes, "...policies were generated with respect to often complex and abstract hierarchies of social objectives which were essentially a product of the planner's imagination." The grouping of policy alternatives into spatially expressed strategies reduced the number of alternatives, but it typically increased the complexity and length of the evaluation process. While the feasible range of policy alternatives was constrained by the slowing of national economic growth and the accompanying reductions in public sector resources to implement plans, the process of evaluation through the steady attrition of policy alternatives was slow and time consuming. The very search for comprehensiveness thus led to a somewhat inefficient planning process.

In addition to providing a comprehensive description of the structure plan area, the report of survey was to analyze the future impact of socioeconomic and other trends on the policies and proposals of the plan. Barras (1981) has argued
that the use of disaggregated forecasting techniques, such as the cohort survival (population) and economic base models, resulted in a fragmented, sectoral approach to analysis. In an attempt to form linkages between policy areas, many planners used the outputs of one forecasting exercise as the inputs of another. Population forecasts, for example, were typically used to determine all other growth figures: labour force, employment, and housing starts, etc. In general, this approach to policy analysis, which Bracken and Hume (1981) term the 'linear deductive' approach, presented a deceptive impression of policy integration and failed to consider the effect of plan implementation itself on the forecast, i.e., feedback.

If the above, linear deductive techniques were criticized for being ineffective, then later efforts were criticized for their inefficiency. Some structure planners, attempting to enclose the dynamic nature of regional planning, initiated complex model building projects. However, efforts to utilize modelling techniques were no more successful in England than anywhere else and, in 1973, the Department of the Environment advised structure planners that the benefits of modelling to assist policy evaluation had to be measured against the time and expense of reaching decisions through such techniques. Later, under the, Local Government, Planning And Land Act, (GB 1980), the requirement of submitting reports of survey to the Secretary of State was completely removed.
The complexity of the survey and the comprehensive search for policy alternatives together resulted in a slow and expensive planning process. To counter such inefficiency, the county planners evolved the key issues concept: structure plan content was to be limited to policy issues of key structural importance to the planning of the area, and these issues were specifically listed in regulations adopted by the government in 1974. "With key issues," note Bristow and Cross (1983, p. 310), "have come more concrete and diverse plan-making approaches based upon real local problems rather than vague objectives." The key issues concept, though, marked the start of a series of Government edicts that served to constrict the scope of the structure plan to that of a strategic land use plan. As Bracken and Hume (1981) have observed, increased efficiency for individual plans led a general weakening of the entire structure planning system.

1.4.4 Evaluation Problems

The, Town And Country Planning Act, (GB 1971), required the counties to give adequate publicity to the reports of survey and draft policies; to ensure the opportunity of individuals and groups to make representations on proposed policies; and to take into consideration the views expressed in these representations. While these requirements were intended to make the planning process open and accountable, the lack of procedural guidelines to ensure this resulted in criticisms of
the new planning system's effectiveness. Barras (1983, p. 19) notes that, "...experience with early structure plans cast doubt on the ability of complex and sophisticated evaluation methods to reflect adequately the local political preferences...." Planners using techniques involving weighted scores and combinatorial selection, i.e., the planning balance sheet (Lichfield, 1966) and goals achievement matrix (Hill, 1968), were accused of producing 'professional plans' in which the input of community values had been carefully filtered in order to support the planners' own preferred options. As Barker (1983, p. 269) has observed, "...it is attractive to the managers to offer options which are within the political middle-ground for general consideration, and then claim their endorsement by the public consultation process."

In extremely contentious circumstances, the public were typically denied access to the formulation of plan policies and strategies altogether. Such a situation occurred in the West Midlands where county amalgamation left planners with a total of eight structure plans competing for approval. Here, public participation was limited to comments on a single plan proposal prepared through 'backroom' negotiations. Barras (1981, p. 16), however, argues that, "Even where councils have made great efforts to test public opinion, they have found a widespread lack of interest." This lack of interest appears to have been an inherent characteristic of the structure plan. Here, Barras (1981, p. 16) points out that, "Their policies
are too broad to be seen to affect individual properties...and they do not generally propose specific investment projects such motorways or airports."

Where strong public participation occurred, it tended to come from organized special interest groups in the form of lobbying. In this regard, Barker (1983, p. 258) notes that, "Public attitudes frequently seem fated to contradict each other." The clash of public interest groups and their political representatives acted to widen the base of policy formulation and countermand the principles of the 'key issues' directive. Since the structure plans could only express one land use strategy to satisfy all interests, such conflicts had a direct impact on the planners' task of reaching consensus. Bristow (1983, p. 237) has observed that, "With more and more consultation and participation thrust upon them, the path to that consensus has now become more tortuous and lengthy, if achievable at all."

The efficiency of the planning process was further decreased by measures that were intended to improve the comprehensiveness, and hence effectiveness, of the planning process. Between 1971 and 1977, the Department of the Environment increased the number of planning agencies that were always to be consulted on structure plans from 8 to 16. This expansion occurred at the same time that the scope of structure planning was being narrowed to shorten the length of
time required for plan preparation.

While the public had the right to voice their objections once the structure plan had been submitted to the Secretary of State, this right was greatly limited after the Government's 1973 decision to eliminate the traditional public hearing. The new arrangement, the 'examination in public', was conducted as a public debate, but only persons invited by the Secretary of State were allowed to speak and only on selected matters of key importance to the Secretary's approval of the plan. Bristow and Cross (1983, p. 315) argue that the examination in public was, "...no more and no less than a formalized discussion between professionals, with only minimal contributions, if any at all, from public pressure groups and, even more rarely, individuals." It thus appears that any increases in the openness and accessibility, i.e., effectiveness, of the plan formulation process at the county level were discounted by the Government's desire for a less time consuming, i.e., more efficient, process of plan approval at the national level.

1.4.5 Economic And Organizational Problems

Structure plans, as originally established, were to be formulated within national policy strategies. During the early 1970's, many counties challenged the status quo and attempted to use their structure plans, "...as a medium for
advocating change in regional or national policies which, they argued, operated to the disadvantage of their areas." (Solesbury 1983, p. 10). One way for the county planners to achieve their redistribution objectives was to include within the structure plan a corporate plan detailing major public works projects and the required expenditures to finance them. In essence, the county level was attempting to decentralize spending from the national level and so increase the effectiveness of the structure plan.

Britain's economy moved into an ever deepening recession during the late 1970's, and its Government, discovering that roughly one-third of all national expenditures were being consumed by the local level, quickly moved to halt structure planning 'advocacy'. In an attempt to restrain and justify spending, the Government created a Public Expenditure Committee and extended its functional basis down to the local level. Where the county level had previously been responsible for allocating resources between its departments, the various Government ministries now dealt directly with each county department in a separate, zero based budgeting format.

This centralization increased efficiency at the national level, but fragmented the operations of local government, especially at the county level. While the Government also established the county positions of Chief Executive Officer (administration) and Policy and Resources Committee
neither of these positions greatly assisted the coordination of county decision making on all those issues pertaining to land use planning. Here, Barras (1981, p. 15) has observed that, "...inter-departmental collaboration at the operational level has not provided the necessary basis for effective strategic planning."

1.4.6 Time Frame Problems

In 1974 as part of its efforts to end structure planning 'advocacy', the Government issued edicts that clarified the status of structure plans and corporate plans. The former were to be statutory and long term in nature while the latter would remain as an optional, inhouse management technique. In theory, there should have bee a balanced, two way relationship between the two plans: the structure plan should have given the corporate plans a perspective on the most effective locations for providing infrastructure, and the corporate plans should have been able to indicate the most efficient means of achieving or changing these strategies given limited public resources. In practice, a fundamental clash arose over differing plan time scales, between the long term perspective of the structure plan and the short term perspective, i.e., five years or less, of the resource based corporate plans. Here, Barras (1981, p. 15) has noted that,

When they were introduced, Structure Plans were a unique medium to long-term plan to guide the
future development of an area. Now they are being surrounded by shorter-term investment plans covering some of the major topics of the Structure Plan such as housing and transport, but prepared independently by separate departments. The future role of Structure Plans in relationship to the new sectoral programmes is thus being called into question.

With the legislative rule against site specificity, the county planners were not able to directly incorporate the spatial details of district level infrastructure into their structure plans. Those structure planners who based their concept diagrams on generalized aggregations of short term infrastructure programs found their plans being quickly outdated when these programs were not implemented due to changing fiscal priorities and cutbacks. In essence, the short term plans and programs implicitly decentralized land use planning authority to the district level and commensurately decreased the effectiveness of the structure plan and the county level.

To compete with the short term approach of the infrastructure plans and increase the effectiveness of the structure plan, the county level initiated shorter formal review periods. Three years, rather than the five years originally conceived, became the typical period for plan review. With the increasing numbers of completed structure plans, the shortening of the review period switched the technical focus of structure planning back to the development of information based monitoring systems. It appears, however, that the new emphasis on monitoring systems merely served to shorten the
review period further, resulting in an annual review period that matched the corporate budgeting systems. By unnecessarily increasing the work and expense of structure planning, the shorter review period decreased the efficiency of the county level.

After 1978, inner city districts facing largely non spatial problems were granted the authority to prepare local plans before the approval of structure plans at the county or metropolitan level. This relaxation of legislatively defined procedures reversed the top down concept of structure planning as strategic planning. Later, the Government's 1980, Local Government, Planning And Land Use Act, extended the relaxation to all districts. The new legislation exacerbated the long standing problems of site specificity and vertical coordination between county and district level plans. In 1982, notes Bristow (1983), a public inquiry found that the land release policies of Greater Manchester's structure plan had been undermined by a district level green belt plan. The prior completion of spatially detailed local plans thus fettered the ability of county planners to later formulate independent land use policies.

While county planners were shortening the review periods of their structure plans to make them more effective, the new legislation inherently permitted the district planners to lengthen the time frames of their local plans. Many critics
now argue that this emphasis on the short term had made structure planning too flexible, and that long term planning at the county level is being ignored or conducted without public knowledge. Thus, states Bristow (1983, p. 253),

...there is a clear conflict of interest, even at the generalized scale of the structure plan, between the desire for a firmly known short-term plan which is effective in implementation terms and the longer-term outline objectives of strategic forward planning.

1.4.7 Conclusions

During some 10 years of strategic regional planning in England, the status of the structure plan and the planning authority of the county level have both steadily declined. Efforts to make the planning system more efficient typically resulted in the centralization of decision making authority at the national level, a situation that lessened the effectiveness of structure plan coordination at the county level. Conversely, the increasing decentralization of development control measures acted to improve the immediate effectiveness of planning at the district level while forcing the county level into a defensive position and decreasing its efficiency. The loss of planning authority up to the national level and down to the district level served to isolate the counties. Now, English planning critics are using the same arguments that were used in the establishment of the structure planning system to defend what remains of the structure
If the foregoing review of England's planning system appears overly negative, it is because the English reviewers themselves have been highly critical of structure planning efforts. The reviewers, over more than a decade of structure planning, have alternatively criticized the efficiency and effectiveness of the new planning system. Without explicit recognition of the fact that these two criteria are not mutually exclusive, the only conclusion possible from this series of snap shot reviews is that England's structure planning has been a failure and that strategic regional planning is unworkable. This conclusion, the result of the traditional approach, ignores the larger argument that strategic regional planning, as enabled by a two tiered, or federated form of regionalism, offers the best possible long term balance between efficiency and effectiveness.

1.5 Towards A Systems Approach

1.5.1 A Theoretical Gap

The preceding review of England's experience with structure planning provides a measure of empirical support for the theoretical assertion that the criteria of efficiency and effectiveness are not mutually exclusive and, in certain instances, may well be in direct conflict with each other over
the long term. If the traditional approach to reviewing strategic regional planning emphasizes both its inefficiency and ineffectiveness, even in circumstances where the planning system is clearly defined in legislation at the onset, then there is even less utility in using such an approach to review strategic regional planning where the arrangements, structural and procedural, are less precisely defined.

A new approach to reviewing strategic regional planning is required, one that considers how the system adjusts to change over time. Rather than judging strategic regional planning on the basis of absolute criteria, the elements of the strategic regional planning system—the plan, the planning agency, and the planning process—must be analyzed relative to each other. Such a dynamic, systems based approach would provide a long term, internal perspective in contrast to the short term, external perspective offered by the traditional, criteria based approach. Unfortunately, an integrated theory capable of fully explaining the long term operation of strategic regional planning has yet to be developed.

Procedural planning theory, what Hightower has called theories 'of' rather than theories 'in' (substantive) planning, can be seen to be part of the interdisciplinary area of organizational behavior. As such, the problems found in organizational behavior are reflective of the problems found in its constituent fields of procedural planning theory,
sociology, social psychology, and business administration. Common to all these related fields is the dilemma of a 'gap' between theories which attempt to explain how the individual elements of an organization function and theories that attempt to explain how the organization, as a whole, functions in the larger, societal context. Merton (1968), a sociologist, was the first to explicitly recognize this gap and call for the creation of 'middle range theories'.

1.5.2 Middle Range Theory

In their historical review of organizational behavior theory and research, Pinder and Moore (1980) track the emergence of middle range theory. Early thinking about organizations, they note, was dominated by efforts to build grand theories, i.e., scientific management (Taylor, 1934) and bureaucratic theory (Weber, 1947). Throughout this 'classical' period, theorists maintained a deterministic view of human nature and suggested that all organizational behavior could be understood by the application of universal principles. The grand theories, observe Pinder and Moore (1980, p. 3), "...were stated at a level of abstraction such that it was logically impossible to deduce hypotheses amenable to proof." By the end of the 1950's, the grand theories had been transformed into a search for empirical generalizations. Research during this period utilized multi-variate methods and focused on studies of individual and inter-personal behavior. While the former
period had been characterized as theory without research, the latter period emerged as research without theory.

Throughout the 1960's, the psychologists continued to pursue the individual behavior approach to studying organizations. However, another major research thrust, known as the complex organization approach, came from the field of sociology. The sociological studies were not directed at the behavior of individuals, but at the characteristics and functioning of the organization as a 'living' entity. Here, Pinder and Moore (1980, p. 6) note that, "The complex interdependencies revealed in these studies contributed to the popularity of the systems approach to the field." By the 1970's, efforts to integrate these two well entrenched fields had lead to a rejection of the search for grand theory and to the construction of 'middle range' theories.

Pinder and Moore (1980, p. 1), in their interpretation, state that, "...middle range theories are not derived from the grand theories, and they are more than summary statements of observed relationships (empirical generalizations)." In function, they state, "...middle range theories should provide for the efficient generation, consolidation, and evaluation of empirical evidence and be liable to modification, refutation, and replacement." (Pinder and Moore, 1980 p. 1). Middle range theories should possess three basic characteristics: they should deal with a limited number of social phenomena; they
should be linkable to each other in a 'modular' fashion; and they should provide more powerful abstractions than simple description while being concrete enough to provide testable hypotheses. In essence, middle range theories are theories of social phenomena lying somewhere between the grand theories and casually formulated working hypotheses.

1.5.3 Classification Schemes And Contingency Theory

Collections of middle range theories surrounding different aspects of the organization have led to what Bigelow (1980) has termed the multiple paradigm approach. Where efforts have been made to integrate and rationalize, i.e., link together, middle range theories pertaining to different organizational types, classification schemes have emerged from the multiple paradigm approach. Classification schemes, in some fields of organizational behavior, have subsequently led to contingency theorizing. Since they attempt to link the internal structure and operation of the organization to its environment and so narrow the theoretical gap, contingency theories can be seen as a movement towards a true systems approach.

An excellent example of middle range theory and a systems oriented approach can be found in Mintzberg's (1979), *The Structuring Of Organizations*. After reducing the business organization into its component parts and linkages through the use of a descriptive set of design parameters, Mintzberg lists
a set of contingency factors, environmental circumstances that impinge on the firm's design parameters. Mintzberg then generates a series of structural configurations or organizational archetypes by describing the causal relationships between the design parameters and the contingency factors.

These structural configurations can be seen as dependent variables while the design parameters function as the independent variables. The contingency factors act as moderator or intervening variables. As the circumstances facing the firm change or the firm makes a strategic decision to move into a new market and face new circumstances, the firm will make the appropriate changes to its design parameters and the overall structure of the firm will more away from one organizational archetype to another. Thus there is no correct management strategy or organizational structure, only an appropriate match between the two.

It is not possible, however, to apply Mintzberg's theoretical framework to strategic regional planning. In the public sector, the administration of land use planning is typically fragmented amongst several independent levels of government and, at any one level, between different government functions and geographic areas. Mintzberg's theoretical framework is thus too detailed for the individual strategic regional planning agency, but not broad enough to encompass the
complexity of the total system of governmental administration. In the field of procedural planning theory, the problem of the theoretical gap has yet to be fully resolved. It can thus be argued that the existing reliance on the traditional, criteria based approach to evaluating strategic regional planning is directly related to the lack of adequate theory.

1.5.4 Comparison Of Approaches

While procedural planning theory is not as evolved as in the other fields of organizational behavior, a classification scheme is selected in the next chapter, the theoretical framework, and operationalized for the interpretation of the Lower Mainland events and issues. This classification scheme, and its application, thus helps to fulfill this study's objective of assisting the development of a systems oriented approach for the field of procedural planning theory. In Figure 2, the essentials of the two approaches, traditional and systems oriented, are summarized and contrasted. Item seven in this comparison, logic, is discussed as part of chapter 2, the theoretical framework, and section 3.1.1., the application of the framework.

1.6 Information Sources And Study Limitations

The detailed study of strategic regional planning for the Lower Mainland starts in 1969 with the establishment of the
### Figure 2: Comparison Of Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRADITIONAL APPROACH</th>
<th>SYSTEMS ORIENTED APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Purpose</td>
<td>Prescriptive; to offer structural and procedural changes to 'cure' planning system</td>
<td>Diagnostic; to broaden knowledge of planning system; raise organizational 'consciousness', i.e., social learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Level Of Analysis</td>
<td>Generalized; external perspective of planning system as a 'black box'</td>
<td>Detailed; internal perspective of planning system's individual components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 State of System</td>
<td>Static; focus on equilibrim</td>
<td>Dynamic; focus on disequilibrim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Time Frame</td>
<td>Short term; a series of separate observations or 'snapshots'</td>
<td>Long term; ongoing, continuous observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Criteria</td>
<td>Absolute; interaction between criteria ignored</td>
<td>Relative; interaction between criteria recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Application</td>
<td>Judgemental; evaluation of planning system according to fixed criteria</td>
<td>Interpretative; analysis of planning system component adjustments and interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Logic</td>
<td>Deductive; criteria used to assess cause of problem and to predict what changes (effects) will follow from prescriptive measures</td>
<td>Deductive; compiling knowledge on the planning system, moving from impacts (effects) of events and issues to causal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Development Of Method</td>
<td>Stationary; constant reference to 'grand' theories, method and techniques remain similar and virtually unchanged from study to study</td>
<td>Evolutionary; continuous efforts to improve methods and techniques and to evolve underlying theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP) and ends in 1981 with the adoption of an updated strategic plan, the 1980 ORP. While a truly dynamic study of strategic regional planning requires an even longer time horizon, it has only been possible here to summarize the main events affecting land use planning in the Lower Mainland beyond this time period.

The perspective of the Lower Mainland study corresponds to that of the LMPRP itself, and the study is subject to the biases of the LMPRP. As such, the study is limited to those events and issues perceived by the LMPRP and its subordinate committees as being of importance to land use planning for the Lower Mainland. Only where the decisions and actions of Municipalities, Regional Districts, and the Province entered into the sphere of the LMPRP's 'consciousness' have they been considered for inclusion in the study. Since its participation in the ORP Update process was limited to observer status, the role of the Federal Government was ignored.

The basic source of information for the case study has been the minutes, reports, and plans of the LMPRP and its subordinate committees. Interviews with the principle staff members responsible for producing the updated ORP were used to help interpret the written record. It has not been possible to document and interpret all LMPRP information. In the LMPRP's early years, this study's interpretation of planning
events and issues takes into consideration the Panel's review of applications to amend the existing plan for the Lower Mainland. This level of detail is required at the start of the study for it helps explain the causes leading to the initiation of the Update process. Subsequently, though, the study focuses on the events and issues of the Update process, ignoring the ever increasing number of amendment applications handled by the LMPRP. The study thus follows the overall course of the Update process.
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a theoretical framework for condensing and interpreting Lower Mainland events and issues, 1969-1981. In the next section, Faludi's (1973) classification scheme is selected and outlined as procedural planning theory's most evolved example of middle range theory. Faludi's three dimensions of planning—the blueprint versus process styles of planning, the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental styles of planning, and the normative versus functional styles of planning—are then tied to the components of the planning system that they are used to measure: the type of plan, the type of planning agency, and the type of planning process. A single continuum of planning, incorporating all three dimensions, is also proposed. Lastly, each of the planning dimensions is reviewed in more detail, and the variables that Faludi employs to describe the dimensions are operationally defined in the context of the Lower Mainland study.

2.2 A Classification Scheme

Procedural planning theory is not completely without its own middle range theories or decision making paradigms. In addition to the rational-scientific tradition of planning,
well known decision making paradigms include incremental planning (Lindblom 1959), advocacy planning (Davidoff 1965), and transactive planning (Friedman 1973). Attempts to fully integrate these paradigms, however, have typically resulted in highly generalized theories that are similar to the forementioned grand theories.

Procedural planning's various decision making paradigms have been more successfully united through the use of classification schemes. In particular, Faludi (1973) has developed a classification scheme that moves beyond pure description towards contingency theory. Faludi's (1973, p. 54) classification scheme is based on a single framework, "...an analogy between planning agencies and the human mind engaged in operational (purposive) thinking." In developing this cybernetic model, Faludi moves beyond planning as merely a guidance-control system and considers the planning agency as a learning system capable of modifying its own feedback.

By characterizing the planning agency as a 'thinking machine' with information inputs, a memory (image), and decision outputs, Faludi establishes a systems framework that enables him to classify the different procedural paradigms as 'system states' or styles of planning. The internal perspective offered by Faludi's classification scheme does not provide as much structural detail as the theories from the complex organizational approach, but it does provide an improvement
over Easton's (1965) broader, external view of the entire political system. More importantly, Faludi's classification scheme allows the different procedural paradigms of planning to be seen as complementary rather than competing theories.

Faludi's systems approach generates explicit definitions of the variables used to identify the different styles of planning. To resolve the dilemma between over-classification and insufficient distinction, the six styles of planning are arranged into three sets or dimensions. Faludi (1973, p. 173) describes these dimensions of planning as possessing the, "...observable features of the conduct of planning agencies." Each dimension is thus differentiated on the basis of the variables that define it while the styles within each dimension are distinguished by the measurement of these variables.

The design of Faludi's classification scheme inherently juxtapositions procedural theories, defining each dimension in terms of styles that are polar opposites. Through the use of such polar opposites, each style is established as an archetype. These 'pure' styles of planning are not typically found in practice, but Faludi's classification scheme can be used to determine the state of the strategic regional planning system relative to the styles of planning and, more importantly, it can be used to document changes over time. The six styles and three dimensions of Faludi's classification
scheme are documented in Figure 3.

Shifts between the styles along Faludi's three dimensions of planning are regulated by two types of variables: determinants and constraints. The determinants act as forces that 'push' the planning agency's style of planning towards one mode or the other along each dimension of planning. Because they limit the extent to which a planning style may be practiced, the constraints may be seen as exerting a 'pulling' force: the more constrained a given planning mode becomes, the more it will be transformed into its polar opposite. Faludi's classification scheme is thus an elementary form of contingency theory in which there is no single correct style of planning.

The styles of planning, the dependent variables, are a function of the determinant and constraint variables. In general, the determinants operate as the independent variables while the constraints act as moderating variables. This relationship, however, is not always completely clear, and this lack of distinction reveals a weakness of the classification scheme. The variables, both determinants and constraints, used in Faludi's classification scheme are described in sections 2.5 to 2.7.
Figure 3: Faludi's Opposing Styles Of Planning

Source: Fashioned from Faludi (1973)
2.3 Conceptualizing The Planning System Components

Each of Faludi's dimensions of planning reflect a fundamental aspect of the strategic regional planning system. The blueprint versus process styles of planning primarily deal with the type of document the plan is: whether it is a detailed and rigid blueprint or a more flexible, conceptual strategy that may not even be expressed in spatial terms. The rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental styles of planning correspond to the type of planning agency that is in place: whether it is a centralized planning organization with a comprehensive perspective of what it plans for or whether it is one a series of isolated planning bodies with a partial or fragmented perspective of what is plans for. While the normative versus functional styles of planning deal with the type of planning process, the term 'process' in this dimension refers to the political ends rather than the technical means of planning. This dimension considers whether the planners seek to challenge or modify the goals set for their planning agency, i.e., normative planning, or whether the planners merely formulate objectives, through plans, policies, and programs, to satisfy these goals, i.e., functional planning.

It is now possible to define strategic regional planning as a system whose components--the type of plan, the type of planning agency, and the type of planning process--can be measured against Faludi's three dimensions of planning. Figure 4 illustrates this relationship.
Figure 4: Components And Dimensions Of Strategic Regional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT OF STRATEGIC REGIONAL PLANNING</th>
<th>CORRESPONDING DIMENSION OF PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Type Of Plan</td>
<td>Blueprint Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versus Process Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Type Of Planning Agency</td>
<td>Rational Comprehensive Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versus Disjointed Incremental Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Type Of Planning Process (ongoing)</td>
<td>Normative Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versus Functional Style Of Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commenting on regional planning and social change, Gillingwater (1975, p. 72) states that, "Government determines the nature and practice of planning qua what is planned and public planning qua agencies in turn influence the nature and practice of planning." Gillingwater uses the reciprocal relationship between planning and government to structure Faludi's (1973) classification scheme. In particular, Gillingwater develops a schema where planning interacts with government at four levels. These four levels of planning context, from most general to most specific, include, ideological characteristics, institutional characteristics, operational characteristics, and administrative characteristics. Gillingwater argues that these levels overlap and can be nested into three tiers of planning-governmental interaction that correspond to Faludi's three dimensions of planning: blueprint versus process planning occurs at an ideological-institutional level; rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental planning occurs at an institutional-operational level; and normative versus functional planning occurs at an operational-administrative level.

Gillingwater's analysis of Faludi's classification scheme also provides support for his study's assignment of planning dimensions to the components of strategic regional planning. The ideological relationship between government and planning will determine the type of plan that is prepared, either a
blueprint or process (concept) plan. Similarly, the institutional level corresponds to the type of planning agency and the administrative level corresponds to the type of ongoing planning process.

Gillingwater's analysis provides a more structured synthesis than that provided by Figures 3 and 4, however. By observing that the ideological context of planning is much broader than its administrative context, Gillingwater is able to arrange Faludi's three dimensions of planning into a nested hierarchy: see Figure 5. The key point made by Gillingwater is that Faludi's three dimensions of planning actually comprise different aspects of a larger, single planning 'continuum'--the system of strategic regional planning. Just as administration-operations (the type of planning process) is set within an institutional context (the type of planning agency), the normative versus functional styles of planning can be subsumed within the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental styles of planning. Operational details and institutional arrangements similarly follow from the basic ideology underlying planning and so the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental styles of planning can be set within those of blueprint versus process planning.

Faludi's (1973) classification scheme can be considered indeterminant in the sense that is not capable of generating any a priori hypotheses, of being able to predict interactions
Figure 5: Gillingwater's Levels Of Planning Context
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between the dimensions of planning or what pattern of shifts will result from a given starting point. However, Gillingwater's (1975) depiction of Faludi's classification scheme as a single planning continuum offers a useful framework for interpreting shifts along the dimensions of planning. The alignment of the planning dimensions provides two common ends or polarities: a 'strong' end and a 'weak' end. At the strong end of the planning continuum, the styles of planning include blueprint, rational comprehensive, and normative planning. Conversely, the process, disjointed incremental, and functional styles of planning are found at the other, 'weak' end of the planning continuum. The terms strong and weak, of course, are only abstract concepts like the pure styles of planning themselves. It is the direction of movement rather than absolute positions that is importance in the interpretation of Lower Mainland events and issues.

2.4 Operationalizing The Dimensions Of Planning

The remainder of this chapter provides a method for applying Faludi's (1973) classification scheme, a typology of planning styles, to the events and issues of Lower Mainland planning. Since Faludi's classification scheme is not capable of generating hypotheses of how the dimensions of planning might interact over time, the level of analysis in this study is primarily descriptive. The approach to interpreting the case study is thus an inductive one in which the objective is to
use a single theoretical framework to synthesize recognizable patterns from a large number of seemingly independent issues and events.

Gillingwater's (1975) hierarchical structuring of Faludi's classification scheme provides an indication of the order and emphasis to be placed on the planning dimensions during the interpretation of the Lower Mainland study. Since the most general or abstract levels of planning provide a context for the more specific levels or dimensions of planning, the four time periods of the study, see section 3.1, are interpreted in this order: blueprint versus process planning, rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental planning, and normative versus functional planning. While the dimensions of planning inherently overlap, this ordering helps to reduce the repetition of planning events and issues.

Each of the eight variables that Faludi uses to define the three dimensions of planning are themselves broad concepts or paradigms composed of numerous sub-variables. Since Faludi also describes the variables in terms of polar opposites, each of the variables could be characterized as a semi-independent dimension. It is thus necessary to briefly restate Faludi's variables and operationally define them in the context of the Lower Mainland study. These operational definitions, which are provided following general descriptions of each planning dimensions's basic concepts, serve two purposes. Firstly, the
definitions describe the theoretical nature and range of each variable. This makes it possible to decide which study events and issues ought to be interpreted under which variables and dimensions of planning. Secondly, the operational definitions help to establish the parameters or conditions that indicate the direction and magnitude of shifts along the dimensions of planning.

A background review of the events and issues leading up to the start of the main, 1969-1981 study of Lower Mainland planning is provided in the next chapter: see section 3.2. All of the agencies and committees involved with Lower Mainland planning in this study are listed in the Glossary, p. xiv, along with their abbreviations. The political and staff positions of the Lower Mainland's system of strategic regional planning are charted in Figures 11 and 12, respectively: see section 2.6.

2.5 The Plan: Blueprint Versus Process Planning

2.5.1 General

The primary issue underlying the polarity of blueprint versus process planning is that of flexibility. In general, the blueprint style of planning is associated with long term planning and rigid, detailed plans while the process style of planning is associated with short term planning and, if any document exists at all, with less specific concept plans.
Engineering projects and detailed land use regulations, i.e., zoning by-laws, are products of a blueprint style of planning. Concept plans for the regional decentralization of urban growth and the less formal, ongoing programs associated with 'urban renewal' are examples of process planning. In determining which style of planning will prevail, Faludi (1973) employs two interdependent variables: certainty of image and degree of control. Movement to either style of planning, however, may be constrained by a third variable: internal and external time lags. Figure 6 illustrates the effects of these variables on the blueprint and process styles of planning.

The blueprint style of planning states Faludi (1973, p. 131) is an approach, "...whereby a planning agency operates a programme though to attain its objectives with certainty." A high degree of control is needed to ensure the level of certainty required in blueprint planning and, commensurately, the assumption that the objectives of the blueprint plan will be attained is often used to justify a high degree of control. With no feedback permitted to modify it during implementation, the blueprint plan remains static over time until its image is fully realized on the ground. Faludi (1973, p. 132) criticizes the blueprint style of planning, noting that, "Where blueprint planning is practised, uncertainties notwithstanding, it is based on grossly simplified assumptions making for its inefficiency and heavy-handedness."
Figure 6: The Blueprint Versus Process Styles Of Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blueprint Planning</th>
<th>Process Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DETERMINANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Control Over Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRAINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Internal Time Lags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>External Time Lags</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fashioned from Faludi (1973, p. 138)
In contrast, the process style of planning is an approach, "...whereby programmes are adopted during their implementation as and when incoming information requires such changes." (Faludi 1973, p. 132). Feedback during implementation means that the process plan will undergo a continuous 'process' of modification. Because there is less certainty that the plan will attain its initial objectives, less control is justified. Less control, in turn, subjects the planners to a higher level of uncertainty, inherently making them risk takers. The strength of process planning is that it avoids stalls or complete failure should the plan not attain its original objectives. Here Faludi (1973, p. 132) notes that,

...rather than lapsing into inaction while striving to provide a firm image, process planning proceeds by implementing some elements of a programme and hopes that the information thus generated will result in more knowledge concerning the next stages.

While the variables certainty of image and degree of control are defined separately below, it is the combination of both spatial detail and regulatory authority that determines movements between the blueprint and process styles of planning. Faludi's schema does not specifically take into account the situation where a concept plan, having a generalized, somewhat fuzzy image, may actually require an

---

1 The term 'process' as a style of planning refers to the changing state of the plan's contents rather than the nature of the ongoing planning process itself which is dealt with under normative versus functional planning, section 2.7
increased degree of control to ensure implementation. With a veto or 'call in' authority over local, i.e., municipal, zoning and development by-laws, the strategic regional planning agency can afford to step back from the daily operations of the municipal level and concentrate of the broader implications of its plan policies. Such a countervailing balance between certainty of image and degree of control defines a mode of planning that lies between the blueprint and process styles.

2.5.2 Certainty Of Image (operational definition)

Faludi (1973, p. 143) defines the variable certainty of image as, "Indications in planning reports and from planners of firmness of assumptions underlying programmes." Here, the image of the strategic plan is operationally defined as the future pattern of urban settlement, i.e., development concept, that the regional planning agency is committed to implement by the end of the plan's time horizon, typically some 25 years. In regions with physical constraints to urban growth, including the Lower Mainland, strategic plans have usually been formulated with a development concept that expresses a nodal pattern of urban settlement. The basic goal of such a development concept is to achieve a clear separation, a dichotomy, between urban nodes or centers and the surrounding rural and agricultural areas in which these centers are embedded. By implementing a nodal settlement pattern where
growth is distributed to the most suitable urban centers and staged to radiate outward from these centers, the region is able to make the most efficient and effective use of its land resources.

The certainty of the development concept's image can be measured, at any point in time, by the level of spatial detail contained in the plan. Implementing its development concept through the use of land use designations or zones with regulatory policies, (use, lot size, and redesignation) and corresponding small scale plan maps, the blueprint type of plan has a detailed or certain image. The concept type of plan, with its development concept described by diagrams or large scale maps and supported by general policies, including such tools as growth share targets, has a less detailed and certain image. In essence, both the blueprint and process (concept) plans can be seen as strategic plans, but at different levels of spatial and policy detail.

While the formulation of land use designations provides an indication of a shift towards a blueprint style of planning, it is possible to retain such designations and still shift back towards a process style of planning. The certainty of the plan's image and, commensurately, the type of plan can thus be measured by the 'tightness' of the land use designations; how well they collectively reflect the development concept's image of a nodal settlement pattern with
a sharp dichotomy between urban centers and surrounding rural and agricultural areas.

Figure 7 illustrates the relationship between the effective number of residential land use designations and the overall steepness of what can be termed the 'rural to urban density transition gradient': the slope collectively defined by the minimum lot sizes, in dwelling units per acre, of the land use designations' subdivision policies. With few designations, the slope or gradient is steep, and the sharpness of the urban-rural dichotomy is preserved. An increase in the effective number of designations 'flattens' the gradient and 'softens' the urban-rural dichotomy. The former situation describes a certain image and blueprint style of planning while the latter situation describes a less certain or 'fuzzy' image and a process style of planning.

If the development concept loses all credibility, then the strategic plan is effectively repealed. The image of the region, from this stage onwards, is defined through whatever ad hoc planning for the region may take place. Affording little certainty, ad hoc planning is perhaps the most pure form of process planning that can be achieved while still being considered as planning. The extension of the regional plan downwards, to completely replace municipal zoning, would similarly result in the strongest form of blueprint planning possible. Strategic regional planning thus occupies a range
Figure 7: Rural To Urban Density Transition Gradient

Steep Slope: Sharp Urban-Rural Dichotomy

Flat Slope: Soft Urban-Rural Dichotomy
between these two extremes.

2.5.3 Degree Of Control (operational definition)

Faludi (1973, p. 143) defines control over the environment in terms of, "Legal powers; administrative resources; financial assets; type of power structure and administrative system; informal controls." Here, degree of control is operationally defined as the power or 'teeth' behind the strategic plan: the formal or legislative authorities granted to the planning agencies administering the plan. Land use planning in the Lower Mainland, illustrated in Figure 8, involves four levels of government administration. From the perspective of blueprint versus process planning, the degree of control can be measured at two levels: Lower Mainland (LMPRP) and Regional District. At the provincial level, land use planning controls inherently displace the authorities of the Lower Mainland and Regional District levels. Provincialy introduced legislative changes or proposed changes with the potential to constrain local land use planning decisions and actions are thus dealt with under the variable autonomy, section 2.7.2.

The Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP) and Regional District's legislative authorities over land use planning, summarized in column B of Figure 9, remained constant during
Figure 8: Degree Of Control And Level Of Authority
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### Figure 9: Measurement Of Degree Of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A) DECREASING CONTROL: delegated formal authority</strong></td>
<td>formulation of criteria to classify RD ORP amendment applications and the delegation of minor amendments to the sole jurisdiction of RD Boards to no LMPRP review function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) EXISTING CONTROL: 1969-81</strong></td>
<td>protection of LM development concept through review of and recommendations on RD ORP amendment applications, an advisory role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C) INCREASING CONTROL: informal or ultra vires authorities</strong></td>
<td>persuasion and influence with RD Boards to a veto authority or 'call in' role over RD ORP amendments to full approval role authority over the adoption and amendment of RD ORPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULATORY AUTHORITY</strong></td>
<td>formulation of conditionally structured land use designation policies to the relaxation of the criteria (servicing standards) and/or limits placed on such conditional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional District</strong></td>
<td>delegating authority to the municipalities by permitting ORP amendments to occur without going through the formal amendment process (making amendments by resolution rather than by by-law) and failing to take to court those municipalities with development by-laws not in conformity with the ORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMPRP</strong></td>
<td>formulation of generalized 'broad brush' land use designation policies and plan maps to ensure the implementation of the LM development concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional District</strong></td>
<td>authority to amend the policies and plan maps of ORP land use designations and enforcement of those designations by taking to court those municipalities passing development by-laws not in conformity with the ORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMPRP</strong></td>
<td>attempts to increase level of spatial resolution beyond 'a general scheme without detail' and transform RD ORPs into zoning type plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULATORY AUTHORITY</strong></td>
<td>failing to make explicit provisions for ORP text (policy) amendments, establishing criteria with which to deem municipal development by-laws 'to conform' to the ORP (veto authority) and attempting to bring non-conforming municipal development by-laws into agreement with the ORP (approval role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITIVE AUTHORITY</strong></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional District</strong></td>
<td>an unincorporated, advisory agency, lacking the authority to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMPRP</strong></td>
<td>attempting to use, or belief in, the LM development concept (regional structure map and growth share targets) as a means of stimulating or fostering growth in particular areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITIVE AUTHORITY</strong></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional District</strong></td>
<td>authority to provide infrastructure through joint municipal agreement, but lacking authority to impose taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMPRP</strong></td>
<td>efforts to include infrastructure provisions in land use designation policies and plan map schedules and so require municipalities to provide infrastructure that they have not individually agreed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 1969-1981 study period.\textsuperscript{2} With each Regional District having adopted its own Official Regional Plan (ORP), the LMPRP's function was to maintain the integrity of the Lower Mainland's development concept as contained in the 1966 ORP and the earlier concept plan, \textit{Chance And Challenge}: see image of society, section 2.6.2. The LMPRP, established by Order-In-Council 4116/68, did not have any authority over Regional District land use planning, but it did have a responsibility to review municipal applications to amend the ORPs and to make recommendations on these applications before any decision was taken by the Regional District Board concerned. Lacking the veto authority necessary for exercising control over ORP amendments, the LMPRP was thus created to be an advisory planning agency.

The Regional Districts had a statutory, 'shall' obligation to prepare Regional Plans and could, by by-law, adopt them as Official Regional Plans (ORP): see Appendix 3. To adopt or amend a ORP required a majority vote on the Regional District Board. Section 807 (1) of the, \textit{Municipal Act}, (RSBC 1979), defined an Regional Plan as a, "...general scheme without detail for the projected uses of land within the regional district, including the location of major highways." With regard to form, section 807 (2) stated that, "A regional plan or plans may be expressed in maps, plans, reports, or by other

\textsuperscript{2} The Regional Districts' planning function was repealed in 1983, see section 3.7.
means." The Act, however, did not specify the level of spatial resolution, and thus the term 'general scheme' implicitly limited the four Lower Mainland Regional Districts and their 'overseeing' LMPRP to a 'broad brush', conceptual type of plan. Here, it can be seen that the strategic plan's level of spatial resolution, i.e., plan map scales, effects degree of control in addition to certainty of image.

The legislation did not grant the Regional Districts a countervailing veto or approval role authority over municipal development by-laws to compensate for their inability to exercise control through spatially detailed land use regulations. Section 812 (1) of the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), only stated that Municipalities, "...shall not enact any provision or initiate any work which would impair or impede the ultimate realization of the objectives of the official regional plan...." Thus, the onus was on the Regional Districts to prove, in Court, that an offending municipal development by-law, including zoning or Official Community Plans (OCP), had violated the objectives of the ORP. The legislative provisions for OCPs, in fact, had been incorporated into the, Municipal Act, in 1977, the year just prior to the onset of the Update process. Since the policy contents of OCPs were more extensively defined in the Act than for ORPs, the Province's creation of OCP's, without commensurately increasing the authority of ORPs, also created the potential for conflict between the municipal and Regional
While the preparation of an ORP was a statutory obligation for the Regional Districts, section 809 (6,a) of the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), clearly stated that an ORP, does not "...commit the Regional Board or any other local government body to undertake any project suggested or outlined in it."
The Regional Districts' authorities to restrict or regulate development, albeit limited, were stronger than its positive authorities or ability to cause development through the provision of infrastructure: roads, water, sewer, and other public works. In keeping with their creation, 1965, as 'joint service boards', see section 3.2, the Regional Districts could only provide any given facility or service on a cost sharing basis with the support of a majority vote from their member municipalities. No exception was made for ORPs; section 809 (6,b) of the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), stated that the adoption of a OSP (or ORP) does not, "...authorize the Regional Board ...to proceed with a project except in accordance with the procedures and restrictions laid down by any Act."

The formal, legislative authorities granted to the Regional Districts inherently defined a level of control somewhere between the blueprint and process style of planning. With less formal authority, the LMPRP's degree of control was more biased towards the process style of planning. Movement
between the two styles of planning, as based on degree of control, can be determined by measuring changes in effective authority.

Movement towards a blueprint style of planning, at either the Lower Mainland or Regional District levels, will be assisted by implicit and explicit efforts to increase the existing degree of control. During the formulation or implementation of the strategic plan, the planning agencies may implicitly extend their authority through persuasion and the interpretation of any seemingly ambiguous wordings or sections in the legislation pertaining to land use planning. Such efforts are akin to the establishment of precedents in case law. In addition, the planning agencies may explicitly challenge the legislation governing land use planning by formulating more extensive positive and regulatory authorities into a new strategic plan. This approach offers the planning agencies the opportunity to 'test case' desired increases in authority without directly breaking the law: until the draft strategic plan containing the proposed increases in authority is adopted, it can not be found ultra vires, i.e., unlawful, with respect to existing legislation. The specific elements of increased control, listed in column C of Figure 9, are identified and expanded upon in the interpretation of Lower Mainland planning events and issues.

Where the LMPRP and Regional Districts implicitly or
explicitly delegate their formal planning authorities downwards, the resulting decrease in control will contribute to a shift towards the process style of planning. Implicit delegation of authority involves the subtle weakening of regulatory ORP policies through amendments or reformulations that expose these regulatory policies to further amendment pressures and relaxations. Explicit delegation occurs where the Regional District level of planning, by ORP amendment or reformulation, specifically delegates its legislatively assigned regulatory authorities and responsibilities to the municipal level of planning.

Since the Lower Mainland and Regional District levels were not specifically assigned positive authorities, i.e., infrastructure provisions, this authority could not be delegated. Decisions not to continue with efforts to incorporate positive authorities into the ORP can be seen as a decrease or loss of potential authority, though. Again, the specific elements of decreased control, listed in column A of Figure 9, are identified and expanded upon in the interpretation of Lower Mainland planning events and issues.

2.5.4 Time Lags (operational definitions)

Internal time lags can be defined as the length of time taken by the strategic regional planning agency to respond to feedback from the local level. Faludi (1973, p. 143) measures
internal time lags as, "Time taken for programme formulation extracted from reports, case studies, interviews, statistics." In the Lower Mainland study, internal time lags can be measured from two perspectives: the length of time that feedback pressures are held back from planning staff by senior officials and politicians, i.e., the 'political component', and the length of time that is taken by the planning staff in formulating appropriate plans, policies, and programs to resolve feedback problems, i.e., the 'technical' component. Long internal time lags are essential for blueprint planning since this style of planning requires the plan's image to remain constant until the plan is fully implemented. Where internal time lags are short, modifications to the plan's image will constrain the style of planning towards process planning.

External time lags can be defined as the length of time taken by the local planning agency to respond to the plan, policies, and programs formulated by the strategic planning agency once these documents have been completed and released. Faludi (1973, p. 143) measures external time lags as, "Time earmarked for completion of projects; time after which first results are expected to become available." In the Lower Mainland study, external time lags can also be measured from two perspectives: the length of time taken by the municipal level to assess the potential impact of the strategic regional planning agency's decisions and the further length of time taken to formulate a
response. The two components of feedback in external time lags are thus recorded objections to the plan and applications to amend the plan. To maintain a blueprint style of planning long external time lags are required. The faster the municipal planning agency can assess the potential impact of the plan and provide feedback, the sooner the certainty of the plan's image will be undermined.

In those instances where a strategic planning agency formulates a plan amendment, either a modification or new policy, on behalf of a local planning agency, the feedback, i.e., a solution to a perceived problem, is considered to be part of the strategic planning agency's work program and is treated as an internal time lag. It can thus be seen that internal and external time lags are not separate variables, but interactive ones.

In particular, the relative balance between the length of internal and external time lags may serve as a constraint to either style of planning. Changes to the plan's image and the certainty with which it is expressed will be accelerated, i.e., positive feedback, when the strategic planning agency makes changes to the plan as fast or faster than the local level can respond to the plan changes. In these situations, where the length of the internal time lags are equal to or shorter than the external time lags, the style of planning will likely be constrained towards process planning. A
blueprint style of planning requires that the internal time lags be longer than the external time lags. Under these circumstances, where the strategic planning agency is slower to respond to criticisms than the local level takes to generate such criticism, the plan's image and the certainty with which it is expressed will be stabilized, i.e., negative or 'dampened' feedback.

2.6 The Planning Agency: Rational Comprehensive Versus Disjointed Incremental Planning

2.6.1 General

Faludi (1973) uses Lindblom's (1959, 1965) analysis of rational deductive or synoptic planning to outline the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental styles of planning. Here, the key issue is comprehensiveness and the breadth of planning at any one point in time rather than any one planning activity over time. The incremental aspects of Braybrook and Lindblom's (1963) 'disjointed incrementalism' is thus dealt with under Faludi's flexibility dimension, i.e., blueprint versus process planning. To outline the 'comprehensibility' dimension, Faludi uses three variables, of which one, image of society, is a determinant: see Figure 10. The other two variables, scope of image and relative autonomy are constraints. Since (relative) autonomy is also the prime determinant of the last planning dimension, normative versus functional planning, see section 2.7, it is not operationally
Figure 10: The Rational Comprehensive Versus Disjointed Incremental Styles Of Planning
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Source: Fashioned from Faludi (1973, p. 156)
defined here or applied to the Lower Mainland study as part of the comprehensibility dimension.

Faludi (1973, p. 155) defines the rational comprehensive style of planning as an approach, "...whereby the programmes put forward for evaluation cover the available action space and where the action space has itself been derived from an exhaustive definition of the problem to be solved." While Faludi's 'action space' refers to both ends and means, the emphasis in this dimension is on means, those alternative plans, policies, and programs that lie within the planning agency's mandate. The full consideration of ends, the legislatively defined goals of the planning agency itself, is the subject of the next dimension, see section 2.7, where the variable of autonomy is dealt with.

Reflecting a single image of society, rational comprehensive planning is determined by the existence of 'macro decision makers' and centralized planning. The planning agency's ability to engage in a rational comprehensive style will be constrained where it lacks complete information about the environment that it plans for. If the planning agency's scope does not encompass the entire environment effecting the agency's mandate, then the requirement for complete information will largely be dependent on the planning agency's connections with other relevant agencies.
In contrast to rational comprehensive planning, disjointed incremental planning is an approach, "...where the programmes considered by any one planning agency are limited to a few which deliberately do not exhaust the available action space, and where that action space is itself ill-defined." (Faludi 1973, p. 155). The basic practise, then, of disjointed incremental planning is to limit the alternative plan options, and associated policies and programs, considered for evaluation to a small number that do not greatly differ from the status quo, a strategy the Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963) refer to as 'margin dependent choice'. Moreover, the range of alternatives considered in this style of planning is further reduced to those for which sufficient information is available. The lack of complete information, reflecting an absence of centralized planning, results in a series of fragmented, atomistic images of society that are held by numerous planning agencies. By working together and creating numerous information linkages with each other, it is possible for otherwise isolated planning agencies to serve as a constraint against disjointed incremental planning.

2.6.2 Image Of Society (operational definition)

Image of society, the determinant of rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental planning, is operationally defined here as the image of the Lower Mainland that is collectively held by its strategic planning agencies. In
particular, this image is not only contained in plans, but in review reports, discussion papers, and meeting minutes. Images of society, states Faludi (1973, p. 176) can be measured in terms of the, "Centralization or decentralization of decision-making structure and procedures." In the Lower Mainland study, the structure and procedures of strategic regional planning are interpreted as interdependent sub-variables.

Prior to 1969, one planning agency, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board (LMRPB), was charged with the responsibility of providing strategic regional planning for the physically limited Lower Mainland and its 28 separate, but functionally interdependent administrative sub areas, i.e., Cities, Municipalities, and Electoral Areas (unincorporated). The LMRPB, functioning as an organization, prepared two plans that collectively expressed a holistic, 'top down' image of the Lower Mainland: a concept plan, Chance And Challenge, (1963), and a more spatially detailed zoning or blueprint type of plan, the 1966, Official Regional Plan, (ORP): see section 3.2.4 to 3.2.5.

By Order-In-Council 4116, December 1968, see Appendix 2, the Province disbanded the LMRPB and replaced it with the Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP). The Panel's purpose was to coordinate the land use planning activities of the Lower Mainland's four new Regional Districts: Greater
Vancouver (GVRD), Central Fraser Valley (CFVRD), Dewdney Alouette (DARD), and Fraser Cheam (RDFC). The Regional Districts, created as joint municipal 'service boards' under a previously enacted amendment to the, Municipal Act, (SBC 1965), inherited the general provisions, i.e., text, of the 1966 ORP and the plan maps pertaining to their specific areas. The political and staff structure of the LMPRP-Regional District planning system are illustrated in Figures 11 and 12.

By reviewing and making recommendations on applications to amend the Regional Districts' ORPs, the LMPRP was to maintain the holistic image of the Lower Mainland that had been formulated in the 1966 ORP. The LMPRP, a standing committee composed of elected representatives appointed from within each Regional District Board, was thus established in an advisory planning capacity. Under the provisions of Order-In-Council 4116/68, the LMPRP was empowered to establish its own procedural by-laws and share costs 'incidental' to its review function between the Regional Districts on a per capita basis. The post 1969 arrangements thus left a somewhat ambiguous, but potentially flexible set of decision making structures and procedures in place to conduct long term land use planning in the Lower Mainland. More than an ad hoc planning body, yet less than a formal planning organization, the LMPRP can be classified as a strategic regional planning agency.

It has been noted that the degree of centralization in the
Figure 11: The Strategic Regional Planning System—Political

* While not a regulation, the second, alternate, Regional District Board appointee to the LMPRP was typically the Planning Committee Chairman.
Figure 12: The Strategic Regional Planning System - Staff
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--- Dashed lines indicate all the positions filled by a single staff person
decision making structure has a direct impact on the image of society. In particular, a collection of separate planning agencies, i.e., Regional Districts, whose geographic areas cover only a portion of the total environment, i.e., the Lower Mainland, will likely lead to a set of separate, atomistic images and a disjointed incremental style of planning. The creation of a strategic or coordinating planning agency such as the LMPRP inherently centralizes the decision making structure; offers the potential to build a holistic image; and initiates a shift towards a rational comprehensive style of planning.

From this stage onwards, the style of planning will be determined by the centralization of the strategic planning agency's internal structure. A holistic image and a rational comprehensive style of planning is more likely to result when the strategic planning agency acquires its own independent staff planners and has a staff executive to manage the staff planners while expanding upon directives from the agency's political board. In contrast, the decentralization or loss of the strategic planning agency's internal structure will likely fragment its image of society and cause a shift toward a disjointed incremental style of planning.

The strategic planning agency's image of society and style of planning will also be determined by how centralized its data bases and planning procedures are. Through a centralized or
joint work program, the strategic planning agency will be able
to coordinate the formulation and implementation of a single
strategic plan from the top down: from a regional development
concept to a set of regulatory land use designations and to
plan maps that provide a broad spatial framework of land use
allocations for the adoption of local zoning by-laws. Top
down procedures, reflecting a rational comprehensive style of
planning, maintain an holistic image of society. Where the
planning agencies being coordinated by the strategic planning
agency pursue parallel, but independent work programs, the
strategic plan, if one emerges, will likely be a collection of
separate, atomistic images linked by a minimal level of common
interest, i.e., a 'common denominator' plan. The
decentralization of the strategic planning agency's data base
and planning procedures thus leads towards a disjointed
incremental style of planning.

The strategic planning agency's internal structure and
planning procedures interact in determining the agency's style
of planning. Where the strategic planning agency strives for
a holistic image and attempts to use centralized planning
procedures, it will inherently be forced to evolve and
internally structure itself into a planning organization. The
strategic planning organization, in turn, will be more capable
of generating centralized procedures and a holistic image of
society. This relationship can also work in reverse, causing
a shift away from rational comprehensive planning towards
disjointed incremental planning. Where the strategic planning organization's staff functions are reduced in size or eliminated, the 'devolved' planning agency will be less able to maintain centralized planning procedures and a holistic image of society. And, the strategic planning organization that does not fulfill its responsibility of conducting centralized planning may well find itself overtaken by atomistic images from the local level and thus lose its staff function due to inactivity.

2.6.3 Scope of Images (operation definition)

Faludi (1973, p. 167) defines the scope of the planning agency's image in terms of the, "Number of known linkages between the areas of responsibility of planning agencies."

Given the nature of the land use decision making structure in the Lower Mainland, the variable scope of image can act as a powerful constraint on either the rational comprehensive or disjointed incremental styles of planning.

The image of the Lower Mainland held by the LMPRP will be greatly affected by the ties or loyalties between the LMPRP members. Where the members exclusively support the interests of the Regional District Boards from which they were appointed to the LMPRP, the LMPRP's image of the Lower Mainland will be fragmented and so constrain the agency's ability to plan in a rational comprehensive style. Strong ties between the LMPRP
members, where the individual members support the long term interests of the Lower Mainland over the immediate interests of their Regional District, will help to support an holistic image and so serve as a constraint to disjointed incremental planning.

Thus, linkages are operationally defined here as internal and external loyalties or ties rather than just information exchanges. The concept of internal and external linkages can also be applied to the strategic planning organization whose staff has been seconded from the regional sub areas, i.e., Regional Districts. Strong internal linkages amongst the staff members will tend to constrain the rise of atomistic images and any potential shift towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. In contrast, strong external linkages between the strategic planning staff and their own respective planning organizations may well fragment the strategic planning organization's image and serve as a constraint against rational comprehensive planning.

In measuring the scope of the LMPRP's image, i.e., of the Lower Mainland, it is not the absolute number of linkages, but the relative balance between the number of internal and external linkages that is of importance. The centralized, strategic planning organization will be constrained from planning in a rational comprehensive style when the internal linkages amongst its politicians and planners are weaker than
the politician's and planner's external linkages with the planning agencies of their respective areas. Conversely, a less centralized decision making structure, i.e., separate planning agencies, will be constrained from a disjointed incremental style of planning when the external linkages between their politicians and planners are stronger than the internal linkages amongst the politicians and planners of each individual planning agency. A wide scope of image is operative in the latter instance and a series of fragmented, narrow images is operative in the former.

2.7 The Planning Process: Normative Versus Functional Planning

2.7.1 General

The terms normative and functional planning, coined by Friedmann (1966, 1967), bear their origin in the work of two German sociologists, Weber (1947, 1965), and Mannheim (1940). Both Mannheim and Weber have argued that the increasing levels of specialization and task differentiation in industrial society has led to poor coordination and 'functional irrationality' where the planners take their agency's goals as given and are rational with respect to its means only. In essence, the key issue underlying this dimension is responsibility; the planning agency's willingness to analyze both ends and means simultaneously. Faludi (1973) uses two variables to measure the normative versus functional styles of
planning: see Figure 13. The determinant, relative autonomy, measures the planning agency's formal ability to consider and pursue alternate ends or goals. However, the role of the individual planners can serve to constrain movement to either style of planning.

Faludi (1973 p. 175) states that the normative style of planning is an approach, "...whereby the goals and objectives defining, inter alia, the limits of the action space of a planning agency, are themselves the objects of rational choice, and whereby that choice is reviewed as and when the need arises." With a high degree of relative autonomy, the planning agency has the mandate to consider alternative ends in terms of reviewing and selecting means, i.e., solutions in the form of plans, policies, and programs, that are beyond the agency's immediate goals. The planning agency's mandate, under the normative style of planning, avoids the 'means trap' where the means themselves are seen as goals. However, the planning agency's ability to engage in a normative style of planning will be constrained if its planners act in bureaucratic roles and fail to fully exercise the agency's relative autonomy.

In contrast to the normative style of planning, the functional style of planning is an approach, "...whereby the goals and objectives defining, inter alia, the limits of the action space are not questioned." (Faludi 1973, p. 175). The
Figure 13: The Normative Versus Functional Styles Of Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Planning</th>
<th>Functional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DETERMINANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Relative Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Autonomy</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRAINT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Role Of The Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Of The Planner</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fashioned from Faludi (1973, p. 177)
planning agency, under a functional style of planning can neither seek out alternative ends, nor apply its resources to these ends. Because the planning agency's image of the future typically changes over time, the planning agency may be faced with situations where it can not adopt new goals and values to satisfy changing circumstances and demands. Any potential movement towards a functional style of planning, however, may be constrained by planners who assume individual responsibility for the planning agency's ends and act in a political role.

2.7.2 Autonomy (operational definition)

Faludi (1973, p. 183) defines autonomy on the basis of the planning agency's, "Range of legal powers; flexibility in the use of resources for alternate purposes." Faludi uses the term 'relative' autonomy to emphasize the fact that the autonomy of the planning agency is dependent on its relationships with other planning agencies. "In a hierarchical structure," notes Faludi (1973, p. 178), "the relative autonomy of the lower-tier agency is appreciably less than that of the higher tier because the higher-tier agency gives directives to the lower one." The autonomy of land use planning in the Lower Mainland is largely interpreted on the basis of provincial legislation, executive orders, and policy initiatives.
As defined by Order-In-Council 4116/68, the LMPRP's autonomy, its freedom to question its ends and pursue alternate ends, was relatively limited. The LMPRP could not engage in such positive planning activities such as public housing, transit, or land banking; its mandate was exclusively to review applications to amend the 1966 ORP and make its recommendations to the concerned Regional District Board. However, Order-In-Council 4116/68 did authorize the LMPRP to establish its own procedures and to apportion costs 'incidental' to the LMPRP amongst the Regional Districts on a per capita basis. The LMPRP, through, joint Regional District agreements, thus had the autonomy to initiate development monitoring, policy analysis, and policy formulation programs. To the extent that the LMPRP could chose to use or not to use this autonomy, it had some determination over its style of planning, either normative or functional.

In general, the strategic planning agency can increase its autonomy by interpreting any ambiguities in its legislative mandate in a manner that will satisfy its own ends. The senior level of Government, however, has two basic options of its own for regulating local autonomy. Firstly, it can decrease local autonomy by taking over control and, thus centralizing, certain aspects of the strategic planning agency's planning mandate, i.e., agricultural or industrial land uses. Secondly, the senior level of Government can assist or restrict local autonomy by either providing or
withdrawing special funds, i.e., grants, for the strategic planning agency's planning programs.

While the variables control and autonomy are clearly related, they express different aspects of the planning system. Legislative changes introduced by the Province may redistribute authority at the local level, between the LMPRP, Regional Districts, and Municipalities, without affecting the overall autonomy of Lower Mainland land use planning. Conversely, municipal attempts to acquire more autonomy over their land use planning activities may translate into a loss of control for the Regional Districts-LMPRP. The latter aspects of the planning system are primarily dealt with under the dimension of blueprint versus process planning.

2.7.3 Role Of Planner (operational definition)

If autonomy determines the extent to which a planning agency may engage in a normative style of planning or be restricted to a functional style of planning, then the role of the planner can serve as a constraint against either style of planning. Faludi (1973, p. 183) defines the role of the planner through, "Terms of reference and administrative rules; informal arrangements; occurrence of political conflict involving planners." Where the planners question the ends of their agency, they assume a political role and help to constrain any shift towards a functional style of planning.
Planners who act in a bureaucratic role, considering only the optimal means of achieving only certain ends, may constrain the agency's ability to engage in a normative style of planning even if the agency has a considerable degree of autonomy.

The political representatives and planners of the strategic planning agency can use three basic political tactics to defend or emphasize the autonomy of their agency. Firstly, they can delay the actions and decisions taken by the strategic planning agency so as to encourage greater cooperation from other planning agencies. The strategic planning agency's members can also attempt to mobilize public support in favour of the agency's position on controversial issues. Lastly, they can refer politically sensitive issues upwards in a manner that pulls the senior level of government into the strategic planning agency's decision making process.

During the formulation of a new or updated plan, the strategic planning agency has an opportunity to increase its future autonomy. The agency's planners, taking on a political role, may attempt to incorporate provisions into the draft plan that would give the strategic planning agency authorities and functions beyond its existing mandate. While these provisions would be ultra vires or illegal if adopted, the strategic planning agency can use them as a 'trial balloon' or test case for seeking new ends.
The senior level of Government, however, can block the strategic planning agency's efforts by refusing to recognize the new strategic plan and failing to commit its ministries to the plan as official policy. Retreating into a bureaucratic role, the planners will then delete the authorities and functions desired by the strategic planning agency as they conform to the existing legislative limits of the agency's autonomy. Thus, the new, 'test case' authorities incorporated in the draft strategic plan are measures of future control while the actual decision to include or delete them is a measure of the planner's role.
3 INTERPRETATION

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Application

This chapter uses the theoretical framework described in chapter 2, Faludi's (1973) classification scheme, to condense and interpret the study of Lower Mainland events and issues from 1969 to 1981. Excluding the prologue (1942-1969) and the epilogue (1981-1983), the balance of this chapter is divided into four time periods:

1969-1974 The Call For An Update Of The ORP
(section 3.3, p. 111)

1974-1978 The Preparation For The Update Of The ORP
(section 3.4, p. 141)

1978-1979 The Formulation Of An Updated ORP
(section 3.5, p. 178)

1979-1981 The Adoption Of An Updated ORP
(section 3.6, p. 222)

At the start of each of these time periods, a chronology provides a time line and sequential description of the basic events and issues found in the Lower Mainland study. A cross-sectional approach is then taken, and the events and issues are analyzed on the basis of the essential components of any planning system: the plan, the planning agency, and the planning process. Corresponding to these planning system
components, Faludi's three dimensions of planning--blueprint versus process, rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental, and normative versus functional--are used to interpret system changes over time.

For each time period and component of the planning system, the relevant events and issues are interpreted in view of the variables that define the corresponding dimensions of planning. Movements along the dimensions of planning caused by the events and issues of the case study are noted in these interpretations, and the overall pattern of movements, in terms of shifts towards a particular end of a given dimension, are summarized at the beginning of each time period-planning component section. In the next section of this introduction, an overview is provided of the shifts along all three dimensions of planning for all four time periods—a summary of summaries.

While the variables were defined separately in the theoretical framework, chapter 2, they are applied collectively to each of the case study's four time periods in the following sections. Each planning dimension's variables act together in determining and constraining shifts between the dimension's opposing styles of planning. In assessing the conflicting impacts of numerous planning events and issues, the variables can be conceptualized as 'vectors' that, 'added' together, yield an overall or averaged movement along any dimension of
planning for any given time period. The discussion of variables relevant to a given dimension of planning is not conducted in a standard format, but is unique to each time period of the Lower Mainland study. In essence, the basic logic of the study interpretation is inductive: building from the impacts of the events and issues to establishing fundamental changes in the style of planning associated with the components of the strategic regional planning system.

3.1.2 Overview

a) 1969-1974

Between the 1969 dissolution of the LMRPB and the LMPRP's 1974 call for a review and update of the 1966 ORP, there was an overall movement towards the weak end of the planning continuum. The LMPRP attempted to be flexible in accommodating urban growth and this led to a shift away from a blueprint style of planning and towards a process style of planning. Without a centralized decision making structure, the LMPRP found it difficult to promote centralized planning procedures, and the style of planning shifted from rational comprehensive to disjointed incremental. There was also a halting shift towards a functional style of planning, but one constrained by the LMPRP's assumption of a political role. Figure 14 indicates the overall pattern of shifts that occurred along the dimensions of planning during this period.
Figure 14: Movements Along The Planning Continuum 1969-1974
b) 1974-1978

From the Minister of Municipal Affairs' 1974 decision to support an updating of the 1966 ORP to the final, Spring 1978 arrangements for initiating the Update process, there was a considerable oscillation of movement along the dimensions of planning. The movements were initially to the strong end of the planning continuum, then, reversing, towards the weak end and, finally, ending at a stronger position than existed in 1974. Along the blueprint versus process planning dimension, the shifts in the style of planning were tied to the type of plan that was envisioned in the terms of reference for updating the 1966 ORP. The terms of reference, directly related to the structure and procedures of the LMPRP, also effected shifts along the rational comprehensive versus disjointed incremental dimension of planning. Finally, shifts along the normative versus functional dimension of planning were largely dependent on issues relating to the funding and future of Lower Mainland planning. Figure 15 indicates the overall pattern of shifts that occurred along the dimensions of planning during this period.

c) 1978-1979

From the establishment of the WG in Summer, 1978 to the completion of the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP, there was a clear movement towards the strong end of the
Figure 15: Movements Along The Planning Continuum 1974-1978
planning continuum. The shift towards a blueprint style of planning largely resulted from the LMPRP's decision to retain the control provided by land use designations and to draft more detailed plan maps. While the movement was somewhat 'jerky', the LMPRP's operation as a centralized planning organization with centralized planning procedures led to a shift towards a rational comprehensive style of planning. There was also a minor shift towards a normative style of planning, one that was essentially a completion of the shift away from functional planning that occurred at the end of the last period. Figure 16 indicates the overall pattern of shifts that occurred along the dimensions of planning during this period.

d) 1979-1981

Between municipal reviews of the first, July 18, 1978 draft of the updated ORP and the legal adoption of the final draft of the plan at the end of 1981, there was a general slide back to the weak end of the planning continuum. The shift towards a process style of planning came as feedback to the drafts of the updated ORP undermined the certainty of the plan's development concept. With the dissolution of the WG, the LMPRP no longer had a centralized decision making structure capable of maintaining centralized planning procedures, and there was a shift towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. Lastly, a shift towards a functional planning style
Figure 16: Movements Along The Planning Continuum 1978-1979
of planning resulted when the LMPRP failed to secure the level of provincial commitment to the plan that it had originally anticipated. Figure 17 indicates the overall pattern of shifts that occurred along the dimensions of planning during this period.
Figure 17: Movements Along The Planning Continuum 1979-1981
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3.2 Prologue: 1942-1969

3.2.1 The Lower Mainland

Located in the south-west corner of British Columbia, the administrative areas of the Lower Mainland covers some 6,600 square miles of territory. Only 15 percent of this land is habitable, and virtually all of it lies in the Fraser Valley which runs some 90 miles from Hope to the Straits of Georgia: see Figure 18. Boxed in by an ocean to the west, an international boundary to the south, and mountains to the north and east, the Fraser Valley is an oasis in a predominantly mountainous and uninhabitable Province. The Fraser Valley, from the perspective of strategic regional planning, has been the subject of an historical conflict between the urban and agricultural use of land.

The Lower Mainland has been the dominant population center of B.C.: between 1951 and 1981, its population more than doubled to 1.4 million persons. The population of the Lower Mainland, though, has remained remarkably constant in relation to the Province; it has always comprised just over half of the Province's total population. Within the Lower Mainland, Vancouver has been the major focal point of urban growth. From Vancouver, growth has spread east along the Burrard Peninsula and then inland as far as Maple Ridge. Bridges and tunnels have permitted and encouraged urban development to the
Figure 18: Regional Districts In The Lower Mainland

Source: LMORPU-TLC (1978/15)
north and south of Vancouver. Highway construction has also helped stimulate growth up the Fraser Valley in such places as Langley, Aldergrove, and Chilliwack.

The patterns of urban growth and settlement in the Lower Mainland have been documented in further detail in numerous other publications. Here, it is sufficient to note that Lower Mainland planning agencies have been faced with two basic problems. Firstly, there has been the problem of continued growth and the allocation of limited land resources amongst competing urban, agricultural, and reserve-park uses. This problem has been complicated by the Lower Mainland's heartland-hinterland relationship with the Province's highly volatile resource based economy. Secondly, there has been the problem of attempting to distribute growth to less developed but highly suitable areas in the Lower Mainland and elsewhere in the Province.

3.2.2 The Early Years

Prior to WWII, the idea of a Lower Mainland plan had been suggested by the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Association, a voluntary collection of municipal representatives and professionals concerned with planning. No formal action, however, was taken until 1942 when the Province established the Bureau of Post War Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. A preliminary report on the proposed plan for the Lower Mainland
was prepared by the Regional Planning Division of the Bureau in 1945. Amongst other things, the report provided a short range projection of post war demands for public works. As South (1983/1, p. 19) notes, "It was a remarkable document for its time...."

In the following year, 1946, the Vancouver Town Planning Commission produced a further report, *Decentralization And Regional Planning*. This report provided a more comprehensive justification for Lower Mainland planning based on the need to deal with the effects of accelerating rates of urban growth and unplanned decentralization, i.e., sprawl. The report made recommendations on the functions that a Lower Mainland agency should undertake, including the encouragement of local planning and zoning, and how the agency should be organized. Specifically, the report recommended that the Province create an official regional planning agency through a Regional Planning Act. Such an agency was to be composed of representatives from the various municipalities, 25 to 30 persons, who would elect their own executive.

The Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction was disbanded in 1947 and its Regional Planning Division transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs. Yet another year later, the, *Town Planning Act*, (RSBC 1948), was amended to create an agency, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board (LMRPB), similar to that which had been recommended by the Vancouver
Town Planning Commission. While the legislation ordered the LMRPB to prepare a plan, in a systematic and coherent manner, for the future physical development of the Lower Mainland and outlined the functions that the Board was to take into consideration in preparing this plan, it did not provide any regulations or guidelines as to how the Board ought to accomplish this task. Here, South (1983/2, p. 14) comments that,

The municipalities in B.C. had maintained a strong attitude of local autonomy....This meant a resentment of provincial interference of any sort.

The Fraser River flood of May 1948 stimulated interaction amongst the Lower Mainland Municipalities. The flood emphasized the benefits of collective action, "...which led to an accepted and realistic basis for some land use planning concerns, such as the control of flood lands." (South 1983/2, p. 14). Thus, the boundaries previously established by the Bureau were legally designated by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in 1949, as the official boundaries for Lower Mainland planning.

3.2.3 Towards A Plan

By 1952, the staff responsible to the LMRPB Executive had produced its first major work, The Lower Mainland Look Ahead. This report provided a more detailed social and economic
review of the Lower Mainland. In addition, it surveyed land use, soil capabilities, and physical constraints to urban growth, i.e., the floodplain. With respect to the future, the report listed the principles of regional planning, one of the most important being the need to allocate limited land resources amongst competing land uses so as to achieve the greatest possible benefits at the lowest public cost. Another important principle was the need to limit city size and to distribute future urban growth between urban centers, a principle based on Lewis Mumford's (1938) idea that large cities were inherently inefficient with negative economies of scale in the provision of public services. The report also listed sub-principles for each basic type of land use and then presented a geographic compendium of land use problems and opportunities for the Lower Mainland based on these sub-principles. This compendium, together with a concept map proposing a pattern of cities, development areas, and highway linkages, was, in fact, the first rough draft of a plan for the Lower Mainland.

The LMRPB's 1952 report noted that regional plans were long range in nature and not immediately capable of implementation. It argued that the pattern of land settlement amongst 'interlocked' Municipalities should be coordinated through the adoption of guiding principles rather than the formulation of spatially detailed plans. In accordance with its emphasis on daily planning operations, the report recommended that the
LMRPB, "...should extend its activities from the purely regional to direct and assist planning programs in the smaller municipalities." (LMRPB 1952, p.54). Following from this, the report suggested that rural zoning by-laws be enacted in non-urban areas and recommended that the LMRPB consider rural zoning as one of its functions. The report's most important recommendation, though, was that an independent study be made of the need for some kind of regional government and what form and scope it might assume.

3.2.4 A Concept Plan

However, the desire for local autonomy remained strong at the municipal level, especially in unorganized areas, suppressing the formation of any type of regional government for the Lower Mainland. Over the next 10 years, the LMRPB worked on a voluntary contract basis with Municipalities, providing planning services and producing a number of reports on various regional functions related to regional planning. By the early 1960's, the pressures of urban growth had begun to emphasize the Lower Mainland's planning problems: many of the most suitable sites for industrial development were being precluded by urban uses; agricultural land was being consumed at increasing rates; urban land was being developed in inefficient patterns, preventing resubdivision to higher, urban densities later; and more land was generally being subdivided for urban use than could economically be serviced
and absorbed by the market. To counter these trends, the LMRPB produced, in 1963, a concept plan, *Chance And Challenge*, for the systematic development of the Lower Mainland.

Quite simply, the regional concept was that the Lower Mainland develop, "...as a series of cities in a sea of green--a valley of separate cities surrounded by productive countryside and linked by a regional freeway network." (LMRPB 1963, p. 6). This strategy was based on two ideas--build livable cities and respect the land--to which all of the previous regional development principles of the 1952 report were subordinated. Through the application of these principles, urban development would be directed to less arable, upland areas and away from the productive farmland of the floodplain. The concept plan expressed the regional strategy not only as a diagram, but as a map with proposed land uses on it at a highly generalized scale. For each of the broadly described land uses was a set of proposed development policies that included desirable services and minimum lot sizes. Most importantly, though, 'Chance and Challenge' was a clearly articulated and easily understood concept plan, one suitable for building public support for regional planning.

The strategic regional plan proposed by 'Chance and Challenge' was to be, "...a reasonably flexible thing, to be interpreted and amended by municipalities in consultation with the Board." (LMRPB 1963, p. 21). As a framework for local development,
the proposed plan was to be dependent on the subsequent actions of the Municipalities, in developing fully serviced communities within the plan's guidelines, for its success. The plan was to be comprehensively reviewed not less than every five years once adopted.

3.2.5 An Official Plan

Within three years, the LMRPB had garnered enough support for a strategic plan amongst the Municipalities to formulate the, **Official Regional Plan**, (LMRPB 1966) and have it adopted. The 1966 ORP was a refinement of the plan proposed in 'Chance and Challenge'; it set out the principles of the earlier concept plan in precise legal terms. Like 'Chance and Challenge', the ORP had a set of long range map schedules depicting broad classes of land use at a highly generalized scale, 1:204,000. The ORP, though, also had a set of short range map schedules at a sufficiently detailed scale, 1:60,000, to oblige the Municipalities to treat the plan as a serious guideline when formulating local zoning by-laws. Corresponding to the land uses of the short range map schedules, were a set of area designation policies that specified, in greater detail than before, permitted land uses, servicing requirements, and possible use modification. The conditional design of the current stage area designations, in conjunction with the broader development area policies of the long range schedules, inherently provided for staged urban growth.
In essence, the strategy behind the 'cities in a sea of green' concept was directly built into the 1966 ORP's set of land use policies. There were no diagrams in the ORP; the town center plan and the transportation linkages plan, schedules D and E, were still in preparation when the ORP was published and would, in fact, never be completed. Occupying a middle position between being a detailed zoning by-law and being a conceptual, broad brush plan, the ORP was criticized for doing neither job satisfactorily.

The LMRPB attempted to give the ORP a degree of flexibility though its plan amendment section. On application to the LMRPB, a Municipality was to be able to make an outright change to a map schedule designation, but only where the modification policies of the existing and desired designation so permitted. The amendment section placed the onus on the Municipality to provide reasoned justification for any proposed changes not in accordance with the staging strategy contained in the designation policies. In a hierarchical manner, an amendment to any part of the plan would have to be justified in view of the plan's next higher level of authority: from current stage designations, to long range development area policies, to general plan policies (supporting objectives), to regional objectives (goals). It was the tiered structure of the plan, in conjunction with the design of the amendment section, that was to provide the plan with 'rationalized' flexibility in operation.
The statutory nature of the 1966 ORP gave the LMRPB the authority to process amendment applications and placed the LMRPB in a quasi-judicial role. The appeal procedure of the amendment section, however, contained an inherent weakness. While the appeal committees were to consist of three persons, the third appointee was to be selected by an agreement between the other two appointees. In the event of a disagreement, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was to appoint the third appeal committee member. This clause effectively transferred the balance of power out of the LMRPB and up to the Province rather than a stronger, locally accountable regional body.

While municipal zoning and land development by-laws were required to conform to the ORP, South has argued that the Regional Boards were not generally seen as politically important or powerful. South (1983/3, p. 5) notes that, "In almost all cases the mayor appointed the junior alderman to the Regional Planning Board." The LMRPB was also beset with questions of bias and equity. While the rural Municipalities felt that the urban issues of metropolitan Vancouver dominated the LMRPB, the metropolitan Municipalities argued that the one municipality-one vote system disproportionately represented the rural Municipalities in relation to their population.

3.2.6 The Regional Districts

Within Vancouver's metropolitan area, it had become clear that
an advisory planning agency such as the LMRPB could not adequately handle the increasing rate of urban growth and concomitant inter-municipal conflicts. At the Union of B.C. Municipalities (UBCM) 1954 annual convention, the Province presented a proposal to introduce a two tier, metropolitan form of government. Legislation to enable the implementation of this proposal was incorporated into the, Municipal Act, (SBC 1957), despite municipal protests. As the first step towards implementation, a (Vancouver) Metropolitan Joint Committee was established by the Province to study the situation. While its 1959 report, Local Government And Administration In The Lower Mainland Metropolitan Community, stimulated considerable interest and discussion, the Committee failed to reach a firm consensus on any of the recommended options, and the Committee was dissolved in 1962.

The unincorporated Electoral Areas were even more jealous of their local autonomy and 'rural' lifestyles. The provision of services in these areas, however, was rapidly becoming an administrative imbroglio. Commenting on the situation prior to the introduction of the Regional District system, South (1983/4, p. 15) notes that,

The government of the day refused to enforce incorporation and it didn't discourage the incorporation of improvements [improvement districts] to provide essential urban services such as water distribution, fire fighting and so on. The administration of this system was under the Department of Lands, who saw no wrong in this proliferation of quasi-municipal systems.
In 1965, the Province introduced the Regional District system that is still in place today. Originally called 'joint services boards', the Regional Districts lack taxation powers and, as such, are not another level of government. Each Regional District exists as an amalgamation of functions which its Board has decided to provide and administer. The Regional District's Board consists of Directors appointed by and from the Councils of the Regional District's Municipalities and unincorporated Electoral Areas. The number of directors on any Board depends on the absolute size of that Regional District's population while the number of votes held by each Board member is based on his Municipality's proportionate share of the District's total population: see Appendix 3. With each Regional District being able to undertake jointly agreed upon services and with each Municipality retaining the right to opt out of any such service, the Regional District system was introduced as one flexible enough to encompass both urban and rural areas.

3.2.6 LMRPB Demise

The Lower Mainland was divided into four Regional Districts on the basis of areas of mutual interest and the desire to protect local autonomy. By the end of 1967, all four Regional Districts had been legally incorporated: Greater Vancouver (GVRD), Dewdney Alouette (DARD), Central Fraser Valley (CFVRD), and Fraser Cheam (RDFC). There was a countervailing
feeling, however, that the Lower Mainland still comprised a single, larger region, and the LMRPB continued to operate, albeit under unstable conditions.

South cites two reasons for the demise of the LMRPB. Firstly, he notes that, "The members of the Planning Board were unsympathetic to the government in power." In essence, a political dichotomy existed where many of the Lower Mainland municipal representatives, who held leading positions of the LMRPB, belonged to a different party than that in power at the provincial level. The second, 'trigger' issue occurred in 1968. B.C. Rail, a Crown Corporation, announced two major construction projects for Delta: a coal terminal at Roberts Bank and an industrial park on a large and nearby track of land. Both of these proposals were contrary to the 1966 ORP, and the LMRPB staff assumed an advocacy position, writing 'protest' reports that had not been officially approved by the Board. "The government," states South (1983/5, p. 11), "took the Roberts Bank affair as an action against them and dismembered the LMRPB gave the regional function to today's four regional districts."
3.3 The Call For An Update Of The ORP: 1969-1974

3.3.1 Chronology

This period begins with the establishment of the Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP) and ends with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs' firm support for the updating of the 1966 ORP. Figure 19 provides a time line chronology of the events and issues that the LMPRP dealt with between 1969 and 1974.

Following the March 1969 dissolution of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board (LMRPB), there was a five month transitional period, (1), presided over by the GVRD, before the first meeting of the LMPRP in August 1969. Even though the establishment of the LMPRP had proceeded more smoothly than expected, the LMPRP soon found itself having to cope with an increasing workload of applications to amend the 1966 ORP. Consequently, the LMPRP requested the Minister Of Municipal Affairs to amend provincial legislation so as to grant the Regional District Planning Committees the authority to screen amendment applications and deal with the minor ones prior to review by the LMPRP, (4). Due to 'administrative difficulties', however, the LMPRP abandoned the amendment classification scheme several months later.

The LMPRP also dealt with the subdivision and servicing
Figure 19: Chronology Of Events And Issues 1969-1974

1. Dissolution of LMRPB, to first LMPRP meeting

2. Adoption of URB-2 amendment, to suggestion that developers install sewers in advance of trunks

3. RDFC request for excision of farm homes, to approval by the LMPRP

4. First LMPRP resolution to formulate a classification scheme, to the repeal of this resolution

5. GVRD proposal for new floodplain and flood-proofing definitions, to LMPRP adoption

6. RDFC request for local autonomy over servicing, to LMPRP decision

7. Establishment of an inter-Regional District Floodplain Committee, to LMPRP tabling of its final report

8. Valley Regional Districts propose their own URB-2 amendment, to the first call for an ORP Update

9. Second proposal for a classification scheme, to LMPRP adoption of scheme

Agricultural Land Freeze
LMPRP request for a new RURAL RESIDENTIAL designation, to staff formulation and rejection of a RRL-4 schedule

LMPRP call for clarification of LMPRP role, to the submission of a report by a LMPRP staff sub-committee

LMPRP referral of RRL-4 designation back, to the Regional Districts for final adoption

LMPRP meetings with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the (Agricultural) Land Commission

LMPRP Secretary's brief on the LMPRP's future role, to the (Agricultural) Land Commission Workshop to the LMPRP's decision to proceed with the ORP Update
policies of the 1966 ORP's URBAN and RURAL land use designations during the 1969-1970 period. An amendment to the URB-2 designation, introduced by the GVRD, but not immediately accepted by the other Regional District Boards, created an imbalance in both servicing standards and urban land supply throughout the Lower Mainland, (2). A GVRD proposal to adopt stricter servicing standards did not resolve this situation; it fact, it later strengthened the demand for local autonomy in regulating servicing. The RDFC's request for the excision of farm homes in rural designated areas was a more easily solved problem, and the LMPRP quickly incorporated the necessary changes into the 1966 ORP, (3). The broader questions pertaining to appropriate uses and servicing in RURAL areas would remain in the background until after the Province's 1973 agricultural land freeze.

From early 1971 onwards, the LMPRP found itself facing not only more redesignation amendments involving larger areas, but also text amendments of increasing policy significance. In particular, the LMPRP's attention was focused on urban and floodplain policies during the 1971-1972 period. The LMPRP's adoption of more precise floodplain and floodproofing definitions, (5), had two effects. Firstly, it strengthened the resolve of Municipalities adversely affected by the floodplain, i.e., Chilliwack Township, to press even harder for local discretion in setting appropriate servicing standards in terms of sewer installation and parcel size, (6).
In this instance, the LMPRP did not acquiesce to municipal demands for increased autonomy, but worked out a compromise solution whereby the Regional Districts were granted the authority to make exceptions to the 1966 ORP's urban servicing standards to meet special local conditions. Secondly, the relative stringency of the new definitions helped to increase the LMPRP's interest in the Province's Fraser River Flood Control Program, (7). However, the staff sub committee that was formed by the LMPRP to liaise with the Province did not discover any technical solutions to the problem of providing development flexibility to the Municipalities most affected by the floodplain while also upholding the floodplain policies of the 1966 ORP.

Running concurrently with the latter two issues was the case of the URB-2 amendment, (8). None of the Lower Mainland Regional Districts, with the exception of the GVRD, had yet adopted this LMPRP proposal for fear that it would delegate too much authority to the Municipalities. The LMPRP members from these Regional Districts continued to question the validity of the URB-2 amendment up to October 1972. At this time, the uncertainty over the URB-2 policies and areas designated URB-2 had become so great that the LMPRP called for a general review of the 1966 ORP.

The Province's December 1972 introduction of an agricultural land freeze, followed by Spring 1973 legislation to create an
(Agricultural) Land Commission and (Agricultural) Land Reserve, had a significant impact on the policies and role of the LMPRP. Since most of the floodplain land in the Lower Mainland was also agricultural land, the freeze inherently relieved the LMPRP of the municipal development pressures that were bearing on the floodplain policies of the 1966 ORP, (7). The agricultural land in the Lower Mainland was also designated RURAL under the 1966 ORP. Accordingly, the freeze represented a potential threat to the LMPRP's autonomy and spurred it into formulating a new set of rural residential uses to be included with the rural policies of the 1966 ORP.

The later agricultural legislation caused the LMPRP's proposed new RRL-4 designation to be modified, but also helped to ensure its ultimate adoption, (12). The creation of this new designation or zone reflected the LMPRP's ability to bring an increasing level of technical sophistication and planning capability to its problems. The LMPRP's final adoption of a classification scheme, whereby the LMPRP staff would classify applications to amend the 1966 ORP as either major or minor, was also another indication of problem solving capability. Again, it was the Province's imposition of what amounted to agricultural zoning on top the 1966 ORP that imbued the classification criteria with sufficient strength to allow the LMPRP to adopt the classification scheme.

From Spring 1972 onwards, the LMPRP members became engaged in
a debate over the level of authority that the LMPRP ought to possess; several LMPRP recommendations on amendment applications had been reversed by Regional District decisions. The Province's 1973 creation of the ALR exacerbated this situation, leaving the LMPRP caught between local demands for more planning autonomy and increased provincial control over land use. Consequently, the LMPRP was left with no alternative but to formally question its role and function in Lower Mainland planning.

By mid 1973, a staff sub committee had prepared a report recommending not only that the LMPRP continue to function, but that the LMPRP be given a stronger voice in planning decisions, (11). LMPRP meetings with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the ALC through late 1973 into 1974 proved to be inconclusive: the LMPRP would carry on, but with no increased responsibility or authority, (13). It quickly became apparent to the LMPRP members that the only way that the LMPRP could have any input into planning involving agricultural land would be to proceed with the update of the 1966 ORP. With the approval and backing of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, the LMPRP made a firm commitment to conduct an update in its July 1974 meeting.
3.3.2 The Plan: Blueprint Versus Process Planning

a) summary

During this period, the LMPRP tried to be flexible in accommodating urban growth, and there was an overall shift towards a process style of planning. Feedback from rejected municipal amendment applications led to external time lags that were comparatively shorter than internal time lags, and this constrained the LMPRP's ability to maintain a blueprint style of planning. The policy amendments, including the relaxation of existing subdivision and servicing policies and the adoption of a new rural residential designation, effectively increased the number of land use designations and flattened the slope of the plan's rural-urban density transition gradient. Since staged growth was the 1966 ORP's most fundamental objective, the weakening of the urban-rural dichotomy undermined the certainty of the plan's image and led to calls for a major review. The policy amendments implicitly delegated some authority downwards, to the Regional District and municipal levels. While decreased controls over land use planning supported the shift towards process planning, the imposition of provincial land use controls, i.e., the ALR, actually helped to stabilized the plan's image and preserve Lower Mainland planning.
b) interpretation

The majority of amendment applications that the LMPRP reviewed were directed at the 1966 ORP's plan maps: applications to redesignate a given area from a low density rural land use designation to a higher density urban designation. When the LMPRP recommended that the Regional District reject such amendments, the Municipalities often resubmitted their applications as policy amendments. These policy amendments were calculated to relax the subdivision and servicing regulations of the given area's existing designation and permit the same type and density of development that would have been possible through redesignation. As the Municipalities and Regional Districts learned how the LMPRP functioned, the rejected redesignation amendments were more quickly transformed into policy amendment applications. This feedback made external time lags relatively shorter than internal time lags, and the resulting pressure on the LMPRP constrained its ability to maintain a blueprint style of planning.

In October 1969, the GVRD was the first Regional District to apply to the LMPRP for an amendment to the text of the 1966 ORP. The LMPRP quickly approved the amendment, one that had been under consideration by the former LMRPB, and recommended that it be adopted by all the Regional Districts. Making the subdivision and servicing policies of the URB-1, ESTABLISHED
URBAN designation applicable to URB-2, DEVELOPING URBAN areas, the amendment permitted subdivision into 20,000 square foot (.46 acre) lots with the provision of a community water supply and Medical Health Officer Approval for septic tanks. The URB-2 designation had previously allowed a minimum lot size of only one acre with the fulfillment of such conditions. By allowing more flexibility with regard to minimum lot size, the amendment created another designation within the URB-2 designation and weakened the ORP's principle objective of staged growth.

In April 1970, the Township of Chilliwhack applied to the LMPRP for an amendment that would allow the owners of rural properties to excise, i.e., separate, their principle residence from the remainder of their farm land. The next designation after the URB-2 designation, RRL-1, ACREAGE RURAL, permitted a minimum lot size of only 5 acres or redesignation, under acceptable conditions, to URB-1. Subsequently, the LMPRP recommended the approval of a text amendment that would permit the subdivision of farm residences (only) into lots between .5 and 2 acres in size. However, this amendment was not enough and, in November 1972, Chilliwhack asked the LMPRP to create a rural residential designation that would permit subdivision of farms into lots between 3 and 5 acres in size.

An LMPRP staff committee, in March 1973, submitted a proposal to the LMPRP that would create a new rural residential
designations, RRL-4. Given Medical Health Officer approval for septic tanks, the RRL-4 designation would permit a minimum lot size of 1.25 acres with a community water system and 2.5 without. While the URB-2 designation proved a transitional stage to URB-1, the proposed RRL-4 designation was to provide a permanent land use, one that would never attain full urban densities. The RRL-4 designation's subdivision policies, which included a provision for cluster development, implicitly legitimized existing, non-conforming suburban development and would have allowed the creation of numerous low density rural-urban settlements. Such development would have violated the 1966 ORP's objective of encouraging staged, outward growth from a limited number of urban nodes—the 'cities in a sea of green strategy'. Together with the URB-2 amendment, the RRL-4 designation increased the total number of land use designations and flattened the slope of the plan's rural to urban density transition gradient. This softening of the plan's urban-rural dichotomy reduced the certainty that the plan's image would be implemented and increased the need for a review of the 1966 ORP.

Since the application of the URB-1 subdivision and servicing policy to URB-2 areas created the possibility that further amendments would be sought to relax these servicing requirements, the URB-2 amendment implicitly delegated regulatory authority downwards, to the municipal level. The LMPRP Secretary, a GVRD staff planner, recognized this
potential loss of land use planning control and recommended a corrective amendment: that the subdivision and servicing policies of the URB-1 and URB-2 designations be altered to require developers to provide local sewers in advance of trunk installation. In April 1971, the LMPRP decided to refer to the Regional District TPC's the entire question of local, i.e., municipal discretion in the provision of urban infrastructure.

The relaxation that the LMPRP Secretary had feared was subsequently applied for. In August 1971, the RDFC, at the request of Chilliwhack Township, asked the LMPRP that lot size in URB-1 areas be placed under the sole jurisdiction of the Municipality concerned. Chilliwhack continued to press for the direct delegation of such authority to the local level and, in October 1971, the LMPRP decided to approve, in principle, the determination of lot sizes by the 'Local Authority'. In January 1972, however, the LMPRP altered this decision and resolved that the 1966 ORP text be amended to replace the term 'Responsible Authority' with 'Regional District' rather than 'Local Authority', i.e., Municipality. This change, and the LMPRP's decision to grant the Regional Districts the authority to make servicing provision exceptions for the purpose of satisfying local conditions merely gave the Regional District an authority that they already possessed.

Shortly after its establishment, the LMPRP considered adopting
a scheme to classify ORP amendment applications: the LMPRP was to review only those amendments of major significance to the development of the Lower Mainland and leave minor amendments to be dealt with by the Regional Districts alone. The LMPRP subsequently introduced a text amendment that modified the 1966 ORP's administrative procedures, making it possible for private individuals to make certain technical adjustments to the boundaries of their properties without applying for a plan amendment. While this text amendment reduced the LMPRP's work load of amendment applications to a manageable level, local pressure for a classification scheme continued.

In November 1972, the CFVRD member of the LMPRP suggested that all applications to amend the 1966 ORP's current stage, i.e., short term, plan maps be classified as minor amendments and dealt with by the relevant Regional District TPC. The subsequent discussion on the classification of amendment applications brought into question the relative distribution of authority between the LMPRP and its four Regional Districts. Of particular concern to the LMPRP was the fact that some of its recommendations against amendment applications were being over turned by the effected Regional District. While the LMPRP did not actually have an approval role over amendment applications, its recommendations had carried enough influence, i.e., informal authority, to bind the Regional District Boards or at least to force them to re-submit a modified amendment application. This decrease in the
LMPRP's informal authority helped to support the overall shift to a process style of planning, but the LMPRP's refusal to adopt a classification scheme halted the potential delegation of its review function and prevented the situation from becoming worse.

In recommending against amendment applications that would redesignate land from rural to urban, the LMPRP relied heavily upon the 1966 ORP's 1 in 200 year flood level map schedule. Not developing floodplain areas for urban use was a condition of redesignation in nearly all of the plan's land use designations. The floodplain criteria was used to support the 1966 ORP's regional development objectives of assisting orderly, staged development; utilizing land for its most suitable use; and providing a sound economy. When Municipalities adversely affected by the floodplain began to question the validity of the floodplain criteria and floodproofing standards, it had a direct impact on the certainty of the plan's image.

However, new legislation in the Spring of 1971, see section 3.3.4, strengthened provincial control over development in the Fraser Valley floodplain and increased the certainty of the plan's image. Dyking was excluded as an acceptable means of floodproofing. And, a 1972 resurvey of the floodplain by the B.C. Water Resources Services confirmed the accuracy, to within two feet, of the 1966 ORP's existing floodplain map.
The Province's creation of an Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) in April 1973, see section 3.3.4, strengthened all the 1966 ORP's land use designation regulations including the floodplain criteria itself. Amounting to the imposition of a provincial land use zone on top of the map schedules of the 1966 ORP's land use designations, the ALR increased the firmness or certainty of the 'sea' in the 'cities in a sea of green' development concept or image. The ALR, together with the new floodplain and floodproofing regulations, indirectly reestablished the LMPRP and Regional Districts' control over land use planning and halted the shift towards a process style of planning.

3.3.3 The Planning Agency: Rational Comprehensive Versus Disjointed Incremental Planning

a) summary

From an initial position where there was a potential for rational comprehensive planning, the LMPRP shifted towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. The 1966 ORP had been formulated from the top down, but the plan was 'undone' from the ground up by amendments that led to a series of fragmented, atomistic images of the Lower Mainland. With differing rates of growth and urban development occurring throughout the Lower Mainland, land use policy amendments that were beneficial for one Municipality and Regional District were harmful to another. The LMPRP did not have an
independent staff function of sufficient size to support a centralized decision making structure, and the LMPRP found it increasingly difficult to maintain centralized planning procedures as the issues facing it became more complex and controversial. For the most part, the LMPRP's internal linkages were stronger than its external linkages, and this helped to constrain or at least slow down the shift towards disjointed incremental planning. The Province's introduction of the ALR and ALC, emphasizing the need to recover and coordinate land use planning at the Lower Mainland level, also helped to foster LMPRP unity at the end of this period.

b) interpretation

In March 1969, the Province dissolved the LMRPB; divided the plan maps of the 1966 ORP amongst the Lower Mainland's four new Regional Districts; and created the LMPRP to maintain the integrity of the plan. The LMPRP was to maintain a holistic image of the Lower Mainland by reviewing and making recommendations on Regional District applications to amend any part of the 1966 ORP. As a review agency with the mandate to share incidental planning costs through joint Regional District agreements, the LMPRP had a limited capability to evolve more centralized decision making structures and develop centralized, Lower Mainland planning procedures. The LMPRP members, appointed by the Regional District Boards rather than elected at large, were inherently exposed to local interests.
The 1966 ORP was formulated from the top down: the 'cities in a sea of green' image contained in the 1963 concept plan, Chance And Challenge, provided a framework for the 1966 ORP's regional objectives and general policies which, in turn, provided a guideline for the formulation of the plan's land use designation policies and the allocation of land, i.e., plan maps. Driven by municipal amendment applications, the plan was 'undone' from the ground up: rejected area redesignation were transformed into land use policies, i.e., text amendments, that threatened the plan's regional objectives. The result of this process was the emergence of a series of separate, atomistic images of the Lower Mainland and a shift towards a disjointed incremental style of planning.

Throughout the Lower Mainland, the LMPRP faced differing rates of urban growth and varying quantities of available and suitable urban land. Land use policy amendments that were appropriate for urbanizing areas were typically detrimental to stable rural areas. With urban development pressures increasing in its suburban Municipalities, the GVRD sought an amendment that would allow the subdivision and servicing policies of the URB-1 land use designation to be applied to URB-2 areas. This amendment was intended to provide the GVRD with more flexibility in accommodating interim urban development during the development of its outlying Regional Town Centers. While the LMPRP recommended its approval of the URB-2 amendment, the Valley Regional Districts did not
immediately adopt it. The 1966 ORP was the only zoning by-law for many unincorporated, Electoral Areas, and the more slowly growing Valley Regional Districts feared that the URB-2 amendment might result in substantial areas of inefficient land use, i.e., permanent, low density development.

By the start of the 1970's, many Municipalities had built small sewerage treatment plants with trunk lines and had the capability to service far more urban land than had been designated under the 1966 ORP's ten year time frame. The provision of trunk sewer lines ceased to be an effective criteria for regulating the location and timing of urban development. After applying for the URB-2 amendment, in October 1969, the GVRD faced a proliferation of unsewered .5 to 1 acre lots and a short term oversupply of urban land.

The Municipality of Surrey (GVRD), in particular, used its trunk sewer system to successfully argue for a large tract of rural land near its Newton Regional Town Center, see Appendix 15, to be redesignated URB-1. While the LMPRP Secretary, a GVRD staff planner, suggested to the LMPRP that an amendment be drafted to make developers in URB-1 and URB-2 areas provide local sewer before subdividing, the LMPRP did not take such action. The LMPRP, dominated by a majority, 75 percent, of Valley Regional District members, decided to refer the entire question of local discretion in providing urban services to the Regional District TPCs.
With physical limits to development such as the floodplain and, later, the ALR, many of the Municipalities in the Valley Regional Districts wanted a more flexible, URB-2 type of designation, but one that would not lead to URB-1 type development. In particular, the Valley Regional Districts wanted to facilitate the development of isolated 'pockets' of rural land that were located in upland areas distant from existing urban centers. An LMPRP staff committee on rural residential uses subsequently formulated a new designation, RRL-4, that would reduce the minimum lot size in rural areas from 5 acres (RRL-1) to 1.25 acres with a community water supply and 2.5 acres without. While the RRL-4 designation was intended to accommodate development in limited numbers of areas that would never be fully serviced with sewers, etc., the staff committee, headed by the LMPRP Secretary, advised the LMPRP not to recommend approval of the proposed designation. The GVRD feared that the proposed RRL-4 designation would lead to strong development pressures in rural areas near developing urban areas and would legitimate permanent low density, suburban development.

Up to the LMPRP staff committee's March 1973 decision advising the LMPRP not to recommend approval of the proposed RRL-4 designation, the LMPRP's internal linkages or ties between LMPRP members were comparatively stronger than its external linkages between the LMPRP members and their respective Regional District Boards. The integrity of the LMPRP had
served as a constraint against the emergence of separate, atomistic images of the Lower Mainland and the overall shift towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. Following the staff rejection of the RRL-4 designation, the LMPRP Chairman, a RDFC representative, directly stated that the problems of the GVRD were different than those of the upper Fraser Valley Regional Districts and that policies formulated by one would not necessarily be applicable to the other (LMORPU-LMPRP, Minutes, April 4, 1973, p 4). The LMPRP's external (political) linkages, at this point, threatened to outweigh its internal linkages and split the LMPRP in two.

The conflict within the LMPRP reflected the difficulties of trying to coordinate policies to regulate both a shortage and oversupply of land. While the basis of this conflict was between urban and rural areas, the predominance of GVRD staff assistance to the LMPRP inherently created an coalition amongst the Valley Regional Districts against the GVRD. The RDFC, in particular, did not have its own regional planner in the early 1970's and appears to have relied on the LMPRP for planning solutions and support. The GVRD members of the LMPRP thus absorbed the ire of growth restricted, but growing rural Municipalities, such as Chilliwack and Langley, on behalf of the less planning capable Valley Regional Districts.

This conflict was also supported by the different voting systems of the two levels: the members and member votes of the
Regional District Boards were set according to each Municipality's share of total population while an equal number of representatives and votes (2) from each Regional District Board, regardless of population size, were appointed to the LMPRP: see Appendicies 2 and 3. Since the more heavily populated urban areas in the GVRD could jointly outvote the less developed, urbanizing areas, the GVRD Board had the potential to seek LMPRP support for ORP amendments to restrict the supply of urban land. The predominantly rural Valley Regional Districts, in contrast, found it more difficult to hold back development in their more populated urban Municipalities. To a certain extent, then, rural issues came to dominate the concerns of the LMPRP.

The fragmentation of the LMPRP's image of the Lower Mainland occurred not only along geographic lines, but on a functional basis. When the LMPRP was not immediately able to resolve planning issues, it tended to appoint ad hoc committees of seconded Regional District staff to cope with the problems of specific policy areas. The LMPRP Secretary, a GVRD staff planner, was able to coordinate the activities of the LMPRP in the early years when most of the technical assistance to the LMPRP was also supplied by the GVRD. As the complexity of planning issues facing the LMPRP increased, coordination between policy areas was not achieved through a centralized decision making structure, but though the chance overlapping of committee memberships. Certainly, the LMPRP lacked the
organizational capacity to conduct the comprehensive review of the ORP that had been called for.

The lack of a centralized decision making structure, in terms of a permanent, independent staff function, also threatened the LMPRP's ability to maintain centralized planning procedures. By April 1970, the number of amendment applications had increased to the level where the LMPRP decided to have a staff committee, composed of seconded Regional District TPC members, screen out all 'minor' applications. Conflicting interests between the Regional Districts, however, prevented the formulation of a uniform set of amendment classification guidelines, one that would permit the implementation of a centralized screening procedure and so preserve a holistic image of the Lower Mainland. A set of 'housekeeping' amendments to the 1966 ORP reduced the number of minor amendment applications to the LMPRP, but local pressures against the LMPRP's review function continued.

In November 1972, the CFVRD member of the LMPRP stated that the CFVRD wanted to decentralize the LMPRP's review procedures so that all amendment application involving the 1966 ORP's current stage, i.e., short term, land use designation policies and plan maps would be reviewed by the relevant Regional District TPC rather than be sent to the LMPRP. The LMPRP rejected both the CFVRD's proposals and the LMPRP Chairman's alternative suggestion: that the review function be
centralized at the provincial level with the Minister of Municipal Affairs approving all amendment applications against a predetermined set of criteria. Despite a serious threat to its integrity, the LMPRP's internal linkages remained stronger than its external linkages. The LMPRP's decision to retain its review function constrained the general movement towards a disjointed incremental style of planning and allowed the LMPRP to maintain a holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

The April 1973 introduction of the ALR and ALC, see section 3.3.4, centralized much of the Regional Districts' land use planning function at the provincial level, and this served to further unite the LMPRP members. In June 1973, the newly established ALC gave the Regional Districts 90 days to prepare permanent ALR plans for their Municipalities. The LMPRP, it appears, did not have any input into this process, and the ALR plans were drafted on the basis of local agricultural land capacity, i.e., soil quality, rather than a holistic image of future Lower Mainland development. While it made numerous requests to the Regional Districts, the LMPRP found it difficult even to acquire its own copy of the ALR plans. The LMPRP, by 1974, was expressing serious concern about its ability to keep track of all the ORP amendments and maintain a single text of the plan.

At the same time that the LMPRP was becoming aware that its lack of a permanent, independent staff function made it
difficult to resist the decentralization of its basic function, the LMPRP was also receiving information that re-emphasized the necessity of coordinating land use planning on a Lower Mainland basis. The GVRD, in April 1973, made a 'growth management' presentation to the LMPRP, a preview of what was to become the, Livable Region Program 1976-86. By describing the potential impacts from the 'overspill' of GVRD growth, the GVRD's presentation made clear the integral relationship between land use and transportation planning. The spectre of increasing growth and its commensurate urban development problems helped to strengthen the LMPRP's internal linkages and constrain the general shift towards a disjointed incremental style of planning.

3.3.4 The Planning Process: Normative Versus Functional Planning

a) summary

During this period, there was a halting movement towards a functional style of planning. The LMPRP was fragmented by different Regional District interests and failed to take full advantage of the autonomy that it possessed. With most of its efforts directed towards maintaining its basic objective of reviewing amendment applications, the LMPRP was largely unable to seek new ends such as an approval role. The LMPRP representatives and their assisting staff, however, assumed political roles in defending the goals of Lower Mainland
planning and so constrained the shift towards functional planning. While the ALR indirectly strengthened land use controls at the Regional District level, it led to an net reduction in the Lower Mainland's autonomy over land use planning. A complete shift to a functional style of planning was again constrained by the LMPRP members, and their staff, who assumed a political role when they petitioned the Province for a review of the 1966 ORP and the role of the LMPRP itself.

b) interpretation

The Province's creation of the Regional District system, 1967, and the Regional Districts' subsequent acquisition of land use planning mandate, 1969, transferred the regulatory control downwards, from the LMRPB to the Regional Districts, but did not reduce Lower Mainland autonomy over land use planning. However, the LMRPB's weaker replacement, the LMPRP, did fail to take full advantage of the autonomy that had been granted to it under Order-In-Council 4116/68, see Appendix 2. The LMPRP, as noted under section 3.3.4, was affected by conflicting Regional District interests and did not reach a joint agreement that would have permitted it to expand its staff function as an 'incidental' expense. Without a more centralized decision making structure, the LMPRP became less able to coordinate planning issues of increasing complexity and political controversy. The LMPRP found itself not only losing control over its basic amendment review mandate, but
Facing an increasing work load of applications to amend the 1966 ORP, the LMPRP decided to opt for a classification scheme that would allow it to delegate amendments of minor significance to the Lower Mainland and review only major ones. The LMPRP itself lacked the autonomy to make such a delegation and, in September 1970, met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to discuss the situation. While it appears the Minister indicated that the legislative changes necessary for such a delegation would be acceptable to the Province, the Regional District TPCs were unable to reach agreement on a single set of guidelines for the entire Lower Mainland.

In November 1972, DARD proposed a set of five criteria to be used by staff in screening amendment applications: environmental impacts, transportation considerations, farmland conservation principles, compact urban development, and floodplain protection. There was considerable LMPRP support for the criteria, but they were not immediately adopted. With some of its recommendations on amendment applications being overturned by Regional District Boards, the LMPRP wanted to conduct a general review of the 1966 ORP. It was hoped that such a Review would reaffirm the validity of the last three criteria and provide a basis for the first two criteria, ones not fully delineated under the plan's regional objectives and
land designation policies. Lacking the financial autonomy to initiate the Review, the LMPRP was exposed to a paradoxical situation: it had to formulate a set of guidelines, based on the objectives and policies of the 1966 ORP, to more efficiently and effectively review amendment applications, yet the text amendments themselves were subtly altering the objectives and policies of the plan.

Despite the existence of internal disagreements within the LMPRP, it appears that individual LMPRP members strongly supported the LMPRP's recommendations on amendment application when sitting on their respective Regional District Boards. The LMPRP members, in defending the LMPRP's position, assumed Lower Mainland (political) rather than local (bureaucratic) roles. Up to the point where some of the LMPRP's recommendations started to be overturned by the Regional District Boards, the LMPRP exercised considerable influence or informal authority. The Lower Mainland-advocate role assumed by individual LMPRP members served to constrain or at least slow down the overall shift towards a functional style of planning.

Until the August 1972 election brought the New Democratic Party into power, the Province had maintained a decentralized and laissez-faire attitude towards local planning, preferring that the Regional Districts and Municipalities resolve their own planning problems. The new Government's December 1972
freeze on the development of all agricultural land changed this situation, though. The freeze not only reduced the Regional Districts' degree of regulatory control, but decreased the Lower Mainland's autonomy on all planning issues related to agricultural land. In particular, it appears that the LMPRP's initial, February 1973, decision to formulate a new rural residential designation was strongly influenced by the agricultural land freeze and upcoming legislation. The LMPRP members feared the further loss of autonomy from future provincial legislation more than they feared the potential delegation of some Regional District control through the creation of a weak, suburban type of land use designation.

Introduced to the Legislature in early April 1973, Bill 42 the (Agricultural) 'Land Commission Act', proposed the creation of a provincial agency with the authority not only to regulate agricultural land, but to establish greenbelts, parklands, and urban-industrial land banks. Bill 42, which would have resulted in a significant loss of Lower Mainland autonomy over land use planning issues, generated much debate and went through several changes before being passed into law. Until the Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) petitioned the Province on behalf of the Municipalities and Regional Districts, the proposed Act contained no provisions for local input into agricultural land use. The Regional Districts were subsequently given 90 days to prepare (agricultural) land reserve plans and submit them to the ALC for approval.
Lastly, the ALC's mandate was strictly limited to agricultural land in the final passage of the Act.

The minimum parcel size that the ALC was willing to consider for subdividing agricultural land was 30 acres. Since the 1966 ORP's most restrictive rural designation, RRL-3, permitted a parcel size of 20 acres, the new legislation left the LMPRP and Regional Districts with little say over the development of agricultural land. The perceived threat to the autonomy of Lower Mainland land use planning was sufficient to prompt the LMPRP into forming a staff sub committee on the future role and responsibilities of the LMPRP. In July 1973, this sub committee recommended to the LMPRP that the 1966 ORP be retained and that the LMPRP seek the authority to appeal those Regional District Board decisions in violation of LMPRP recommendations to the Province. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, in an October 1973 meeting with LMPRP representatives, stated a preference for retaining the LMPRP as an inter-Regional District agency, but offered no indication that the LMPRP would ever have more authority over the approval of applications to amend the 1966 ORP.

The LMPRP continued to act in a political role. In November 1973, the LMPRP asked the Regional Districts to assign planning staff to a joint study that was to resolve 1966 ORP-ALR conflicts. The LMPRP believed that if the three levels of planning policy and regulations--the Province's ALR and
environmental concerns; the Regional Districts' ORPs and growth management plans; and the Municipalities' zoning and development by-laws—could be brought into agreement, then it would be possible to have the ALC relinquish its direct role in land use appeals for veto authority over the development of agricultural land. While the LMPRP's efforts were not successful in returning full autonomy over land use planning to the Lower Mainland, the LMPRP's assumption of a political role did prevent a complete shift to a functional style of planning.

Since the ALR inherently stabilized development in rural areas, the Regional Districts had acquired an indirect form of regulatory control with which to attain the objectives of the 1966 ORP. The predominantly rural Municipalities, however, felt a direct loss of autonomy over land use planning and they pressured their Regional Districts for some form of relief. By 1974, the LMPRP members had enough support from their respective Regional Districts to petition the Province for a review and update of the 1966 ORP. The impacts from the Province's imposition of an agricultural land use zone over the Lower Mainland, in terms of decreased planning autonomy, had travelled down to the municipal level and then 'bounced' back up to the LMPRP again. While the Ministry of Municipal Affairs supported the idea of a Review, the would be participants clearly had differing expectations of what they might gain from the Review.
3.4 The Preparation For The ORP Update: 1974-1978

3.4.1 Chronology

This period begins with the LMPRP's establishment of the Terms of Reference Staff Committee (TORSC) and ends with an agreement amongst the participants on the organizational arrangements for preparing an updated ORP. Figure 20 provides a time line chronology of the events and issues that transpired during the preparation for the ORP Update between 1974 and 1978.

Following its establishment in July 1974, the TORSC presented the LMPRP with a report entitled, Scope Of The Proposed Review Of The Official Regional Plan. The report called for a major review of the 1966 ORP and listed the substantive and procedural matters to be considered. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs considered the report in the beginning of 1975 and indicated that a planning grant would likely be available to assist the LMPRP, (2). With this support, the LMPRP adopted, in principle, the recommendations of the 'Scope' report as the terms of reference for the ORP Review. The LMPRP also called for the preparation of further, more detailed terms of reference and asked the Regional Districts to lend it staff assistance for this purpose. With the exception of the GVRD, which was still completing its 'Livable Region Program', all the Regional Districts quickly agreed to
Figure 20: Chronology Of Events And Issues 1974-1978

1 - LMPRP's establishment of a Terms of Reference Staff Committee (TORSC), to TORSC presentation of the 'Scope Of Proposed Review Of ORP' report

2 - MOMA reviews 'Scope' report and offers funding for a Review of the 1966 ORP

3 - LMPRP call for more detailed terms of reference, to tabling of ORP Review to allow GVRD to complete Livable Region Plan

4 - LMPRP appoints DARD's Planning Director as TORSC Chairman, to preparation of new terms of reference

5 - GVRD criticism of new terms of reference and TORSC revision of new terms of reference

6 - Provincial election, change of government

7 - LMPRP approval of the revised, new terms of reference

8 - Ministry of Municipal Affairs renewal of support for the ORP Review and funding offer

9 - TORSC recommendation for an ORP Review Liaison Committee (RLC) and LMPRP approval

10 - LMPRP attempts to have Minister of MOMA sit on LMPRP Steering Committee
RLC selection of consultant, to presentation of 'OPR Review-Program Definition' report

Consultant presentation of 'Work Program' report, LMPRP approval in principle of a new 'Chance And Challenge', and LMPRP request for a more detailed work program
RLC work on operational details for ORP Review, to GVRD Board Decision to withdraw from joint work program
MOMA decision to establish a Regional District Review Committee

LMPRP approval of TLC's 'Proposed Work Program-ORP Review' report, to Consultant presentation of 'Review Of The Official Regional Plan' report

Technical Liaison Committee (TLC) production of terms of reference for another report, to Consultant presentation of 'Report On A Regional Plan' report

TLC consideration of action program proposals, to implement 'Regional Plan' report

TLC reaches agreement on approach to the ORP Update process

GVRD TPC Staff Committee conditionally accepts the TLC's compromise agreement

TLC accepts GVRD TPC Staff Committee Codicil to the compromise agreement and the ORP Update process begins
proceed with the ORP Review. The LMPRP subsequently tabled the ORP Review with the exception that it asked the TORSC to evolve terms of reference to take the GVRD's 'Livable Region Program' into account, (3).

In mid 1975, the LMPRP appointed DARD's Planning Director as the new Chairman of the TORSC, and, by Fall, the TORSC had prepared new terms of reference for the ORP Review, (4). The new terms of reference ignored the legislative and procedural problems of the ORP and focused on the substantive, housekeeping concerns of the ORP's policies and schedules. The GVRD, however, was not pleased with the new terms of reference, especially the fact that they did not directly recognize the role of the 'Livable Region Program'. In response to the GVRD's criticism, the TORSC made further revisions to the new terms of reference, but only minor ones, (5). The ORP Review had stalled.

The 'stop and go' attempts to initiate the ORP Review in 1975 continued into 1976. A late 1975 provincial election resulted in a change of government and further delay, (6). While the LMPRP approved the changes to the new terms of reference in the Spring, (7), it was not until July 1976 that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs renewed its support for the ORP Review, (8). In order to promote municipal input, the LMPRP expanded the TORSC into the more representative ORP Review Liaison Committee (RLC) approved the formulation of the ORP Review
Liaison Committee (RLC), (9). For the remainder of the year, the LMPRP tried, without success, to have the Minister of Municipal Affairs sit on the LMPRP's ORP Review Steering Committee. At the same time, the RLC was searching for a project manager for the Review, (10).

Throughout 1977, the LMPRP tried to initiate the ORP Review, but instead ended up with a series of reports, produced by consultants, that only attempted to set the stage for a review of the ORP. The first report, *ORP Review-Program Definition*, broadened the scope of the Review to what had originally been proposed in 1974; it called for a 'guideline' or 'framework' type of plan, one to be administered under a strengthened LMPRP, (11). Shortly following this, the same Consultant presented the LMPRP with another report, *Work Program-Revised ORP*, that recommended the preparation of a new conceptual plan, i.e., a new, 'Chance and Challenge', as the first step to a major overhaul of the LMPRP and ORP. The LMPRP subsequently approved this recommendation in principle and asked the RLC to prepare further details on the first, inventory section of the Consultant's work program, (12).

The RLC started to work on the operational details of the ORP but, in mid 1977, the GVRD decided to leave the joint work program and complete the initial tasks of the Review on its own, (13). The RLC, though, continued and produced a short report, *Proposed Work Program-Phase I-ORP Review*, that
sequentially itemized the steps necessary to complete a review of the ORP. The LMPRP subsequently approved the work program and informally stated that each Regional District would have the right to include separate statements and assessments within the future review report.

To overcome the continuing disagreements over the organizational arrangements for reviewing the ORP, two consultants were hired. Their report, Review Of The Official Regional Plan Lower Mainland B.C., completed at the end of 1977, was the result of a major survey of all the users of the existing 1966 ORP, (15). While the 'Review' report did not make any definitive recommendations, it did confirm considerable support for a framework type of plan, especially amongst the Municipalities. One of the causes behind the lack of recommendations in the report was the uncertainty generated by the establishment of a Regional District Review Committee by the Province, a Committee whose mandate included the authority to make recommendations on the legal and organizational structure of the Regional District system, (14).

In 1978, the organizational arrangements necessary to start the ORP were finally settled. The lack of clear recommendations in the 'Review' report caused the Technical Liaison Committee (TLC) to formulate new terms of reference for the Consultants. The resulting document, Report On A
Regional Plan For The Lower Mainland Of British Columbia, provided fairly succinct recommendations on the type of ORP that was to be prepared and on the organizational arrangements under which it would be prepared, (16). The 'Regional Plan' report became the basis of the Valley Regional District's preferred 'comprehensive' approach to the ORP Update. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing also favoured a 'comprehensive' approach to the ORP Update, but one operating under a strengthened LMPRP rather than a quasi-independent Steering Committee composed of Regional District Planning Committee Chairmen. The GVRD, however, wanted an 'incremental and linked' approach whereby each Regional District, in linked cooperation with the other Regional Districts, would update its own ORP under the existing regional planning legislation. These three positions were submitted to the TLC as action program proposals, (17).

While the TLC could not initially reach a consensus on the approach to the ORP Update a compromise agreement was devised shortly afterwards, (18). The compromise, however, strongly favoured the GVRD's approach and did not clearly specify what type of plan was ultimately to emerge. Before accepting the TLC's compromise agreement, the GVRD prepared a codicil, making its acceptance dependent on a final set of conditions, (19). These conditions further clarified the organizational characteristics of the 'incremental and linked' approach to the ORP Update process, while also presenting the opportunity
to make the substance of the ORP policies themselves more comprehensive. The TLC agreed to accept the GVRD's codicil, June 1978, and official approval by the Regional District Boards soon followed. The ORP Update was now underway.

3.4.2 The Plan: Blueprint
      Versus Process Planning

i summary

During this period, there were numerous attempts to initiate the Update process, and the style of planning, as implied by the proposed type of plan, first shifted towards blueprint planning, then towards process planning and, finally, back towards blueprint planning. The updating of the 1966 ORP was initially to include a review of plan policies at both the Regional District and Lower Mainland levels, but later terms of reference narrowed the scope of the Update to purely 'housekeeping' matters. Emerging from a detailed review of the 1966 ORP's land use designations and Regional District plan map schedules, the updated ORP would have been strictly a blueprint type of plan. Subsequent ORP review and work program reports, prepared by a consultant, emphasized the need for a concept plan at the Lower Mainland level, and the style of planning shifted towards process planning. While the concept plan would not contain land use designations or plan maps, the Consultant proposed that the LMPRP be given increased land use planning authority, i.e., veto powers over
development proposals, to ensure municipal compliance with plan objectives.

A survey report, prepared by another consultant, provided the only local feedback to the question of plan type: the Municipalities supported a concept type of ORP, but only as a means of gaining more local autonomy over land use planning. However, the second Consultant also prepared a second report, one that recommended the retention of land use designations and plan maps 'to support the objectives of a Lower Mainland concept plan. This movement towards a blueprint style of planning was reinforced by the final arrangements to initiate the Update process, arrangements suggesting that the updated ORP might be little more than a 'housekeeping' revision of land use designations and plan maps at the Regional District level.

b) interpretation

As contained in, The Scope Of The Proposed Review Of The ORP, the first, November 1974 terms of reference called for a review of the 1966 ORP at all levels of detail. The Update was to evaluate the past effectiveness of the ORP's land use designation policies in achieving the plan's regional objectives; examine the current stage and long term land use designation boundaries, i.e., plan map schedules; determine the need to formulate new policies on such land use concerns
as transportation, town centers, and open space; bring all sections of the ORP into agreement with legislative changes, i.e., the ALR; review the planning authorities and functions, including plan amendments, granted to the LMPRP and Regional Districts by legislation; and outline the relationships and responsibilities between all agencies and levels of government involved with land use planning in the Lower Mainland, i.e., a policy framework. While the 'Scope' report did not directly specify the type of plan the updated ORP was to become, its list of substantive and procedural issues outlined an ORP that could possibly be both a Lower Mainland concept plan and detailed Regional District land use plan.

The LMPRP tabled the 'Scope' report and, after almost a year of delays, another report was prepared: Terms Of Reference For Review Of ORP. In contrast to the 'Scope' report the new, October 1975 terms of reference only called for a housekeeping review in which land use designation policies and plan map schedules would be updated and brought into agreement with provincial legislation. The need to undertake a second phase study, presumably a review of regional planning legislation, would only be determined after the completion of the housekeeping review. If the 'Scope' report's implicit decision not to eliminate detailed land use designations and plan maps at the Regional District level had biased the future plan towards a blueprint style of planning, then the new terms of reference, in concentrating review efforts solely on
updating land use designation policies and plan maps, had reinforced the potential shift towards a blueprint style of planning.

The LMPRP subsequently approved the addition of three review objectives to the introduction of the revised terms of reference: policy topics such as open space, regional town centers, transportation, and population-employment targets were to be considered; a process for bringing non conforming municipal by-laws into agreement with the ORP was to be considered; and the formulation of a coherent Lower Mainland development policy was to be considered. While these introductory objectives broadened the scope of the Review, the terms of reference did not specify how the review was to 'consider' the objectives in order to be 'effective'.

The LMPRP, after more than a year of further delays, hired a consultant to prepare a detailed work program. However, the first 'Rawson' report, ORP Review-Program Definition, was not a work program, but a interim report that primarily dealt with the question of plan type. The 'Rawson' report, March 1977, recognized the need to review the lines on the 1966 ORP's land use designation maps, but it emphasized the preparation of an updated, Chance And Challenge. The report, in fact, argued that there would be 'considerable merit' in moving towards a 'guideline' type of ORP and delegating the responsibility for by-law regulation to the Municipalities.
However, the report also stated that the effectiveness of such a guideline plan would be dependent on legislative changes giving the ORP more 'teeth' to ensure the implementation of the plan's objectives at the municipal level. Increased land use planning authority at the Lower Mainland level, of course, implied a LMPRP veto or approval role over ORP plan amendments. By recommending a guideline or concept type of plan with a countervailing increase of Lower Mainland land use control to compensate for a lack of spatial detail, the Consultant had reversed the proposed style of planning from blueprint planning towards process planning.

While the Consultant's interim report was generally well received by the RLC, several members were highly concerned with the need to translate the 'program definition' into a detailed work program. The Consultant responded to such criticisms by stating that the specific work program details would depend on the type of plan selected. In its subsequent approval of the report's recommendation that an updated, 'Chance and Challenge', be prepared first, the RLC gave formal recognition to the need for a Lower Mainland concept plan. The RLC, however, did not approve the report's recommendation that would have enabled such a concept plan, the recommendation calling for more 'teeth' to be given to the LMPRP.

In the second, April 1977, 'Rawson' report, Work Program-
Revised ORP, the Consultant outlined a series of work items that were to lead up to the preparation of an updated, 'Chance and Challenge'. The TLC, though, only approved the initial data inventory and analysis items on the work program, ones that could have been used merely to update the 1966 ORP's land use designations and plan maps. Thus, there was much support for a Lower Mainland concept plan, but the issues pertaining to the plan's level of spatial detail and degree of regulatory control were far from settled.

For some six months following the completion of the 'Rawson' reports, the RLC debated the question of review objectives and what various plan users ought to expect from a revised ORP. The RLC finally hired a second consultant and made the determination of plan type the primary research question of review efforts. By surveying municipal attitudes and expectations, the first, December 1977 'Jones' report, Review Of The Official Regional Plan Lower Mainland, B.C., provided local feedback to the proposed updating of the 1966 ORP.

The Municipalities stated that they wanted a 'policy framework', 'policy guideline', or 'regional strategy' type of plan; they did not want a land use or zoning by-law type of plan. While some of the Municipalities felt that the LMPRP ought to be strengthened and that the revised ORP ought to have more 'clout' and 'teeth', all the Municipalities made it quite clear that they wanted to maintain a high degree of
local autonomy over local matters. The Municipalities felt that local plans ought to be more detailed than the revised ORP, but also ought to 'complement', 'agree with', and 'fit into' the revised ORP.

While the first, 'Jones' report confirmed municipal support for a Lower Mainland concept plan, it failed to specify the characteristics of the future plan, particularly the level of spatial detail. The report also did not recommend any legislative changes, i.e., increased LMPRP land use control to support such a concept plan. Instead, the report made reference to an appendix that contained extracts from two Ontario reports dealing with the organizational structure and land use planning control of supra inter-regional planning: Report Of The Royal Commission On Metropolitan Toronto, (Ontario 1977/2,3), and, Report Of Plan Planning Act Review Committee, (Ontario 1977/1).

The extract from the Ontario reports outlined aspirations for a strategic planning system where regulatory authority over land use planning would be delegated to the Municipalities, counterbalanced by the grant of a veto authority to the regional level. With the ability to 'call in' those municipal plans and plan amendments re222222pugnant to the broader objectives and policies of the regional plan, the regional level would be able to maintain control and not become overly involved in regulatory detail. The first 'Jones' report thus
indirectly echoed the sentiments expressed in the 'Rawson' reports, i.e., a style of planning lying between blueprint and process planning.

The RLC subsequently engaged the same consultant to outline the specific characteristics of a 'regional' plan. In the second, April 1978 'Jones' report, Report On A Regional Plan For The Lower Mainland Of B.C., the Consultant did not specify the plan's level of detail, i.e., plan map scales, but assigned each level of land use planning specific responsibilities. The Province was to delineate settlement and resource policies within which the Regional Districts and Municipalities would operate. At the Lower Mainland level, there was to be a 'rational structure plan' that would outline primary infrastructure systems and document the physical, 'quantitative' allocation of land use so as to satisfy human, animal, and plant needs. Urban design and the detailed allocation of land uses were to remain the responsibility of the municipal level.

However, the role proposed for the Regional Districts was somewhat ambiguous. Each Regional District was to interpret and elaborate Lower Mainland 'purposes' while retaining its existing statutory responsibilities for planning and implementation. Since the Regional Districts' statutory responsibilities already included land use planning, it appears that the updated ORP could have been prepared at two
levels of spatial detail: Lower Mainland and Regional District.

While the Consultant largely dismissed the second phase of the work program, the legislative review, the Consultant did recommend that the ORP be formally approved by the Province and that the Province have the power to veto any plan amendments contrary to the provincial component of the plan. The consultant also recommended that the Regional Districts be granted the authority to prevent the Municipalities from violating the regulatory matters of the plan. With a higher degree of regulatory control over land use planning and the implied retention of land use designations using plan maps, the ORP outlined by the Consultant reflected a potential return towards a blueprint style of planning.

The final arrangements to initiate the Update process, see section 3.4.3, served to reinforce this movement towards blueprint planning. As there was no guarantee that a Lower Mainland concept plan would be prepared it was possible that the updated ORP would emerge as merely a housekeeping review of the 1966 ORP's land use designations and 1:60,000 scale plan maps.
3.4.3 The Planning Agency: Rational Comprehensive versus Disjointed Incremental Planning

a) summary

With two exceptions, the LMPRP strove for a rational comprehensive style of planning during this period. LMPRP efforts were directed towards establishing the updated ORP as a single plan for the Lower Mainland and preparing a joint work program to ensure that the plan would be formulated from the top down, i.e., a holistic image. The attempts to initiate the update process led to the creation and strengthening of an LMPRP staff executive, the RLC-TLC. In turn, this structural centralization helped to foster centralized planning procedures and so maintained the drive for an updated ORP. The exceptions, near the start and at the end of this period, occurred when consideration was given to reviewing and updating the 1966 ORP's land use designation policies and plan maps prior to the formulation of a Lower Mainland concept plan. Under these proposals, the top down strategy of Lower Mainland planning could have been reversed, and the updated ORP might have emerged as a series of separate Regional District plans linked by a minimal level of common interest, i.e., atomistic images. The LMPRP's external linkages were stronger than its internal linkages at these times, and this also helped to constrain the movement towards a rational comprehensive style of planning.
b) interpretation

The first step towards updating the 1966 ORP came with the July 1974 transformation of the LMPRP staff sub-committee on the role and function of the LMPRP into the Terms of Reference Staff Committee (TORSC). As noted in section 3.4.2, the TORSC's 'Scope' report called for a review and updating of the 1966 ORP at both the Lower Mainland and Regional District levels. More importantly, though, the report stated that the relationship between the levels of government having interests in Lower Mainland land use planning ought to be reviewed and clearly defined. Thus, the policy framework outlined by the 'Scope' report implied a top down approach to formulating an updated ORP, one that would reflect a holistic image of the Lower Mainland and a rational comprehensive style of planning.

The LMPRP approved the 'Scope' report in principle and directed the TORSC to prepare more detailed terms of reference. These new terms of reference, however, limited the immediate research objectives of the Update process to reviewing and updating the 1966 ORP's land use designation policies and plan maps. Since the Regional District aspects of the ORP would be considered before its broader Lower Mainland concerns, the new terms of reference served to reverse the top down strategy of plan formulation that had been suggested in the 'Scope' report. The possibility existed that the updated ORP would have emerged as a set of separate
Regional District plans linked only by a minimal level of common interest. Such atomistic images of the Lower Mainland would have shifted the style of planning back to disjointed incrementalism.

The new terms of reference did not satisfy GVRD interests, however. With most of its land already designated URB-1, ESTABLISHED URBAN, and thus beyond the effective regulatory authority of the 1966 ORP, the GVRD wanted to have the key principles, i.e., growth share targets, of its emerging concept plan, *The Livable Region Program: 1976-1986*, recognized in the updated ORP. The GVRD also wanted a legislative review to help bring non conforming municipal zoning by-laws into agreement with the ORP. Several large, undeveloped areas in the GVRD's outlying Municipalities had been zoned for long term urban use prior to the adoption of the 1966 ORP, and the potential for low density, i.e., suburban development in these areas threatened the nodal settlement pattern concept, i.e., Regional Town Centers, expressed the GVRD's 'Livable Region Program'. In essence, it appears that the GVRD wanted to use the updated ORP to achieve a level of control over municipal planning similar to that which it might have attained from a stronger, more centralized form of metropolitan government.

The new terms of reference largely reflected the interests of the TORSC's Valley Regional District members who wanted
revised land use designation policies and plan maps to cope with immediate planning problems. Aside from the fact that the TORSC planners were inherently subject to the interests of their respective Regional District planning departments, the GVRD had been heavily involved with the final stages of its 'Livable Region Program' and had not heeded the LMPRP's call for staff assistance in preparing the more detailed, 'new' terms of reference. The split between the GVRD and Valley Regional District planner and politicians over the question of planning priorities and plan type resulted in a situation where both the TORSC and LMPRP's external linkages were stronger than their internal linkages. This lack of cohesion amongst the TORSC and LMPRP members slowed down the efforts to initiate the Update and constrained the LMPRP's ability to engage in a rational comprehensive style of planning.

With the addition of some of the GVRD's concerns as general review objectives, the LMPRP subsequently approved the new terms of reference. The TORSC itself was expanded, August 1976, to make the Update process more representative. In addition to at least one senior staff planner from each Regional District, the Review Liaison Committee (RLC) also included senior provincial staff representatives from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Environment and Land Use Committee Secretariat (ELUC). The drive to re-establish a holistic image of the Lower Mainland was also assisted by the first, January 1977 joint meeting of the four
Regional District Technical Planning Committees (TPC). Focusing on the growing problems of long distance commuting and imbalance between employment and residential locations, the joint TPC meeting gave explicit recognition to the Lower Mainland as a single economic unit and increased the general level of support for a review of the 1966 ORP.

The RLC hired a consultant to prepare a more detailed work program for the Review, and the resulting 'Rawson' reports moved the LMPRP back towards a rational comprehensive style of planning. In particular, the Consultant recommended the preparation of a Lower Mainland concept plan, i.e., an updated, 'Chance and Challenge', before the review and updating of the 1966 ORP's land use designation policies and plan maps. Such a top down strategy for formulating an updated ORP was to promote a holistic image of the Lower Mainland. To preserve this single, holistic image, the Consultant also recommended that the structure of Lower Mainland planning be more centralized: the LMPRP was to acquire its own permanent and independent staff function.

As noted in section 3.4.2, the LMPRP approved the preparation of a Lower Mainland concept plan, but only adopted those items of the 'Rawson' work program that could have been used merely to update the 1966 ORP's land use designation policies and plan map schedules. The GVRD, having recently completed a major collection and analysis of land use and socioeconomic
data to support its 'Livable Region Program', was not anxious to fund similar programs for the other three Regional Districts. At this time, the GVRD threatened to leave the joint work program and pursue its own parallel approach to updating the ORP. The GVRD-Valley Regional District conflict and constraint to rational comprehensive planning was resolved, in part, through, negotiations that made a more thorough investigation of plan type the first priority of the Review.

The assignment of planning functions in the second 'Jones' report outlined an ORP that would be formulated from the top down and provide a holistic image of the Lower Mainland: provincial interests in the pattern of Lower Mainland settlement would be expressed in the updated ORP and the plan, in turn, would provide a framework for subsequent Regional District and municipal plans. To help protect the plan's Lower Mainland perspective, the report recommended the creation of a 'regional intelligence center' that would monitor development trends and analyze the collective impact of plan amendments. The Consultant, however, avoided directly recommending a larger and more centralized LMPRP, stating that the precise organizational arrangements for future Lower Mainland planning could only be determined after the preparation of the plan.

In response to the second 'Jones' report, members of the RLC,
now called the Technical Liaison Committee (TLC), prepared a number of 'action programs' that contained organizational and operational proposals for the actual preparation of the plan (LMORPU-MOMAH 1978/4; LMORPU-TLC 1978/5). Two basic positions existed within the TLC as to how the production of the ORP ought to be approached. The first position, held by the representatives from the Valley Regional Districts and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, was that the 'new' ORP should be produced through a comprehensive approach, one in which consistency amongst provincial and regional planning policies would be achieved at a broad level of detail.

The GVRD, however, did not support a comprehensive approach; it wanted an 'incremental and linked' approach to 'updating' the ORP. Under this approach, several key regional issues would be selected for detailed policy development and then be linked to other plans. It appears that the Regional Districts' planning priorities had reversed: the GVRD now wanted a revised ORP to be formulated from the ground up, maintaining some degree of control over municipal land use, while the Valley Regional Districts wanted the plan to be formulated from the top down, maintaining a holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

In general, the organizational details of the action programs, May 1978, were a reflection of the TLC members' differing approaches to the preparation of an ORP. The Valley Regional
Districts, concurring with the Consultant's opinion that the formulation of a new ORP was 'everybody's' business and not the prerogative of any one level of business, wanted the preparation of the plan to be guided by an 'outside' Steering Committee, one that would be independent of the LMPRP's fragmented interests. Under this proposal, the technical details of formulating the new ORP would be delegated to a working group solely responsible to the Steering Committee.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs' proposal for ensuring a comprehensive approach to the formulation of a new ORP was the enlargement of the LMPRP and the centralization of the Lower Mainland planning function, a proposal that the Valley Regional Districts themselves could not have put forth. Under the Ministry's organizational arrangements, the temporary strengthening of the LMPRP's mandate would be balanced by the addition of one extra elected representative from each Regional District Board and further elected representatives from the Province. The technical matters pertaining to the preparation of a new ORP were to be handled by a seven member working group solely responsible to the Steering Committee, but directed by a senior staff planner from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.

The GVRD, however, rejected the organizational arrangements proposed by the Valley Regional Districts and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs; it wanted the ORP to be revised through the
normal amendment process and, hence, within the existing legislative structure of the Regional District system. Similar to the organizational arrangements of the Valley Regional Districts and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, the GVRD proposed that the technical side of formulating the plan be dealt with by a working group composed of staff seconded from Regional District planning departments. The GVRD was willing to have the activities of the working group coordinated by the TLC, but insisted that the seconded staff would remain responsible to their respective Regional Districts. Under the GVRD's organizational arrangements, the plan could emerge as a collection of separate or atomistic Regional District images rather than a single, holistic image of the Lower Mainland. The structural details of the GVRD's proposal thus reflected its preferred 'incremental and linked' approach to updating the ORP.

Since the interim arrangements, however temporary, for formulating the plan would implicitly effect the structure of the planning organization left in place to implement the plan, the final negotiations to initiate the Update process were actually a protracted debate over the future style of planning. The GVRD, possessing most of the technical and financial resources necessary to prepare an ORP, won this debate: each Regional District was to update its own ORP in a 'collaborative way' with the other Regional Districts, and the TLC was to review the updated ORPs for 'fit' and make a
recommendation to the LMPRP. Combined with the GVRD's arrangements for a decentralized working group, this approach shifted the style of planning towards disjointed incrementalism.

This shift away from a rational comprehensive style of planning was by no means complete, however. To provide a framework for the Regional Districts' ORPs, it was expected that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs would provide an overall policy statement of provincial interests at the start of the Update process. The final GVRD-Valley Regional District arrangements also called for the preparation of Lower Mainland growth projections at the start of the Update process, and these projections offered a further chance that a top down, holistic image of the Lower Mainland might emerge.

While the final arrangements for updating the ORP thus offered some centralized procedures, they did not provide a centralized Lower Mainland planning organization to oversee the application of them. Coordination of the Update process was to be provided through collaboration, i.e., joint Regional District meetings and discussions, rather than from the authority of a centralized planning organization. While it was expected that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, or appropriate Cabinet Committee, would step in to settle any unresolved conflicts between the Regional Districts, there was no guarantee that the 'fit' between the updated ORPs would be
anything more than a series of atomistic images linked by a minimal level of common interest, i.e., a 'common denominator' plan.

3.4.4 The Planning Process: Normative Versus Functional Planning

a) summary

Following an initial shift towards normative planning at the start of this period, there was a quick shift towards a functional style of planning and, finally, a gradual, but halting shift back towards normative planning. The shift towards functional planning was determined by the LMPRP's lack of relative autonomy; it did not have the financial resources or full provincial support necessary to prepare an updated ORP. While the Province's subsequent review of Regional District functioning, including land use planning, undermined the present and future autonomy of Lower Mainland planning, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs later helped to initiate a return towards normative planning by offering the Regional Districts more funding and suggesting that the LMPRP be temporarily strengthened to allow it to prepare an updated ORP.

The TLC, except at the start and end of this period, acted in a bureaucratic role by proposing that the updated ORP be prepared strictly within the existing framework of planning
legislation. Acting in more of a political role, the planning Consultants to the TLC recommended the preparation of an updated ORP that would increase the autonomy of Lower Mainland planning. Their efforts served to constrain the shift towards functional planning.

b) interpretation

Having secured the support of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to conduct a review of the 1966 ORP, the LMPRP's TORSC proceeded to formulate terms of reference. The 'Scope' report proposed a review not only of the plan's policies and map boundaries, but of the functioning of Lower Mainland planning itself. Since the Review would consider the distribution of responsibility and authority between the Province, LMPRP, Regional Districts, and Municipalities, it had the potential to recommend a greater degree of autonomy for Lower Mainland land use planning. The Regional District planners sitting on the TORSC, in proposing such a Review, had implicitly acted in a political role and established the conditions for moving towards a normative style of planning.

However, the TORSC's new, more detailed terms of reference, proposed that the first phase of the Review be limited to strictly substantive concerns. Any legislative review of Lower Mainland planning administration and authority was to be considered as part of a 'possible' second phase study. By
assuming that the existing framework for regional planning policy in the Lower Mainland was satisfactory, the new terms of reference placed the onus on the future reviewers to show otherwise. The TORSC, in not seeking to use the preparation of an updated ORP as a vehicle for increasing the autonomy of the LMPRP, limited itself to a bureaucratic role and constrained the potential for a shift towards a normative style of planning.

Through the use of joint, i.e., unanimous, Regional District agreements, Order-In-Council 4116/68 permitted the LMPRP to apportion 'incidental' planning expenses to the Regional Districts on a per capita basis. This arrangement left the LMPRP lacking its own, independent financial resources. With internal conflicts in the TORSC, and between the Regional Districts, over the type of plan the updated ORP was to be, the LMPRP's lack of financial autonomy was exposed. The LMPRP, lacking full GVRD commitment to the Review, was unable to initiate the formulation of an updated ORP.

In December 1978, a provincial election returned a new Government, and the LMPRP was faced with the task of rebuilding support for its proposed Review. It was not until over six months had passed, July 1976, that the new Minister of Municipal Affairs provided the LMPRP with the assurance that the Province was willing to support the Review and share its costs. What type of Review and updated ORP the Ministry
actually supported was not fully clear, however. In stating that the Review had 'promise' as a framework for Lower Mainland planning issues and decisions, it appears that the Minister favoured a substantive review of the 1966 ORP's policies rather than a legislative review of land use planning authority and administration. The LMPRP, by this point, had essentially completed a full retreat to a functional style of planning.

The TORSC, however, began to act in a more political role again. In August 1976, the TORSC recommended that it be expanded into a more representative body, one composed of seconded Regional District planners, i.e., the subsequent RLC. The TORSC also recommended that the LMPRP create a political steering committee, composed of LMPRP members and provincial ministers, to oversee the preparation of an updated ORP. By officially bringing the Province into the Review process, it appears that the TORSC hoped to secure a strong provincial commitment to the updated ORP and Lower Mainland planning in general. The Minister of Municipal Affairs refused to sit on such a steering committee, but sent planning officials, senior staff, to sit on the new RLC. While not completely successful, the TORSC's recommendations did serve as a constraint against a purely functional style of planning.

The Province did provide the Regional Districts with a planning grant to update the ORP, but the funds were
insufficient to initiate the Review, and the RLC hired a consultant to prepare a more detailed work program. The Consultant, going beyond the RLC's call for an immediate update of the 1966 ORP's policies and plan maps, recommended a concurrent legislative review of Lower Mainland land use planning. In particular, the 'Rawson' reports proposed a more distant, but stronger LMPRP: the Municipalities would gain more control over land use regulations while the LMPRP would acquire its own independent staff function and veto powers over regulations violating the provisions of the new plan. Such suggestions, if adopted by the Province, would have greatly increased the autonomy of the LMPRP. By assuming a political role, the Consultant, qua planner, helped to constrain the shift to functional planning.

The RLC, however, retreated to a more bureaucratic role and adopted only the work program items leading to the immediate objective of preparing a new concept plan, items that could have been merely used to update the land use designation policies and plan maps of the 1966 ORP. Still wanting a legislative review to help secure additional authority for its own, recently completed concept plan the, 'Livable Region Program', the GVRD did not want to assist the RLC with the collection and analysis of basic land use and socioeconomic data for the Lower Mainland. The RLC, however, lacked the financial autonomy to proceed with the Review without GVRD support. As a consequence of this, the RLC had no choice but
to readdress the question of Review objectives, i.e., what the Review was to accomplish.

In September 1977, the RLC hired another consultant to determine Review objectives. The Consultant, while conducting a more detailed survey of municipal expectations and concerns relating to the updated ORP, initially assumed a political role. The subsequent first 'Jones' report noted considerable local support for a 'guideline' or 'policy framework' type of ORP, but it neither described the characteristics of such an ORP, nor recommended a stronger LMPRP to implement the plan. Only the Consultant's oblique reference to two Government of Ontario reports dealing with the legal authority and structure of regional land use planning offered any indication that the LMPRP might benefit from increased autonomy.

To a large extent, the Consultant was forced into a bureaucratic role by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs's decision to appoint a Regional District Review Committee in September 1977. The Committee was to examine the functioning of all the Province's Regional Districts in terms of their jurisdictional role and responsibilities; their organizational structures and administrative boundaries; and their relationships with other levels of government. Implicitly including an examination of the Regional Districts' land use planning function, the proposed review was essentially an expansion of the legislative review originally called for in
the first terms of reference, i.e., the 'Scope' report. This review, however, was to be conducted by the Province rather than the LMPRP.

In January 1978, the TLC endorsed the first 'Jones' report and commissioned the Consultant to prepare another report defining the nature of the plan and the process of preparing it. The GVRD attempted to alter the terms of reference for the second report, but the TLC resisted. By providing the assurance that the Province would 'pickup' the difference in costs if the GVRD decided not to participate, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs increased the LMPRP's autonomy to the point where it could avoid disagreements with individual Regional Districts and function more independently.

The second 'Jones' report recommended the preparation of a two tier, hierarchical ORP that would both provide a strategy for Lower Mainland growth and a more detailed framework for municipal development: a combination of the 1963 concept plan, 'Chance and Challenge', and the 1966 ORP. While not specifying the level of spatial and regulatory detail the new ORP would contain, the Consultant did recommend that the role of the plan, and its relationship to other levels of the planning system ought, to be directly incorporated into the plan itself. The new ORP, as proposed by the Consultant, would be as much a pseudo legislative document as it would be a substantive land use plan. In particular, it appears that
the Regional Districts feared a potential loss of autonomy from the Regional District Review Committee and that the Consultant's report was drafted as a principled response to forestall such a possibility.

The interim organizational structure recommended by the Consultant would explicitly bring the Province into the plan preparation process. Specifically, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was to chair a political steering committee composed of Regional District Planning Committee chairmen and assisted by staff seconded from each participant. The Province was to delineate its settlement and resource policies in the new ORP; to officially approve the plan; and to have veto authority over plan amendments in violation of the provincial component of the plan.

However, these recommendations did not represent a potential intrusion into Lower Mainland planning. The earlier expansion of provincial functions into the domain of land use planning, i.e., the ALR, had already decreased the autonomy of Lower Mainland planning. By internalizing provincial interests within the plan, it might have been possible to have exposed Lower Mainland-Province land use conflicts at an earlier stage and to have resolved them in a more open and equitable manner.

To prevent the Municipalities from violating the regulatory matters of the new ORP, the Consultant recommended giving the
Regional District Boards sufficient authority, presumably a veto power. The Consultant also recommended the creation of a Lower Mainland 'intelligence center' for plan monitoring and policy analysis, but left the organizational options for establishing such a center open and did not directly recommend either the continuation or expansion of the LMPRP. In essence, the Consultant's failure to recommend a stronger LMPRP with greater autonomy over land use planning led to a basic contradiction: while the new ORP was described as a single plan for the Lower Mainland, it was to be adopted under the existing legislation, individually, by each Regional District Board.

The recommended veto authorities for the Province and Regional Districts could have both been incorporated into the, Municipal Act, (SBC 1978), without changing the basic structure of local government. Through these recommendations to bring the Province into the plan preparation process, the Consultant had pushed for as much Regional District autonomy as possible without actually proposing to change the Regional District system. The Consultant, in this respect, assumed both bureaucratic and political roles. Thus, the consultant's failure to recommend a stronger, more autonomous LMPRP was likely influenced by the ongoing Regional District Review and the Regional Districts' desire to protect their own interests.

The second 'Jones' report made it quite clear to the TLC
members that the organizational arrangements for preparing an updated ORP, however temporary, would likely influence the future arrangements for Lower Mainland planning. Supporting the existing legislative framework and assuming a bureaucratic role, the GVRD member of the TLC wanted each Regional District to update its own ORP and to have the TLC coordinate this process. The Valley Regional District members of the TLC, however, supported the Consultant's recommendations: they wanted to bring the Province into the planning process and have a political steering committee oversee the preparation of a new ORP by seconded staff.

In a surprise move, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs suggested the organizational arrangement with the greatest potential for leading to a substantial increase in Lower Mainland land use planning autonomy. The Ministry proposed that a new plan be prepared by a temporarily strengthened LMPRP with its own staff; the success of such a Lower Mainland process was then to help determine the final arrangements for administering and implementing the plan.

The final organizational arrangements for updating the ORP were closest to the GVRD's preferences. Because the Province's planning grant system made payments to the Regional Districts on a per capita basis, the GVRD, with the largest population, still possessed most of the financial and staff resources necessary to conduct the Update: see Appendix 4.
The GVRD, however, agreed to give the TLC staff seconded from its planning department, and this offered the LMPRP at least the opportunity to pursue increased autonomy and move towards a normative style of planning.
3.5 The Formulation Of An Updated ORP: 1978-1979

3.5.1 Chronology

This period begins with the LMPRP's establishment of the Working Group (WG) and ends with the completion of the first draft of the updated ORP. The work program for this period consisted of two sequential but overlapping phases: research and problem identification, and policy development and plan formulation. Figure 21 provides a time line chronology of the events and issues that transpired during the preparation of the updated ORP between 1978 and 1979.

The WG met for the first time in late June 1978, (1), and formed three sub-committee that reflected a highly analytical approach to the Update process. Recommendations prepared by the Mapping, (2), and Work Program, (3), Sub-Committees were approved by the TLC in mid August 1978. By early October 1978, the Data Base and Forecast Sub-Committee, (4), had completed land use and socioeconomic inventories and had produced a preliminary demographic forecast for the TLC, a forecast subsequently published as, Technical Memorandum No. 2, in December 1978, (5).

Pressure from a DARD member of the TLC for more direct work on the plan resulted in a reorganization of the WG, (6), by policy areas (planning issues) and the preparation of policy
Figure 21: Chronology Of Events And Issues 1978-1979

1. First Working Group (WG) meeting

2. WG Mapping Sub-Committee meetings, to report submission

3. WG Work Program Sub-Committee meetings, to report submission

4. WG Data Base and Forecast Sub-Committee meetings, to report submission

5. WG produces 'Technical Memorandum No. 2' (pop. forecast)

6. Establishment of policy areas (issues)

7. WG policy areas advisory group meetings

8. WG produces 'Discussion Paper On The Plan Instrument'

9. WG produces 'Summary Of Policy Content Papers'

10. TLC discussion of plan type
11. WG work on the Lower Mainland economic forecast

12. WG produces 'Technical Memorandum No. 5' (Economic forecast)

13. WG interpretation of the TLC plan type discussion

14. WG produces 'Plan Instrument I'

15. GVRD reaction to 'Plan Instrument I'

16. WG produces 'Plan Instrument II'

17. WG produces 'Plan Instrument III'

18. TLC approves 'Plan Instrument III' as the basis for the updated ORP

19. WG produces the 'Way Ahead' as a summary of past work and phase I comes to an end

20. WG produces 'Industrial Development Strategy'

21. WG calculates land requirements
22 — WG produces 'Plan Instrument IV'

23. WG produces report, 'Objectives And Criteria For Reservation Areas'

24 — WG works through development strategy methodology

25. TLC approves WG selection of a nodal settlement pattern

26 — The 'Way Ahead' is presented to Municipalities

27. TLC take no action on RDFC Board resolution not to adopt the updated ORP

28. WG meets with ALC staff

29 — Langley Township heads Valley Municipalities protest meeting over the 'Way Ahead'

30 — WG produces first ORP Update draft

31. DARD Board Chairman responds to Langley's concerns
content evaluation sheets (preliminary outlines). After receiving TLC approval for the policy content evaluations, mid October 1978, the majority of the WG members worked semi-independently throughout the rest of the year as policy area group coordinators, (7). The results of the policy areas group meetings were a series of discussion papers which were subsequently used to produce two WG reports: Discussion Paper On The Plan Instrument, (8), and, Summary Of Policy Content Papers, (9). In a late January 1979 meeting, the TLC reviewed these two reports and discussed what issues or themes the updated ORP ought to contain, (10). The TLC, however, did not clearly specify what type of plan, i.e., instrument, the updated ORP ought to be; this task was left to the WG.

While most of the WG members were preparing discussion papers on various policy issues, a GVRD member of the WG was independently working towards the preparation of an economic, i.e., employment forecast for the Lower Mainland, (11). The economic forecast, which was summarized in, Technical Memorandum No. 5, (12), was not detailed enough to translate employment growth into land consumption figures. Before attempting a more detailed study, the WG wanted the TLC to define what type of plan the updated ORP was to be, especially with regard to the level of detail, i.e., land use designations, that it might contain.

A flurry of WG activity throughout February 1979 settled the
question of what type of plan the updated ORP ought to be. In an early February meeting, the WG interpreted the TLC's discussion on plan type and decided that while the TLC had preferred a concept or general policy type of plan, the TLC has also directed the WG to investigate ways of putting 'teeth' into the updated ORP, (13). A DARD member of the WG subsequently prepared a report, **General Structure And Basic Elements Of A Plan Instrument**, that rejected a purely conceptual type of plan and provided a specific list of principles that the updated ORP, as outlined in the report, ought to satisfy, (14). In essence, the type of ORP proposed in this report was a combination of the two options outlined in the CFVRD's previous plan instrument discussion paper: the Regional Structure ORP (conceptual) and the Housekeeping ORP (land use designations).

The GVRD members of the WG agreed with DARD's plan instrument, but stressed the need to have an updated ORP that was not too different from the existing, 1966 ORP, (15). In response, the DARD member of the WG prepared a similar report, 'Plan Instrument II', that emphasized land use designations rather than policy areas as the basic units of the updated implementation measures, (16). 'Plan Instrument III', (17), also prepared by the DARD member of the WG, was approved by the TLC, March 1979, as the basis for further work on the updated ORP. This final plan instrument or outline specifically established a 'coordination' section that called
for a joint Lower Mainland planning agency and described some the functions that it ought to perform.

Phase one of the ORP Update work program, 'Research and Problem Identification', came to an end with the TLC's April 1979 approval of, The Way Ahead: A Report On The State Of The Lower Mainland, (19). While the report briefly evaluated the success of the 1966 ORP in achieving its objectives and reviewed the reasons leading up to the Update process, the main purpose of the report was to summarize the results of the technical studies and to outline the approach, i.e., the plan instrument, to be taken in the remaining work.

With the decision to retain land use designations in the updated ORP, the WG considered a paper that it had received, February 19, 1979, from a GVRD member: A Tentative Work Program For Developing A Lower Mainland Industrial Development Strategy, (20). The study was to determine the required supply and location of industrial land which, in turn, would provide a basis to help guide the spatial allocation of future urban lands. Due to the extensive amount of work required, the WG cancelled the study, March 1979, and turned to population rather than employment forecasts as a means of calculating land demands, (21). The calculations for residential and industrial land requirements were completed by mid May 1979, but they did not provide any basis for locating the supply of these lands.
Throughout March 1979, the DARD member of the WG worked towards the preparation of 'Plan Instrument IV', (22). The development objectives and general policies of Plan Instrument IV's Lower Mainland Development Framework expressed the concept of a nodal settlement pattern, but did not provide a coherently organized development strategy. Shortly following the TLC's April 1979 approval of Plan Instrument IV, the CFVRD member of the WG produced the report, Objectives And Criteria For Reservation Areas, (23). The report provided a rudimentary outline of a reservation based development strategy in which urban areas would emerge as the areas remaining after all environmentally sensitive areas had been reserved or excluded from urban use.

The reservation strategy, however, did not provide sufficiently positive development directions for urban settlement, and the WG subsequently evolved a methodology for generating a development strategy, (24). During April 1979, the WG identified alternative settlement patterns; established the criteria for evaluating the alternatives; and analyzed the alternatives in a 'goals achievement matrix' type of format. The highest scoring option—the nodal settlement pattern—was then approved by the TLC, mid May 1979, as the basis for accommodating future urban growth, (25).

Throughout April and May 1979, the Regional Districts presented the 'Way Ahead' to their respective Municipalities
and Electoral Areas, (26). The first objection to the report came from the Township of Chilliwhack. While the RDFC Board supported Chilliwhack and resolved not to adopt the updated ORP until the conflict with the ALC had been resolved, the TLC decided, early June 1979, not to take any action on the matter, (27). The WG subsequently met with ALC staff to discuss the relationship between the ALR and the development directions of the updated ORP, (28). The ALC representatives indicated that some 'fine tuning' of ALR boundaries might be possible through its ongoing review process, but not in areas that included Chilliwhack and most of the Municipality of Langley (CFVRD).

The Township of Langley, of course, was the second Municipality to object to the 'Way Ahead', (29). And sent its concerns to the TLC Chairman, mid June 1979, for the purpose of discussing the updated ORP and its implications on the growth potential of predominantly rural Municipalities. The Chairman of the DARD Board responded in late August 1979, noting that Langley's concerns were premature and that there would be adequate opportunities for the Municipalities to review the first draft of the updated ORP, (31).

Untroubled by local objections, the WG had worked through May and June 1979 on land use designations and other implementation measures policies to produce, in mid July 1979, the first, incomplete draft of the updated ORP, (30). The
first draft was a 'tighter' plan than the 1966 ORP; it had a more comprehensively defined development strategy and a stronger set of implementation measures formulated to support this strategy. With less residential designations and redesignation policies formulated to restrain the transformation of rural to urban land, the updated ORP provided a sharper distinction between the cities and the countryside than had existed in the 1966 ORP, i.e., a steeper rural to urban density transition gradient.

3.5.2 The Plan: Blueprint
   Versus Process Planning

a) summary

The preparation of the first draft of the updated ORP resulted in a decisive shift towards a blueprint style of planning. After some initial vacillation over the level of detail the plan was to contain, it was decided that land use designations would be retained to help reinforce the plan's image or development concept of a nodal urban settlement pattern. The land use designations, collectively delineating a sharp dichotomy between urban and rural areas, greatly increased the certainty of the plan's image. With their unequivocal regulatory policies, the land use designations recovered Regional District planning authority that had been implicitly been delegated down to the Municipalities and so supported the shift towards a blueprint style of planning.
The application of the designations through plan maps of greater spatial detail further increased the certainty of the plan's image and bolstered its degree of control. Apart from the response of the Municipalities to the, Way Ahead, there was little feedback to constrain the shift towards blueprint planning. Internal time lags were kept comparatively longer than external time lags by the TLC who largely managed to 'protect' the WG from adverse feedback during the formulation of the first draft.

b) interpretation

As noted in section 3.4, the TLC's final negotiations to initiate the Update process were primarily focused on organizational arrangements and did not settle the question of plan type. The WG's August 1978 preparation of a work program, however, changed this: it was clearly stated in the work program that the updated ORP was to be a revision of the 1966 ORP rather than a completely new plan (LMORPU-WG 1978/7). Earlier, in July 1978, a WG sub-committee on mapping had recommended that the updated ORP use more detailed, 1:10,000 scale plan maps than the 1966 ORP's 1:60,000 scale plan maps (LMORPU-WG 1978/6). This level of spatial detail, the WG noted, would allow the application of land use designation policies to exercise planning authority over individual properties.
The TLC's subsequent approval of the work program and mapping requirements thus reflected an initial move towards a blueprint style of planning, one in which the certainty of the plan's image would be supported by a high level of spatial resolution. Since the Regional Districts did not strictly possess the legislative authority to prepare or adopt spatially detailed ORPs, the decision to employ 1:10,000 scale plan maps was also an implicit attempt to increase the plan's degree of control.

Following the approval of the work program, the WG prepared a series of discussion papers that dealt with Lower Mainland policy topics, i.e., planning issues (LMORPU-WG 1978/16-23, 1979/1-4). Attempts to consolidate these discussion papers into an outline of updated ORP contents revealed that the options for the actual substance of any given policy were closely dependent on the assumed level of policy detail and, commensurately, on the extent of research required to support the selected level of detail. In essence, the preparation of the discussion papers had reopened the question of plan type: the type of plan the updated ORP was to become would depend on the level of policy detail seen as necessary to achieve the objectives of the plan.

After the completion of the policy topic discussion papers, the WG produced a series of 'plan instrument' papers that ultimately led to the formulation of the first draft. The
first of these papers, The Plan Instrument, January 1979, outlined plan options at two levels of spatial detail: a 'regional structure' or concept plan that would be an update of the 1963, 'Chance and Challenge', and a 'housekeeping' plan that would be a more detailed version of the 1966 ORP. As a broad brush plan lacking land use designations, the regional structure option was evaluated as being efficient, in terms of reducing regulatory complexity, but not effective in terms of ensuring the implementation of Lower Mainland development objectives: see Appendix 5. The paper's evaluation of the housekeeping option, which was similar to the detailed review of the 1966 ORP's land use designations that had originally been proposed at the start of the work program, was the inverse of the regional structure option: effective, but not efficient.

Another report, Summary Of Policy Content Papers, January 1979, was subsequently prepared; it recommended against the regional structure plan's lack of detail and proposed an expansion of the 1966 ORP, i.e., the housekeeping plan. In the next plan instrument paper, General Structure And Elements Of A Plan Instrument (I), February 1979, a combination of both the regional structure and housekeeping plan options was proposed. The updated ORP was to contain a development framework (part 2) which, through the use of regional objectives, growth share targets, and a regional structure map at a generalized 1:250,000 scale, would provide an image or
concept of the Lower Mainland's future pattern of urban settlement.

At the Regional District level, the updated ORP's regional development principles (part 3) were to be organized on the basis of four policy areas: residential settlements, activity centers, transportation and infrastructure, and natural resources and environment. Each policy area was to be self-contained with general policies, regulatory policies, i.e., land use designations, and attached plan map schedules. As an extension of the development framework, the regional development principles, i.e., policies, were to continue the Regional District's existing authority or control over land use planning and ensure the firmness or certainty of the plan's image.

The type of plan the updated ORP was to be and an indication of its basic policy directions was outlined in a publically disseminated report, April 1979, that summarized the work completed for the first, research phase of the Update process: The Way Ahead: A Report On The State Of The Lower Mainland. While some remarks were made calling for a simpler and more flexible ORP, one expressed in 'laymans' language', the 'Way Ahead' was initially well received by the LMPRP, Regional District Planning Committees, and Regional District Boards. The TLC's staff representative from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs also noted that the Province was supportive of the way
the Update was progressing as a joint Regional District planning program.

At the municipal level, though, there was a perceived conflict between the top down approach of the 'Way Ahead' and the desire for immediate changes to the ALR. The Municipalities of Chilliwack (Township) and Chilliwack (City) resolved, June 1979, that no ORP be adopted until this conflict had been dealt with, a resolution that was quickly ratified by the RDFC Board (RDFC, Board Minutes, June 20, 1979). After considering the RDFC resolution, the TLC decided to delay taking any formal action until the first draft had been completed.

The 'conflict', which constituted the first negative feedback to the Update process, subsequently spread to the Municipality of Langley in CFVRD. Like the Municipalities in RDFC, Langley had a dominant proportion of its land in the ALR, some 85 percent, and felt that the Update process was not paying enough attention to its particular problems. Langley solicited all the Municipalities in the Valley Regional Districts, inviting them to a meeting for the purpose of discussing the implications of the work completed on the update of the ORP (Langley 1979/1). Held just before the completion of the first draft of the updated ORP, the July 11, 1979 meeting of the Valley Municipalities raised two basic concerns: that the 'final' submission date of the updated ORP was too early and that LMPRP officials had not provided
adequate opportunity for the opinions of elected municipal council members to be heard and assessed (Langley 1979/2).

The TLC rejected these criticisms, stating that the public, and its elected municipal representatives, would have ample opportunity to discuss the updated ORP during the final, reconciliation phase of the Update process and that each Regional District would also hold a public hearing before adopting the plan (LMORPU-LMPRP 1979/32). By 'protecting' the WG from premature feedback during the formulation of the first draft, the TLC kept internal time lags comparatively longer than external time lags and so constrained the possibility of any potential movement towards a process style of planning.

The first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP emerged from the work completed for two more, successively more detailed plan instruments (LMORPU-WG 1979/15,17). While the first draft (LMORPU-WG 1979/31) did not document the evaluative process that had been used to select an image or development concept for the Lower Mainland, it listed the alternate growth scenarios that had been considered and stated that the preferred development concept best satisfied the documented set of development objective which, in turn, had been derived from the early discussion papers's review of Lower Mainland planning issues and concerns. The preferred development concept, that of developing the Lower Mainland with a well defined metropolitan area and a limited number of Valley
Towns, was a continuation of the 'cities in a sea of green' image that had originally been expressed in the 1963 concept plan, 'Chance and Challenge'.

At a highly generalized, 1:250,000 scale, the plan's regional structure map presented a visual image of the development concept while the plan's development strategy policies provided a numerical distribution of future Lower Mainland development through the use of advisory population and employment growth share targets. Over half of Lower Mainland growth was to be directed to the metropolitan area, the GVRD, and at least 50 percent of Lower Mainland growth occurring beyond the GVRD was to be directed to areas on the north side of the Fraser River, i.e., DARD. Finally, all growth, including residential, commercial, industrial, and public facilities, was to be focused on urban centers within the metropolitan area and four Valley Towns: Abbotsford-Clearbrook, Langley, Mission, and Maple Ridge.¹

Similar to that which had been outlined in the first 'combined' plan instrument paper, the first draft's development strategy policies and implementation measures, i.e., regional development policies and land use designation policies, were both organized on the basis of four major policy groupings: cities and towns, countryside and farms, the

¹ The development concept and strategy remained virtually unchanged in the final draft and can been seen in Appendicies 11-13 and 15.
environment, and transportation and utilities. This organization helped to establish a link between the two key parts of the plan. In comparison to the prior separation of the concept plan, 'Chance and Challenge', and the implementation measures, the 1966 ORP, the combination of both these elements into a single plan greatly clarified the updated ORP's image of future Lower Mainland development.

In the 'country and farms' section of the development strategy, the development concept's image of a nodal settlement pattern was supported by the statement that, "The plan envisions a clear separation of land uses between the countryside and urban areas." (LMORPU-WG 1979/31, p. 43). The plan's regional development policies and implementation measures followed through on this theme of a sharp distinction between urban and rural areas by reducing the total number of residential land use designations. Where the 1966 ORP had contained six land use designations permitting residential land uses, the updated ORP only contained three such designations: see Appendix 7.

The updated plan's URBAN and RURAL designations were close replacements for the 1966 ORP's ESTABLISHED URBAN and UPLAND RURAL designations. The new designations respectively permitted 'unlimited' densities in fully serviced urban areas and 10 acre subdivisions in 'permanent' rural areas. In function, the new URBAN RESERVE designation was a combination
of the 1966 ORP's DEVELOPING URBAN and ACREAGE RURAL designations; its minimum lot size, where an OCP containing sewer and water infrastructure plans had not been adopted, was 5 acres. The 1966 ORP's LOWLAND RURAL designation, with its 20 acre minimum lot size, was replaced by a new AGRICULTURE designation which did not permit any subdivision in ALR areas. Lastly, it should be noted that the updated ORP offered no replacement for RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RRL-4), the rural-urban transition designation that had been previously formulated by the LMPRP to legitimize and facilitate limited amounts of low density, 'suburban' development that would remain unserviced and never attain full urban densities.

Unlike the 1966 ORP, the redesignation policies of the updated ORP's land use designations did not directly permit redesignation from one designation to another. The updated ORP thus avoided the rural to urban progression of redesignations that had been inherent in the structure of the 1966 ORP's land use policies: from UPLAND RURAL to ACREAGE RURAL to DEVELOPING URBAN to ESTABLISHED URBAN. In contrast to the policies of the 1966 ORP's DEVELOPING URBAN designation, the updated ORP's URBAN RESERVE redesignation policies did permit the extension or creation of new URBAN RESERVE areas. Such implicit redesignations, however, were only to be allowed in areas contiguous to URBAN areas and where specified servicing standards were satisfied. The redesignation policies of the updated ORP's RURAL designation
also permitted the extension or creation of RURAL areas, but only where the proposed areas, regardless of existing designation, were composed of predominantly large parcels remote from existing or possible future URBAN areas.

In terms of its ability to ensure a sharp dichotomy between urban and rural areas, the first draft of the updated ORP was a 'tighter' plan than the 1966 ORP. The land use designations of the updated ORP, with fewer residential designations and more restrictive redesignation policies, delineated a steeper rural to urban density transition gradient. In conjunction with the TLC's approval to use detailed 1:10,000 scale plan maps, the updated ORP's land use designations increased the certainty that the image contained in the plan's development concept, i.e., the nodal pattern of urban settlement, would be implemented on the ground, and this shifted the plan towards a blueprint style of planning.

In contrast to the 1966 ORP, the updated ORP largely eliminated the use of conditionally structured policies in its land use designations: there were few regulations where the development of a particular land use, i.e., units per acre, was made dependent on specified conditions such as the level of servicing to be provided. The URBAN designation, for example, simply permitted no subdivision without the provision of water and sewer systems or the formal adoption, by by-law, of an OCP outlining land development in relation to the future
provision of such services. With its unequivocal land use designation policies, the updated ORP would not be exposed to situations where future municipal development pressures might generate plan amendment applications to relax or remove any specific conditions for low density residential development. By not weakening future regulatory authority by implicitly delegating it downwards to the Municipalities, the updated ORP had recovered the Regional Districts' authority over land use planning and increased, relatively, the plan's degree of control.

To help support the development concept, the plan's regional development policies called for the Lower Mainland's urban nodes to be linked by a continuous network of transportation and utilities corridors. The first draft, unlike the 1966 ORP, contained a separate TRANSPORTATION/UTILITIES land use designation that was to be used for identifying and reserving such corridors in the updated ORP's plan map schedules. While the Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), see Appendix 3, required ORPs to show the general location of proposed highways, it was beyond the Regional Districts' formal authority to use their ORPs as a way of securing the provision of infrastructure. Another area where the first draft attempted to exercise 'informal' authority was in its environmental policies. Under its development strategy policies, the first draft stated that Lower Mainland air quality 'will' be maintained, that the water quality in bays and rivers 'will' be maintained, and that
the pollution of soil 'will' be minimized.

While the plan's degree of control and the certainty of its image were greatly increased in the final draft compared to the 1966 ORP, the movement towards a blueprint style of planning was by no means complete. The updated ORP, at the Lower Mainland level, did not possess the increased authority that the WG's first draft implied. In essence, the updated ORP was to be implemented by a planning agency, the LMPRP, that lacked a veto or approval authority over plan amendments not in the best interests of the Lower Mainland: see section 3.6.2.

3.5.3 The Planning Agency: Rational Comprehensive Versus Disjointed Incremental Planning

a) summary

In a somewhat 'jerky' manner, there was a shift towards a rational comprehensive style of planning during the formulation of the first draft of the updated ORP. An internal conflict within the WG over the type of plan the updated ORP ought to be initially constrained the movement towards rational comprehensive planning, but the centralized structure of the LMPRP, as a planning organization, carried the joint work program along, and an acceptable plan outline was eventually prepared. The 'combined' plan instrument called for the updated ORP to be a Lower Mainland concept plan
that would also include a shared set of Regional District development policies and implementation measures, i.e., land use designations similar to those of the 1966 ORP.

Since the structure described in the plan instrument inherently prescribed a top down process of plan formulation, it increased the chances of producing an updated ORP with a holistic image of the Lower Mainland. The WG, though, was not able to generate a Lower Mainland development concept using strictly technical methods. Instead, the preferred development concept, the nodal pattern of urban settlement, was selected through the use of a modified goals achievement matrix, a centralized procedure that strengthened the WG's internal linkages and constrained any potential movement back towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. While it appears that the first draft's development concept and development strategy policies were actually formulated from the ground or bottom up, the plan still presented a coordinated or holistic image for future Lower Mainland development.

b) interpretation

The Update process began with the WG's preparation of a joint work program, one that outlined the expected level of cooperation between the four Regional Districts and the LMPRP. In the first phase, research and problem identification, the
WG was to identify Lower Mainland planning issues through the provision of a common data base (land use and socioeconomic statistics) and growth forecast. The first phase was largely to be a collaborative effort, but each Regional District would retain responsibility for conducting an internal review of its ORP and for handling its own public input. In phase two, the work items were to include the development and formulation of policy options, the analyses of these options, and the preparation of a draft plan containing the recommended options. Responsibility for policy formulation would lie with each Regional District while all the updated ORP's would have to conform to a common set of terms and classifications. In the final phase, plan adoption, the Regional Districts were again to work in a collaborative manner to eliminate inconsistencies in policies between the updated ORP's and to ensure a common ORP format. Each Regional District, however, would still retain final responsibility for ORP adoption.

The establishment of the WG centralized the structure of the LMPRP and transformed it into a planning organization with a political board (Review Panel representatives), and executive (TLC), and staff group (WG). However, while the work program was the result of a centralized planning process, which in turn prescribed a fairly centralized set of procedures for formulating an updated ORP, it offered no guarantee that the plan would emerge with a holistic image of the Lower Mainland. The updated ORP, as defined in the work program, would be a
review of the 1966 ORP and would continue to exercise control at the Regional District level through the application of land use designations and detailed plan maps schedules. Without increased land use planning authority at the Lower Mainland level to support the centralized structure of the LMPRP, there was the possibility that the joint work program might not be successful and that the updated ORP(s) would emerge as a collection of separate plans sharing a minimal level of common interest, i.e., a 'common denominator' plan.

Responding to a call for more direct work on the plan and less emphasis on data collection and research, the TLC added 'policy consideration and development' as a phase one work item. The WG was subsequently regrouped on the basis of ten major policy topics, and this restructured the WG's approach from systematic analysis to a problem or issue oriented review. However, the potential for fragmentation and atomistic images of the Lower Mainland was held in check by the order with which the policy topics were assigned to the WG members. The WG representative from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs was assigned responsibility for urban area limits (development constraints); use and conservation of natural resources; and administration and amendment procedures. Within this framework, the Regional District members of the WG were assigned those policy areas that would lead to the spatial definition of a Lower Mainland settlement pattern: activity centers (commercial and institutional land use);
economic activities (industrial land use); population and housing distribution (residential land use); and transportation (linkages). This assignment of policy topics reflected a centralized, top down approach with the potential for a holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

In practice, the restructuring of the work program by policy issues temporarily fragmented the WG's efforts to update the ORP. The WG members, assuming responsibility for different policy topics, conducted separate reviews of past planning policies pertaining to their topics and held individual meetings with relevant government agencies and elected representatives so as to collect ideas for possible new policies. During the preparation of the policy content discussion papers, the WG members operated as individuals and held no official or recorded joint meetings. This apparent lack of coordination was not assisted by the fact that the WG's informal leader, a senior staff representative from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and a member of the TLC, slowly retreated from a leadership role and eventually left the WG.

During the preparation of the policy content discussion papers, a GVRD member of the WG prepared an initial long range forecast of Lower Mainland population growth to 2001. The figures, documented in, Technical Memorandum No. 2, indicated that the annual rate of population growth would decline from 3.5 to 1.5 percent, but that a substantial absolute increase
in population, some 400,000 persons, could still be expected. Given the unquestioned assumption that such growth was to be 'accommodated', the WG's population forecast reinforced the need for a centralized approach to Lower Mainland land use planning.

The accuracy and biases of the cohort survival method that was used to make the forecasts was not seriously challenged by the TLC. In particular, the population forecasts for the four Regional Districts and, collectively, the Lower Mainland were largely dependent on in-migration rather than natural growth. This meant that the trend distribution of growth between the Regional Districts was primarily based on local growth trends as determined by the existing spatial pattern of settlement. Reflecting the ground up summation of local historical projections, the population forecast for the Lower Mainland was thus a set of atomistic images linked together rather than a holistic image based on integrated perspective of economic growth.

Shortly after the completion of the population forecast, the WG prepared an economic study. The figures, documented in, Technical Memorandum No. 5, indicated that employment in the Lower Mainland would grow at a rate of between 1.5 and 2 percent per year to 1986. While the forecast lent support to the population projections, it was not the result of the economic base study that had originally been called for. The
economic forecast was based on Lower Mainland shares of economic activity that had been projected at the provincial level rather than on the interaction between the Lower Mainland's economic sectors and the 'export' of the Lower Mainland's goods and services. Aside from the volatility of the Province's export driven economy and the accuracy of the 'step down' method, the study's projections were only disaggregated by general economic sectors and not by Municipalities or even Regional Districts. The economic study's lack of geographic detail, of course, meant that it could not be applied in a top down manner to determine the allocations, i.e., quantity and spatial distribution, of various land uses.

As noted under section 3.5.2, the policy content papers reopened the question of the plan's level of spatial and policy detail. The type of plan the updated ORP was to become itself became a matter of conflict within the WG. The GVRD members of the WG supported the 'housekeeping' plan option, a review of the 1966 ORP's land use designations and plan maps. The Valley Regional District members of the WG, for differing reasons, supported the idea of a concept plan as outlined in the 'regional structure' plan option. Since it appears that the WG members were supporting the informally held preferences of their respective Regional Districts, the WG faced a situation where its external linkages were becoming stronger than its internal linkages. The plan type conflict thus
reflected the WG's fragmented work efforts on the policy content discussion papers and served to temporarily constrain the movement towards a rational comprehensive style of planning.

Seeking a resolution to the question of plan type, the WG passed the issue up to the TLC. The TLC's response, a general description of the themes that the updated ORP ought to address, was rather vague, but permitted the WG sufficient flexibility to reach a consensus on the type of plan the updated ORP would be (LMORPU-TLC, Minutes, January 30, 1979, p. 9). From the TLC's listing of joint Regional District policy concerns—agriculture, natural assets, rural land use, population distribution and residential settlement, and employment distribution and industrial centers—the WG concluded that a comprehensive planning document for the Lower Mainland was still required.

The WG interpreted the TLC's theme of reducing the 'over' regulation and jurisdictional complexity as meaning that the updated ORP ought to be a simpler plan, but one containing no less 'teeth', i.e., authority. In particular, the WG decided that the use of land use designations and detailed plan maps ought to be continued while the distinction between short term and long term designations and maps would be eliminated (LMORPU-WG, Minutes, February 9, 1979, p. 1). The updated ORP was thus to be a combination of both the regional structure and
housekeeping plan options: a Lower Mainland concept plan that would be implemented through one set of simplified land use designations and plan maps that would last the duration of the plan's time horizon, until 2001.

The 'top down' structure of the proposed ORP was outlined in the WG's first 'combined' plan instrument paper and was subsequently approved by the TLC. In the plan type section of the public document, 'The Way Ahead', the WG summarized the basic principles that had been used to guide the preparation of the proposed ORP's outline: to provide a broad set of objectives and development directions for the Lower Mainland; to use the minimum level of control required to achieve these objectives; to provide maximum flexibility for the individual Regional Districts and Municipalities within this framework; and to provide a focus for an ongoing process of monitoring, consultation, and joint planning amongst all the users of the plan. These principles, containing the basic concepts of strategic planning, were an extension and more precise expression of the TLC's earlier discussion on plan type. Thus, the resolution of the plan type question, through an evolving series of plan instrument papers outlining the proposed ORP, was a centralized process that was made possible through the continuing operation of a centralized Lower Mainland planning agency. The 'combined' plan instrument, in turn, described a centralized, top down procedure for formulating the updated ORP and maintaining a holistic image
of the Lower Mainland.

In approving the WG's decision to retain the use of land use designations as the minimum level of control required to achieve the plan's Lower Mainland development objectives, the TLC renewed the need to devise a method capable of translating total Lower Mainland growth into land use consumption and location, i.e., a settlement pattern. The WG subsequently reconsidered an earlier, February 1979 work program for formulating an industrial strategy, one that involved analyzing the Lower Mainland's industrial base to more accurately forecast industrial land demands and determine the required supply and location of such industrial land (LMORPU-WG 1979/9). By dealing with the long term issue of industrial land supply first, the industrial development strategy was to help provide a spatial framework for the subsequent allocation of urban land, i.e., a holistic, top down image of the Lower Mainland.

An economic base analysis again proved to be beyond the immediate capability of the WG, and the industrial development strategy study was cancelled. Translating the results of the earlier economic study, employment forecasts, into policies relating to land use consumption and location was to remain as part of the ongoing process of Lower Mainland planning.

To determine land demands, the WG turned to other data sources. The future demand for industrial land use was
projected on the basis of annual absorption rates, historical rates of industrial land consumption (LMORPU-WG, Minutes, May 3, 1979, p. 2). Here, the assumption was that the efficiency of industrial land use would remain constant and that future consumption would be driven by the economic study's forecast of slow, but steady industrial employment growth.

The future demand for residential land was based on the WG's population forecast with the assumption that increases in population would consume residential land at existing residential densities. For any particular residential use, i.e., dwelling type, the acres of land demanded were calculated by dividing the proportion of new residents demanding this type of dwelling unit by the average number of persons occupying one acre of this residential use. It must be noted, however, that the WG did not attempt to determine the future demand for rural living and rural land. With its desire to ensure staged growth, the WG had declared rural living to be an inefficient use of land, a use to be restricted rather than accommodated (LMORPU-TLC, Minutes, April 10, 1979, p. 3).

Notwithstanding the accuracy of the growth forecasts, averaged

---

2 The density figures, average persons per acre, were derived from the GVRD's LUIS (Land Use Information System) data base: sub area populations were divided by sub area acreages and the averages, for each residential type, were calculated across all the sub areas of the GVRD. The increases in future population were taken from the forecasts contained in, Technical Memorandum No. 1.
densities, and consumption rates, the above methods did not provide the WG with the means to spatially allocate future land uses within the Regional Districts. Each Regional District, moreover, was to retain final authority over its land use allocations and, in the instance of residential land use, over the appropriate mix of dwelling unit types. While the WG had coordinated the calculation of the land consumption figures, the updated ORP was still in danger of fragmenting into four completely separate plans and presenting atomistic images of the Lower Mainland. This situation was exacerbated by the March 1979 completion of 'plan instrument IV' and its recommendation that each Regional District formulate its own 'sectoral strategy' (LMORPU-WG 1979/17).

The development framework section of 'plan instrument IV' also contained a list of development objectives for the Lower Mainland. A spatial pattern of settlement could not be directly synthesized from these development objectives, however, and the WG subsequently pulled together its diverging work programs and concentrated it efforts on this task. In its first attempt to define a technique capable of generating a settlement pattern, the WG placed a dominant emphasis on the overall objective of reservation and 'respecting the land' rather than on the opposing objective of 'accommodating growth'.

The actual technique, proposed in early April 1979, involved
delineating reservation areas by 'hard' lines on large scale maps (LMORPU-WG 1979/23). In particular, the criteria for reservation areas included floodplain lands, agricultural land reserves, hazard lands, biologically sensitive lands, and park and crown lands. All of these criteria were then to be integrated into reserve areas through the use of coloured, transparent overlays. In essence, this development strategy was a 'remainder' or constraint based method; urban development would only be permitted on those lands not designated reserve.

The constraint based method described above, with its Lower Mainland-wide consideration of land availability and distribution, constituted a holistic approach to the updating of the ORP. Even using detailed, 1:50,000 scale maps, though, this method alone would not have led to a coherent spatial pattern for further development in the Lower Mainland. The WG subsequently devised its own methodology for generating a Lower Mainland settlement pattern. The methodology was composed of four basic steps: identifying alternative settlement patterns, i.e., growth scenarios, and defining the implications of each scenario; establishing criteria for evaluating the scenarios; evaluating the scenarios; and quantifying the implications of the selected scenario, including its impact of urban form. Occupying all of the WG's efforts during the first three weeks of May 1979, this methodology constituted a highly centralized set of
procedures: see Appendix 6. The methodology also strengthened internal linkages within the WG and constrained any possible movement back towards disjointed incrementalism during the formulation of the first draft of the updated ORP.

The settlement patterns were generated by directing varying levels of forecast growth into three basic spatial distributions: growth constrained by resource (land) capability; growth focused into selected urban centers; and growth allowed to follow the existing trend of low density, urban fringe development, i.e., sprawl. Of these, the focused or 'nodal' growth scenario emerged as the preferred option. The actual evaluation was conducted through the application of a modified goals achievement matrix, (Hill 1968), in which the growth scenario options were rated against criteria that had been individually weighted for importance.

In particular, the highest ranking nodal growth scenario was virtually identical to the 'cities in a sea of green' concept that had originally been presented in the 1963 plan, 'Chance and Challenge'. The WG's evaluation criteria, of course, had been synthesized from the development objectives expressed in past plans. Thus, the selection of the nodal growth scenario reflected the inertia of past LMRPB planning and, implicitly, a holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

The TLC ratified the WG's selection, May 17, 1979, and the
nodal settlement pattern was defined as the development concept for the Lower Mainland in the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP. Under the plan's development strategy policies, the development concept was described in a top down manner: Lower Mainland growth was first to be redirected towards the metropolitan, GVRD area, then towards the north side of the Fraser River, i.e., DARD, and finally, within each Regional District, to Regional Town Centers and Valley Towns. The WG, it appears, left no records to indicate how it had calculated this distribution of Lower Mainland growth in terms of the actual growth share numbers and percentage targets. By examining the updated ORP's 'strategy in numbers' and noting the differences between the trend and target figures, it is possible to determine each Regional District's net gain or loss of future growth: see Appendix 18.

The development strategy proposed the redistribution of 46,000 new residents away from trend locations, some 10 percent of the total population growth, 461,000 person, forecast for the Lower Mainland. With a large proportion of its land composed of highly productive and protected (ALR) farmland, CFVRD was to lose some 27 percent of the 166,000 new residents that it was forecast to gain through trend growth. CFVRD's net loss of 45,000 new residents provided virtually all, some 98 percent, of the growth to be redistributed to GVRD, 32,000 net new residents, and DARD, 14,000 net new residents. The remaining balance of 1,000 new residents was to come from a
less than 1 percent decrease in the trend growth forecast for RDFC, 75,000 net new residents. Thus, contrary to the top down order presented in the development strategy policies of the updated ORP, it appears that the allocation of future growth was made from the ground up on the basis of land constraints and growth capacity.

Even though the updated ORP's growth share targets were calculated from the ground up, the development concept was not merely the aggregated product of separate or atomistic images of the Lower Mainland. The growth share targets were used to lend quantitative substance to a development concept, the nodal pattern of urban settlement, that had already been selected through a centralized approach. Similar to the previously proposed 'remainder' method of defining a settlement pattern, the growth share targets were based on the Lower Mainland-wide distribution of lands suitable and available for urban use.

The updated ORP's 'strategy in numbers' thus reflected an holistic image of the Lower Mainland and a rational comprehensive style of planning. Overall, the updated ORP was formulated in a top down manner that provided not only increasing certainty of image, see section 3.5.2, but a holistic image of the Lower Mainland: from the development objectives to the development strategy policies, to the land use designation policies. The manner of LMPRP's application
of the land use designations, holistic or atomistic, is considered in the next, final time period, section 3.6.3.

3.5.4 The Planning Process: Normative Versus Functional Planning

a) summary

There was a minor shift towards a normative style of planning during this period. In particular, the shift was not a change in direction, but the completion of the shift away from functional planning that occurred at the end of the last period. The shift resulted as the LMPRP made full use of the relative autonomy that it had acquired through the temporary expansion, i.e., centralization, of its decision making structure and procedures. In the context of formulating the first draft of the updated ORP, the WG acted in a political role and implicitly urged the TLC, who largely acted in a bureaucratic role, towards securing additional autonomy for the LMPRP. The WG's political role constrained the possibility of any movement back towards a purely functional style of planning, but the LMPRP's future authority and functions, as outlined in the administration and amendment section of the first draft, were clearly within the ambit of existing legislation.
b) interpretation

Section 807 of the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), stated that an ORP was to be a general land use plan 'without detail'. However, the TLC approved the WG's July 1978 recommendation that the ORP's plan maps, i.e., area designations, be sufficiently detailed to ensure the interpretation of the effect of the plan on individual properties. The WG, in seeking increased control over municipal land use planning through the updated ORP's increased level of spatial resolution, had thus also increased the LMPRP's degree of autonomy.

The WG's August 1978 work program explicitly stated that the ORP was to be prepared as an update to the 1966 ORP rather than as a fundamental review and new plan. While the first phase of the Update process was to be a collaborative effort encompassing Lower Mainland research and problem identification, policy consideration and development was subsequently added as a first phase work item. This change served to bring the Update process forward, into its second phase, and implicitly gave the WG considerable autonomy in formulating policy, a task that had previously been listed as the sole prerogative of the individual Regional Districts.

Reorganized on the basis of policy issues rather than by analytical tasks, the WG acted in a political role for the
remainder of 1978. The WG members met with the Regional Districts, Municipalities, and other planning agencies pertinent to their assigned policy areas and compiled a series of 'policy content evaluation sheets' that listed the basic advantages and disadvantages of different policy directions for an updated ORP. In mid October 1978, the TLC acknowledged that a 'new' approach to the Update process was not beyond consideration. The WG thus pressed the TLC towards making full use of the autonomy that the LMPRP had temporarily acquired and constrained any potential shift back towards a functional style of planning.

By the start of 1979, the WG had completed its policy content discussion papers, but had not been able to translate the Lower Mainland economic growth projections of 'Technical Memo No. 5' into the land use demands and spatial allocations required for a detailed ORP. The WG, from its discussion papers, had also discovered that the type of plan the updated ORP was to become would closely depend on the level of detail seen as necessary to ensure the implementation of the plan's objectives and the amount of research required to support such detail. Unable to choose between the proposed regional structure option (a generalized concept plan) and the housekeeping option (a detailed land use plan) the WG temporarily reverted to a bureaucratic role and passed the decision up to the TLC.
The TLC subsequently instructed the WG to include within the scope of the updated ORP virtually all of the policy areas considered in the policy content discussion papers. While the TLC also stated that reducing regulatory and jurisdictional complexity should be a theme for the updated ORP, it did not specify how this was to be accomplished. The WG, interpreting the TLC's general discussion of the plan instrument, i.e., plan type, subsequently decided that the TLC had instructed it to simplify the ORP without sacrificing the plan's strengths. In particular, the WG decided to retain the use of land use designations and to reject the exclusive adoption of the regional structure option. The WG thus constrained a potential shift back towards a functional style of planning by acting in a political role and refusing to fully conform to the TLC's implicit desire to formulate the plan strictly within the bounds of the existing legislation.

The 'plan instrument papers' called for the updated ORP to be a two tier plan: Lower Mainland development objectives, along with a generalized 1:250,000 scale regional structure map, would provide an overall framework for the future pattern of urban settlement while regional development principles, composed of general policies, regulatory land use policies, and detailed plan maps, would assist the implementation of this framework. As the outline of the updated ORP emerged through successive plan instrument papers, much of the general policy, including growth share targets, was shifted from the
regional development principles section to the Lower Mainland
development objectives or framework (LMORPU-WG 1979/14).

This inherently increased the importance of the development
framework section, and the WG attempted to protect it by
recommending that a majority vote, i.e., three out of four
Regional District Boards, be required for amendment. In
addition, the WG used the plan instrument papers to recommend
that the functions and staffing arrangements for the future
LMPRP be written directly into the updated ORP's
administration and amendment section. The WG, by implicitly
urging the LMPRP to secure, if not increase, future autonomy,
thus acted in a political role.

The WG also acted in a political role during the formulation
of the updated ORP's Lower Mainland development concept.
Having failed to devise a purely technical method for
translating Lower Mainland growth into a development concept,
i.e., a spatial settlement pattern, the WG decided to generate
and evaluate its own set of growth scenarios. The WG used a
modified goals achievement matrix, (Hill 1968) to select the
preferred development concept, a nodal pattern of urban
settlement. Based on criteria that had been synthesized from
the development objectives of past concept plans and weighted
by the WG members, the evaluation was virtually an exclusive
reflection of professional planning values: see Appendix 6.
The WG's bias was clearly towards maintaining tight control over the supply of urban land. During its earlier calculation of Lower Mainland land demands, the WG's stated purpose had been to show that lands already designated urban would be sufficient to meet anticipated growth. The WG, believing rural residential living to be an inefficient use of land that ought to be discouraged, did not attempt to calculate the demand for rural land.

After considering the first phase summary document the 'Way Ahead', in June 1978, RDFC resolved that the updated ORP would not be adopted by its Board until local conflicts between the ALR and ORP had been settled. The WG subsequently met with ALC staff to discuss the relationship between the ALR and the development directions of the updated ORP. While the ALC representatives stated that some 'fine tuning' of ALR boundaries might be possible, they noted that exceptions would not be possible in areas including the Municipalities of Langley (CFVRD) and Chilliwack (RDFC). The ALC's position did not directly effect the LMPRP, but it did undermine some of the rural-agricultural Municipalities' hopes that the Update process would increase their autonomy over land use planning.

In terms of its certainty of image, see section 3.5.2, the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP was a 'tighter' plan than the 1966 ORP. The WG, in retaining the use of land
use designations and employing more detailed plan maps, had taken full advantage of the autonomy temporarily granted to the LMPRP to formulate an updated plan and had even increased the strength of the plan relative to the vague, legislative definition of an ORP.

With respect to the future of the LMPRP, though, the first draft of the updated ORP did not incorporate the recommendations of the WG's 'plan instrument papers', i.e., the call for a majority (3/4) Regional District Board vote to approve amendments to the development framework. The administration and amendment section of the updated ORP recognized many of the LMPRP's ongoing review and monitoring functions, but it did not give the future LMPRP any authority or functions that the LMPRP could not have itself assumed under existing legislation, i.e., Order-In-Council 41156/68. Here, both the TLC and WG had partially retreated into a bureaucratic role and not fully moved towards a normative style of planning.
3.6 The Adoption Of An Updated ORP: 1979-1981

3.6.1 Chronology

This period begins with the review of the first draft and ends with the Regional Districts' approval and adoption of the final draft of the updated ORP. Figure 22 provides a time line chronology of the events and issues that transpired during the final phase of the Update process.

After the first draft of the updated ORP was approved by the TLC and LMPRP, August 1979, (1), the Update process moved into a review phase. Municipal, (2), and provincial, (3), reviews of the first draft were conducted throughout September and October 1979. As before, the strongest protests to the first draft came from RDFC and the Municipality of Langley (CFVRD). The difference between their criticisms of the first draft was that RDFC's comments were directed at specific plan policies while Langley's arguments challenged the basic distribution of power between the Regional Districts and Municipalities.

During the 'review' period, one of the WG's greatest concerns was whether or not the LMPRP ought to have an approval role over future amendments to the updated ORP, (4). The WG could not resolve its internal differences of opinion on the approval role issue, and it subsequently referred the matter to the TLC. In an early September 1979 meeting, the TLC
Figure 22: Chronology Of Events And Issues 1979-1981

1. TLC and LMPRP approve 'First ORP Update Draft'

2. Municipal reviews of 'First ORP Update Draft'

3. Provincial reviews of 'First ORP Update Draft'

4. WG considers approval role for the LMPRP

5. TLC considers status of new OCPs

6. WG produces 'review' work program

7. WG produces a list of recommended revisions to the 'First ORP Update Draft'

8. TLC approves revisions to 'First ORP Update Draft'

9. TLC reviews WG's preliminary 'Final ORP Update Draft'

10. TLC approves WG's 'Final ORP Update Draft'
11. WG proposes common methodology for final plan map land use allocations

12. TLC approves its 1980 work program

13. WG recommends its dissolution and the TLC approves

14. WG coordinates legal review of the updated ORP

15. Municipalities and Regional Districts review the 'Final ORP Update Draft'

TLC considers the 'Response Packages' prepared by the four Lower Mainland Regional Districts

LMRP recommends all Regional Districts to adopt the 'Final ORP Update Draft' as a Regional Plan

GVRD conducts work on the industrial component of the updated ORP

Minister of Municipal Affairs announces a proposal for a 'Land Use Act' and later meets with the LMPRP to discuss it

GVRD prepares and TLC considers a memo on alternative structures for Lower Mainland planning

LMRP approves the TLC's reaffirmation of the updated ORP's LMPCC structure for Lower Mainland planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Minister of Municipal Affairs meets with LMPRP to discuss reducing the number of Lower Mainland Regional Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>RDFC request to TLC for designation text changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>TLC considers RDFC text change requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>GVRD formulates URBAN-2 designation as key to final package of text changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>TLC approves final text change package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>LMPRP approves final text change package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>TLC approves GVRD amendments of the new URBAN-2 designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>LMPRP recommends Regional District plan map schedules for adoption, with amended ORP text, for adoption as ORPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>LMPRP recommends that all Regional Districts incorporate RDFC's new CANYON HAMLET designation into their updated ORPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(July 1981)
considered the approval role issue in the context of the legal status of draft OCP's such as the one in progress for Langley, (5). The basic argument was that the LMPRP required an approval role so that it could ensure the conformity of OCP's with the updated ORP. Many Municipalities, it appears, saw the Update process as a means of having all their demands, as embodied by their draft OCP's, included in the updated ORP(s). However, the provincial representatives of the TLC were able to offer little assurance that the primacy of the updated ORP, from a legal perspective, would be recognized by the Government.

The WG, to this point, had only succeeded in making minor revisions to the first draft. Accordingly, the WG prepared a work program, early September 1979, that was to allow enough time to ensure that the technical and political assessments of the first draft plan could be adequately reflected in the final draft, (6). WG members worked through October 1979, preparing a series of 'review papers' which were subsequently summarized into a list of recommended draft plan revisions, (7). In a late October 1979 meeting, the TLC approved most of these revisions, (8).

In the TLC's late October 1979 meeting, it also requested that the WG consider designating Chilliwack (City) as a Valley Town under the development strategy of the final draft. The WG then consolidated these approved revisions into the text of
the updated ORP, and the TLC considered this 'final draft' in its mid December 1979 meeting, (9). At this meeting, the TLC issued the WG with the specific directive, rather than the previous suggestion, that it include Chilliwack as a Valley Town. The TLC, after making a number of text changes to the designation policies, approved the final draft for publication in mid January 1980, (9).

The final draft of the updated ORP, (10), was still a strategic, framework type of plan, but one that had become much more regulatory in nature. While the final draft gave the Municipalities more flexibility with respect to minimum lot sizes, the conditional structures and details of the final draft's land use policies made it a more complex plan than the first draft. The final draft of the updated ORP had returned to the basic style of the 1966 ORP. Lastly, the final draft was a 'looser' plan; the weakening of its land use policies constituted a partial retreat from the sharp rural-urban dichotomy contained in the first draft.

In addition to reviewing feedback on the first draft and preparing a final draft, the WG also assumed responsibility for a third area of work: 'overseeing' the allocation of land uses in each Regional District's final set of plan maps schedules, (11). The WG prepared technical specifications for the drafting of plan maps, but a general review of the plan maps designations was never conducted because the WG itself
was disbanded just prior to the final phase of the Update process. All that was prepared, mid December 1979, was a crude analysis of land demand and supply that quickly proved to be inadequate during later political negotiations.

The TLC, in a mid February 1980 meeting, approved a work program for the final phase of the Update process, reconciliation and adoption, (12). Having completed all the necessary technical work on the updated ORP, the WG told the TLC that the political negotiations required for the adoption of the plan should be handled by the TLC rather than the WG. The TLC subsequently resolved, in a late March 1980 meeting, that the WG be disbanded, (13). Consequently, the WG's last work item was the coordination of a legal review of the updated ORP, (14). The findings of the legal review, also presented to the late March 1980 meeting of the TLC, revealed that the basic concept of the updated ORP, as a regulatory land use plan, was within the ambit of the law and that only a number of minor text changes were required to avoid excess jurisdiction or unlawful delegation of authority.

From mid February 1980, when the final draft was approved for distribution by the LMPRP, until June 1980, the updated ORP went through a second 'review' period, (15). The Regional Districts, during this review period, compiled municipal comments and public feedback on the final draft into 'Response Packages', documents that contained recommended policy
changes. Throughout June 1980, the TLC considered these Response Packages and established an Editorial Committee to consolidate TLC approved changes into the text of the final draft, (16). The LMPRP, in a mid June 1980 meeting, considered all the text changes that the TLC had made and recommended that the Regional District adopt it (text only) as a Regional Plan, (17), with the policy issues outstanding to be resolved before its adoption as an Official Regional Plan (with plan map schedules).

While the primary emphasis of the reconciliation and adoption phase was on the updated ORP's land use policies, two other issues arose. One issue was the relation between industry and the updated ORP, (18). In mid June 1980, the TLC received a report on this subject that had been prepared by the GVRD Planning Department. The report noted the problem of potential long term shortages of industrial land and recommended that positive measures be taken to deal with the situation. However, the TLC could only make minor changes to the text of the updated ORP in support of the report. The GVRD Planning Department subsequently prepared a memo for the TLC, mid July 1980, calling for a major industrial land demand and supply study and providing a preliminary outline and work program for this study. This memo was tabled by the TLC for later consideration, and the issues of industrial land and its relationship to the development strategy passed out of the Update process without being resolved.
The second issue, affecting the legislative framework for regional planning, was external to the substantive concerns contained in the updated ORP. At the end of May 1980, the Minister of Municipal Affairs announced a proposal for a 'Land Use Act', one that would centralize 'broad brush' land use planning, i.e., for the Lower Mainland, at the provincial level and would effectively remove the regional planning function from the Regional Districts, (19). The Minister subsequently met with the LMPRP, late June 1980, to inform its members that Municipal Affairs recognized the utility of the updated ORP in attempting to plan for the Lower Mainland as a single economic unit. However, the Minister provided no assurances of what functions the LMPRP would serve or how much authority it would possess. In fact, the Minister requested the LMPRP to delete mention of ministerial representation on the Lower Mainland Plan Coordinating Committee (LMPCC) as outlined in the updated ORP.

At this same meeting, the LMPRP ordered the TLC to report on the structure and operation, including the amendment procedure, of the LMPCC, i.e., the future LMPRP. The GVRD subsequently prepared a memo for the TLC on this subject that evaluated several structural and organizational arrangements for strategic regional planning in the Lower Mainland, (20). In mid July 1980, the TLC approved the GVRD's recommendation to retain the LMPCC option, a decision that the LMPRP then ratified in mid August 1980, (21). The review of Lower
Mainland planning appears to have had a unifying effect on the LMPRP, for the LMPRP, in an early 1980 meeting with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, was not particularly receptive to the Minister's suggestion that the four Lower Mainland Regional Districts be combined into two (GVRD and Valley Regional District) so as to reduce the 'burden' of government, (22)

During the GVRD's heavy involvement with the implications of the proposed Land Use Act, the RDFC Planning Department had been preparing a set of text amendment proposals for the final draft of the updated ORP. The proposals, which included requests for smaller minimum RURAL lot sizes and relaxations to the URBAN servicing standards, were sent to the TLC Chairman in early July 1980, (23), and considered by the TLC throughout August 1980, (24). With some modifications, the TLC adopted RDFC's requests, a situation that did not meet with full GVRD or DARD approval.

RDFC's proposed land use designation policies were not restrictive enough for DARD, but were too restrictive for GVRD. The GVRD subsequently reviewed all of the subdivision policies of all the updated ORPs' land use designations and prepared a 'final package' of text changes, (25). Formulated to legitimize pre 1966 ORP subdivisions in Surrey (GVRD), the new URBAN-2 land use designation was the key to this final package. The URBAN-2 designation was to provide flexibility
for urban development in Surrey while still leaving the Valley Regional Districts with the URBAN RESERVE designation to provide greater, staged control over a generally slower rate of rural to urban conversion.

While the GVRD stated that this new designation might eliminate the need for smaller RURAL lot sizes, it did not; another new designation, CANYON HAMLET, was ultimately incorporated into the updated ORP, July 1981, to solve RDFC's Upper Valley planning problems. The final package of text changes was quickly approved by the TLC, (26), and the LMPRP, (27), in late August 1980. With the exception of some additional changes to the URBAN-2 designation, (28), in early September 1980, the text of the updated ORP had been 'reconciled', and the Regional Districts proceeded, during the remainder of 1980, to adopt it, along with plan map and other schedules, as an amendment to their 1966 ORPs.

The net result of the reconciliation and adoption phase of the Update process was a 'common denominator' plan, one whose land use designation policies satisfied the concerns of all the Regional Districts. In particular, the addition of new residential designations and the relaxation of the subdivision regulations that had been included in the final draft both served to make the adopted ORP an even 'looser' plan. The land use designations in the adopted ORP largely reflected the existing pattern of land use on the ground. In essence, the
adopted ORP's land use designation lacked the 'teeth' to implement the adopted ORP's 'cities in a sea of green' development concept, a situation that reflected the proposed weakening rather than strengthening of the regional planning function and the LMPRP's failure to acquire an approval role over ORP amendments.

3.6.2 The Plan: Blueprint Versus Process Planning

a) summary

In a staggered, two part movement corresponding to the completion of the final draft and the adoption the updated ORP, the style of planning shifted away from blueprint planning and towards process planning. Comparatively long internal time lags constrained or slowed down the movement to process planning prior to the completion of the final draft. During the adoption period, though, it was not possible to maintain any semblance of a blueprint planning style; external and internal time lags were both so short that locally desired changes were almost immediately incorporated into the updated ORP.

The prime determinant of the shift to process planning was the decrease in the certainty of the plan's image caused by this feedback. In the final draft, the formulation of conditionally structured land use and subdivision regulations
softened the sharpness of the plan's urban-rural dichotomy, and the subsequent relaxation of the limits attached to conditional development led to the adoption of an updated ORP whose land use designations did not collectively express or implement the certainty of the plan's image, i.e., the development concept and strategy of a nodal pattern of urban settlement. The movement towards process planning was temporarily halted by the incorporation of a Regional District approval role over OCP's into the final draft, but this authority was removed after being found to be ultra vires of provincial legislation. For the most part, the move away from blueprint planning was supported by the implicit delegation of regulatory authority and a corresponding decrease in the plan's degree of control.

b) interpretation

While feedback to the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP continued for several months, the Lower Mainland's Municipalities and Regional Districts expressed their basic position very quickly, within a few weeks of first draft presentations. There was a broad level of support for the plan's image, and the majority of criticisms were directed at the question of how flexible the strategic planning system would be during implementation rather than at specific plan policies. The WG, in contrast, was comparatively slow in responding to local feedback. Attempting to protect the
certainty of the plan's image as best it could, the WG conducted numerous discussions and reviews before formulating new policies to cope with the issues raised by the feedback. Internal time lags were thus longer than external time lags, and this served to constrain the shift to process planning.

While the basic structure of the updated ORP remained the same in the final, January 1980 draft, improvements to the text of the final draft made it easier for the user to read and understand the plan (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1). The use of legally precise words such as 'should', 'may', and 'shall' rather than the generalized headings of 'advisory' and 'regulatory' transformed the land use designations of the plan's regional development policies into a clearer, 'zoning' type of format. To reduce repetition, many of the general policies listed under the regional development policies of the first draft were eliminated in the final draft. Introductory sections and improved graphics, i.e., flowcharts, were then used to provide connecting linkages, a solution that both clarified the overall organization of the plan and strengthened the identity of its two major parts: see Appendicies 8, 9, and 14. In turn, the improved text served to more clearly reveal the plan's image.

The development strategy policies that supported the updated ORP's development concept were consolidated in the final draft, from 27 to 9 in number: see Appendix 10. However, the
growth forecast and target shares on which these policies were based, i.e., the plan's 'strategy in numbers', remained virtually unchanged. Some 50 percent of total residential growth was still to be directed to the Valley Regional Districts, and 38 percent of this growth was still to be directed to the north side of the Fraser River, i.e., DARD: see Appendix 11. The final draft did increase the target proportion of Valley Regional District population growth to be located in Valley Towns from 75 to 80 percent, but this increase was completely due to the recognition of Chilliwack (City) as the plan's fifth Valley Town: see Appendix 13.

While Chilliwack was to receive 20 percent more population growth under the new target distribution than it would have received from trend growth, this additional growth was comparatively small in absolute terms, 2,000 persons, and was to come solely from RDFC's rural areas. RDFC, under the final draft's 'strategy in numbers', was still targeted to lose 1,000 new residents, some four percent, of the 23,500 new residents that it would have received under trend growth. Thus, RDFC acquired its own Valley Town, but only under conditions where Chilliwack's growth potential could not detract from the plan's image or concept of concentrating urban growth around a limited number of settlement nodes: see Appendix 18, Figure A18-3.

In the final draft, each land use designation listed all the
individual land uses to be permitted and made certain uses dependent on specific conditions. The most significant of these conditional uses was contained in the URBAN RESERVE designation where limited amounts of URBAN uses were now permitted. In addition, the final draft conditionally allowed the designation of limited amounts of new URBAN land. This had not been permitted under the first draft for fear of opening a 'loophole' that could threaten the plan's development strategy policies of encouraging staged growth and preventing the proliferation of urban centers.

More importantly, though, the final draft's residential land use designations used conditionally structured subdivision regulations that made development densities dependent on the existence of a recognized Official Community Plan (OCP) and the level of servicing. Without the immediate provision of a sewer system or both a sewer and water system, the final draft permitted lower densities, i.e., larger lot sizes, in URBAN designated areas and comparatively higher density development, i.e., smaller lot sizes, in URBAN RESERVE and RURAL designated areas: see Appendix 19. All of these conditionally structured regulations created designations within designations and so flattened the plan's rural to urban density transition gradient.

For reasons noted in section 3.6.3, the time frames of the residential land use designations were shortened in the final
draft: the supply of URBAN designated land was to last for 10 rather than 20 years; the URBAN RESERVE's land supply was to satisfy demands immediately beyond the URBAN designation's time frame rather than the previously unspecified 'long term' period; and the context of the RURAL designation was altered from 'permanent' to long term. This sequential shortening of time frames compressed the temporal distance between the designations, heightened the possibility that the process of rural to urban land conversion would be accelerated by future plan amendments, and increased potential pressures against the conditions and limits used in the designations' regulations.

Plan amendments to relax the final draft's conditions and limits for preventing too much conditional, low density development would have likely been generated from growth pressures at the municipal level. In essence, the final draft offered the Municipalities a more flexible set of land use designations, but had simultaneously created a more complex, more 'exposed' set of regulatory policies that implicitly delegated future authority downwards. The Municipalities thus gained a measure of autonomy at the potential expense of the Regional Districts' regulatory authority, and this reduced the plan's overall degree of control.

Indeed, the possibility of relaxations to the conditions and limits placed on low density urban development was a serious concern. The first draft's requirement that areas designated
RURAL not be extended into areas near URBAN or future URBAN designated areas had already been deleted from the final draft. One sign of the movement towards a process style of planning was thus the lack of certainty surrounding the residential land use designations' ability to ensure the implementation of the development concept's image of a sharp urban-rural dichotomy.

References to advisory policies were deleted from the final draft's land use designations, and this served to further reduce the plan's degree of control. For example, neither the (re)designation, nor the subdivision policies of the URBAN designation made reference to the updated ORP's residential settlement guidelines, Lower Mainland development concept map, or centers concept map as criteria for development. It appears that this revision, in part, was due to the difficulties of making general principles and large scale concept maps into legally binding, i.e., regulatory, schedules. In the case of the URBAN designation, the severing of important links to the plan's development concept and strategy was a serious problem. The final draft now permitted the creation of new urban areas, but had lost the use of key policies and concepts to help regulate the locations of such new urban areas.

In addition to decreased regulatory control, the final draft of the updated ORP exercised less positive control.
Objectives pertaining to economic growth were listed in the development framework as qualities to be enhanced rather than developed, a subtle change reflecting a growing awareness that the updated ORP could only provide land use opportunities for economic growth and could not directly create or stimulate economic growth. Any possibility that the updated ORP would become an 'action plan', incorporating infrastructure or corporate plans came to an end, and the provision of public works was deleted from the text of the final, January 1980 draft ORP. Accordingly, the TRANSPORTATION land use designation, which was to have reserved future transportation land through spatially detailed plan maps, was replaced by a policy calling for transportation corridors. The proposed transportation corridors were to be represented through a generalized, concept map, i.e., a transportation network plan.

The environmental policies were also deemphasized in the final draft; their primary function, especially the floodplain and ALR regulations, was no longer to directly protect the environment, but to support the plan's land use designation and development strategy policies. Since the Regional Districts did not have the legislative authority to directly incorporate such positive measures into their ORP's, the delegation of these measures represented a partial retreat from the use of the updated ORP as a venue of informal authority.
While the final draft again mentioned the need to bring non-conforming OCP's and zoning by-laws into agreement with the updated ORP, the plan's authority to do so was not increased. All the final draft offered was the statement that the Regional Districts would be prepared to work with the Municipalities. However, the final draft did specify that all new OCP's, after receiving two readings by a municipal council, 'shall be' sent to the Regional District Board of the Municipality concerned. Such new OCPs would have to conform to the updated ORP in general, i.e., the development concept and strategy, and to the subdivision policies in the updated ORP's land use designations: see Appendix 16. Moreover, having an approved OCP was one of the conditions in the final draft's land use designations for permitting the interim development of unserviced, low density residential uses.

As described under the 'effect' section of the final draft, the process for securing Regional District Board approval of new OCPs reversed the direction of land use control. The Municipalities, in the future, would have to request approval for their OCPs from the Regional District Boards. Under the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), see Appendix 3, the onus was on the Regional District Board to take an offending Municipality to Court and prove that its OCP had violated the objectives of the Regional District's ORP. The decision to incorporate an approval role into the final draft thus represented an informal attempt to increase the Regional District's
regulatory authority over land use planning. If the final draft had been adopted, unchanged, this approval role would have more than compensated for the authority that had been implicitly delegated down to the Municipalities through the final draft's use of conditionally structured land use designation policies. The final draft's proposed approval role thus functioned as a temporary constraint on the overall shift towards a process style of planning.

Following the completion of the final draft, there was a brief pause while the Regional Districts conducted a public review of the updated ORP, one that resulted in a series of 'Response Packages' (LMORPU-DARD 1980/13; LMORPU-GVRD 1980/14,17; LMORPU-CFVRD 1980/16; LMORPU-RDFC 1980/21,24). There was some feedback from the provincial level, but most of the comments on the final draft came from municipal criticisms of the plan's land use designations. Since all of the Lower Mainland's Regional Districts had now acquired considerable experience and familiarity with the updated ORP, each planning department was able to quickly compile comments on the final draft, translate these comments into desired policy changes, and draft specific text revisions. In essence, there was little separation or distinction between receiving feedback and responding to it. Internal time lags were thus equal to external time lags, and this situation served to constrain any efforts to maintain a blueprint style of planning in terms of holding the policy content of the updated ORP constant.
The organization and format of the adopted ORP (GVRD-PD 1980/3) was identical to that of the final draft. The adopted plan's development concept and development strategy policies, i.e., growth share targets, also remained unchanged. What had been changed, though, was the plan's land use designations. The adopted ORP contained two new residential designations: URBAN-2, Developing Urban and Suburban Areas, and CANYON HAMLET: see Appendix 21. Of these, the URBAN-2 designation posed the greatest threat to the certainty of the plan's image. The CANYON HAMLET designation was limited in application to a comparatively small number of topographically isolated 'pocket subdivisions' in RDFC's up-Valley areas.

Under the new URBAN-2 designation, suburban areas would not have to be developed with full servicing. The basic difference between the new URBAN-2 designation and the existing URBAN and URBAN RESERVE designations was that areas under the latter two designations were ultimately to be developed to full urban densities, i.e., four or more dwelling units per acre, while areas under the URBAN-2 designation would remain at lower densities. In the adopted ORP, the permanent, low density character of this designation was legitimized on the basis of encouraging a variety of densities suitable to Lower Mainland needs and lifestyle choices. The URBAN-2 designation was to preserve unique features of the built environment and facilitate residential development patterns capable of providing an appropriate transition
between city-town and countryside-farmland areas.

Along with the conditionally structured regulatory policies in the other residential land use designations, the adopted ORP's URBAN-2 and CANYON HAMLET designations served to further flatten the plan's rural to urban density transition gradient. The land use designations were more a reflection of the existing and trend development patterns than they were an expression of the development concept's image of a sharp urban-rural dichotomy. Even though the adopted ORP contained spatially detailed, 1:10,000 scale plan maps, the designations used in these plan maps no longer had the ability to ensure the implementation of the plan's image with any degree of certainty. The adoption of the updated ORP thus moved the style of planning further towards process planning.

The contents and operation of ORPs were not explicitly defined in the legislation governing Regional District planning, and there was some concern that the final draft might be found too detailed and too complex to be adopted as an ORP. A legal consultant was subsequently hired. Drawing heavily upon the precedent set by a single ORP Court case, i.e., common law, the Consultant stated that an ORP was only in effect when implemented through municipal by-law and did not directly affect individual property rights. As such, the Consultant concluded that the updated ORP could not be classified as a zoning by-law or judged to be too spatially detailed: see
Appendix 20. The plan's conditionally structured land use designations did not discriminate against any particular class of individual and were thus within the ambit of regional planning legislation.

The legal Consultant, however, noted that some of the plan's provisions were 'ultra vires', purporting to exercise authorities not granted under the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979). Consequently, the Regional Districts' approval role over OCPs and the criteria with which to determine conformity with the ORP were deleted in the adopted ORP. The adopted ORP similarly did not require Municipalities to have an OCP that was 'recognized' by their respective Regional District Boards as a condition for permitting specific uses and lot sizes. To remain within the authority of regional planning legislation, the 'recognition' requirement in all the land use designation policies was replaced by the phrase, 'provided that the areas has been the subject of a plan amendment supported by an OCP'. The updated ORP's loss of an illegal approval role removed a constraint that had slowed the general shift towards a process style of planning.

The final draft's classification of 10 acre boundary adjustments as minor plan amendments that did not require full Regional District Board consideration and approval by by-law was eliminated in the adopted ORP. Aside from the Regional Districts' recovery of an authority that had been implicitly
delegated to the Municipalities, most of the remaining changes to the updated ORP decreased the adopted plan's degree of control and supported the overall movement towards a process style of planning.

The limits used in the final draft's land use designations to geographically limit the amount of conditionally permitted low density development were either increased or deleted in the adopted plan. As had been feared during the drafting of the final draft, the relaxation of these limits implicitly delegated regulatory control downwards by increasing the Regional Districts' susceptibility to plan amendments generated by municipal development pressures.

The last vestiges of the updated ORP's attempt to exercise positive control of Lower Mainland planning were also eliminated in the adopted plan--those policies in the TRANSPORTATION and UTILITIES designations that required the provision of municipal and Regional District infrastructure. While not mentioned in the legal review, such policies were ultra vires of the legislative requirement that ORPs not commit Regional District Boards or Municipalities to undertake the provision of infrastructure or similar services.
3.6.3 The Planning Agency: Rational Comprehensive Versus Disjointed Incremental Planning

a) summary

As the process of plan formulation came to an close and the process of plan adoption began, there was a move away from a rational comprehensive style of planning and towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. The pivotal point in this movement was the dissolution of the WG following the completion of the final draft. Up to the dissolution of the WG, the LMPRP was a planning organization with a sufficiently centralized structure to resolve most of its internal conflicts and generally constrain any potential movement towards disjointed incrementalism. The LMPRP, functioning as an organization, had been able to generate a holistic image of the Lower Mainland and maintain a rational comprehensive style of planning.

However, the dissolution of the WG, the staff planners, decentralized the structure of the LMPRP, leaving its executive body, the TLC, directly exposed to local interests. The TLC members became negotiators for their respective Regional Districts, making the TLC's external linkages stronger than its internal linkages and constraining the LMPRP's ability to plan in a rational comprehensive style. While efforts were made to strengthen the LMPRP's image of the Lower Mainland, the lack of a centralized procedures
ultimately led to the adoption of a 'common denominator' plan.

b) interpretation

To a large extent, the movement towards a disjointed incremental style of planning was presaged by the first draft's arrangements for future plan administration (LMORPU-WG 1979/31). The plan defined the requirements for centralized Lower Mainland planning procedures such as plan monitoring and review, but these procedures were ones that either had already been assumed by the LMPRP, or could have been assumed by the LMPRP through joint Regional District agreements as permitted under the LMPRP's enabling legislation, Order-In-Council 4116/68. From a structural perspective, the LMPRP remained unaltered; it would continue to be composed of the Chairman and one other Director from each of the Lower Mainland's four Regional District Boards.

The first draft formally recognized the existence of the TLC, but did not establish a permanent, independent staff group. With an unaltered LMPRP to be served by a staff group seconded from Regional District planning departments, the first draft offered no guarantee that there would be a centralized planning organization in place to maintain a holistic image of the Lower Mainland. The LMPRP's ability to engage in a rational comprehensive style of planning would thus continue to be constrained by the eventuality of strong external
linkages, both political and staff.

Directly following the presentation of the first draft, the WG spent most of its time debating unresolved issues and little significant progress was made in refining the plan. There was a clear division within the WG over the issue of whether or not the final draft of the updated ORP ought to be based on the assumption that the LMPRP would acquire an approval role over plan amendments: GVRD for and DARD against. With the key members of the WG opposing each other and supporting their respective planning department positions, the WG's external linkages were becoming stronger than their internal linkages. The WG, in September 1979, passed this issue, and many related issues, up to the TLC. While the TLC was not able to secure the necessary provincial support required for a LMPRP approval role, the TLC's function as a higher source of authority, an executive body, helped to reduce internal conflict within the WG. The centralized structure of the LMPRP, as a planning organization, thus served to overcome a potential constraint to rational comprehensive planning.

Staff turnovers in the RDFC and CFVRD planning departments left the comparatively small WG with two new members half way through the process of plan formulation. With the new members inherently more likely to identify with their respective planning departments than the WG, the WG once again faced a situation where external linkages could constrain its ability
to engage in a rational comprehensive style of planning.

The original WG members asked the TLC to reaffirm the joint approach to updating the ORP, and the TLC subsequently approved a revised work program for the WG, one calling for a comprehensive review and analysis of the first draft (LMORPU-WG 1979/38). Under this directive, all the WG members worked cooperatively through October-November 1979 and prepared a series of review papers on various policy issues. These review papers, confirming the basic principles of the first draft, temporarily renewed the joint Regional District approach to the Update. By fostering a group spirit, i.e., stronger internal linkages, amongst the WG members, it can be said that the revised work program constrained a potential movement towards a disjointed incremental style of planning. The revised work program was thus a centralized procedure that enabled the WG to maintain it holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

Following the review of the first draft, both the WG and TLC became increasingly aware of the need to strengthen the economic component of the development concept and strategy. The GVRD members of the WG, using a computer model of the Lower Mainland's road network to forecast future travel patterns, provided a measure of empirical evidence to substantiate the plan's claim that, of all the growth scenarios considered, the nodal pattern of urban settlement
would lead to the greatest reduction in travel demands and long term infrastructure supply costs (LMORPU-WG 1980/3).

The amelioration of transportation problems alone, however, would not be sufficient to ensure the top down implementation of the updated ORP's development concept and so preserve the plan's holistic image of the Lower Mainland. During the remainder of the update process, the Regional Districts would attempt to designate as much URBAN land as they could to secure or increase their prescribed share of projected Lower Mainland growth.

It appears that the first draft's preliminary land use allocations, i.e., generalized plan maps, either reflected the patterns of land use allocation made in the 1966 ORP, or were more restrictive towards urban growth in rural areas. Since the improper application of the land use designations during the drafting of the detailed, 1:10,000 scale plan maps could have fragmented the updated ORP's image of the Lower Mainland, the WG recommended, in mid December 1979, that the final land use allocations ought to be prepared under a common methodology (LMORPU-WG 1979/56). The TLC concurred with the WG's recommendation even though it had been agreed under the original terms of reference, work program, and plan instruments that the application of the plan's land use designations was to remain the responsibility of individual Regional Districts. To a certain extent, the WG's call for a
common methodology can be seen as an informal attempt to prolong the joint work program and so protect the plan's image of the Lower Mainland through the continuation of centralized planning procedures.

As a first step towards such a common methodology, the WG prepared an analysis that compared the proposed supply of various land uses to the projected demands for these uses (LMORPU-WG 1979/57). The WG's land supply and demand memo stated that the Lower Mainland's total supply of URBAN and INDUSTRIAL lands, as designated in the first draft's preliminary plan maps, would be sufficient to meet demands up to the year 2001, the updated ORP's time frame, and would allow the objectives of the plan's development concept and strategy to be attained. However, another land supply and demand analysis was subsequently prepared, one that contradicted the findings of the first analysis (LMORPU-WG 1980/4).

The second supply and demand memo argued that, with the same demand projections, there would be serious long term shortages of URBAN and INDUSTRIAL designated lands in RDFC and CFVRD. Prepared by the new CFVRD member of the WG, the second land supply and demand memo was submitted to the TLC, in mid January 1980, without the full knowledge or agreement of the WG. This action weakened the cohesiveness, i.e., internal linkages, of the WG, but had little immediate impact on the
plan's image of the Lower Mainland.

It appears, however, that the WG did take 'defensive' action against the second land supply and demand memo. To justify the preliminary land use allocations, the time frames of the updated ORP's land use designations were shortened in the final draft. The WG, by reducing the length of time that the supply of URBAN and other residentially designated land was supposed to last, largely avoided the issue of long term land demands and postponed the immediate designation of additional lands. In essence, the adjustments to the land use designation's time frames rationalized the status quo and protected, albeit temporarily, the top down implementation of the plan.

One key issue not resolved by the review of the first draft's policies was that of the centers nomenclature: whether or not Chilliwack's (City) designation as a District Center (local) ought to be changed to the higher order designation of Valley Town. With the RDFC member of the WG supporting RDFC's demand for a Chilliwack Valley Town and the other members of the WG divided over the issue, the WG's external linkages were beginning to outweigh the strength of its internal linkages. The WG, as before, passed the unresolved issue up to the TLC.

While the members of the TLC were similarly divided over the issue, they were able to reach a compromise: the WG was to
consider the designation of five Valley Town, including Chilliwack, with a general description of both the function and growth potential of each Valley Town. The centralized structure of the LMPRP as a Lower Mainland planning organization was thus able to overcome a potential constraint to the rational comprehensive style of planning.

After reviewing the matter further, the WG reached a new consensus and submitted a preliminary final draft to the TLC, mid December 1979, that restated the first draft's development concept of four Valley Towns. The TLC responded by specifically ordering the WG to designate Chilliwack a Valley Town. Since the growth share targets in the final draft limited its development potential, Chilliwack's designation as a Valley Town did not greatly weaken the plan's strategy of directing urban growth to a limited number of settlement nodes.

The TLC, prior to the February 1980 publication of final draft of the updated ORP, issued the WG with further directives, one including text changes, i.e., specific rewording, for the plan's land use designation policies. With the TLC's increasingly direct involvement in the policy content of the plan, the WG's function as an independent staff group had been compromised.

Having completed its assigned task of plan formulation, the WG
members argued that the third phase of the work program, the adoption of the final draft, would primarily be a matter of negotiation and that the WG would require a new mandate if it was to continue. The TLC, still lacking the authority to create a permanent staff group, subsequently dissolved the WG, late March 1980, a decision that decentralized the structure of the LMPRP as a planning organization. Without the full time assistance of the WG staff, the LMPRP was also less able to generate and maintain centralized planning procedures.

The common methodology that had been called for earlier was eventually reduced to a set of technical specifications for drafting the final plan maps. A comprehensive review of each Regional District's final land use allocations in relation to the updated ORP's development strategy and land use designation policies was never completed prior to the adoption of the updated ORP. And, without the centralized procedure of a final, comprehensive review to bring competing Regional District interests, i.e., atomistic images, into agreement with the updated ORP's development concept and strategy, the style of planning shifted towards disjointed incrementalism.

The adoption of the final draft was period of intense negotiation that was coordinated by the TLC. Without an independent staff group to refer contentious issues to for study, the TLC was directly exposed to local pressures, and each TLC member inherently became an agent for his Regional
District. The TLC subsequently divided along the familiar GVRD-RDPC axis with the other two Valley Regional Districts taking positions between the two depending on the specific issues involved. Thus, the TLC's ability to plan in a rational comprehensive style was constrained by the strength of its external linkages. While some of the former WG members did help to provide linkages between the various factions of the TLC, their efforts were primarily directed at protecting the interests of their respective Regional District planning departments.

To provide the Regional Districts with more flexible land use designations, the final draft's subdivision policies, i.e., minimum lot sizes, had been structured on the conditional provision of water and sewer services. The Valley Regional Districts, during the adoption process, then pressed the TLC for relaxations to the limits that had been placed on the quantity of unserviced, low density urban land that could be developed. However, this created situations where land use regulations that were flexible enough to accommodate a slow rate of urbanization in some of the Valley Regional Districts' rural areas were too flexible for the rapid rates of urbanization in the GVRD and other urban centers in the Valley Regional Districts. It was feared that the relaxation of the final draft's regulatory policies would lead to the inefficient long term use of land, i.e., urban sprawl, in these rapidly urbanizing areas.
To cope with the problems posed by the complexity of the final draft's land use designations, the TLC enlisted the help of former WG members. These GVRD planners, in mid-August 1980, consolidated all of the proposed changes to the final draft's regulatory land use policies into a 'final package' of land use designations for joint TLC consideration and approval (LMORPU-GVRD 1980/28). The conflict of interest between the Lower Mainland's urban and rural areas was resolved by transforming some of the final draft's conditionally structured land use and subdivision regulations into separate designations, each with a clearly stated purpose and well defined description of the circumstances under which it could be applied. Through this approach, each Regional District acquired the land use designations that it desired while other Regional Districts were largely prevented from using 'inappropriate' designations.

While the consolidation of the proposed text changes, i.e., relaxations, to the policies of the final draft's land use designations was the result of a centralized procedure, it was not one that reflected a rational comprehensive style of planning. The final package of land use designations was not a 'top down' or strategic expression of the updated ORP's development concept and strategy, but the result of a 'ground up' rationalization of existing or locally desired land use patterns. Instead of altering the designation boundaries on their plan maps to achieve their desired land use allocations,
it appears that the Regional Districts altered the regulatory policies of the updated ORP's land use designations to permit the uses and densities they wanted within the existing spatial pattern of designations made in their plan maps. The adopted ORP was thus a 'common denominator' plan, one reflecting a collection of separate Regional District images rather than a single, holistic image of the Lower Mainland.

Given the regulatory nature of the ORP instrument and its inherent bias towards restricting residential growth rather than stimulating economic growth, it might be argued that the attempts by the Regional Districts to acquire as much urban development potential as possible, in the hope of securing or even increasing their allocated share of growth, were perhaps inevitable. Certainly, the failure to establish any type of agreement for a common Lower Mainland tax base prior to the adoption of the updated ORP increased the level of implicit competition between the Regional Districts.

The Valley Regional Districts had received the largest proportion of the additional INDUSTRIAL lands that had been designated since the first draft, but the GVRD still had more than twice the Valley Regional Districts' total stock of industrial available land (LMORPU-GVRD 1980/19). It was perceived that this imbalance could threaten the updated ORP's strategy of directing a larger than trend share of employment growth to the Valley Regional Districts and, in turn, this
perception also helped to undermine the top down implementation of the plan.

Arguing that industrial jobs were more easily redirected than office jobs and that the success of the updated ORP's development concept and strategy would depend on locating more industrial jobs near Valley Towns, a GVRD planner and former WG member submitted a proposal to the TLC, in July 1980, that called for a detailed industrial land use study (LMORPU-GVRD 1980/26). The first phase of the study was to review the demand for industrial land through a sectoral analysis of Lower Mainland industry and a forecast of its growth. In the second phase, particular attention was to be given to the Lower Mainland's economy. It was thus hoped that the designation of appropriate INDUSTRIAL lands in or near the Valley Towns would help to ensure their success and prevent the further urban development of the surrounding RURAL and AGRICULTURAL lands.

The proposed industrial land study faced two major problems, though. Firstly, the Regional Districts lacked the power to make the Municipalities designate and service INDUSTRIAL lands. The GVRD's attempts to have additional INDUSTRIAL lands designated in Surrey, in fact, had been met with considerable opposition from local residents adjacent to the proposed new INDUSTRIAL areas. Secondly, the mere supply of INDUSTRIAL land, regardless of quantity, could not guarantee
the attraction of industry and industrial jobs to the Valley Towns. Whether or not the study would have led to a strengthening of the updated ORP's development concept and strategy became a moot point, for the TLC tabled the proposed study. The industrial land use study was beyond the LMPRP's capabilities and, even with a large staff group, could not have been completed before the adoption of the ORP.

When a controversial issue threatened to fragment the unity of the WG, the WG was able to pass the issue up to the TLC for an 'executive' decision. The TLC, however, had no such centralized decision making structure to rely upon. With its members appointed from Regional District Boards, the LMPRP was as equally subject to external linkages, i.e., local demands and development pressures, as the TLC had become once it dissolved the WG and entered the adoption phase of the Update process.

The LMPRP's apparent reluctance to become directly involved in the adoption process and so serve as a possible constraint to the overall movement towards disjointed incremental planning, can be attributed to three causes. Firstly, most of the issues relating to the adoption of the updated ORP were centered on the plan's land use designations and were immediately technical rather than political in nature. The Update process had also taken considerably longer than expected, and the LMPRP was anxious to have the updated ORP
adopted, even a somewhat atomistic one, before losing all Regional District support. Finally, the entire matter of land use planning at the Regional District and Lower Mainland levels was being reviewed by the Province and it appears that this affected the LMPRP's decision making, see section 3.6.4.

3.6.4 The Planning Process: Normative Versus Functional Planning

a) summary

During the 1979 to 1981 period there was also a two stage movement towards a functional style of planning. The increased degree of autonomy that the Regional Districts had assumed, through the incorporation of illegal authorities in the final draft of the updated ORP, was eventually lost when the Province failed to commit its ministries to the plan as an official guide for land use planning in the Lower Mainland. Following the completion of the final draft, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs proposed a 'Land Use Act' that would eliminate the Regional Districts' planning function and drastically reduce the level of local autonomy in strategic land use planning for the Lower Mainland.

Some WG members pressed for an LMPRP approval role over plan amendments and for centralized procedures in making final land use allocations, but the TLC, waiting for provincial commitment to the updated ORP, was limited to a more
bureaucratic role. With the dissolution of the WG and the proposed 'Land Use Act', the Regional Districts, TLC, and LMPRP found themselves in a defensive position that constrained any immediate return to a normative style of planning.

b) interpretation

Following the completion of the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP, both RDFC and the Township of Langley (CFVRD) raised strong objections against the plan. Their basic concern was that the objective of minimum land use control and maximum local flexibility, as stated in the, Way Ahead, was not being achieved under the plan's proposed implementation measures. Arguing that the plan's appeal procedures had been formulated to prevent amendment, Langley by-passed its Regional District Board and protested directly to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (Langley 1980/3). The Ministry, however, refused to intervene, temporarily protecting the autonomy of the LMPRP and the Update process.

By September 1979, the TLC had become aware that several Municipalities were preparing Official Community Plans (OCP) and that these plans might not comply with the updated ORP before its final adoption. Some Municipalities, rather than viewing the updated ORP as a guideline for their local plans, saw the update process as a means of incorporating long
desired land use changes into the updated ORP. While the WG had recommended to the TLC that the LMPRP ought to have an approval role over municipal zoning and development by-laws, including OCPs, the TLC was not in a position to formally seek such increased authority.

The TLC was waiting for provincial support of the first draft and so could not immediately seek to secure and expand the autonomy of the LMPRP. Both the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Environment and Land Use Committee Secretariat representatives on the TLC stated that the Province ought to support the plan as policy for guiding all provincial involvement with land use planning in the Lower Mainland. However, the Province never adopted the updated ORP as official policy, and the LMPRP began to lose the small measure of autonomy that it had acquired.

It appears that inter-ministerial conflict was one of the basic reasons why the Province did not approve the updated ORP as official policy. In particular, the Municipalities were upset with the plan's 'blind adherence' to existing ALR boundaries and had pressed the TLC and LMPRP for changes that it could not secure from the ALC. A Ministry of Municipal Affairs representative subsequently told the TLC that the ALC was prepared to review ALR boundaries and make changes in the context of logical arguments supported by the policies of ORP and OCPs. When the WG met with ALC staff, October 1979, the
Municipalities' desired changes were not made. The ALC stressed the importance of maintaining large lot sizes, i.e., no subdivision; refused to recognize the need to reserve long term industrial lands in areas designated agricultural; and recommended that the ORP's transportation land use designation be replaced with transportation corridors, i.e., network concept maps, to avoid potential conflicts with the ALR.

The issue of OCP compliance with the ORP and a LMPRP approval role continued. Since the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), did not directly deal with the question of precedence between OCPs and ORPs, the TLC felt that the matter ought to be settled by the Province. The WG, in contrast took a more active, political role. In an attempt to assure the LMPRP's future autonomy, the WG pressed for a common methodology to be used by all Regional Districts during the application of the updated ORP's land use designation policies and stated that the final plan maps, i.e., land use allocations, ought to be reviewed by the LMPRP prior to final plan adoption.

The WG, realizing that an approval role would be necessary for the successful implementation of a common methodology, incorporated the authority for the Regional Districts to 'deem' OCPs to conform with the updated ORP into the final draft's administration and amendment section. By drafting additional authority into the plan, the WG had acted to temporarily increase the LMPRP's autonomy and to constrain the
shift to a functional style of planning.

The LMPRP's autonomy, its ability to pursue alternate ends, was decreased by the dissolution of the WG and the Province's proposed 'Land Use Act': see section 3.7. During the preparation of the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP, the TLC had become more and more directly involved with the substance of the plan's policies. The WG felt that its own purpose or autonomy had been violated and requested that it be given a new mandate or be disbanded. Without provincial commitment to the plan, the TLC could not secure an approval role for the LMPRP and, without an approval role and stronger LMPRP, the TLC could not create a permanent mandate for the WG. The TLC, acting in a bureaucratic role, dissolved the WG. Without the WG, the LMPRP's autonomy became increasingly dependent on provincial dictates.

In May 1980, the Minister of Municipal Affairs announced a proposal to prepare new legislation to be called the 'Land Use Act' (Bill 9, see section 3.7). The proposed act would divide the Province into seven large economic regions, including the Lower Mainland, and require the preparation of 'broad brush' land use plans for each region. Eliminating the Regional Districts' planning function, except in unincorporated, Electoral Areas, and giving the new plans precedence over the land use planning activities of other provincial agencies, the proposed act was to centralize considerable decision making
authority in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. The Municipalities, within the guidelines of the broad brush plans, were to have more control over their own land use planning. To reduce delays and speed up the development application process, the proposed Act would create a provincial-municipal appeal board to deal directly with land use conflicts between Municipalities and between Municipalities and individuals.

Since the basis of the updated ORP, its development concept and strategy, was a broad brush plan, the proposed 'Land Use Act' was not an immediate threat to the substance of the plan's policies or the Update process itself. The proposed Act, in eliminating the Regional Districts' planning function, however, did inherently threaten the future existence of the LMPRP's coordinative function and autonomy of Lower Mainland land use planning. While the Minister of Municipal Affairs later met with the LMPRP, late June 1980, and stated that it was important not to remove the decision making process too far from the local level, the Minister provided no assurances that the LMPRP would continue to operate in the future or that its function would be anything more than a venue for public discussion.

The Minister also stated that senior staff from Municipal Affairs could continue to sit on the TLC, but that the LMPRP ought only to include representatives elected from the
municipal level and not provincial MLAs. Thus, the recommendation that Cabinet members, i.e., Ministers, sit on the future LMPRP was deleted from the adopted version of the updated ORP, and this further prevented the LMPRP from securing and enhancing the autonomy that it sought over Lower Mainland land use planning.

Faced with the task of implementing the updated ORP in an unknown legislative context, the LMPRP directed the TLC, in mid July 1980, to prepare a report that would answer two fundamental questions: the level of government and agency that should have the final decision over ORP amendments of significance to the Lower Mainland, and the criteria that should be used to determine such significance (LMORPU-GVRD 1980/25). The TLC, using GVRD planning staff, formulated six alternative organizations for Lower Mainland planning based on four structural characteristics: composition (level of government), staff (permanent or seconded), decision making authority (veto or approval role), and geographic area (number of units in the Lower Mainland). To evaluate the organizational options, the TLC employed a set of nine criteria. All of these criteria, of course, were variants of the two basic systems criteria of efficiency and effectiveness. In essence, the TLC went through an exercise that formalized much of the debate on the LMPRP's function that had been ongoing since the 1969 creation of the LMPRP.
Representing increasing degrees of centralization, the organizational options ranged from ad hoc Lower Mainland planning with no formal arrangements to a completely provincially operated system similar to that proposed by the 'Land Use Act'. The TLC's evaluation selected the joint municipal-regional board option, an organizational structure that would represent all of the Lower Mainland's Municipalities and Regional Districts, have a centralized (independent) planning staff, and possess the final say on ORP amendments (veto authority). Similar in character to the old LMRPB, the joint municipal-regional board emerged as the highest scoring option because it lay at the balance point between the total weight, including number of criteria and WG staff weightings, of the local autonomy criteria, i.e., effectiveness of land use planning, and comprehensive planning criteria, i.e., efficiency of land use allocation. The TLC, however, recommended the organizational option that most reflected the existing LMPRP and future agency (LMPCC) proposed by the updated ORP.

The proposed 'Land Use Act' marked the end of any hopes that the LMPRP might have had for increasing its degree of autonomy in the future. In recommending the LMPRP (LMPCC) organizational option over the higher scoring municipal-regional board option, the TLC was reflecting the defensive posture of the Regional Districts who were to suffer a substantial decrease in autonomy through the loss of their
planning function. The TLC's logic was simple: if the joint municipal-regional board option represented an unsupportable loss of local autonomy, then the scheme proposed for the 'Land Use Act', with its further centralization and decrease in local autonomy, would be even more unacceptable to the Lower Mainland. The GVRD planners, in promoting the value of the status quo, had retreated to a bureaucratic role and thus constrained the potential for returning to a normative style of planning.

In October 1980, the Minister of Municipal Affairs met with the LMPRP to discuss the Minister's desire to accomplish a net reduction in the size and burden of regional government. Noting that the 'Land Use Act' would potentially be passed into law during the Spring or Summer of 1981, the Minister argued that it was an opportune time to review Regional District boundaries. The general proposal was for the Lower Mainland to be divided into two Regional Districts: the western urbanized areas of DARD and CFVRD would become part of the GVRD while the remainder of the Lower Mainland, including RDFC, would become a single Valley Regional District. Since all the Regional Districts were to lose their planning function under the proposed 'Land Use Act', the boundary changes were more for the purpose of rationalizing the supply and administration of other Regional District utility functions, i.e., water and sewer systems.
The LMPRP members, composed of municipally elected representatives, were not supportive of the Minister's proposal and subsequently turned the discussion to the question of Lower Mainland planning versus local autonomy. In particular, the members stated that the LMPRP had been more successful at achieving a balance between these two competing interests than the proposed 'Land Use Act' likely would. The situation thus ended in a stalemate.
3.7.1 Planning Act-Land Use Act

The Minister of Municipal Affairs's previously announced Planning Act, see section 3.6.4, was presented as, The Planning Act: A Discussion Paper, to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities' (UBCM) September 1980 conference. Under the proposed act, planning was to be a sequential, top down process: expressly stated ministerial interests in land use would be coordinated by ELUC and approved as provincial policy by Cabinet; broad brush Provincial Regional Plans (PRP) would be prepared by provincially appointed Regional Coordinating Committees (RCC); Official Community Plans (OCP) would be prepared by the Municipalities under Ministry of Municipal Affairs approval; and zoning by-laws would be prepared by the Municipalities under the scope of their OCPs. The proposed act thus transferred the responsibility for preparing 'Official Plans' downwards, from the Regional Districts to the Municipalities.

Summarizing the positions taken by many Municipalities, the GVRD (1980/5) argued that the centralized authorities of the proposed act would reduce the participation and consultation of local government in the planning process; decrease local autonomy and flexibility in land use decision making; and further reduce the accountability of government to the public.
In addition to criticisms pertaining to effectiveness, the centralized provisions outlined in the 'Discussion Paper' were also criticized for being potentially less efficient than the existing system. The fear was that the staff requirements of the proposed act would add the cost of another layer of 'bureaucracy' and serve to slow down the planning process.

To reflect its predominantly regulatory nature, the proposed Planning Act was renamed the 'Land Use Act' and introduced in the Legislature as Bill 9 on December 1, 1981 (MOMA 1981/1). Deleted were those provisions which would have required the mandatory disclosure of ministerial land use interests. Under the proposed Land Use Act, PRPs were to be replaced with more generalized Regional Planning Statements that would not be binding on the Province. The earlier provisions for Urban Regional Committees and Urban Regional Plans (URP), which would have paralleled the Regional Coordinating Committees and PRPs, were also deleted. While the other service functions of the Regional Districts would remain, the Lower Mainland was to be treated as one economic region with no special arrangements for its metropolitan (GVRD) area. In short, the proposed Land Use Act both excluded those measures of provincial accountability that had been drafted to balance the heavily centralized nature of the new planning system and further decreased local autonomy over land use planning.

After a second 'wave' of criticism from the Municipalities and
Regional Districts, the Minister of Municipal Affairs withdrew Bill 9 from the Legislature on July 22, 1982. A revised Land Use Act was introduced into the Legislature the next day as Bill 72 (MOMA 1982/2). While many of the Minister's unilateral authorities over municipal planning were deleted, the changes did not alter the new Land Use Act's basic design for a centralized planning system.

Not deleted from Bill 72 was a provision that would have led to the repeal of the, Island Trust Act, (RSBC 1982), and the absorption of such places as the Gulf Islands into surrounding Regional Districts. It was this provision, perhaps, that proved to be the final downfall of the Land Use Act. On July 26, 1982, residents from Hornby Island 'invaded' the Legislature and conducted an intense lobbying campaign that lasted several days (Vancouver Sun 1982/2). Section 73 (2) of the proposed Land Use Act transferred 20 percent of the capital costs of servicing new development onto the Municipalities, another decision that was heavily criticized. Subsequently, the Government decided not to proceed with the proposed act, and Bill 72 'died' on the order paper as the legislative session ended on July 30, 1982.

3.7.2 LMPRP Policy Issues

The 'Discussion Paper' on the proposed Land Use Act was presented just as the TLC was in the final stages of
negotiating the adoption of the updated ORP. At this time, the TLC's expectation was that a provincial policy statement on the updated ORP would be taken to ELUC after the four Lower Mainland Regional Districts had officially adopted the plan. Such adoptions, pending certain text and plan map amendments, were concluded by the end of January 1981, but the provincial policy statement did not follow. In February 1981, the LMPRP made a formal request for a provincial policy statement from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and, one month later, sent the Ministry copies of the amendment by-laws that the Regional Districts had used to adopt the updated ORP. The Ministry's basic problem was part four of the updated ORP, Lower Mainland Planning Coordination. Without fettering the authority of its proposed Planning Act, the Ministry could not condone the implementation of the plan through the Lower Mainland Planning Coordination Committee (LMPCC), the LMPRP's unofficial new name. The other Ministries were also not willing to subordinate their long term interests to the updated ORP, and the plan was never recognized as an official provincial policy.

During the first half of 1981, the TLC reviewed part four of the updated ORP in light of the proposed Planning Act and considered the LMPRP's future role in Lower Mainland planning. The LMPRP, in early June 1981, decided to table the matter of regional planning structure and organization until more information had been received from the Province. To a certain
extent, it appears that the LMPRP wanted to see the actual act before launching a strong initiative against the Province. The 'Land Use Act', when it did emerge at the end of 1981, offered the LMPRP a more rather than less centralized planning system, one with no provision for the complexities of intermunicipal planning.

The LMPRP played only a minor role in the municipal response to the proposed Land Use Act, but did coordinate the April 1982 preparation of, *A Proposed Legislative Framework For Intermunicipal Planning In Metropolitan Areas*. The report argued that metropolitan economic areas such as the Lower Mainland and Greater Victoria required intermunicipal planning at the local rather than provincial level. Through its recommendations, the report established the criteria for achieving such intermunicipal planning, criteria that essentially described the existing Regional District system and its planning function.

To a certain extent, the proposed Land Use Act's threat of centralized land use planning at the provincial level served to strengthen municipal support for the Regional District system and, indirectly, for the LMPRP. The LMPRP, at the end of June 1981, assigned first priority to the formulation of joint work program for implementing the updated ORP. The scope of the LMPRP's policy consideration subsequently included industrial land use, refuse disposal, dangerous goods
movement, historical site preservation, Valley Towns, and plan monitoring. Through the continuation of its TLC, the LMPRP established its position on the first three of these policy issues by preparing terms of reference. The LMPRP, as before, lacked the funds to carry extensive studies on these issues, and most of the work was conducted by the senior levels of government.

In late July 1981, the LMPRP approved terms of reference for a six part Lower Mainland industrial land study: demand, supply, density, zoning, servicing and development, and implementation strategy (LMPRP TLC 1981/1). The ORP Update had identified a long term shortage of industrial land, but the focus of the proposed study was to be on the development of industrial land and the roles played by the various levels of government rather than on supply. However, it appears that the LMPRP only saw the demand part of the study before the passage of Bill 9 and the repeal of the Regional Districts' planning function: see section 3.7.4.

Much of the same type of situation occurred with respect to the development of Valley Town policies. A TLC subcommittee, dominated by municipal planning directors, delivered a presentation to the LMPRP on Valley Towns in late May 1983. Defining the outer extent of Valley Towns, it was argued, would prevent 'urban sprawl' by concentrating urban growth, making high density residential servicing possible, and
providing a focus for public and commercial facilities. How these objectives were to be achieved became the main issue of debate. While one option was the addition of a Valley Town schedule, with map and policy statement, this regulatory option was rejected. The LMPRP, in mid July 1983, recommended that a discussion paper on Valley Town policies be prepared and that municipal input be solicited on how Valley Towns could be 'fostered' through the updated ORP.

During this time, the LMPRP also prepared terms of reference for monitoring the implementation of the updated ORP. The actual report, Official Regional Plan: 1982 Monitoring Report, was prepared by the GVRD's planning department in January 1983. Compared to what had been proposed to the LMPRP in January 1982 by the TLC, the monitoring report was much narrower in scope. The report, due to the lack of a comparative data base between the four Regional Districts, did not monitor or analyze the actual amounts of land being redesignated. The monitoring report was predominantly based on the results of the 1981 Census, figures that actually measured the continuing implementation of the 1966 ORP rather than the updated ORP of 1980.

Moreover, the GVRD's monitoring report further limited itself to population growth, ignoring the key issue of employment growth and distribution. The report noted that Lower Mainland growth, 1976 to 1981, was approximately 1.9 percent higher
than expected and revised the forecasts to 2001 accordingly. From declining annual growth rates within the GVRD, it had been predicted that the GVRD's share of Lower Mainland growth would fall from 55 percent in 1976 to 43 percent in 2001. The report, however, indicated that GVRD growth rates had increased dramatically since 1976, pushing the GVRD's share of Lower Mainland growth, 67 percent, to well over the ORP's target of 50 percent. While this increase was sufficiently large in absolute numbers to bring into question the redistribution of growth with the Valley Regional Districts, the report did not criticize the GVRD's 'over achievement' or suggest that any re-evaluation of ORP policy be made.

Thus, from 1980 to 1983, the LMPRP faced many of the same policy issues and planning problems that it had dealt with previously. The LMPRP, without provincial commitment to the updated ORP and sustained funding, was unable to engage its own, independent staff and fully complete established work program items. The LMPRP also lacked the focus of a major planning project, the ORP Update. Yet, despite these difficulties, the existence of the LMPRP offered a means for expressing the Lower Mainland wide interest and for coordinating the differing, if not competing, interests of the Regional Districts.
3.7.3 Agricultural Land

Introduced to the Legislature August 30, 1977, Bill 88 amended the Agricultural Land Commission Act, RSBC, 1977, to allow the Minister of Environment to forward appeals against ALC decisions to ELUC. Rejected applications for ALR exclusions had previously required the consent of two Commissioners to be heard by ELUC. While the amendment had been justified on the basis of giving elected representatives the final say on land use decisions, the Government found itself facing ever increasing charges of political interference and favoritism (Vancouver Sun 1982/1). Cabinet decisions to grant ALR exclusions against ALC recommendations undermined the integrity of the ALC and became a focal point for the opposition. With the Province and Municipalities typically supporting agricultural to urban-industrial land use changes and the Regional Districts opposing such changes, considerable pressure was directed against the plan map schedules of ORPs. Two cases causing considerable political conflict were those of Gloucester Properties Ltd. and Spetifore-Dawn Development Corporation.

The ELUC, on October 1, 1979, advised the ALC that it had granted Gloucester Properties exclusion from the ALR, a decision that caused the ALC Chairman to resign. In response to a public outcry against this decision, Cabinet imposed a freeze, October 25, 1979, on the development of the land, and
Gloucester subsequently filed a law suite against the Government. A complex legal battle, lasting some two years, ensued on the matter of Cabinet-ALC jurisdiction over agricultural land. At one point, the Premier and other Ministers were subpoenaed and the question of Cabinet confidentiality came before the courts. The Government, however, dropped the freeze, eliminating the need for the Ministers to appear in court. Ironically, Langley Council (Township) would later announce, March 3, 1983, that it had enough industrial land to last 19 years without rezoning the 620 acres of Gloucester property (Province 1983/1).

With the Gloucester Properties case before the courts during the adoption of the updated ORP, the land was left undesignated in CFVRD's plan map schedules. Langley subsequently argued that the land, being undesignated, did not require a plan amendment or the approval of the CFVRD Board. On October, 19, 1982, the CFVRD Board endorsed this position, leaving Langley free to rezone the land. CFVRD's decision not to block Langley's desired rezoning implicitly redesignated the land industrial. Whether the Board had, in effect, unlawfully delegated its authority over land use planning down to the municipal level was a question that was never addressed.

Even during the Cabinet imposed freeze of the Gloucester property, another controversial appeal for ALR exclusion was
before ELUC. A Cabinet order to release some 523 acres of farmland in south Delta from the ALR, the property of the Spetifore family, was granted on January 15, 1981. Over a phased, 10 year period, the proposed development of the Spetifore lands would increase Delta's population by approximately 10-15 percent, an expansion of some 10,000 new residents. (Province 1983/2) The GVRD Board, on March 25, 1981 narrowly rejected Delta's application for an ORP amendment to redesignate the Spetifore lands from agricultural to urban use. Unlike the Gloucester Properties case in CFVRD, the Spetifore land represented a situation where the regional district level had become the final check or impediment against a municipally desired land use change that had also been condoned by the provincial level.

The Spetifore property was subsequently sold to Dawn Development Corporation and, on March 21, 1983, Delta's Council altered its application to amend the GVRD's ORP. While Delta's new proposal decreased the proportion of urban land and increased the proportion of park land, the GVRD Planning Department argued that the benefits from extra regional park lands were "...not sufficient to offset the costs of additional transportation facilities, traffic congestion at the Massey tunnel and lost food productions." (Province 1983/3) The LMPRP, on April 12, 1983, recommended that the lands not be used for housing, but held for the future agricultural needs of the region. While the GVRD
Planning Committee rejected the LMPRP's recommendation, the full Board turned down Delta's application to amend the ORP on June 29, 1983. This surprise reversal, caused by three previously undecided Board members from the more heavily urbanized areas of the GVRD, prompted the MLA for Delta, and the Speaker of the Legislature, to state that the Government would step in with new legislation (Province 1983/7).

3.7.4 Repeal Of Regional Planning

On June 5, 1983, it was announced that the Minister of Municipal Affairs intended to 'streamline' land use planning and zoning by-law procedures (Province 1983/5). Bill 9, the Municipal Amendment Act, was subsequently introduced to the legislature on July 7, 1983. In essence, the 2 page bill repealed the Regional Districts' land use planning function, including ORPs and TPCs, without providing any of the centralized measures for intermunicipal coordination that had been contained in the former Bill 9 (MOMA 1981/1). The Minister stated that Bill 9, through the application of deregulation principles to planning and development approval in B.C., would help fulfill the Government's objective of economic recovery (Hansard 1983/1). In addition, the Minister argued that the number of comprehensive municipal plans (OCPs) adopted made the ORPs a surplus level of land use control and that Bill 9 would thus help strengthen the municipal level.
While Bill 9 had clearly been prepared before the GVRD's rejection of the Spetifore-Dawn Development Corp.'s second application to amend the ORP, the opposition referred to Bill 9 as the 'Spetifore' amendment in legislative debates (Hansard 1983/2). PIBC (1983) sent a brief to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in July, urging the Minister to withdraw Bill 9 until a better mechanism for the intermunicipal coordination of land use planning issues could be established. Noting that Regional District work on land use, servicing, and transportation dealt with issues crossing municipal boundaries, PIBC argued that regional level planning did not duplicate the work being done by the Municipalities.

No significant changes were made to Bill 9 and, by late September 1983, the LMPRP and its four Regional Districts had come to accept the elimination of the Regional Districts' planning function as inevitable. Their strategy, at this time, was to seek a legislative provision to retain land use planning as a non binding, but mandatory Regional District function. In particular, the LMPRP wanted the, Municipal Act, (RSBC 1979), to require the Regional District Boards to prepare regional development strategies and to maintain research facilities adequate to support this function. The Minister, however, refused to comply with LMPRP desires, stating that intermunicipal planning would have to be conducted on a purely voluntary basis through joint municipal agreements under sections 770 (2) and 776 of the, Municipal
Act, (RSBC 1979): see Appendix 3. Bill 9 received royal assent on October 21, 1983, and was brought into effect on November 18, 1983 by Order in Council 1881/83, (BC Reg 431/83).
4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The interpretation of strategic regional planning for British Columbia's Lower Mainland suggests the existence of a long term planning cycle. In the next section, the stages and characteristics of planning cycles are reviewed, and a comparison between the 1966 and 1981 ORP is made. It then argued that strategic regional planning should not be seen as a prescription for resolving the planning cycle, but that a strategic regional planning system inherently generates a cycle of planning. Based on the theoretical framework, chapter 2, and its application to the Lower Mainland study, chapter 3, a two stage, six phase planning cycle is then hypothesized. Finally, the approach taken by this study is considered and some directions are provided for improving Faludi's (1973) classification scheme.

4.2 The Planning Cycle: Empirical Observations

4.2.1 The Literature

The existence of cycles in the fields of biology, earth sciences, economics (Kondratiev 1935), and politics has been recognized for some time. With land use planning activities having declined since the world-wide recession of the early
1980's, planners are now taking a longer term view of land use planning (Hall 1981). The current perception amongst planners is that planning activities have reached a low point and will increase with increasing levels of economic growth. Accordingly, numerous references to the 'wave or cycle' theory of planning have appeared in the literature.

Gunton (1985) has provided perhaps the most succinct and detailed case for the existence of a long term planning cycle. After reviewing key trends in the history of Canadian planning Gunton (1985, p. 4) argues that, "...for the past eighty years planning has followed a cycle in which planning activity has been undertaken in response to rapid growth." Gunton identifies economic growth and increased rates of urban development as the motive force behind the planning cycle. By using housing starts as an indicator of economic growth, Gunton is able to demonstrate a generalized relationship between increases in urban development and increased planning activity: see Figure 23. Planning activity, including the establishment of land use planning legislation and the formulation of land use policies, have historically occurred just after the greatest increases in the rates of growth. While planning activities can not be as easily quantified as housing starts, Gunton's graph does provide some empirical evidence to support the existence of a long term planning cycle.
Figure 23: Canadian Housing Starts And Planning Activity
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Source: Gunton (1985, p. 41)

Figure 24: The Planning Cycle
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Source: Gunton (1985, p. 42)
The basic problem, notes Gunton, is that of delay: the long length of time between the initiation of planning in response to pressures generated by increased rates of growth and the formulation of planning policies and programs to cope with these problems. Since the planning policies and programs have not typically been implemented until after the growth crisis has passed, planners have often found support for their policies and programs weakened or withdrawn until the next wave of economic development. The net result, states Gunton (1985, p. 42), "...is that planning capability has been strongest when the need for planning is weakest." In terms of the theoretical framework, chapter two, Gunton's 'delay' can be seen as extremely long internal and external time lags. Figure 24 illustrates the stages and dynamics of Gunton's planning cycle.

4.2.2 Historical Overview

a) establishment

A longitudinal comparison of the Lower Mainland planning events and issues behind the 1966 and 1981 ORPs reveals remarkable similarities between the two periods of time. In both instances, the legal and organizational structures for strategic regional planning were established after a period of rapid urban growth. Provincial legislation in the form of the, Town Planning Act, (RSBC 1948), and the, Municipal Act,
(SBC 1965), provided a federated, two-tiered system of land use planning.

While the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board (LMRPB) included all the 28 Cities, Municipalities, and Electoral Areas (unincorporated) in the Lower Mainland, the Lower Mainland was later broken into four Regional Districts. An advisory planning agency, the Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel (LMPRP) was subsequently formed in 1969 to help coordinate the planning activities of the four Regional Districts and their Municipalities. Unlike the LMRPB, the LMPRP was not independently empowered to hire its own staff to assist with its review function. It thus took the LMPRP considerably longer than the LMRPB to evolve its own staff structure, some four years. However, the LMPRP did ultimately emerge as a planning organization capable of coordinating the preparation of a strategic plan for the Lower Mainland.

b) formulation

Both the LMRPB and the Lower Mainland Regional Districts, as coordinated by the LMPRP, had a legislative mandate to prepare broad-brush plans for the future use of land. Accordingly, both planning organizations made land use and socioeconomic surveys, analyzed this data, and defined planning issues. The results of their work were summarized in two similar documents: The Lower Mainland Looks Ahead, 1952, and, The Way
Ahead: A Report On The State Of The Lower Mainland, 1979. Both reports provided a set of principles of objectives pertaining to what strategic regional planning and a strategic regional plan ought to achieve. From a substantive viewpoint, the plans were to ensure the efficient and effective use of the Lower Mainland's limited land resources. The first report provided a highly generalized concept map that proposed a nodal settlement pattern for the Lower Mainland while the latter report reviewed the implementation of this development concept and recommended a renewed commitment to it.

Constituting the first phase of the plan formulation period, both of these review reports proposed a framework or strategic type of regional plan. The 1952 report stated that the municipal pattern of land use should be coordinated through the adoption of a concept plan containing development directions and not through the preparation of spatially detailed plans. Similarly, the 1979 report stated that the updated ORP ought to provide the local level with maximum flexibility and ought to contain the minimum level of land use control required to ensure the implementation of the plan's development directions.

The second phase of the plan formulation period, of course, was the preparation of a concept plan with a rationale for its development directions. While it took the LMRPB some ten years to prepare the background reports and build the
municipal support necessary for its 1963 concept plan, *Chance And Challenge*, the LMPRP (Working Group) formulated a development concept and strategy for the Lower Mainland in less than a month. The LMPRP, however, had already spent some four years reviewing the 1966 ORP and building municipal support for an updated ORP that would contain an improved concept plan.

In the third phase of the plan formulation period, both planning agencies, the LMRPB and LMPRP, transgressed on their own principles or objectives of what strategic regional planning, as represented by the type of plan, ought to achieve. The LMRPB, by 1966, had produced an ORP with regulatory policies in the form of 12 land use designations and corresponding map schedules at a 1:60,000 scale. These maps were too generalized to affect individual properties, but they were detailed enough to ensure that the municipalities would have to treat them as a constraint when formulating zoning by-laws. A similar progression towards a more spatially detailed plan occurred just over a decade later. As stated in the, 'Way Ahead', the objective of using a minimal level of control to ensure the implementation of the updated ORP was ultimately expressed in the form of complex land use designation policies and highly detailed 1:10,000 scale plan maps. These plan maps were sufficiently detailed to affect individual properties.
The legislation defining the planning authorities of the LMRPB and Regional Districts only stated that the Municipalities could not make decisions, take actions, or adopt by-laws that would contravene the policies of the ORP, a situation that placed the onus on these agencies to prove, in Court, any infractions on the part of the Municipalities. In response, both planning agencies attempted to formulate the amendment and administrative procedures of their ORPs so as to place this onus of proof back on the Municipalities. The LMRPB formulated the sections of its 1966 ORP in an hierarchy of authority that descended from regional objectives to general policies, to long range land use designation plan maps, and to current stage (short term) land use designation plan maps. A Municipality would have to justify an amendment to any section of the ORP in view of the section immediately above it.

In the first draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-WG 1979/31), separate amendment procedures were formulated for each section of the plan, but there was still a two level hierarchy where applications to amend the text of the plan's land use designation policies were not to adversely affect the plan's regional structure map, i.e., development concept. The planners, in the final draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1), attempted to increase the plan's land use planning authority more directly. The WG unlawfully gave the Regional Districts the approval role authority to 'deem' Official Community Plans (OCP) to be in conformity with the updated ORP
according to specified criteria. These attempts to build detail and authority into the ORP resulted, in part, from the agencies' historical failure to enhance their legislative mandates sufficiently to ensure successful plan implementation.

In its 1952 report, 'The Lower Mainland Looks Ahead', the LMRPB had recommended that an independent study be made of the need for some kind of regional government and what form and scope it might assume. The Province subsequently established a (Vancouver) Metropolitan Joint Committee, 1959, to investigate all options, including the Province's own proposal for a two tier form of metropolitan government. A similar study, also initiated by the Province, was conducted by the Regional District Review Committee, 1978. In both instances, the Committees encountered strong demands to preserve local autonomy at the municipal level and, accordingly, did not provide conclusive recommendations for the structural and procedural reform of local government. The result was a continuation of the status quo in which neither the LMPRP, nor the Regional Districts acquired the approval role over municipal zoning and development by-laws necessary to ensure plan implementation.

c) dissolution

During the final phase of the plan formulation period, both
planning agencies reached the peak of the planning cycle, a point of overextension in relation to the scope and authority of their statutory provisions. Both planning agencies, from this point, moved into a period of dissolution. Where the 1966 and 1981 ORPs were formulated from the top down, i.e., from a development concept to implementation measures, they were both 'undone' from the ground up, i.e., from plan maps schedules to development policies.

In the case of the 1966 ORP, this retreat took place between 1969, following the dissolution of the LMRPB, and 1974. Regional District rejections of plan map amendments, ones that would have made significant land use redesignations, led to plan text amendment applications, amendments that would have changed the plan's land use policies to legitimize these municipally desired changes. In turn, the proposed text amendments challenged the 1966 ORP's general policies and regional objectives, causing the LMPRP to question the validity of the plan and to call for a review to update and strengthen the plan.

The updated ORP also went through a similar phase. With fewer residential land use designations and redesignation policies, the first draft of the updated ORP restrained the transformation of rural to urban land use and provided a sharper distinction between the cities and countryside than had existed in the 1966 ORP, a steeper rural to urban density
transition gradient. This urban-rural dichotomy quickly disappeared with subsequent drafts, however. In addition, the LMPRP's (WG) inclusion, under the plan's administrative section, of a Regional District approval role over the municipal adoption of OCPs was deleted in the adopted ORP.

The key difference between the 1966 and 1981 ORP was that the weakening of the 1981 ORP occurred during the Update process itself. Following the release of the updated ORP draft to the Municipalities, the Regional Districts assembled local feedback into 'Response Packages'. The Regional Districts effectively 'undid' the updated ORP by translating municipal concerns over the land use of specific areas into land use policy changes. After a period of intense political negotiations between the Regional Districts that was coordinated by the LMPRP (Technical Liaison Committee), the adopted ORP, 1981, emerged as a 'common denominator' plan. The adopted ORP, 1981, was basically fitted to the existing pattern of land use and zoning, leaving a policy 'gap' between what the development strategy proposed and what the implementation measures, i.e., land use designations, actually provided for on the ground. In a period of some two years, the Update process had completed a cycle of plan formulation and retreat that had taken the LMRPB nearly 20 years.

The second phase of the dissolution period occurred when the Province repealed the legislation that defined the LMRPB and
the Regional Districts' planning function, their authority to
direct land use through ORPs. Without an ORP to support its
review and recommendation function, the LMPRP also ceased to
exist. The controversy generated by major land use issues
involving substantial economic development was the primary
reason behind the Province's decision to disband the strategic
planning agencies. In both instances, the applications to
amend the land use plan maps of the ORPs were strongly
supported by the Province and the concerned Municipality, but
were strongly opposed by the regional planning agencies. The
LMRPB and the Regional Districts, caught between the Province
and the Municipalities, thus found themselves engaged in a
losing struggle for planning authority.

The Province's 1973 introduction of an agricultural land
freeze, and subsequent legislation creating and Agricultural
Land Reserve (ALR) and Commission (ALC), was alternatively
beneficial and harmful to strategic regional planning for the
Lower Mainland. Since the new legislation centralized a
considerable amount of land use planning authority and the
provincial level, it indirectly caused the Municipalities to
support a review of the 1966 ORP as a means of rationalizing
and adjusting ALR boundaries, i.e., securing desired
amendments that were not supported by the ALC.

Such adjustments were not made, however. The ALC held firm on
its principles during the Update process, and the LMPRP (WG)
simply adopted the existing ALR boundaries as the plan map areas of the 1981 ORP's agricultural designation. When private interests subsequently succeeded in securing Cabinet support to have the ALC release large blocks of ALR lands, the updated ORP, with its overlying agricultural designation, became the only regulatory document resisting the proposed land use changes. The 1981 ORP, without the authority of the ALR behind it, was fully exposed to the pressures of rural Municipalities that had been disaffected by the Update process, notably the Township of Langley.

In the 1966 ORP, the development concept was not directly stated. The 'cities in a sea of green' concept map and development policies were contained in a separate, non-regulatory document, 'Chance and Challenge'. In part, it was this separation between the concept plan and detailed land use regulations that made it possible to dissolve the planning agency, the LMRPB, while amending and retaining the 1966 ORP itself. The land use, i.e., plan map redesignations that led to the 1983 repeal of the Regional Districts' planning function and the dissolution of the LMPRP were so large in the scale of their potential impact that they violated not only the 1981 ORP's land use designation policies, but the fundamental policies of the plan's development concept and strategy, i.e., the nodal settlement pattern. The updated ORP, containing both concept plan and detailed land use regulations, was initially a stronger plan than the 1966 ORP,
but ultimately a less adaptable one.

The repeal of the Regional District's planning function and the 1981 ORP came in November 1983 as part of the Province's 'restraint program', one formulated to reduce administrative costs and to remove regulations that were seen to hinder economic development. Occurring after the most severe economic recession since WWII, see Figure 25, the restraint program and its cancellation of mandatory regional planning represents the low point of the planning cycle associated with the 1981 ORP. The LMRPB, in contrast, was dissolved by the Province after three years of successive increases in economic growth. While the LMRPB was dissolved because of politicized land use conflicts and the creation of four separate Regional Districts, the Province's preservation of the 1966 ORP as a vehicle for coordinating Lower Mainland planning can largely be attributed to this growth.

In the instance of the 1981 ORP, the Province's repeal of the Regional District's land use planning function effectively served to 'topple' an already weakened plan. The 1981 ORP's land use designation policies and plan maps no longer had the capacity to ensure the implementation of the plan's development concept. Moreover, the inclusion of growth share targets as part of the plan's strategy for implementing the development concept exposed the LMPRP and Regional Districts to future criticisms in terms of the 1981 ORP's ability to
meet its own (advisory) targets. The GVRD's, Official Regional Plan 1981 Monitoring Report, indicated that the updated ORP's development strategy objectives, i.e., growth shares, were being over achieved in some areas such as the GVRD and underachieved in other areas such as the north side of the Fraser River (DARD). Post plan growth trends thus created a situation where the best strategy for the Municipalities and Regional Districts was to independently promote the best interests of their own Regional Town Centers.

From an overall perspective, there appears to be a broad correspondence between the concept of a planning cycle and the findings of the Lower Mainland study. Figure 26 compares the theoretical stages of the planning cycle with the actual periods and phases of strategic regional planning that occurred in the Lower Mainland.

4.3 The Planning Cycle: Theoretical Considerations

4.3.1 Prescription Or System?

After describing the basis of the Canadian planning cycle, Gunton (1985, p. 42) notes that, "...planners from all periods have proposed remarkably similar solutions to the problems of urban growth." The four points of similarity that Gunton discusses are listed below:
**Figure 26: The Planning Cycle And Strategic Regional Planning**

**Gunton's Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Emerges</th>
<th>Lower Mainland Periods And Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Recognition Of Problem</td>
<td>ESTABLISHMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Pressure Grows</td>
<td>- strategic legislative framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Of Problem</td>
<td>- strategic planning organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation Of Problem</td>
<td>FORMULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategic Development</td>
<td>- strategic planning principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Implemented After Problem Already Dissipates Or Changes Form</td>
<td>- strategic concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Monitored</td>
<td>DISSOLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies No Longer Relevant</td>
<td>- repeal of strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Emerges</td>
<td>- dissolution of strategic planning organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gunton (1985, p. 42)
1 That planning be conducted through a top down method where broad land use plans at the regional level serve as a framework for guiding growth at the detailed, site plan level;

2 That planning not be expressed as a rigid blueprint, but as a flexible, ongoing process;

3 That urban growth be decentralized to linked satellite communities as a means of mitigating urban core congestion and suburban 'sprawl'; and

4 That valuable resource lands be protected from urban development and that urban development be prohibited on hazard lands.

Gunton goes beyond a description of the planning cycle to propose that planners become more action oriented. Specifically, he states that planners, "...must resist the urge to do more studies and concentrate, instead, on implementing their programs before the opportunity disappears." (Gunton 1985, p. 41). Gunton suggests that planners draw from past experiences rather than perpetually attempting to 'reinvent the wheel'. Such an approach, according to Gunton, would yield two benefits. Firstly, planners could use their knowledge of the planning cycle to persuade politicians of the necessity for anticipatory rather than reactive planning. And, secondly, planners could use their knowledge of past planning efforts to reduce the length of the plan formulation process while still preserving analytical rigor. Gunton (1985, p. 44), in his conclusions, argues that planners,

...must adopt alternative planning styles such as incremental and strategic planning and must
devote more energy to achieving institutional reforms such as increased entrepreneurial power which will allow them to initiate anticipatory planning when the intensity of the problem and public concern is at a low point in the cycle.

Gunton's prescriptive measures for mitigating the problems of the planning cycle are derived from an evaluation of past Canadian planning activities. In arguing that planners should spend less time 'reinventing the wheel', Gunton's underlying premise is that planning resources have been used inefficiently. That planners should become more action oriented to avoid implementing policies after the original problem has passed is an indication that planning has been largely ineffective. Gunton, however, does not consider the inherent conflict between these two fundamental criteria, one that has been described in the introduction to this study. In essence, Gunton's analysis of long term land use planning is a variant of the traditional approach.

Gunton's prescriptive measures collectively embody the concept of strategic regional planning. However, strategic regional planning is not the cure for the planning cycle; strategic regional planning inherently defines a cycle of planning. Economic growth, as expressed in terms of urban development, provides the underlying force of the planning cycle, but the cycle is not driven by economic considerations alone. Propelled by the Province's resource based economy, urban development in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia has,
over the long term, progressed in a four year cycle: three years of increasing growth followed by a sharp decline in the final year of the cycle. The Lower Mainland's cycle of planning activities has operated through several economic cycles rather than by any long term economic trend. It thus appears that the Lower Mainland's cycles of planning activities and urban development are not directly linked or 'in phase' and that the Province's economic cycles have driven Lower Mainland planning activities with a wave like 'push-pull' action.

While Gunton make a valuable contribution in identifying the stages of the planning cycle, he does not link them to the various components of the strategic regional planning system. Gunton's planning cycle, generalized from a comparative study of land use planning in different Canadian locations, offers an external perspective of strategic regional planning. To a large extent, the planning cycle is driven by the interaction between the components of the strategic regional planning system itself: the type of plan instrument (document), the type of planning agency, and the type of planning process. What is still required, then, is an internal perspective of the strategic regional planning system.

4.3.2 Hypothesis

From the overview of the Lower Mainland study provided in
section 4.2.2, it can be seen that there has been a cycle of planning in the Lower Mainland and that this cycle strongly indicates a pattern of interaction amongst the components of the strategic regional planning system. The theoretical concept of the planning cycle can be extended to Faludi's (1973) classification scheme, chapter 2, by generalizing the patterns of shifts along the dimensions of planning that were found in the interpretation of the Lower Mainland planning events and issues, chapter 3. By taking the existence of a planning cycle as a given, it is possible to describe the strategic regional planning system through a planning cycle having a set pattern of shifts along Faludi's dimensions of planning. The pattern of shifts that is hypothesized to occur during the cycle is then offered as the starting point for analyzing the historical activities of strategic regional planning in other locations.

In chapter 2, the theoretical framework, Gillingwater's (1975) analysis of Faludi's (1973) classification scheme was used to argue that the three dimensions of planning, measuring the basic components of strategic regional planning, could be nested within each other to yield a single continuum of planning. The planning cycle, as generalized from the interpretation of the Lower Mainland study, can now be described as a two stage, six phase movement along this single continuum. In particular, the two stage planning cycle involves a series of shifts from the 'weak' end of the
planning continuum, i.e., the process, disjointed incremental, and functional styles of planning, to the 'strong' end of the planning continuum, i.e., the blueprint, rational comprehensive, and normative styles of planning, and back to the weak end again. The strong and week ends of the planning continuum should not be interpreted in absolute terms; it is the direction of movement towards the strong and weak ends of the planning continuum that indicates the relative position, either high or low, in the planning cycle: see Figure 27.

Three basic assumptions are required to postulate a cycle of strategic regional planning. First, the region must have a federated, two tier administrative structure or at least be divided into a number of administratively independent sub areas. There must be economic and social linkages between the sub area, however, making them to some degree interdependent on one another. Economic growth, or at least periodic waves of urban development, must also be present at a level capable of emphasizing land use planning issues, i.e., job and residence location imbalances, and fostering demands for regional planning. Finally, the region must have development potential in terms of a vacant and available supply of residential and urban land. It is hypothesized, given the above assumptions, that the region will progress through a series of cycles of strategic regional planning approximating the following two stage, six phase cycle:
Figure 27: The Planning Continuum And Cycle

The Planning Continuum

THE PLAN

Blueprint Planning V. Process Planning

THE PLANNING AGENCY

Rational Comprehensive V. Disjointed Incremental Planning

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Normative Planning V. functional Planning
STAGE ONE: Movement from the weak to the strong end of the planning continuum

Phase 1: Shift from a functional to normative style of planning

At the weak end of the planning continuum, all the planners in the region lack the autonomy to pursue alternate ends or goals; they deal only with the means to implement their plans, policies, and programs in their respective sub areas. Increased economic growth, however, forces the planners to acknowledge the commensurate pressures and problems of urban development. By acting in a political role in respect to these emerging planning issues, the planners constrain the ability of their local planning agencies to engage in a functional style of planning, and a shift towards a normative style of planning results.

Phase 2: Shift from a disjointed incremental to a rational comprehensive style of planning

The planners of the region's sub areas, taking on political roles with respect to the planning issues, inherently begin to form linkages with each other. With continuing growth pressures, the linkages or loyalties between the 'spokesplanners' of the region's sub areas become as strong or stronger than between these planners and their respective sub area planning departments. An upper tier or regional planning agency is formed at this time, if one has not already been
created. Widening the geographic scope of land use planning, the creation of a coordinative regional planning agency inherently constrains the sub areas', i.e., Municipalities or Regional Districts, ability to engage in a disjointed incremental style of planning.

Positive movement towards the rational comprehensive style of planning occurs as the regional planning agency evolves into a strategic regional planning organization. By centralizing its decision making structure and planning procedures, the strategic regional planning organization is now capable of generating and maintaining a holistic, long term image of the region it plans for. Such centralization, in operational terms, requires the acquisition of an independent staff function, the internal arrangement of the staff into a management hierarchy, and the use of comprehensive analytical and evaluative methods.

Phase 3: Shifting from a process to blueprint style of planning

With its centralized decision making structure and procedures, the strategic regional planning organization is able to formalize its holistic, long term image of the region into a strategic regional plan. The plan is formulated from the top down: it provides long term guidelines, i.e., a strategy, for the development of the sub areas within the context of the region as a whole. As long as the strategic regional planning
agency does not have to face or resolve feedback from sub areas planning departments that might be critical of the plan's potential impacts, the regional planners will be able to formulate a plan whose future image of the region is progressively more certain or detailed. External time lags (plan evaluation period) that are longer than internal time lags (plan preparation and amendment period) thus serve as a constraint on the process style of planning.

Without an approval role or veto authority over sub area adoption of zoning and development by-laws, the strategic regional planning agency is not able to ensure that the plan's development concept and strategy, its image of the region, will be properly implemented in the future. This lack of control causes the strategic regional planning organization to 'pre-implement' the plan by formulating a more detailed plan: using a limited number of rigid land use designations, i.e., regulatory land use subdivision policies, and increasing the level of spatial resolution, i.e., plan maps. Lastly, unlawful attempts to incorporate statutory authorities, i.e., an approval role or veto power, directly into the draft plan may temporarily strengthen the shift to a blueprint style of planning.
STAGE TWO: Movement from the strong to the weak end of the planning continuum

Phase 4: Shift from a blueprint to a process style of planning

At the strong end of the planning cycle, the strategic regional plan has assumed more authority than permitted under the legislation governing its provisions. The national or senior level of Government, subsequently, refuses acknowledge and legitimize this authority through the enactment of new legislation, and these authorities are deleted from the plan. Lacking an adequate degree of control, i.e., an approval role or veto power over the sub area, i.e., municipal level, adoption of zoning and development by-laws, the plan is vulnerable to strong criticism from sub area feedback. Internal time lags, now, are as short or shorter than external time lags, reducing the certainty of the plan's image.

Subject to unrelenting pressure from the sub areas, the plan is 'undone' from the ground up. Applications to amend the plan's land use designation areas (maps), after being rejected, are rewritten into amendment applications directed against the regulatory policies of the plan's land use designations (text) and ultimately at the plan's objectives and development concept. While retaining its level of spatial detail, the strategic regional plan is transformed into a 'common denominator' plan, one merely reflecting the existing patterns of regional land use, by this process of amendment.
and revision. It is the overall weakening of the plan's basic ability to implement its development concept, the decrease in the certainty of the plan's image, that finally determines the shift back towards an process style of planning.

Phase 5: Shift from a rational comprehensive to disjointed incremental style of planning

If the sub area amendments fragment the plan sufficiently during a period of economic recession or low urban growth, then the strategic regional planning organization itself may be threatened with the decentralization of its decision making structure and planning procedures. The devolution of the strategic regional planning organization into an advisory agency involves the loss of the organization's independent staff function, the collapse of any management hierarchy, and the absence of comprehensive analytical and evaluative methods. Without the support of a strong strategic regional plan, the decentralized planning agency is no longer able to generate or maintain a holistic image of the region.

The planning agency's ability to coordinate any form of regional planning is likely to be once again dependent on the support of planners from the sub area planning departments, seconded or voluntary. Since the linkages or loyalties between the planners are weaker than the linkages between the planners and their respective sub area planning departments, the strategic regional planning agency will be constrained
from returning to a rational comprehensive style of planning. The planning agency, engaged in a disjointed incremental style of planning, is left with a fragmented or atomistic set of image of the region, one joined together by the least possible level of common interest.

Phase 6: Shift from a normative to functional style of planning

At the strong end of the planning continuum, the planners have successfully questioned and expanded the ends of their mandate to evolve a strategic regional planning organization and formulate a strategic regional plan. The expansion of the regional planner's autonomy will only be temporary, however, unless the national or senior level of Government acknowledges them and enacts new legislation to formalize their planning activities. The retreat to the weak end of the planning continuum, up to this point, can be seen as a consequence of the senior level of Government's failure to do just this.

In the final phase of the planning cycle, the shift to a functional style of planning is determined by a further loss of autonomy. This loss comes as the senior level of Government enacts legislation that takes away, i.e., hives off, some of the responsibilities associated with regional land use planning; repeals the strategic regional plan; disbands the strategic regional planning agency; or commits
some combination of these actions. Since the planners of the region are less able to look beyond the means, i.e., geographic boundaries, of their mandates, they become constrained to roles that are bureaucratic in character and this, in turn, prevents any immediate return to a normative style of planning.

4.3.3 Comments On The Hypothesis

It has been hypothesized that, as long as the basic assumptions hold, this cycle of strategic regional planning will continue indefinitely. In practice, it appears that the planning cycle will likely take place within smaller and smaller sub areas as the region is filled in with urban development, i.e., from Lower Mainland to Regional District to Municipalities. The actual extent and pattern of shifts between the two ends of the planning continuum, i.e., phases, may also differ in actual planning experience. However, the Lower Mainland study does provide some basis for the sequence of shifts described above.

The movement towards the strong end of the planning continuum appears to primarily be associated with Faludi's (1973) constraint variables (time lags, scope of image, and role of planner) in terms of the planners and planning organization taking initiatives that mediate against the styles of planning found at the weak end of the planning continuum. The movement
back to the weak end of the planning continuum, though, appears to be primarily associated with Faludi's determinant variables (certainty of image, degree of control, image of society, and autonomy) and the direct loss of acquired strengths.

In the context of Gillingwater's (1975) single continuum model, and its hierarchical nesting of Faludi's three planning dimensions, the two phase, six stage planning cycle can be seen as a movement up from the operational to the administrative, institutional, and ideological levels, and then back down again. The planning cycle thus follows Faludi's (1973) description of how multiple planning agencies unfold and grow into strategic planning agencies. In particular, the evolution of strategic regional planning in the Lower Mainland corresponds closely to what Faludi (1973, p. 212) terms the 'sideways and upwards' projection of rational methods.

4.4 Research Problems And Future Directions

The interpretation of the Lower Mainland planning events and issues, chapter 2, reveals that virtually each event or issue has an impact on the components of the planning system as measured by Faludi's (1973) three dimensions of planning. Indeed, even a single planning report or memo may have enough weight to initiate or halt a shift towards a given style of
planning. Movements along the dimensions of planning, for each time period, are thus established through averages of many individual events and issues. Since planning events and issues occur on a daily basis, the interpretation of shifts along the dimensions of planning is, to some extent, dependent on the researcher's selection of time period lengths. Faludi's classification scheme would thus not be appropriate for short term studies that might not extend to relevant events and issues occurring before and after the study's time period.

The Lower Mainland study also shows that the interaction between the components of the planning system occurs on a daily basis with each event and issue directly or indirectly effecting the plan, planning agency, and planning process. While it has been possible to aggregate the daily impacts of the Lower Mainland planning events and issues into longer term shifts along the dimensions of planning that are used to measure these components, it has not been possible to clearly demonstrate causal relationships between the dimensions over time. The problem is one of trying to infer causal relationships between averages without having a high enough order of data to facilitate statistical analysis.

The hypothesized pattern of shifts along the planning continuum, section 4.3.2, was not the result of empirically established inter-relationships between the dimensions-
components of planning form the four time periods, but was generated by applying Faludi's (1973) classification scheme to an observed long term, interactive sequence of events and issues, section 4.2.2. To this extent, this study has failed to develop a truly dynamic systems approach.

The need for such an approach remains, however. Planners must conduct more long term studies of strategic regional planning and explore the patterns of interaction amongst the components-dimensions of planning in other locations. From further case studies, it will be possible to take 'averages of averaged movements' and so determine if the pattern of shifts associated with the hypothesized planning cycle is unique to the Lower Mainland or is a broader phenomenon. Such studies, by providing more empirical evidence, will increase the knowledge of the strategic regional planning system to the point where it will be possible to state that a given change in one component will cause an adjustment in another component.

An internal perspective of the strategic regional planning system and the formulation of a 'contingency' type model of the states that the system may assume, i.e., styles of planning, offers planners two benefits. Firstly, it could give planners guidance in the short term, to let them know where in the planning cycle they are and what direction they are headed towards. Planners would more readily be able to
envision the cumulative effects of numerous, often conflicting events and issues, i.e., the ongoing interactions or adjustments between the components of the strategic planning system. Armed with such knowledge, planners would be in a stronger position to prevent sliding movements to the extreme ends, i.e., weak and strong, of the planning continuum. The second benefit of an internal, systems perspective would thus be institutional learning and a corresponding dampening of the planning cycle.

While it has provided a good starting point, Faludi's (1973) classification scheme requires improvement before it can be used as a standard model. It is clear that the variables comprising Faludi's dimensions are dimensions in themselves and that the indicators defining the parameters of the variables are variables themselves. In particular, there are often stronger and clearer relationships between individual variables than between the dimensions of planning that they define. Faludi's dimensions of planning are hypothetical constructs; they provide a strong conceptual basis for the components of the planning system, but are difficult to manipulate in operational terms. In conclusion, the components of the planning system ought to be directly measured by Faludi's variables rather than the planning dimensions.
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Appendix 1: Excerpts From The Town Planning Act

PART IV.

REGIONAL PLANNING AREAS.

65. Where it appears expedient to the Minister, he may declare any area a planning area and may define the boundaries of the area. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

66. (1) There shall be a board, to be known as the “Regional Planning Board,” for each planning area.

(2) The Regional Planning Board shall be constituted as follows: One member shall be appointed by the Minister and one member shall be appointed by each municipality in the area.

(3) Each municipality shall appoint its engineer, or where there is no engineer then some other official to act as an advisory member of the Board. Advisory members shall not vote.

(4) Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of three years, but shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall hold office until his successor has been appointed.

(5) The Board shall be presided over by a chairman, to be chosen annually by the Board from among the appointed members. The Board may determine a quorum and adopt rules for its procedure, and shall cause proper records of its proceedings to be kept.

(6) No member of the Board shall receive compensation for his services, other than allowances for actual expenses necessarily incurred in the discharge of his official duties. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

67. (1) The first meeting of the Board shall be convened by the Minister, and thereafter meetings of the Board shall be called by the secretary, on instructions from the chairman, by written notice, and the notice shall state the day, hour, and place at which the meeting is to be held.

(2) The Board may appoint an executive committee, but any such executive committee shall not make any expenditure without the authorization of the Board. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

68. It shall be the duty of the Board to prepare a plan for the future physical development and improvement in a systematic and orderly manner of the area, based primarily upon public convenience and general welfare through the economic use of land, improved facilities for traffic, transportation, sewage-disposal, water-supply, institutions, schools, parks, recreation, and other public requirements. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.
69. When plans, or work in connection therewith, affecting or that may be affected by present or anticipated future conditions in a municipality are being considered by the executive committee, the member of the Board for that municipality shall sit and vote as a member of the executive committee, and the advisory member for that municipality may be required to attend any meetings of the committee for the purpose of discussing the plans or work. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

70. (1) Upon completion of any plans by the executive committee, the chairman of the Board shall be notified, and he shall thereupon call a general meeting of the Board to consider the plans.

(2) If the plans are approved by the Board, one set shall be forwarded to the Municipal Council of each municipality affected, together with recommendations, and one set to the Minister.

(3) The Municipal Council of each municipality referred to in subsection (2) shall take the plans under consideration and, if there is a Town Planning Commission appointed for the municipality, refer the plans to that Commission for report.

(4) If the plans relating to a municipality are satisfactory to the Municipal Council, they may be adopted by by-law. In case the plans are not satisfactory, the Municipal Council may, with the consent of the Board, amend the plans and adopt the amended plans by by-law. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

71. The adoption by a Municipal Council of any plan recommended by the Board shall not commit the Council to undertake any work or project recommended or provided for therein, but the Council shall not undertake any public work or pass any by-law that is at variance therewith. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

72. Where a plan affects or is affected by the conditions in an area in unorganized territory, the plan shall be forwarded to the Regional Planning Division, Department of Municipal Affairs, for comment and recommendation. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

73. For the purpose of preparing plans, the Board shall investigate, make surveys of, and consider any matters dealing with the physical, social, and economic development of the area as it may deem expedient and, for the purpose of informing and obtaining the co-operation of the residents of the area, may hold public meetings, publish information, and give such publicity to its proposals as it considers desirable. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

74. The Board shall appoint a secretary and may appoint such planning engineers, consultants, or other officers as may be necessary, whose salaries or other remuneration shall be paid from the general funds of the Board. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.
75. (1) The Board, in the month of January in every year, shall cause to be prepared an estimate of its expenditures for the current year, which shall be submitted to the Council of each municipality, together with an estimate of the proportion thereof to be paid by that municipality.

(2) The Council of each municipality may include in its annual estimates of expenditure such sums of money as it considers necessary to cover the expenditures of the Board.

(3) The expenditures of the Board shall be kept within the total revenue of the Board. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

76. Where the recommendations of the Board to a Municipal Council include provisions for a zoning by-law, the Municipal Council, if it adopts the plan, shall forthwith pass a zoning by-law. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

77. Every approving officer shall give due regard to and take cognizance of any adopted plan when dealing with applications for the approval of any plan of subdivision. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

78. When a majority of the municipalities in a regional planning area have, with the approval of the Regional Planning Board, adopted a plan, the Minister may recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that the whole or any portion of unorganized territory within the planning area be established as a regulated area under Part III of this Act. 1948, c. 96, s. 4.

Source: taken from the, **Town Planning Act**, SBC (1948), Chapter 339.
MUNICIPAL ACT

WHEREAS section 723A of the Municipal Act is inapplicable in the case of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board because the Board encompasses four regional districts;

And whereas section 878 of the Municipal Act provides that for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of that Act according to their true intent and of supplying any deficiency therein, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such regulations as are considered necessary and advisable, and such regulations shall have the same force and effect as if enacted by that Act and shall be published in the Gazette:

Therefore, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, by Order in Council No. 4116, approved the 31st day of December, 1968, has been pleased to order that to provide for the orderly dissolution of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, for the transfer of the duties and responsibilities of the said Board to the Greater Vancouver Regional District, Regional District of Dewdney-Alouette, Central Fraser Valley Regional District, and Regional District of Fraser-Cheam; and for the continuity of the planning programmes currently under way, the following regulation be approved pursuant to the provisions of section 878 of the Municipal Act:

"1. The Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board and the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Area declared by the Minister of Municipal Affairs June 21, 1949 (The British Columbia Gazette, June 23, 1949), shall be dissolved, effective the 31st day of March, 1969.

2. The provisions of the Municipal Act with respect to membership on the Board shall not apply after the 31st day of December, 1968.

3. The present members of the Executive Committee of the Board shall have all the powers of the Board during the period January 1, 1969, to March 31, 1969. The present members of the Executive Committee are Alderman D. A. S. Lainskail, Chairman; Alderman H. G. Hunt, Vice-Chairman; Alderman E. Sweeney, Alderman G. H. F. McLean, Alderman J. Francis, Alderman R. A. McMath, Mayor N. W. E. Cox, Mayor D. G. Taylor, Mayor D. W. Poppy, and Alderman S. C. Mapleton.

4. In addition the Executive Committee shall have power to

"(a) assign any contract of employment or any contract for planning services to any one of the aforesaid regional districts or to a municipality which is a member of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board;

"(b) without limiting the foregoing, do such other things as are necessary to wind up the affairs of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board;

"(c) requisition, on the same basis as formerly, from the member municipalities of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board such sums of money as are required to meet the costs of the Board during the transition period; and

any matters not so dealt with shall be concluded by the Greater Vancouver Regional District as trustee for the member municipalities represented by the four Regional Boards aforesaid.

5. There shall be established the Lower Mainland Planning Review Panel, consisting of the Chairman and one other Director of each of the regional districts aforesaid assisted by the senior planning officer of each such regional district or such other official as such Regional Board may appoint.

6. Before an amendment or alteration is made to the official regional plan, the proposed amendment or alteration shall be submitted to the Review Panel for evaluation, review, and report on the effects of the proposed amendment or alteration on the planning concept for the whole of the Lower Mainland area.

7. The Review Panel may determine its own procedure and shall appoint a Chairman from among its members.

8. The costs incidental to the Review Panel shall be apportioned among the regional districts aforesaid on the basis of the population of each regional district.

And to further order that supplementary Letters Patent making the provisions of sections 795 to 798D, inclusive, of the Municipal Act apply to the Greater Vancouver Regional District, Regional District of Dewdney-Alouette, Central Fraser Valley Regional District, and Regional District of Fraser-Cheam in the form attached hereto do issue.

DAN CAMPBELL
Minister of Municipal Affairs.
Department of Municipal Affairs.
Victoria, British Columbia.
December 31, 1968.

Source: OIC (4116/68)
PART 24

Interpretation: regional districts

766. In this Part and in any regulation or bylaw passed under it
"chairman" means the chairman of the regional board;
"function" means an object, power or duty or group of them;
"member municipality" means a municipality or an electoral area that is included in a regional district by the letters patent;
"municipality" includes the City of Vancouver, and an improvement district, designated for the purposes of this Part in the letters patent;
"regional board" means the governing and executive body of the regional district;
"regional district" means a regional district incorporated under this Part;
"voting unit" means the number of persons for each vote designated in the letters patent for the purpose of calculating the number of votes to which each member municipality is entitled.


Incorporation of regional districts

767. (1) On the recommendation of the minister, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by letters patent, incorporate an area of land and the residents in it into a regional district for the purpose of carrying out any functions granted under this section or conferred by this Act.

(2) In addition to the functions conferred by this Act, a regional district has the functions provided by letters patent, and for this purpose the Lieutenant Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the minister, may provide in supplementary letters patent further objects, powers, obligations, duties, limitations and conditions for any or all functions requested under this section.

(3) Before making a recommendation under subsection (2), the minister shall have received from the regional board a request that it be granted the power to undertake a function, and the request shall specify the member municipalities which are to participate and the basis for sharing the cost for the function.

(4) Except as otherwise provided, before advancing a request under subsection (3), the regional board shall have received the consent of the council of each municipality which is to participate in the function and have submitted for and received the assent of the electors in each electoral area which is to participate in the function, except where the exercise of the function is subject to a subsequent vote or petition under this Act or under letters patent.

(5) Where the function requested is of a regulatory nature or a service of general application or benefit to the inhabitants of the member municipalities that are to participate, the request under subsection (3) shall have received the affirmative vote of at least 2/3 of the directors having among them at least 2/3 of the votes, and shall have received the consent of at least 2/3 of the member municipalities which are to
participate; but, where a member municipality is an electoral area, the consent in
writing of the director representing that electoral area shall be deemed to be the consent
of that member municipality.

(6) The annual net cost of a function granted under subsection (5) shall not exceed
the product of 2 mills on the assessed value referred to in section 791 (1) within the
participating member municipalities; and the annual net cost of all functions granted
under subsection (5) shall not exceed the product of 3 mills on that assessed value.

(7) Where the function requested is public housing, trunk sewers or sewage
disposal facilities, the request under subsection (3) shall have received the affirmative
vote of a majority of all the directors, having among them the majority of all the votes.

(8) Prior to giving consent under subsection (4) the council may, in its discretion,
submit at any time for the assent of the electors of the municipality the question of that
municipality participating in a proposed function.

(9) For the purposes of this section, the assent of the electors is deemed to have
been obtained if the number of votes cast in favour of the question is a majority of the
number of votes cast by valid ballot.

(10) On a regional board’s request for a function in subsection (7) which was
granted prior to April 3, 1970, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by
supplementary letters patent, provide for participation by additional member
municipalities. He may also provide that additional member municipalities share any
function granted at any time on the minister’s recommendation, and subsections (2) to
(9) apply.

(11) On the recommendation of the minister and with the consent of the regional
board, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may by supplementary letters patent
redefine the boundaries of an electoral area, and in the supplementary letters patent
may make the provision, deemed proper and necessary, for the apportionment of the
annual debt charges and other obligations incurred for a function in which the electoral
areas, concerned were sharing the cost.

(12) On the recommendation of the minister and the consent of the regional
board, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may by supplementary letters patent change
the name of a regional district.

(13) On the recommendation of the minister, the Lieutenant Governor in Council
may amend the voting unit established by the letters patent of a district.

(14) Where a new municipality is incorporated, that municipality becomes a
member municipality of the regional district under the same terms and conditions as
pertained to the electoral area that contained the area of the new municipality, except as
modified by the letters patent. The apportionment of costs for a function, unless
otherwise provided by the letters patent, shall be on the same basis as pertains to any
other member municipality that is a city, district, town or village.

(15) The regional board may request, under subsection (3), that it be granted the
power to undertake a function where it has
(a) designated, with the approval of the minister, the area in the regional district that it believes would benefit from the proposed function and has specified the municipalities and electoral areas or parts of them which will participate and share in the costs of the function; and
(b) submitted the question for the assent of the electors at large within the area referred to above and is satisfied that the total number of votes cast in favour is a majority of the total votes cast by valid ballot in the area as a whole.


Regulatory bylaws

769. The regional board shall not adopt a bylaw regulating persons or their property until a synopsis of the proposed regulations has been advertised in a newspaper published or circulated in the member area or member municipalities in which the regulations are to apply, and any other requirements required by letters patent or by any Act have been fulfilled.


Additional regional district powers

770. (1) For that part of a regional district not within a city, district, town or village, the regional district has all the powers of a district municipality under Part 16, except sections 656 and 657. A bylaw establishing a specified area requires either the assent of electors under section 674 (4), or a sufficient petition under sections 658 and 659.

(2) A regional district may undertake any work or service for a member municipality, other than an electoral area, on mutually agreed terms, if the work or service is within the powers of the municipality and the entire cost of the work or service is borne by the municipality.

(3) Section 269 (h) applies to a regional district, but the aggregate of all grants made in any year shall not exceed the product of 1/10 mill of the assessed values referred to in section 791 (1); and the annual cost shall be apportioned among all member municipalities on the basis provided under that subsection.

(4) The regional board may provide that grants made under subsection (3) be charged only to member municipalities benefiting from the organization to which the grant is made; but the aggregate of all grants under this section for which a member municipality may be charged may not exceed the limit in subsection (3). 

(5) Section 280 applies to that part of a regional district not within a city, district, town or village, but a bylaw under that section shall not be adopted unless and until it has been submitted to the electors in all the electoral areas at large within the regional district and a majority of the electors who vote on the bylaw are in favour of its passage.

(6) The regional board may, for that area of the district not within a city, district, town or village, exercise any power contained in section 930 (f).

Letters patent of regional district

776. (1) Letters patent incorporating a regional district shall specify the
(a) name and boundaries of the district;
(b) member municipalities;
(c) population deemed to be a voting unit;
(d) last date for appointment of municipal directors to the first board;
(e) time and manner of first election of directors of electoral areas;
(f) returning officer at the first election, if required;
(g) polling places at the first election, if required;
(h) date, time and place of the board’s first meeting;
(i) sums which may be borrowed to meet the current lawful expenditures of
the regional district in the year of incorporation and, if deemed
expedient, for the year next following; and
(j) dates which may be observed initially, and once only, in place of
statutory dates.

(2) The letters patent of a regional district may specify
(a) the member municipalities which participate in a function;
(b) the powers, duties and obligations of the district in addition to those
specified in this Part;
(c) the powers, duties and obligations of a member municipality transferred
to the exclusive jurisdiction of the district;
(d) the basis of apportioning the cost or revenue of each function of the
district not otherwise provided for by any Act;
(e) a limitation on the borrowing power of the district for each function, but
nothing in this paragraph affects the validity of any borrowing under
letters patent issued prior to April 2, 1969;
(f) a limitation on the district’s annual expenditure for a function; and
(g) other provisions and conditions the Lieutenant Governor in Council
deems proper and necessary.

Regional board

778. In accordance with section 779, the regional board shall consist of the
requisite number of directors appointed by the council or trustees of each municipality
from among its members (in this Part referred to as “municipal directors”) and the
requisite number of directors elected from the electoral areas, if any, (in this Part
referred to as “electoral area directors”).

Membership and voting

779. (1) On the regional board,
(a) the number of votes to which a member municipality is entitled is the
number obtained by dividing the population of the member municipality
by the voting unit, and if the quotient is not an integer the number of
votes shall be the next greater integer;
(b) the number of directors to which a member municipality is entitled is the
number obtained by dividing the number of votes to which the member
municipality is entitled by 5, and if the quotient is not an integer the
number of directors shall be the next greater integer;
(c) no director shall have more than 5 votes; and
(d) the votes to which a member municipality is entitled shall be distributed
as evenly as possible among its directors, and the council or trustees, as
the case may be, shall notify the regional board of the number of votes
assigned to each director.
(2) When voting, a director may not cast the votes assigned to him partially or separately.

(3) A director shall not vote on a function entailing the provisions of a work or service unless the member municipality he represents shares in the cost of that function under the budget of the current year or immediately ensuing year, but this restriction does not apply to a proposal related to that function which will require that member municipality to become liable to share in the cost of the function at a future date or to the adoption of a borrowing bylaw or a regulatory bylaw, or where the board is acting under Part 16 or entering into a contract.

(4) The population of a regional district is the sum of the population of the member municipalities. Where the population of a member municipality has not been established by census, its population is as determined by certificate of the minister until determined by census.

(5) A change in the population of a member municipality established by the census or caused by a change in boundaries shall, for the purposes of voting power on the regional board, take effect in the year immediately following the year in which that census was taken or in which the boundaries were altered.

Chairman

786. The regional board shall elect one of its members as chairman at the first meeting held after each December 1, and notwithstanding section 787 each director has one vote only for the election.

Majority vote

787. (1) All bylaws and resolutions of the regional board shall, save as otherwise provided, be decided by the majority of the votes of directors who are at the meeting and entitled to vote on them.

(2) The adoption or amendment of a regulatory bylaw of the regional board requires an affirmative vote of a majority of the directors present and entitled to vote on the bylaw, having among them a majority of all the votes cast.

Apportionment of cost

791. (1) Except as otherwise specified in the letters patent, the annual cost attributable to each function of the regional district shall be apportioned among the member municipalities on the basis of the net taxable value of land and improvements for regional hospital district tax purposes.

(2) A surplus or deficit existing at the end of a year for that function shall be taken into account as revenue or expenditure, as the case may be, for that function for the immediately succeeding year.

(3) There shall be apportioned among all member municipalities, on the basis provided under subsection (1), the remuneration and expenses of the chairman and the directors of the regional board and that portion of the cost of administration not specifically attributable to a function.

(4) The cost of administration attributable to a function shall be added to the cost of that function.

(5) The cost of election of directors shall be apportioned in the same manner as administrative costs under subsection (3), except that no part of them shall be apportioned to a municipality.

(6) Cost of membership in the Union of British Columbia Municipalities and expenses of delegates to conventions of the union shall be apportioned in the same manner as administrative costs under subsection (3), except that no part of them shall be apportioned to a city, district, town or village that is a member of the union.
(7) Revenue attributable to a function shall be set off against its cost.

(8) The assessment commissioner shall, as required by the secretary, certify and forward to the secretary the current year net taxable value for general municipal purposes of all land and improvements in each member municipality and the net taxable values for regional hospital district purposes for each member municipality.

(9) A copy of the values certified under subsection (8) shall be forwarded to the inspector and in the case of a member municipality that is a village, to the Surveyor of Taxes.


Regional plans

807. (1) The regional board shall prepare regional plans applicable to the regional district and revise them as necessary, and for this purpose a regional plan means a general scheme without detail for the projected uses of land within the regional district, including the location of major highways.

(2) A regional plan may be expressed in maps, plans, reports or by other means.

(3) A regional plan may apply to any or all areas of the regional district.

(4) The regional board may, in a regional plan, provide for transition from present to proposed use, and shall, in preparing the plan, have regard for interrelationships of areas and uses.

1965-28-22; 1966-31-34; 1969-21-34.

Official regional plans

808. (1) The regional board may by bylaw designate a regional plan prepared under any Act as an official regional plan.

(2) An affirmative vote of a majority of the directors present at the meeting at which the vote is taken and entitled to vote on the bylaw, having among them a majority of all the votes cast, is required to adopt or amend a bylaw pursuant to subsection (1).


Official settlement plans

809. (1) Following the adoption of an official regional plan, the regional board shall prepare official settlement plans.

(2) An official settlement plan applies only to that area of the regional district outside a city, district, town or village, and may apply to all or part of that area.

(3) The regional board may adopt or amend an official settlement plan only by a bylaw adopted by an affirmative vote of a majority of the directors present at the meeting at which the vote is taken and entitled to vote on the bylaw, having among them a majority of all the votes cast.

(4) The regional board shall not adopt, amend or repeal a bylaw under subsection (3), except after a hearing in accordance with section 720, and, for this purpose, the reference in section 720 to a bylaw shall be deemed to be a reference to an official settlement plan, and section 814 (4) and (5) applies.

(5) A bylaw under subsection (3) does not come into force until approved by the minister.

(6) An official settlement plan does not

(a) commit the regional board or any other local government body to undertake any project suggested or outlined in it; and

(b) authorize the regional board or any other local government body to proceed with a project except in accordance with the procedures and restrictions laid down by any Act.
(7) The regional board or the trustees of an improvement district shall not adopt a bylaw or undertake works contrary to or at variance with an official settlement plan.

(8) Subsection (7) does not empower the regional board to impair, abrogate or otherwise affect the rights and privileges to which an owner of land is otherwise lawfully entitled.

(9) On an official settlement plan coming into force,

(a) section 814 (2) does not apply to a bylaw adopted under Division (3) or (4) of Part 21 that regulates only the area of the regional district covered by an official settlement plan;

(b) section 57 (2) of the Highway Act and section 80 (1) of the Land Title Act do not apply to a zoning bylaw that regulates the area of the regional district covered by an official settlement plan if the Minister of Transportation and Highways has approved the official settlement plan and the amendments to it; and

(c) the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint an officer of the regional district as the approving officer under section 77 of the Land Title Act to approve subdivision plans within the area of the regional district covered by an official settlement plan.

(10) An official community plan of a regional district adopted prior to September 1, 1977 shall be deemed to be an official settlement plan; but subsection (9) does not apply unless the plan is approved by the minister, the Minister of Transportation and Highways, or both, as the circumstances require.

(11) Where, but for the approval of an official settlement plan under subsection (9) (b), a zoning bylaw would otherwise be subject to Part 6 of the Highway Act, site plans of commercial or industrial buildings exceeding 4,500 m\(^2\) in gross floor area require the approval of the Minister of Transportation and Highways.


Requirements of official settlement plan

810. (1) An official settlement plan, following its adoption, shall be the basis for the preparation and adoption of land use regulating bylaws and amendments to them. It shall be in writing and may include plans, maps, tables or other graphic material.

(2) An official settlement plan shall contain, apart from other matters that may be required by the minister, a statement of broad social, economic and environmental objectives to be achieved by implementation of the plan and a statement of the policies of the regional board on the general form and character of the future land use pattern in the area covered by the plan, including

(a) the location, amount and type of major commercial, industrial, institutional, recreational and public utility uses;

(b) the location, amount, type and density of residential development required to meet the anticipated housing needs over a period of at least 5 years in the area covered by the plan;

(c) the protection of land areas subject to hazardous conditions;

(d) the preservation, protection and enhancement of land and water areas of special importance for scenic or recreational value or natural, historical or scientific interest;

(e) the preservation and continuing use of agricultural land for present and future food production;

(f) the proposed sequence of urban development and redevelopment, including, where ascertainable, the proposed timing, location and phasing of trunk sewer and water services;

(g) the need for and provision of public facilities, including schools, parks and solid waste disposal sites;
(h) the location in schematic form of a major road system for the plan area;
(i) the location, amount and type of development to be permitted within
1 km of a controlled access highway designated under Part 6 of the
Highway Act;
(j) the distribution of major land use areas and concentrations of activity in
relation to the provision of existing or potential public transit services; and
(k) a program identifying the actions required by the regional board to
implement the official settlement plan.

(3) In preparing the official settlement plan, consideration shall be given to
(a) the probable social, environmental and economic consequences of
proposed policies;
(b) the stated objectives, policies and programs of the government;
(c) the suitability of land for various uses;
(d) land area requirements for uses related to projections of population and
economic growth; and
(e) the prevention of pollution of air, water and land.

(4) Official settlement plans shall be prepared and amended in consultation with
the member municipalities of the regional district, elected electoral area representatives
and the minister.

Public access to proposals

811. In submitting an official settlement plan or amendments for approval by
the minister, the regional board shall provide evidence that the public was given
adequate opportunity to examine and comment on the proposed plan or amendments,
and shall provide a summary of the comments received by the regional board.

Regional plan restrictions

812. A regional board, or the council or trustees of a member municipality, may
not enact a provision or initiate works which would impair or impede the ultimate
realization of all or part of the objectives of an official regional plan. The limitation in
section 809 (8) also applies to this section.

Regional plan: no commitment

813. The provisions in section 809 (6) also apply to an official regional plan.

Technical planning committee

815. (1) The regional board shall provide for the establishment of a technical
planning committee which, except as otherwise provided in the letters patent of the
regional district, shall consist of
(a) the planning director for the regional district, or, where the regional
district does not employ a planning director, an employee of the regional
district appointed by it;
(b) the medical health officer having jurisdiction in the regional district or a
person designated by him;
(c) one municipal employee appointed by each member municipality;
(d) one person at the option of each of the Ministries of Agriculture; Energy,
Mines and Petroleum Resources; Environment (fish and wildlife);
Environment (water resources); Forests; Lands, Parks and Housing
(lands); Lands, Parks and Housing (parks); Municipal Affairs; Transportation and Highways and any other ministry or branch designated by the
minister;
(e) one person at the option of each Crown agency designated by the
minister;
(f) one school board employee at the option of the board of school trustees
of each school district within the regional district; and
(g) one employee of any ministries, departments and Crown agencies of
Canada designated by the minister.

(2) The technical planning committee shall advise the regional board on planning
matters referred to it by the board and act as liaison between the administration of the
regional board and the respective ministries of government and the member
municipalities.

(3) All matters under sections 807 to 814 requiring legislative action by the
regional board shall be referred to the technical planning committee at least 30 days
before being acted on by the regional board.

(4) Subsection (3) does not apply to a development permit issued under section
717.

(5) The technical planning committee shall, at its first meeting in each year,
appoint from among its members a chairman and vice chairman to hold
office for that
year or until their successors are appointed.

(6) The minutes and reports of the technical planning committee shall be
submitted to the regional board.

Appeals

819. (1) The council of a member municipality, or the director of a member
municipality which is an electoral area, as the case may be, may appeal any bylaw,
order, decision or action of the regional board to the inspector who may, by himself or
by another person authorized by him, hold an inquiry which shall be open to the public.
Orders made by the person holding the inquiry and as a result of the inquiry shall, on
approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, be binding on the regional board and
the member municipalities.

(2) Section 745 (2) applies with the necessary changes and so far as applicable.

Source: taken from the Municipal Act, RSBC (1979),
Chapter 290.
### Appendix 4: ORP Update Budget 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional District</th>
<th>Regional District Share</th>
<th>Provincial Government Share</th>
<th>Combined Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVRD</td>
<td>$ 41,600</td>
<td>$ 83,200</td>
<td>$ 124,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFVRD</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFC</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LM Total         | $ 66,800                | $ 133,600                  | $ 200,400             |

|                | 33.3 %                  | 66.6 %                     | 100.0 %               |

Source: LMORPU-TLC (1978/5 p. 3)
Appendix 5: Plan Instrument Evaluation Summary

REGIONAL STRUCTURE OPTION

i efficiency

+ plan would be less detailed and complex and so more in keeping with the drive for de-regulation

+ plan would lead to faster processing of applications and so savings in staff time

ii effectiveness

- plan would be less precise, less ascertainable under law and so open to varying interpretation

- plan would provide less control over regionally significant land use decisions

- plan violations would be harder to detect and correct

+- plan in avoiding absolute standards would give more flexibility and autonomy to the local level, but not all local areas would have the planning capabilities to make proper use of such a plan

HOUSEKEEPING OPTION

- plan would become more detailed and complex and so not in keeping with the drive for de-regulation

- plan might lead to more lengthy processing of amendment applications and so additional time and expense

+ plan policies would be more precise and designations more clearly delineated so there would be fewer uncertainties over land development

+ plan would allow greater regional input into local land use decisions

+ plan would place the onus on the local authority to prove its case for plan amendment

Source: summarized from LMORPU-WG (1979/5)
Appendix 6: Formulation Of The Development Strategy

The process through which the WG evolved a development strategy began with two principles that reflected the basic orientation of the 1966 ORP: the need to reserve land for further urban and other uses and the need to accommodate urban growth through the designation of sufficient quantities of land in appropriate locations. Initially, the WG emphasized the reservation principle, a situation undoubtedly influenced by the fact that the extensive biophysical mapping program for the Lower Mainland, which had been authorized by the TLC and undertaken by the Resource Analysis Branch of the Ministry of Environment, was nearly completed.

The CFVRD member of the WG proceeded to prepare a report, Objectives And Criteria For Reservation Areas, dated April 5, 1979, that provided a rudimentary outline of a reservation based development strategy. Reservation areas, stated the report, would be delineated by 'hard' lines on a map. Specifically, the criteria for reservation areas included floodplain lands; agricultural land reserves; lands with steep slopes or poor soil stability; lands of biological importance, (natural area and wildlife habitats); and government and crown lands, (parks, forests, watersheds, tree farm licenses, and ecological and recreation reserves). All of these criteria
were then to be integrated into reserve areas by using the technique of coloured, transparent overlays. In essence, this development strategy was a 'remainder' method; urban development would only be permitted on those lands not designated as reserve.

In its April 10, 1979 meeting, the WG approved the criteria for reservation, but adjusted the level of analysis to match the biophysical maps: a scale of 1:50,000 rather than 1:250,000. The determination of urban land availability through the 'remainder' method, however, only proved a generalized development strategy. Neither land demand, nor land supply alone could lead to the spatial expression of a development strategy, i.e., a regional structure map.

The development strategy was to be culled from the settlement objectives and growth share scenarios. While a list of some 14 development objectives reflecting the twin directions of reservation and accommodation was prepared, the WG found, in its April 24, 1979 meeting, that these objectives could lead to a number of different growth scenarios. Subsequently, the WG devised a methodology for generating a development strategy. The methodology was similar to that which the GVRD had used to produce a rationale for the Regional Town Center concept of its, Livable Region Program: 1976-1986. In fact, the WG member who set down the methodology was a senior GVRD staff member who had been involved in the formulation of the
'Livable Region Program'. The Methodology was composed of four basic steps:

1 Identify growth scenarios, i.e., alternate settlement patterns, and define the implications of each scenario;
2 Establish criteria for evaluating the growth scenarios;
3 Evaluate the growth scenarios; and
4 Quantify the implications of the selected growth scenario, including its impact on urban form.

The WG sequentially worked through the first three steps of the above methodology during its meetings in early May 1979. As part of the first step, the WG identified five growth scenarios:

1 Trend Scenario: present relationship to remain and development to proceed without the introduction of any new policy.
2 New Focus Scenario: emphasis would be placed on the development of a major new urban center in the Lower Mainland.
3 Nodal Scenario: emphasis would be placed on a variety of urban centers in the Lower Mainland.
4 Resource Capability: the primary emphasis would embody the principle of respect for the land.
5 Economic Development Scenario: the primary focus would be to maximize the economic development potential of the Lower Mainland. (LMORPU-WG, Minutes, May 3, 1979, p. 3).

The implications of these growth scenarios were then described in terms of 12 topics: population, labour force, employment, housing, land consumption, government, economy, transportation and infrastructure, environment, land values, servicing and
public facilities, and financing. In essence, the first step was a crude impact analysis; it established the 'facts' of what would happen under each of the five growth scenarios. The growth scenarios were not completely unique options, though. Under the trend scenario; the GVRD would experience the greatest absolute increase in population and benefit most from employment growth; the Valley Regional Districts would receive much less employment growth, but would have to service a rapidly growing residential population; and the Lower Mainland as a whole would suffer from the inefficient use of scarce land resources while having to pay for additional highways to support increased commuter flows into the GVRD. If the trend scenario was the 'sprawl' option, then the economic development scenario was the 'super sprawl' option. The resource capabilities option called for a selective freeze of trend growth: urban growth was to be halted on the south side of the Fraser River and directed to the north side, a shift away from the CFVRD's agricultural and floodplain lands towards DARD's more hilly, upland topography. Finally, the remaining two options, the new focus and nodal scenarios, were similar as their basic objective was to focus growth within the Regional Districts rather than to direct growth between them.

Next, the WG formulated a set of criteria and evaluated the growth scenarios in terms of these criteria: see Figure A6-1. Each scenario-criteria rating, scored on a five point scale
Figure A6-1: Scenario Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCENARIO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TREND</td>
<td>NEW FOCUS</td>
<td>NODAL</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>1. Economic Growth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Economic Diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Dist. of Econ. Act.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4. Nat. Assets Conservancy</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Nat. Hazards</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Environ. Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Finance</td>
<td>7. Effic. of Pub. Exp.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Local Assess. Base</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Total Pub. Exp.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't &amp; Society</td>
<td>10. Govt. Regulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Local Views-Control</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. New Legislation</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Options Open</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>14. Farming</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Husband Land Res.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Energy</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>17. Choice of Life Style</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Rec. &amp; Comm. Fac.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>20. Journey to Work</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Transit</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: taken from LMORPU-WG, Minutes, May 11, 1979, p. 4.
from -2 to +2, was determined by a consensus of the WG members. After this initial evaluation, the WG members each assigned a weight, on a 1 to 5 scale, to the criteria: see Figure A6 -2. In the final step of the evaluation, the WG multiplied the scenario-criteria ratings by each WG member's weighted criteria set to produce a composite impact rating: see Figure A6 -3. The right end column of this final table represents a summary of all the WG member's composite impact ratings, the WG's total score and rank order for all the growth scenarios. In essence, the WG's methodology provided a rationale for selecting a settlement pattern to be the focal point of the updated ORP's development strategy. The methodology itself was a simplified form of Hill's (1968) Goals Achievement Matrix.

From the WG's evaluative exercise, the nodal growth scenario, a settlement pattern based on regional town centers, emerged as the 'best' option. The resource capacity growth scenario was the second best option, closely followed by the new focus growth scenario. The other two growth scenarios, economic development and trend, were both assigned negative ratings with the latter, 'do nothing', scenario being the least desirable option. In its May 17, 1979 meeting, the TLC ratified the WG's selection, resolving that, "...the Regional Town concept having been re-examined in light of the other options be affirmed as the basis for Part II Development Directions..." (LMORPU-TLC, Minutes, May 17, 1979, p. 4) Most of the TLC's discussion on this matter, it appears, was
## Figure A6-2: Evaluative Criteria Weightings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CFVRD</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>RDFC</th>
<th>DARD</th>
<th>CFVRD</th>
<th>MOMA</th>
<th>WORKING GROUP AV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Econ. Growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conservancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hazards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Environ. Quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Efficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pab. Expenditure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regulation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Local Views</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Energy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Journey to Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A6-3: Composite Impact Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO</th>
<th>CFVRD</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>RDFC</th>
<th>DARD</th>
<th>CFVRD</th>
<th>MOMA</th>
<th>WORKING GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREND</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW FOCUS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NODES</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: taken from LMORPU-WG, Minutes, May 11, 1979, p. 5.
concerned with how the regional centers would be presented in the plan; the validity of the WG's methodology itself was not challenged.

The WG's evaluation of the growth scenarios was an extension of its step one 'impact analysis'. The topics were more formally stated as criteria and the facts or outcomes of what would happen under each scenario were assigned values according to the scenario's degree of positive or negative impact on the criteria. This procedure was based on the knowledge accumulated in the technical memoranda and on the WG members' own judgement; it was not based on any type of comprehensive systems model or quantitative analysis. In an attempt to externalize the subjectivity of the evaluation, the WG members each weighted the importance of the criteria according to their individual concerns. This step, of course, immediately exposed the WG members as Regional District representatives and points out the lack of public participation or consultation.

The 'equity' step traditionally employed in goals achievement analysis was lacking in the WG's method; the members' weightings of the criteria were not weighted themselves. Since all the WG members had an equal voice in the determination of the final scores, some of the Regional Districts were over represented in relation to their share of Lower Mainland population, CFVRD and RDFC, while others were under represented, GVRD and DARD. It is doubtful, however, if a 'population
equalization factor' would have significantly altered the results, for the WG members appear to have been quite consistent in their attitudes towards the growth scenarios. From the composite impact ratings, Figure A6 -3, it can be seen that the WG members' rank orderings of the growth scenarios were basically the same with generally not more than one member differing by more than one position. A comparison of the net ratings from the scenario-criteria evaluation, Figure A6 -1, and the WG's (total) composite impact ratings, Figure A6 -3, reveals no change in the rank order of the growth scenarios. In essence, the application of the weighted criteria did little to alter the initial evaluation. It appears, then that the WG functioned as a coherent team during the evaluation and that the results were the product of consensus.

One of the strengths of the WG's goals achievement analysis as an evaluative technique was its use of multi-dimensional objectives or criteria. To provide a clearer impression of the WG's evaluation, the 21 criteria have been grouped under four basic dimensions or goals rather than the seven used by the WG: see Figure A6 -4. The criteria were grouped on the basis of common interest, whether the criteria measured the public and private costs of 'operating' the various growth scenarios, i.e., efficiency, or measured the utility of the growth scenarios, i.e., effectiveness, in terms of environmental respect, autonomy, and economic prosperity.
Figure A6 -4: Total Working Group Scores Reordered

**EFFECTIVENESS:**
Environmental Respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 conservation</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 avoidance</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 flexibility</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 farmland viability</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 husband land and resources</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 regulations, intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 local opinion, control</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 new legislation</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 choice of lifestyle</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFECTIVENESS:**
Autonomy

**EFFECTIVENESS:**
Economic Prosperity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 growth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 distribution</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+52</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 local assessment base</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 affordability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 efficiency</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 total public expenditure</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 energy</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 journey to work</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 transit oriented</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFICIENCY:**
Public and Private Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 efficiency</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 total public expenditure</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 energy</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 journey to work</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 transit oriented</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-290</td>
<td>+145</td>
<td>+423</td>
<td>+177</td>
<td>-107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: calculated by multiplying Figure A6 -1 by Figure A6 -2.
The polarities of the scenario-criteria ratings under these four dimensions were more consistent than under the WG's seven headings, a fact that provides justification for the regrouping. What this regrouping demonstrates is that the WG's evaluation of the growth scenarios was implicitly weighted by the relative number of criteria under each dimension. In particular, the evaluation was biased towards economic concerns. More than half of the 21 criteria, 11, were ones measuring economic objectives from either an efficiency or effectiveness point of view. Only six criteria were used to measure environmental respect and four to measure autonomy. Neither the TLC, nor the LMPRP questioned the WG's selection of the evaluative criteria. Thus, there was a lack of political accountability for the WG's implicit weighting of the goals or dimensions by number of supporting criteria, a failing that can be attributed as much to the method as to the actual process.

The sub-total scores in Figure A6 -4 also provide a clearer indication of how the rank order of the growth scenarios was established. The nodal scenario ranked first because it scored the highest on the economic criteria while still achieving middle place scores on the remaining criteria. Because of its very high score on environmental respect, one that out-weighted its lesser performance on the economic criteria, the resource capacity scenario accumulated just enough points to be ranked in second place over the new focus scenario. The
fourth ranked economic scenario was the inverse of the resource capacity scenario; it scored very low on environmental respect and comparatively high on the economic criteria. With substantial negative scores in all categories except autonomy, the trend scenario ranked fifth and last. The directed growth or 'planned' scenarios--nodal, new focus, and resource capacity--generally scored high (+) on environmental respect, economic prosperity, and public and private costs, but scored low (-) on autonomy. In contrast, the market directed or unplanned scenarios--trend and economic development--scored just the opposite of this pattern.

In conclusion, the WG's formulation of a development strategy was perhaps the most important achievement of the process of updating the ORP. The development strategy, a nodal settlement pattern, provided a common framework for the development of the Lower Mainland and largely eliminated the need for each Regional District to prepare its own 'sectoral strategy', an approach that might well have fragmented the joint update process. The WG's selection of this development strategy, though, was the result of a secluded, academic exercise that was not questioned by the TLC. While the WG members used a goals achievement matrix technique, they did not seek the input of either public, or political opinions. The WG members scored options which they had formulated against criteria that they had determined and weighted. Not surprisingly, there was a high degree of agreement between the WG members
on the basic rank order of the growth scenario options. The WG members were, to a certain extent, guilty of 'group think', a phenomenon arising from the psychological processes of socialization and peer pressure that reduces intra-group conflict and narrows the range of acceptable options to a select few or single choice (Janis 1972). Moreover, the criteria used by the WG were derived from the development objectives of plan instrument IV (LMORPU-WG 1979/17), objectives which themselves had been recycled from, Chance And Challenge, the 1966 ORP, and the, Livable Region Program. The WG's selection of the nodal growth scenario option thus came from an evaluation method that inherently reflected the inertia of past plan concepts.
Appendix 7: Comparison Of Designations, 1966-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing, 1966 ORP</th>
<th>First, January 18, 1979 Draft Of The Updated ORP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URB-1, ESTABLISHED URBAN</td>
<td>URBAN RESERVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND-1, DEVELOPING INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>URBAN INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND-2, POTENTIAL INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>COUNTRYSIDE AND FARMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URB-2, DEVELOPING URBAN</td>
<td>RURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRL-1, ACREAGE RURAL</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRL-2, UPLAND RURAL</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRL-3, LOWLAND RURAL</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV-2, INSTITUTIONAL RESERVE</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION/UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRK-1, ESTABLISHED PARK</td>
<td>PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRK-2, POTENTIAL PARK</td>
<td>LIMITED USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV-1, LIMITED USE RESERVE</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION/UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV-3, UNDETERMINED RESERVE</td>
<td>PORT/Terminal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

under transportation use in other designations

Sources: compiled from LMRPB (1966), LMORPU-WG (1979/31)
Appendix 8: How The Plans Fit Together

HOW THE PLANS FIT TOGETHER

LIVABLE REGION STRATEGY
- UPDATED OFFICIAL REGIONAL PLAN
  FOR GREATER VANCOUVER

- Regional Actions
- Official Settlement Plans
- Regional Parks Plans
- Rapid Transit Plans
- Bus Improvement Programs etc.
- Development Strategy and Implementation Measures
- Based on wide consultation with Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments and the Public
- Supported by an on-going Lower Mainland Planning Coordinating Process.

- Municipal Actions
- Official Community Plans
- Development By-laws
- Local Road Improvements
- Servicing Schemes etc.

PRIVATE ACTIONS

UPDATE OFFICIAL REGIONAL PLAN
FOR CENTRAL FRASER VALLEY

- Regional Actions
- Regional Growth Management
- Agricultural Land Appeals
- Industrial Land Development Strategy
- Etc.

- Municipal Actions
- Official Community Plans
- Development By-laws
- Local Road Improvements
- Servicing Schemes etc.

PRIVATE ACTIONS

LOWER MAINLAND PLAN

- Development Strategy and Implementation Measures
- Based on wide consultation with Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments and the Public
- Supported by an on-going Lower Mainland Planning Coordinating Process.

UPDADTED OFFICIAL REGIONAL PLAN
FOR DEWDNEY-ALOUETTE

- Regional Actions
- Regional Growth Management
- Official Settlement Plans
- Economic Development etc.

- Municipal Actions
- Official Community Plans
- Development By-laws
- Servicing Schemes etc.

PRIVATE ACTIONS

UPDADTED OFFICIAL REGIONAL PLAN
FOR FRASER-CHEAM

- Regional Actions
- Official Settlement Plans
- Agricultural Land Appeals
- Economic Development Plans etc.

- Municipal Actions
- Official Community Plans
- Development By-laws
- Settlement Schemes etc.

PRIVATE ACTIONS

PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT
- Highway Plans
- Fish and Wildlife Protection
- Forestry Plans
- Provincial Park Plans etc.

FEDERAL ACTIONS
- Airport Development
- Port Development
- Housing Programs etc.

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 12)
Appendix 9: Evolution Of The Development Strategy

### EVOLUTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC ISSUES, CONCERNS AND PROBLEMS</th>
<th>LOWER MAINLAND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS</th>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>PREFERRED CONCEPT</th>
<th>REFINED CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public concerns</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Renewal natural resources</td>
<td>TV with Development</td>
<td>Other in a set of</td>
<td>Other in a set of</td>
<td>1. Forces productive boomland, floodplains and natural assets from urban and industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Views of elected representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop and use natural resources for the long-term benefit of the Lower Mainland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Views of federal and provincial agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>International opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Locate more of the total population growth within the metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experience with 1966 plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Options for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Locate more of the population growth outside the metropolitan area in the north of the Fraser River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Focus four-thirds of Fraser Valley growth in the valley towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forecasts and projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Promote higher residential densities in the metropolitan area and the valley towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Focus new commercial employment and high and medium density housing in and around the metropolitan core and existing regional centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Improve the balance in the distribution of jobs and labour force in all parts of the Lower Mainland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Provide infrastructure and physical services in a way which will reinforce the development concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 14)
Appendix 10: Lower Mainland Development
Concept And Strategy

A METROPOLITAN AREA AND FIVE VALLEY TOWNS AND OTHER URBAN AREAS
LINKED BY EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SURROUNDED BY
PRODUCTIVE FARMLAND, STABLE RURAL AREAS, AND PROTECTED ENVIRON-
MENTALLY SENSITIVE AND RECREATIONAL AREAS.

The strategy consists of nine interconnected elements:

1. PROTECT PRODUCTIVE FARMLAND, FLOODPLAIN AND NATURAL ASSETS FROM
   URBAN AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

2. DEVELOP AND USE NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE LONG-TERM BENEFIT OF
   THE LOWER MAINLAND.

3. LOCATE MORE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION GROWTH WITHIN THE METROPOLITAN
   AREA.

4. LOCATE MORE OF THE POPULATION GROWTH OUTSIDE THE METROPOLITAN
   AREA TO THE NORTH OF THE FRASER RIVER.

5. FOCUS FOUR-FIFTHS OF FRASER VALLEY GROWTH IN FIVE VALLEY TOWNS.

6. PROMOTE HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA AND
   THE VALLEY TOWNS.

7. FOCUS NEW COMMERCIAL EMPLOYMENT AND HIGH AND MEDIUM DENSITY
   HOUSING IN AND AROUND THE METROPOLITAN CORE AND EXISTING REGIONAL
   CENTRES.

8. IMPROVE THE BALANCE IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF JOBS AND LABOUR FORCE
   IN ALL PARTS OF THE LOWER MAINLAND.

9. PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION AND PHYSICAL SERVICES IN A WAY WHICH WILL
   REINFORCE THE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT.

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft
of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1
p. 16, 17)
Appendix 11: The Strategy Illustrated

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH: GVRD AND THE REMAINDER OF THE LOWER MAINLAND

- **1971 - 1976**
  - REST: 45%
  - GVRD: 55%

- **TREND 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 57%
  - GVRD: 43%

- **TARGET 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 50%
  - GVRD: 50%

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN THE LOWER MAINLAND: GVRD AND THE REMAINDER OF THE LOWER MAINLAND

- **1971 - 1976**
  - REST: 11%
  - GVRD: 89%

- **TREND 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 11%
  - GVRD: 89%

- **TARGET 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 22%
  - GVRD: 78%

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH OUTSIDE THE GVRD: NORTH AND SOUTH OF THE FRASER RIVER

- **1971 - 1976**
  - NORTH: 26%
  - SOUTH: 74%

- **TREND 1976 - 2001**
  - NORTH: 28%
  - SOUTH: 72%

- **TARGET 1976 - 2001**
  - NORTH: 38%
  - SOUTH: 62%

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH OUTSIDE THE GVRD: VALLEY TOWNS AND OTHER AREAS

- **1971 - 1976**
  - REST: 45%
  - VALLEY TOWNS: 55%

- **TREND 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 50%
  - VALLEY TOWNS: 50%

- **TARGET 1976 - 2001**
  - REST: 20%
  - VALLEY TOWNS: 80%

Source: Taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 19, 22, 25)
## Appendix 12: The Strategy In Numbers

### THE STRATEGY IN NUMBERS

#### POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District</td>
<td>1,085,000</td>
<td>1,261,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,315,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>534,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford-Chilliwack Valley Town</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Valley Town</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-North Delta Regional District</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Town</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge Valley Town</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Delta - Delta Regional District</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody-Cariboo Regional District</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mainland</td>
<td>2,375,000</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,075,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LABOUR FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>394,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford-Chilliwack Valley Town</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Valley Town</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-North Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Town</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge Valley Town</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Delta - Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody-Cariboo Regional District</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mainland</td>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td>456,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>541,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford-Chilliwack Valley Town</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Valley Town</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-North Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Town</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge Valley Town</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Delta - Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody-Cariboo Regional District</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mainland</td>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford-Chilliwack Valley Town</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Valley Town</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-North Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Town</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge Valley Town</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Delta - Delta Regional District</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody-Cariboo Regional District</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody - Coquitlam Town</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mainland</td>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORP-TLC 1980/1 p. 26)
Appendix 13: Lower Mainland Development Concept Map-2001

A metropolitan area and five valley towns and other urban areas linked by efficient transportation facilities and surrounded by productive farmland, stable rural areas, and protected environmentally sensitive and recreational areas.

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 29)
Appendix 14: From Concept To Implementation

### FROM CONCEPT TO IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOWER MAINLAND DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT</th>
<th>PART III SECTIONS</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A METROPOLITAN AREA AND FIVE VALLEY TOWNS AND OTHER URBAN AREAS&quot;</td>
<td>CITIES AND TOWNS</td>
<td>LAND-AREA POLICIES AND DESIGNATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURROUNDED BY PRODUCTIVE FARMLAND, STABLE RURAL AREAS</td>
<td>COUNTRYSIDE AND FARMS</td>
<td>URBAN AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND PROTECTED ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AND RECREATIONAL AREAS</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>URBAN RESERVE AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINKED BY EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES*</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL FEATURES POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CENTRES POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL SETTLEMENTS POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITED USE AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOODPLAIN POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL ASSETS POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT/TERMINAL AREA POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION NETWORK POLICIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL UTILITY POLICIES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 35)
Appendix 15: Centers Map

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 48)
Appendix 16: Effect Of ORP

The regional board may deem an Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan to conform to the Official Regional Plan where an Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan is to be adopted or amended such that the adoption or amendment would render the plan at variance with the URBAN, URBAN RESERVE, or RURAL subdivision policies or the URBAN RESERVE or RURAL use policies of this plan and where the Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan is recognized by the board to have demonstrated that the use or subdivision policies proposed in the Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan would not impede the realization of the objectives and policies of this plan.

The process leading to regional board approval is as follows:

(a) An Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan and their amendments shall conform to the policies and provisions of this plan. The regional district should be consulted during the preparation of an Official Community Plan or an amendment. When an Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan or an amendment by-law has received two readings by the responsible authority it shall be submitted to the regional board with a request that the board recognize that the Official Community Plan or Official Settlement Plan conforms generally to the Official Regional Plan as a whole and specifically to one or more of the following policies:
- URBAN area subdivision policy;
- URBAN RESERVE area use policy;
- URBAN RESERVE area subdivision policy;
- RURAL area use policy; and/or
- RURAL area subdivision policy.

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 94)
Appendix 17: Plan Amendment Procedures

Final Draft

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Source: taken from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-LMPRP/1 p.95)
Adopted ORP

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Source: taken from the adopted ORP (GVRD-PD 1980/3 p. 89)
Appendix 18: Analysis Of The Development Strategy

The final, January 1980 ORP draft's 'Strategy In Numbers' table, see Appendix 12, provided a set of proposed distributions, i.e., Regional District growth shares, for population, labour force, households, and employment, that was identical to the figures contained in the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP. However, the final draft included trend forecast figures, an addition that made it possible to analyze the trade-offs involved in the suggested target growth distributions. Figure A18-1 provides a comparative analysis of the basic population-employment trade-off between the GVRD and the Valley Regional Districts.

Compared to the trend forecast, the suggested distribution for new Lower Mainland population growth would increase the GVRD's share by 7 percent to a total of 50 percent. The Valley Regional Districts, though, would increase their share of new employment growth in the Lower Mainland from 11 to 22 percent, a net gain of 11 percent. In absolute figures, the GVRD would lose 1.09 potential jobs for each additional resident that it acquired while the Valley Regional Districts would gain 1.09 jobs for each potential resident lost. The basic strategy underlying these figures, of course, was to balance jobs and residents within each urban areas and so reduce travel demand and capital intensive road programs.
Figure A18-1: Comparison Of GVRD and VRD Growth To 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>Valley Regional Districts</th>
<th>Lower Mainland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>231,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>+32,000</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>-35,000</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>+35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled from Appendix 12
The concept of balancing the distribution of population and employment growth was listed as a separate policy element in the final draft's development strategy. However, the WG did not, and perhaps could not, address two factors acting against this policy: the implicit nature of the ORP and the positive feedback characteristics of agglomerative economies. The basic strength of the updated ORP, as a regulatory document, lay in its ability to restrict the spread of residential growth. The updated ORP could not force the relocation of economic activity; it could only provide adequate land supply opportunities. As such, the inherent bias of the updated ORP was towards shifting population growth back into the GVRD and not towards directing employment growth out to the Valley Regional Districts. The GVRD's large population also gave it the largest force and hence the best opportunities for economic diversification and the internal generation of employment, i.e., an agglomerative economy. With its 2001 labour force target of 700,000, the GVRD would ultimately possess 76 percent of the Lower Mainland's total labour force, a figure only marginally lower than the projected trend of 75 percent. This situation points out the updated ORP's lack of an industrial strategy and need for a detailed economic base study to facilitate the formulation of such policies.

Since the target forecast figures were merely a redistribution of the trend forecast figures, a comparison between the two brings into question the origin and characteristics of the
trend forecasts. The updated ORP's population figures, from which all the other forecasts were derived, were taken directly from the middle, medium range figures contained in the December 1978, Technical Memorandum No. 1: Population, Labour Force, And Housing Forecasts 1981-2001. A key input into the cohort-survival model used to produce the population forecast was the assumption pertaining to net migration: a fixed total of 75,000 for each five year segment of the forecast. As can be seen in Figure A18-2 migration accounted for nearly all, 81 percent, of the Lower Mainland's new population growth. The basic distribution of future growth between the Regional Districts, i.e., the 'trend', was thus dependent on a continuation of past migration patterns which, in turn, were a function of Regional District socioeconomic and land use characteristics. In essence, the trend forecast represented a freeze of existing growth patterns, a situation that would not likely hold over the long term even without planned change.

The next level of the updated ORP's development strategy was the redistribution of the new Valley Regional District population growth away from the south side of the Fraser River (72 percent trend location) and towards the north side of the Fraser River (28 percent trend location). Here, the final draft proposed population growth share targets of 62 and 38 percent respectively, a significant change from the first draft's proposal of directing 50 percent of all new population growth to the north side of the Fraser River,
Figure A18-2: Net In-Migration And Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Total Trend Population</th>
<th>Percent Due To Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFVRD</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFC</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled from LMORPU-TLC (1978/14 p. 15-16)
(DARD). The decision to shift 12 percent of new growth back to the south side of the Fraser River (CFVRD) was neither a political compromise, nor an acceptance of the difficulty of redirecting growth, however. The 'Suggested Distributions' table in the first, July 18, 1979 draft of the updated ORP proposed that 140,000 of the 423,000 persons locating in the Valley Regional Districts be allocated to DARD, 38 percent (LMORPU-WG 1979/31 p. 34). Thus, the first draft's policy statement (text) that 50 percent of new population growth beyond the GVRD should be directed to the north side of the Fraser River was in contradiction with the numerical distribution (table), and the following change to 38 percent was a correction rather than a change in policy.

The 'lowest' level of the updated ORP's development strategy was the distribution of new growth between urban and rural areas. Unlike the first draft, the final draft did not contain a set of suggested targets for distributing growth between the Municipalities and Regional Town Centers of the GVRD. The GVRD Planning Department, in September 1980, would publish a separate update of its own concept plan, The Livable Region: From The 70's To The 80's. Because this document used a short term, 1986, target date and presented its target distributions only as percentages and ratios, a direct comparison with the final draft of the updated ORP on the basis of absolute figures is not possible. The basic concept of moving towards a balance of employment and
resident labour force within each Municipality, though, remained the same. In particular, employment growth was to be directed away from Vancouver and focused around the Regional Town Centers of Burnaby Metrotown, Downtown New Westminster, Whalley/Guildford (north Surrey), and Coquitlam Town Center. This strategy was briefly outlined in the final draft, and the 'Livable Region Program' was referenced as a supporting plan: see Appendix 8.

Compared to the trend location of Valley Regional District population growth, the target distribution called for the direction of some 53,000 new residents away from 'rural' areas and into Valley Towns: see Figure A18-3. This figure was almost double that of the 32,000 residents that were to be directed away from the Valley Regional Districts to the GVRD. If the 32,000 persons that would have located in the Valley Regional Districts are proportioned on the same basis as the trend split between Valley Towns (50 percent) and 'rural' (50 percent), then it can be said that the updated ORP had the potential to stop some 69,000 residents from locating in rural Valley Regional District areas. The updated ORP, however, did not translate this figure into land area 'savings' in terms of the RURAL and URBAN RESERVE land that would have been consumed by the trend growth, i.e., 69,000 residents.

In relative terms, the final draft increased the target proportion of Valley Regional District population growth to
**Figure A18-3: Distribution Of Valley Regional District Population Growth To Valley Towns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Trend No.</th>
<th>Trend %</th>
<th>Target No.</th>
<th>Target %</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFVRD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford/ Clearbrook</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+3,000</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+13,000</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (rest)</td>
<td>82,400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-61,000</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-45,000</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+15,000</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+20,000</td>
<td>+89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (rest)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-21,000</td>
<td>-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+14,000</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (rest)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total VRD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Towns</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184,100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+53,000</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (rest)</td>
<td>131,900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-85,000</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-32,000</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled from Appendix 12
be located in Valley Towns from 75 to 80 percent, an increase completely due to the recognition of Chilliwack (City) as the fifth Valley Town. Chilliwack was to receive 20 percent more population growth under the target distribution than it would have received from trend growth: see Figure A18-3. Moreover, the target distribution would increase the proportion of RDFC population growth locating in Chilliwack from 43 to 53 percent. This Valley Town 'densification', which was still well below the Valley Regional District average of 80 percent, was not caused so much by an increase in Chilliwack's population growth (20,000 in absolute terms) as it was by a net decrease in new RDFC growth. Compared to trend growth, the target distribution for new population would actually direct 1,000 persons away from locating in RDFC. The final draft thus gave RDFC its own Valley Town, but only under conditions where little real growth could take place. In justifying this low growth policy, the text directly stated that,

Chilliwack valley town will be subject to less growth pressure than the other towns because of its distance from the metropolitan area...The ability of Chilliwack valley town to accommodate extensive growth is constrained by its surrounding agricultural lands and its position within the floodplain.

(MLORPU-TLC 1980/1 p. 21).

While the Valley Towns of Abbotsford/Clearbrook and Langley (CFVRD) would receive some additional population growth from the suggested target distribution, the largest gains
were to go Mission and Maple Ridge (DARD). DARD's Valley Towns would receive approximately twice the amount of new population growth that they would have received from trend growth: see Figure A18-3. In absolute terms, the extra Valley Town population growth to be received by DARD, 35,000, would be more than twice the extra 16,000 persons that CFVRD's Valley Towns were to receive. DARD, however, faced a 'deficit' situation. Even by redirecting 21,000 new persons away from its rural areas, DARD would only be able to achieve some 60 percent of the proposed population growth, 35,000, targeted for its Valley Towns. The balance, 14,000 persons, was to come from a redirection of population growth away from CFVRD's rural areas. CFVRD, with its total trend-target growth loss of 45,000 new residents, was also supplying the population growth, 32,000, that was to be redirected to GVRD. In essence, CFVRD was directly supporting all three levels of the updated ORP's 'redistributive' development strategy: Valley Regional Districts to GVRD; south to north side of the Fraser River; and, for DARD, rural to Valley Towns.
Appendix 19: Comparison Of 1966 ORP, First Draft, And Final Draft Of The Updated ORP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1966 ORP</th>
<th>First Update Draft</th>
<th>Final Update Draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neither CWSS or CSSS</td>
<td>3 acres</td>
<td>no subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS only</td>
<td>1 acre; 20,000 sq ft with MHO; by responsible authority with plan</td>
<td>no subdivision; by responsible authority in exceptional cases with MHO and OCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS and CSSS</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neither CWSS or CSSS</td>
<td>3 acres</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS only</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS and CSSS</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>5 acres, 2 acres as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RURAL 1-4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Floodplain</td>
<td>(RRL-3) 20 acres</td>
<td>10 acres; by responsible authority with OCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not In Floodplain</td>
<td>(RRL-1) 5 acres</td>
<td>10 acres; by responsible authority with OCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RRL-2) 10 acres</td>
<td>2.5 acres with MHO and OCP, 1 acre with CWSS, MHO, and OCP, but 25% limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RRL-4) 2.5 acres, 1.25 acres with CWSS and MHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWSS: Community Water Supply System/ CSSS: Community Sanitary Sewer System/ MHO: Medical Health Officer septic tank approval/ OCP: Official Community or Settlement Plan with advance street plan, building siting regulations, and other local by-laws appropriate to ultimate development pattern and density/ Limit: percentage of municipal land used out of total land designated in part of ORP applying to that municipality

Sources: compiled from LMRPB (1966), LMORPU-WG (1979/31), and GVRD-PD (1980/1)
On November 23, 1978 the British Columbia Supreme Court ruled on official regional plans in *Capozzi Enterprises Ltd. v. Regional District of Central Okanagan* (unreported, Vancouver Registry No. C782827). It was alleged in this action that the by-law purporting to designate a regional plan as the official regional plan was in fact a zoning by-law. The Court specifically referred to (and indeed, underlined) the words "general scheme without detail" in Section 795 of the *Municipal Act* R.S.B.C. 1960, c. 255 (the "Act") and then referred to the "constraints and detailed permitted uses in schedule "B" (of the designated regional plan) along with the specification for minimum lot sizes." However, the Court noted that, by virtue of Section 797 (2), "the policies and proposals contained in the Plan have no effect upon an individual land owner unless implemented by a zoning by-law." Hence, the Court concluded that, in spite of the detail contained in the plan, it was properly designated to be the official regional plan and the designating by-law was therefore definitely not a zoning by-law. The reasoning contained in that ruling implies that the proposed update would not lose its status as a regional plan as a result of too much detail.

Source: taken from LMORPU-WG (1980/10 p. 3).
## Appendix 21: Comparison Of Final Draft And Adopted ORP Minimum Lot Sizes

* shows new or changed regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>*URBAN-2</th>
<th>*CANYON</th>
<th>URBAN RESERVE</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With neither CWSS or CSSS-basic</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>5 acres or by responsible authority with pre-1966 ORP zoning</td>
<td>1 acre with on site services</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>20 acres in FP *from 10 to 5 acres beyond FP (FP applies to all regs below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neither CWSS or CSSS-but with OCP and MHO septic tank approval</td>
<td>No Development</td>
<td>No Development</td>
<td>No Development</td>
<td>No Development</td>
<td>2.5 acres *from 25% to 50% limit (and 50 acre-limit with zoning, no OCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS, OCP, and MHO septic tank approval</td>
<td>by responsible authority with 5%, 100 acre limit</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>.5 acres</td>
<td>*from 2 acres with 25%, 100 acre limit to 1 acre with no limit</td>
<td>1 acre *from 25% to 50% limit (and 50 acre-limit with zoning, no OCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With CWSS and CSSS</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>by responsible authority</td>
<td>5 acres (redesignate to urban if appropriate)</td>
<td>(redesignate if appropriate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWSS: Community Water Supply System/ CSSS: Community Sanitary Sewer System/ MHO: Medical Health Officer/ OCP: Official Community Plan or Settlement Plan with advance street plan, building siting regulations and other local by-laws appropriate to ultimate development pattern and density/ FP: Floodplain/ Limit: percentage of municipal land used out of total land designated in part of ORP applying to that municipality.

Source: compiled from the final, January 1980 draft of the updated ORP (LMORPU-TLC 1980/1) and the adopted plan (GVRD-PD 1980/5)
Appendix 22: Data For Figure 26, Annual Housing Starts: 1948-1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>British Columbia</th>
<th>Lower Mainland</th>
<th>LM As A Percent</th>
<th>Of BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>8,341</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>7,033</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>10,848</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>10,468</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>14,953</td>
<td>12,383</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>10,199</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6,442</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>5,893</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>9,665</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>12,559</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>17,657</td>
<td>12,870</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16,361</td>
<td>11,748</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>13,021</td>
<td>9,187</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1967</td>
<td>16,988</td>
<td>13,896</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>19,443</td>
<td>15,690</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>22,936</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17,242</td>
<td>13,437</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>20,748</td>
<td>15,553</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>27,832</td>
<td>16,859</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>28,690</td>
<td>17,717</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>23,615</td>
<td>15,067</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>26,569</td>
<td>13,882</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>29,575</td>
<td>17,685</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>26,302</td>
<td>17,192</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>19,576</td>
<td>13,293</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>21,266</td>
<td>13,947</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>30,337</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>29,992</td>
<td>17,556</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>16,853</td>
<td>11,485</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>18,297</td>
<td>13,882</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13,812</td>
<td>10,529</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>16,157</td>
<td>12,413</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>19,009</td>
<td>15,126</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total housing starts for all centers larger than 10,000 residents; for 5,000 residents before 1967.

Source: Statistics Canada (1948-1986)