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ABSTRACT

Suburban employment centres have increasingly become major workplaces for suburban women without consideration of the specific requirements of these workers. This thesis examines the ability of suburban employment centres to respond to the particular needs of women employees by analyzing the relationship between the Greater Vancouver Regional District's (GVRD) objectives for suburban centres and the needs of women office workers.

This thesis includes case studies of female workers at suburban firms located in Burnaby and Richmond, British Columbia. The research points to the specific considerations that can contribute to providing women with employment opportunities in a quality working environment.

The thesis stresses the necessity for including a gender perspective in urban research, such as the suburbanization of offices and employment.

Background information on the GVRD's Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centres strategy is provided, including a description of their objectives, successes and weaknesses, particularly as they pertain to suburban office workers. The growth of suburban offices and employment, and specifically, the development and characteristics of the Burnaby and Richmond town centres are also presented.
The empirical research involved interviews of women working in suburban offices in Burnaby and Richmond to establish their actions, perceptions and expectations regarding their office location. The interview responses indicated that there is as much similarity and difference between the women working in Burnaby and Richmond, as there is between those working in town centre and non-town centre locations. Many of the women placed greater emphasis on the type of work than on the location of the office and its relationship to transit, services and amenities. Generally, most women only wanted basic amenities (banking, postal services and a convenience store) and a pleasant, relaxing environment.

The findings from the interviews are analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the GVRD's Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centres strategy. Recommendations are made for ensuring that the GVRD's objectives are more cognizant of the requirements of women office workers.
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1.1 RESEARCH FOCUS

This thesis examines the ability of suburban employment centres to respond to the particular needs of women employees by analyzing the relationship between the Greater Vancouver Regional District's (GVRD) objectives for suburban centres and the needs and expectations of women office workers. Based on case studies of female workers at four suburban firms, this study evaluates the effectiveness of the GVRD's Regional Town Centres strategy and its objectives in improving the quality of life for female office employees. Some recommendations are suggested for improving the effectiveness of the Regional Town Centres strategy.

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM

In the early 1970s, the GVRD undertook a "Livable Region Program" with the major objective

"to manage growth and change so as to maintain or enhance the livability of the Region" (GVRD, 1972/73, p.4).

As part of this program, one strategy was to establish regional town centres to attract much of the incremental employment required to balance the suburban population with
suburban jobs. Besides providing jobs, the regional town centres were also expected to provide a "quality working environment". The policy-makers of the day had high expectations about the regional town centres developing as centres of employment located in a livable environment.

However, the GVRD's planning process lacked adequate definition of the different types of people that would work in these new centres. One group in particular is women who represent the largest component of the employees working in the suburban centres. Consequently, the GVRD's objectives for regional town centres may not be achieved. Furthermore, by not explicitly recognizing the specific needs of women within the Regional Town Centre strategy, it is difficult for the GVRD to ensure that it is providing women with the quality of working environment that is required.

The literature on suburban employment is quite diverse, and includes suburban centres, transportation, demographics and gender considerations. Research about suburbanizing offices and employment tends to focus on understanding their size, growth and locational features. Demographic changes along with concerns about growth management are offered as reasons for the development and expansion of suburban offices and employment. Suburban centres have increasingly been featured as a significant component of suburban office growth.
While the needs and requirements of suburban firms and their employers are frequently discussed, the implications for employees are often ignored. Such research on suburban employees, that exists, suggests that, at least for women office workers, many jobs offer lower wages and fewer career opportunities. As a consequence, these jobs may not be contributing to an improved quality of life.

The literature on suburban transportation and commuting patterns provides mixed messages for suburban employees. While it acknowledges that suburban offices may be providing work closer to home, in many instances the transportation networks are unable to adequately cope with the increasing inter-suburb commuting patterns. This situation has worsened traffic congestion.

The literature on women provides some insight into the special needs of women that should be relevant to the development of suburban employment centres. Women are characterized as restricted by a lower level of mobility and limited by the time constraints imposed by the dual roles they are frequently required to perform. In addition, the importance of providing a gender perspective to urban research and policy is also stressed in the literature. The conclusion is that research cannot be gender neutral when it is dealing with issues that can affect men and women differently.
This thesis extends previous research by examining the attitudes of female employees about working in a suburban office location and their perceptions about the quality of their working environment. Furthermore, this thesis contributes to the evaluations of the GVRD's Regional Town Centres strategy by providing some insight from the perspective of women office workers.

1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study are to:

- Identify the perceptions and expectations of female suburban office workers regarding the location of suburban employment and the quality of the working environment;

- Determine whether regional town centres have been more or less effective than other suburban locations at meeting the needs of female suburban office workers;

- Describe the GVRD's approach to managing growth and livability in the region through the objectives and policies of the Livable Region Program;

- Outline the quantitative and the qualitative expectations of the GVRD's Regional Town Centre strategy; and
Recommend changes in policy at the local and regional level which could improve the effectiveness in matching the objectives of the Regional Town Centre strategy with the requirements of women workers.

1.4 RESEARCH OUTLINE

The first chapter introduces the research focus, the problem, the objectives and the outline of this study.

Literature on suburbanizing offices and employment, and women workers is reviewed in Chapter 2. The purpose of this chapter is to identify the emphasis and current directions in suburban office literature; to determine the special needs of women workers; to relate the needs of women workers to the development of suburban offices; and to provide a context for the gender perspective.

Chapter 3 describes the GVRD's Livable Region Program and the Regional Town Centres (RTC) strategy. This chapter identifies the objectives of the RTC strategy as they pertain to women suburban office employees.

Chapter 4 provides an overview of the suburbanization of office development and employment in two municipalities within the Greater Vancouver region, the Corporation of Burnaby and the City of Richmond [1], including a description of each town centre.
The empirical research associated with this thesis is presented in Chapter 5. This chapter describes the actions and perceptions of the female suburban office employees in Burnaby and Richmond who were interviewed in the four case studies. The interviews include women working in town centre and non-town centre office locations.

Chapter 6 draws conclusions from the study findings by linking the female employees' actions, perceptions and expectations with the Regional Town Centres objectives, and recommends possible adjustments to the policies and actions of the Region and the two municipalities.
CHAPTER 2

SUBURBAN OFFICES AND WOMEN EMPLOYEES:

A LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews two fields of writing, suburban offices and office employment, and working women. The objective of the literature review is to:

- Identify the themes emphasized in the current literature on suburban offices, noting their relevance for women office workers; and
- Determine special characteristics and requirements of women workers.

The chapter concludes with references to the literature supporting the need to include a gender-based analysis in urban research.

2.2 THEMES IN SUBURBAN OFFICE LITERATURE

There are four identifiable themes which reoccur in the literature pertinent to the suburbanization of offices and office employment. This section of the chapter briefly
discusses each of the following themes:

- **Theme 1**: Understanding suburban office and employment growth;
- **Theme 2**: Formation and location of suburban offices;
- **Theme 3**: Role of technology and telecommunications; and
- **Theme 4**: Suburban transportation and commuting patterns.

2.2.1 **Theme 1**: Understanding Suburban Office and Employment Growth

A common theme throughout the literature is seeking an understanding of the growth of offices in the suburbs. Suburban office growth has frequently been associated with the expansion of the service sectors of the economy (Daniels, 1985; Dowell, 1987; Kutay, 1986) and related to the development of a post-industrial society (Hartshorn & Muller, 1986; Bell, 1974; Gershuny and Miles, 1983). One of the characteristics of the post-industrial society has been change in the structure of industry and employment, with noticeable consequences of this change being an increase in the amount of office space and the movement in office locations to areas away from the traditional locations in the downtown or urban core. The growth of the information society has occurred along with a dramatic shift towards the types of employment which are located predominantly in offices. In particular, growth in the employment sectors including finance, insurance and real estate, and business
and personal services, have been accompanied with corresponding increases in office space for accommodating these activities.

Since the Second World War, North America has experienced significant population growth, with much of that growth occurring in the suburbs of large cities. At the same time, there have been shifts in household size and formation, and an increase in women's participation in the paid work force. During the 1970s and 1980s, the suburbs were the focus for new job formation in both traditional blue and white collar occupations (Hartshorn & Muller, 1986). All of these factors have contributed to the increase in suburban employment and suburban offices.

Some of the suburban offices have appeared or expanded in response to the needs of an increasing local population. In addition, the growing number of single person households and the rise in female participation in the labour force have helped provide additional employees necessary for the expanding suburban office employment.

Besides population-related growth and structural shifts in the economy, the development of suburban offices has also been encouraged by specific government policies. Decentralization, with explicit support for suburban centres, has frequently been adopted as a growth management strategy (Daniels, 1982 & 1986; Ley, 1985). In an effort to control
Commercial expansion in city centres, local governments have adopted restrictive policies to limit growth in the downtown and/or provided incentives to encourage new development to select a suburban location.

Furthermore, some office firms have chosen to relocate to suburban areas as a result of: city centres becoming more congested with both traffic and people; increased business leasing and operating costs; and growing commuting distances. Other firms have moved only certain components of the business, such as the back office functions, to the suburbs.

2.2.2 Theme 2: Suburban Office Formation and Location

The literature shows that office location, as it pertains to suburban offices, has been analyzed from two distinctive positions. One body of literature discusses the process of office suburbanization and the various patterns of suburban office development, often based on specific case studies of suburban office employment centres. A second group of researchers have concentrated on the spatial analysis of office space and office employment. This research has tended to emphasize the criteria influencing the selection of a suburban office location and the rationale for offices selecting either a central city or a suburban site. Frequently, the focus of this work has been in response to policy-related issues, such as the decentralization of office space.
Suburban office and employment growth has been described as an evolutionary process (Daniels, 1986; Hartshorn & Muller, 1986; Leinberger, 1990) as well as a consciously planned process (Langdon, 1990). Hartshorn and Muller (1986) see the stages of suburban employment growth as an evolutionary process in which many of the suburban business centres that appeared during the 1970s emerged from the retail centres of the 1960s and, up to the present day, are continuing to evolve. Leinberger (1990) includes suburban office centres in his typology of urban cores and observes that urban cores also progress through stages of growth. While Langdon (1990) recognizes that some suburban downtowns emerge, built without much coordination, he prefers the process of a planned, well-designed suburban centre that can provide the diversity required to serve the entire community.

Suburban centres have increasingly been featured as a significant component of suburban office growth (Daniels, 1986; Hartshorn & Muller, 1986; Langdon, 1990; Pivo, 1990; Leinberger, 1990). For instance, Daniels (1986) suggests that such

"centres offer the prospect of, firstly, improved access to a range of office employment opportunities for suburban residents; secondly, minimizing the number of work trips by private transport because adequate public transport networks are more likely to be made viable when serving large employment nodes; and, thirdly, improved business efficiency (both private and public sector) as a result of agglomeration economies." (p.32)

Suburban town centres, as they have frequently been called,
are also seen as places which offer a mixture of activities, including housing, shopping, entertainment, parks and public facilities, all of which are within walking distance of each other and accessible by public transportation. The designation of suburban centres in cities such as Toronto, Ottawa, Edmonton and Denver, was intended to ensure a distribution of office employment and travel patterns that was balanced within the region, to support the development of an efficient public transportation system, and to minimize the negative impact of growth on the environment (Christy, 1987; City of Toronto, 1986; Regional Municipality of Ottawa, 1977; Denver, 1980).

Often presented along with the process of suburban office growth are its patterns of development. The patterns include office corridors along freeways or major arterials (Manners, 1974; Erickson, 1983) and office or business clusters (Hartshorn & Muller, 1986; Leinberger, 1990; Cervero, 1989b; Langdon, 1990). As Pivo (1990) suggests, most metropolitan areas are actually a combination of both patterns as well as some low density office development spread randomly throughout the suburbs.

The literature discussing the specific locational features of suburban offices is more extensive. Often this literature is presented in the context of decentralization and the movement of offices out of the CBD (Fernie, 1977; Schwartz, 1979;
Daniels, 1982; Armstrong & Milder, 1984; Dowell, 1987). To a large extent, this literature emphasizes the push and pull factors that influence a firm's decision to locate part or all of its activities in a suburban rather than a central city location.

A segment of the literature emphasizes the implications of office location decisions on workers (Nelson, 1982; Baran, 1985; Erickson, 1983; Dowall, 1987). For instance, Nelson (1982) regards suburban office jobs as primarily for suburban workers, therefore office employment which moves to the suburbs becomes a lost opportunity for inner city residents. Dowell (1987), Baran (1985) and Nelson (1982) comment that although suburban offices provide employment close to home, often it also offers lower wages and fewer career opportunities for suburban employees, especially women.

2.2.3 Theme 3: Technology and Telecommunications

The technology and telecommunications theme and the fourth theme, suburban transportation and commuting patterns, which is discussed in the next section are frequently included in the literature dealing with office locations. However, they each have received enough individual attention that they warrant special reference in this chapter.

Technological change and the growth of telecommunications
have been identified as enabling the decentralization of office activities (Goddard & Pye, 1977; Downs, 1981; Hyde, 1984; Drucker, 1989; Hartshorn & Muller, 1986) because current telecommunication systems

"no longer require offices to be in close physical proximity to one another" (Smith & Selwood, 1983, p.304).

There have been divergent opinions, however, about the influence of technology on suburban office location decisions. One major concern has been that the separation of office activities or the decentralization of an entire firm, which may be facilitated by technology, ultimately suffers from the loss of important face-to-face contact (Schwartz, 1984; Gad, 1979; Dowall, 1987; Hutton & Ley, 1987). As a response, Goddard and Pye (1977) and Edgington (1982) suggest that location decisions based on technological change also may require organizational changes.

Other researchers foresee technology as increasing its impact on the workplaces of the future. Olmstead (Dart, 1990) states that at least one-third of all employees will be working at home, at least on a part-time basis, in the coming century. Drucker (1989), who does not agree that the trend is toward individuals working at home, expects an increase in office work being contracted out, similar to cleaning and maintenance activities. Hartshorn (Husted, 1990) predicts that telecommuting will become more popular as transportation systems become overloaded, and commuting distances and times increase.
Telecommuting is also seen to provide potential advantages and disadvantages to both employers and employees. For example, for the employee, telecommuting may reduce commuting time and cost, while at the same time increasing work flexibility, residential location opportunities and family interaction and community ties. Conversely, for some employees the isolation and distraction of working at home may be overriding negative features (National Capital Commission, 1989; McQuarrie, 1990).

2.2.4 Theme 4: Suburban Transportation and Commuting Patterns

Congested city streets and increasing travel time to work are regarded as important contributing factors to the movement of offices out to the suburbs. For some cities the creation of suburban office centres was part of a growth management strategy that was intended to improve the metropolitan transportation network and to reduce congestion. A few researchers have suggested that the suburbanization of offices provides workers with good transportation and shorter commuting times (Dowell, 1987; Richardson & Gordon, 1989). Richardson and Gordon (1989) observe that for work trips in the U.S.

"work trips are not getting longer. Commuters increasingly value commuting-time savings and congestion is being relieved as both firms and households relocate to shorten their work trips." (p.7)
However, many other researchers are finding that suburban offices have created transportation problems of their own. Daniels' (1972) study of firms moving out of London, found that private transportation was of increased importance for employees at the decentralized offices. Cervero (1989b) postulates that the suburban workers' dependence on the private automobile is related to the design of suburban centres, which are generally low-density, and include an abundance of free parking, poor road facilities, and inadequate levels of suburban transit services.

According to Orski (1987),

"surveys of suburban office complexes indicate that even buildings that are well served by transit (those within walking distance of rapid transit stations) are overwhelmingly auto-dependent." (p.474)

One explanation provided for the underutilization of transit by suburban workers is that many of their commutes are suburb to suburb (Orski, 1987; Cervero & Hall, 1989; Richardson & Gordon, 1989; Fox, 1986; Dubin, 1991), while in most cases transit systems have remained oriented to transporting people between the suburbs and the city centre; therefore, the suburbs must rely on fewer public transit alternatives and lower levels of service (Daniels, 1972; Manners, 1974; Hartshorn & Muller, 1986).

Orski (1987) also suggests that the rapid development of suburban centres often did not allow adequate time for traffic increases to be accommodated, while Cervero (1989b)
adds that the suburb to suburb commuting pattern has resulted in a saturated suburban road network. Cervero (1989a) proposes that

"the balancing of job and housing growth could do as much to improve regional mobility as any mix of traffic management or roadway expansion programs" (p. 148),

although in order for this strategy to be effective communities would need to ensure that there is a diversity of housing opportunities available.

2.2.5 Summary

To varying degrees, each of the themes discussed in this chapter refers to implications of suburban offices to the workforce, which are summarized as follows:

- The growth of suburban offices is seen as responding to an increasing suburban population which requires additional facilities, services and employment opportunities.

- The processes and patterns of suburban office development are less concerned about workers, although the literature on suburban centres includes references to fulfilling residents' employment needs as well as other social and economic objectives.

- The literature on office location decisions primarily emphasizes the location requirements of firms, although
some writers have considered the implication of location decisions for special groups, such as women and the poor.

- Technology and telecommunications provide direct impacts on the workforce by broadening the range of options for where, how, and by whom work is done.

- The research on transportation and commuting patterns has placed the greatest emphasis on identifying and addressing the actions and requirements of workers.

The next section identifies some of the specific characteristics of women workers which may be relevant to their distinct requirements as suburban workers.

2.3 CHARACTERISTICS AND REQUIREMENTS OF FEMALE OFFICE WORKERS

There is a deficiency of literature dealing specifically with women working in suburban offices. Consequently, most of the comments in this section are taken from the literature about women in the workforce in general.

The common observation in this literature is that women have substantially increased their participation in the labour force and accordingly altered their role in society. Although the majority of women continue to be employed in
traditional occupations (i.e. clerical, services, sales, teaching, or health and related occupations) (Shea, 1990), there have been slight shifts in the type of jobs (Baran, 1985; Shea, 1990) with noticeable increases in the number of women in managerial and administrative positions. However, this trend is expected to be slow, with additional women participating in professional careers described as a long-term direction (Little, 1988).

Statistics indicate that women continue to earn less than male workers and remain over-represented in low status jobs (Statistics Canada, 1986). Wekerle and Rutherford (1989) observe that much of the growth in the white collar secondary sector [2] employment in the suburbs is dominated by female workers. As Nelson's research (1982) in the San Francisco area reveals, many of the women who are part of the suburban labour market are secondary wage earners, that is women who are married to primary wage earners. Nelson does not consider their suburban employment as improving their position in the workforce but rather views many of these women as an exploited resource.

A reoccurring theme in the literature about employed women is the disadvantages they experience due to transportation restrictions and time constraints. Working women are seen as having restricted access to private transportation and consequently have reduced employment opportunities. Access
to suburban jobs is seen as being heavily dependent on automobile ownership (Hartshorn & Muller, 1986; Baran, 1985; Nelson, 1986; Pickup, 1988; Little, 1988) thereby limiting the job search of some women. Studies have shown that women who have access to a car choose suburban work to reduce their travel time (Dubin, 1991) or are able to make longer commuting journeys than women without access to a car (Pickup, 1988).

Women are usually more transit dependent and the women who must use transit have trips that are twice as long as car users (Rutherford & Wekerle, 1988a). Additionally, public transit systems that are not designed and operated to acknowledge women passengers have further limited women's job opportunities by not considering their safety and convenience requirements (Rutherford and Wekerle, 1988b).

Married women have been found to have less access to automobiles for their exclusive use because men usually have the first choice of car use (Michelson, 1985; Pickup, 1988; Rutherford & Wekerle, 1988b). Married women are also less residentially mobile because the location of their home is often selected with respect to the location of their husband's job (Madden & Chui, 1990; Fox, 1986; Hanson & Pratt, 1988a). Michelson's (1985) research found that

"married women choose work location as a function of residential location, placing logistical ease higher in priority than career development" (p.121).
Single women can also be less residentially mobile because they are more likely to rent their housing and this form of tenure is often less available in the suburbs (Wekerle and Rutherford, 1989).

Hanson and Pratt's (1988a) research confirmed that

"women's job sites are closer to home than men's, women tend to travel shorter times and distances to work and are more likely to work within the local community" (p.307).

Numerous other studies support the findings that women commute a shorter distance than men (Madden, 1981; Rutherford & Wekerle, 1988a; Hanson & Johnston, 1985). Generally women's travel times are shorter than men's (Hanson & Johnston, 1985; Gordon et al, 1989), although often the duration of the trips can be longer for women who are dependent on transit (Rutherford and Wekerle, 1988a).

Nelson (1986), Dubin (1991) and Michelson (1985) all consider women as geographically restricted in their search for employment due to their household responsibilities, although Wekerle and Rutherford (1989) report from a study by Villeneuve and Rose

"that household responsibility is losing ground...in its effects on work trip length" (p.147).

The study concludes that women are choosing work close to home because of the type of work available not because their household responsibilities require them to work nearby.
Dubin (1991) notes that the female single parent has the greatest incentive to economize on commuting because she has the greatest demand on her "non-work" time. Fox (1986) adds that female-headed households are further constrained by low income which limits their residential mobility.

Many of the time constraints that are referred to in the discussions about women's journey to work result from the "dual role" of many women. Women are often expected to perform at least two jobs - employee and homemaker. Michelson's (1985) research shows that "women, even if employed, still do the greatest share of household and childcare activities" (p. 62).

The employed women that he interviewed spent 3 to 5 times more time on household activities, childcare and marketing than their husbands. Michelson (1985) emphasizes the limitations placed on women by childcare responsibilities when he states that "women have to fit the temporal organization and spatial location of childcare into everything else they have to do during the day." (p.4)

Furthermore, his research found that women in general made more trips to satisfy a wider range of activities and tasks than men.

However, some empirical work questions the influence of children on the length of women's work trips (Hanson and Johnston, 1985) and studies have concluded that children do not significantly affect the different commuting patterns of
men and women (Madden, 1981; Gordon et al, 1989).

Other researchers have observed that women's daily routine has increased in complexity, and that stress results from women's need to save time in order to fulfill her dual role (Little, 1988; Wekerle, 1985). Women continue to carry the major responsibilities for childcare and domestic activities (Ogle, 1991), and the trend towards the rise of more egalitarian families has been described as a long-term process (Little, 1988). In other words, women will continue to fulfill two roles for the foreseeable future. Nelson (1986) proposes that women accept lower paid suburban employment to satisfy the demands of their dual roles.

Wekerle (1985) suggests that the centralization of activities could benefit women who are attempting to accomplish a variety of tasks. For suburban women, stress can be created "by the segregation of land uses in the suburban environment" (Wekerle, 1985, p.90), therefore women have come to rely on their local neighbourhood for many of their social and economic needs. Women's local neighbourhood has been found to play an important role in their search for employment and women often rely more on their social network, their family and friends, when they are seeking a job (Hanson and Pratt, 1988a).

As the literature in this section demonstrates, there are identifiable differences between women and men workers.
Besides working in different types of jobs often for lower levels of remuneration and recognition, women workers also tend to carry the primary responsibility for domestic activities, including the care of children and the elderly. Differences between men and women in the type of work they do, their mode and length of trip to work, and their levels of household responsibilities suggest that each group should receive more distinct consideration by researchers and policy/decision-makers. The final section in this chapter presents some additional arguments for applying a gender perspective to this research thesis.

2.4 A GENDER PERSPECTIVE

Both academics and practitioners have recognized the need for a gender perspective to urban research and policy (Baran, 1985; Little, 1988; Pratt, 1990; MacKenzie, 1988; Hapgood, 1977; Strong-Boag, 1991). There have been major changes in women's aspirations and activities but

"planners and others involved in community development decisions have tended to perpetuate traditional social patterns without questioning them even though many of our assumptions are at variance with the facts." (Hapgood, 1974, p.1-2)

There has also been a tendency for public policy to continue to assume

"that women are primarily mothers and housewives who remain in the residential environment." (Institute of British Geographers, 1984, p.67)

One explanation for why gender issues are often ignored is
that the male view has predominated and men tend to view the world differently to women (Little, 1988; Andrew & Milroy, 1988). Little (1988) explains that women's daily lives are qualitatively different from men's,

"i.e. women and men perceive and use their environments differently." (p.7)

As an example, the concept of home and work has been identified as different to men and woman (Hanson & Pratt, 1988a; MacKenzie, 1988; Little, 1988). For men the home is a place away from work, a place of relaxation. Whereas, for women both the home and workplace are their usual working environments. The dual role of women provides a further explanation for why women's lives are different to men. Women are performing a variety of activities within a variety of locations. Because of their different perceptions about their surroundings, changes to the environment which may meet the needs of men may not be appropriate for women.

Research is often "gender blind" (Baran, 1985, p.147) when it comes to dealing with topics which may have special implications for women workers (Baran, 1985). For example, issues such as transit service and childcare facilities, have not received the priority that is required because they are issues that are of particular relevance to women (Mackenzie, 1988). However, McLafferty and Preston (1991) remind us of the racial and ethnic differences between women and stress that gender studies must be careful not to replace a gender blind perspective with one that embraces a concept of
"universal womanhood".

2.5 CONCLUSION

The preceding literature review has shown that there have been a variety of interests in the suburbanization of offices and office employment. To a large degree this literature has dealt sparingly with the implications for workers and has almost forgotten the largest share of office workers, women. On the other hand, the literature on women offers limited additional information about women office workers, although this body of literature provides material about women that also applies to women working in offices.

Arising out of this literature review are the following questions which this thesis attempts to address:

- Do suburban offices provide women workers with employment located closer to home?

- Do women have a preference for work near home over other features such as career opportunities or salary?

- Are suburban transportation systems adequate for women employed in suburban offices?

- Can suburban office centres assist women in performing
dual roles by providing a wide range of facilities and activities?

The next two chapters provide the regional and local context in which this study was undertaken. Chapter 3 describes the efforts by the Greater Vancouver Regional District to manage growth in the Vancouver region so as to maintain its livability, as well as the contributions of the Livable Region Program and the Regional Town Centres strategy to achieving this objective. Chapter 4 outlines the growth of offices and office employment in the region with special emphasis on the two municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond.
CHAPTER 3
THE LIVABLE REGION AND REGIONAL TOWN CENTRES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the Greater Vancouver Regional District's Livable Region Program and the Regional Town Centres strategy which is a critical element of that program. The chapter introduces the Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centres, summarizes the reviews of the Program over the past fifteen years, and concludes by highlighting the objectives that are of most relevance to the subject of this thesis.

3.2 BACKGROUND

3.2.1 Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centres

During the 1960s the annual growth rate in Greater Vancouver had been over 2.5 percent, and this high level of growth was expected to continue into the 1970s and 1980s. In 1971, in response to concerns about rapid population growth in the region, the GVRD's Board of Directors established as one of the their major objectives a program

"to manage growth and change so as to maintain or enhance the livability of the Region" (GVRD, 1972/73, p.4)
The Livable Region Program (LRP) was developed as a strategy for growth management in the region and by late 1972 the GVRD Board had endorsed a number of policy statements on regional planning related to the LRP.

The Program's initial phase included a series of public meetings held to gain input and insight from the people in the region's communities. The most common feelings expressed at the meetings were anti-growth sentiments and concerns about quality of life. From the public's comments the GVRD recognized that regional development needed additional guidance emphasizing the following two specific policies:

- "Provide maximum opportunities for people to live close to where they work, or to work close to where they live.
- "Regionally control and develop "office centres" or "Regional Town Centres" outside of downtown, and attempt to decentralize some downtown growth to those centres." (GVRD, 1972, p.9)

These policies formed the basis for the GVRD's Regional Town Centres (RTC) strategy. Regional Town Centres policy was also proposed to address concerns about regional transportation and to respond to the growing social and economic needs of local communities.

The Regional Town Centres proposal was not new. Ten years earlier the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, as part of the Official Regional Plan for the Lower Mainland (Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, 1963), had proposed a system of town centres as a means of directing urban growth.
But no specific actions were taken on developing the centres.

By 1975 the creation of Regional Town Centres had become one of the following five strategies that the GVRD had proposed for managing growth and achieving livability in the region:

1. Achieve residential growth targets in each part of the Region.
2. Promote a balance of jobs to population in each part of the Region.
3. Create Regional Town Centres.
4. Provide a transit-oriented transportation system linking residential areas, regional town centres and other major work areas.
5. Protect and develop regional open space." (GVRD, 1975b, p.1)

The principal objective of the RTC strategy was to decentralize a significant amount of the office employment and cultural activity that was concentrating in downtown Vancouver to the regional town centres which would each serve major areas of the Region. The regional town centres were seen as enabling the provision of jobs, leisure activities and educational opportunities closer to people's homes so that residents would not be required to travel long distances to meet their various economic and social needs.

Specifically the regional town centres were intended to:

- "Bring jobs, shopping and cultural opportunities closer to people, so that travel to these activities does not consume as much time, effort, energy and money."
Create more interesting and urban areas that are designed for people rather than scattering and spreading activities all over.

Avoid aggravating traffic congestion, crowding, air pollution, and other problems associated with over concentrating commercial activities in downtown Vancouver.

Locate large activity complexes where they can be provided essential urban services, particularly public transportation, more effectively and economically..." (GVRD, 1974c, p.1)

To help define what a regional town centre should be, the GVRD released a policy report in 1975 (GVRD, 1975b) that provided some quantitative and qualitative criteria for guiding the growth of regional town centres. The GVRD suggested that a sizable proportion of the employment growth between the mid-1970s and the mid-1980s would be "site-flexible". Therefore, it could be attracted to the regional town centres instead of locating in Vancouver.

The GVRD recommended employment targets of 7,000-10,000 employees for self-sustaining town centres but noted that a significant amount of office space would be required to meet that target. It was estimated that about one million square feet of office space would contain 5,000 employees. Furthermore, 1,500-2,000 retail jobs and 1,000-2,000 jobs related to community services and cultural activities were anticipated.

There should be 2,000-3,000 dwelling units within walking
distance of the Centre, housing between six and nine thousand people who could work in the Centre or take advantage of its various activities. The town centres were expected to serve a market of at least 100,000-150,000 people.

The GVRD recognized that it would be impossible to balance jobs and population in every part of the region. But it felt that promoting a balance at least made an effort to providing people a greater opportunity to live closer to work.

The regional town centres were also envisioned as compact, pedestrian-oriented and well-served by transit facilities. The intention was that the local population could easily walk to and around the centre or access the centre through convenient transit service. The light rapid transit system of the future was seen as being integrated with the region's town centres.

Other features were recommended that would contribute to the each town centre's unique character. The town centres were advised to develop a design which reflected the local conditions and provided a pedestrian-oriented, human scale to the centre.

The GVRD identified seven potential locations for regional town centres but realized that it would be impossible for all of the centres to be selected and developed at the same time.
Therefore, the GVRD reviewed each locale based on the following two criteria:

- Areas where regional town centres were most needed because the population/employment imbalance was greatest; and
- Areas where the regional town centre would be easiest to develop because of existing plans, servicing and interest.

Based on these criteria, Burnaby-Central Park (Metrotown) and New Westminster were chosen because they would be easiest to develop, and Surrey and the Coquitlam area were chosen because they were most necessary due to their areas' faster population growth. (Figure 1)

Downtown New Westminster and Burnaby Metrotown were also identified as the first two regional centres to be developed. New Westminster was an established center. Burnaby Metrotown was already attracting development, the municipality had prepared a concept plan outlining Metrotown's growth as a town centre, the area had the potential for improved transit service, and the centre included sufficient vacant land for continued development. The GVRD agreed that New Westminster and Metrotown should be developed as self-sustaining regional town centres by 1980.

The GVRD staff recommended against pursuing the development of a regional town centre in Richmond (Brighouse) because the municipality already had a surplus of jobs, therefore it was
not necessary to seek a balance of population and jobs. Some additional arguments against encouraging a Richmond town centre were the traffic and noise conflict between a town centre and the expansion of the airport, and the anticipated high cost of providing a light rapid transit route to Brighouse.

In order to accomplish the objectives for encouraging growth in regional town centres, the GVRD presented an action program which included the following elements:
"to reserve Regional Town Centre sites until plans can be prepared, to provide for joint planning, to acquire land, and to establish a development management process that is capable of actually building Regional Town Centres according to plan." (GVRD, 1975b, p.34)

In conjunction with the action plan, the GVRD also recognized the need to work with the City of Vancouver to control and manage downtown growth.

3.2.2 Reviews of the Livable Region Program and the Regional Town Centres Strategy, 1978-1990

The LRP and RTCs have undergone numerous reviews since the mid-1970s. In this section the reviews are considered in three time periods reflecting the different economic and social situations and expectations within the region.

1976-1981 Reviews

The Livable Region Program and the Regional Town Centres strategy were developed during a period of increasing population and economic growth. However by the end of the 1970s, both the population and economic growth had slowed considerably resulting in less commitment and effort to creating regional town centres as originally envisioned. By 1980 the first priority centres, New Westminster and Burnaby Metrotown, had experienced only modest growth.
According to a study by Goldberg and Horwood (1978) of the region's commercial development, the situation was not helped "by the lack of commitment to a positive transit program for the region and an increasingly protective attitude on the part of the City of Vancouver to the idea of deflecting their office development and publicly supporting the regional town centre program of the LRP." (p.14)

Goldberg and Horwood saw the changes in demographics (population growth rates, household size and composition), market conditions and commercials trends as significantly impacting the success of the Livable Region Program's RTC strategy. Based on their projections for regional commercial activity up to 1986, Goldberg and Horwood (1978) concluded that the RTCs would benefit from

"increased co-ordination among all GVRD policies that impinge upon regional development patterns and goals" (p.40)

and increased emphasis on including housing, providing recreation and park space to further the quality of life of residents and workers, and providing a diversity of access modes.

During 1980-81, the GVRD (GVRD, 1980a) undertook a review of the first five years of the LRP and considered future directions for the Program. According to this review, the LRP was experiencing successes and weaknesses. While the Program was making great strides towards the development of an efficient public transportation system, regional town centres were beginning to emerge, and the regional park system was seen as successful, the review concluded that
"the most significant aspects of the program, the balancing of population to labour force in order to reduce traffic congestion and the need for costly new facilities, is not being realized." (GVRD, 1980a, p.17)

Office jobs were continuing to concentrate in downtown Vancouver, thereby contributing to a worse overall employment balance in the region and reinforcing the patterns of commuting to the downtown from the suburbs.

During the same period, the GVRD undertook a review of commercial development in the region during the 1970s and found that between 1970 and 1979 the suburban commercial development did not concentrate in the regional town centres and

"despite the efforts of the GVRD and its member municipalities to focus growth in the Regional Town Centres, the proportion of total suburban commercial growth in those centres remained unchanged" (GVRD, 1981, p.13).

Furthermore, whereas office growth in the City of Vancouver was focussed in its downtown, office growth in the suburban municipalities was occurring outside their major commercial centres.

In 1981, a survey of developers (GVRD, 1981) concluded that office development in the suburban centres was considered more risky and that most of the demand remained for new offices located in a prestigious location with a high concentration of other offices.
1986-1987 Reviews

In 1986, a further review of the region's commercial centres (GVRD, 1986) indicated that between 1980 and 1985 the regional town centres' commercial component had grown in conjunction with the increase in local population, not because the RTCs were attracting development away from Vancouver or their neighbouring municipalities.

The GVRD's report (GVRD, 1986) offered the following prospects for the regional town centres during the decade from 1986 to 1996:

- Each town centre will evolve at a different rate and with a unique character;
- There will be limited deflection of office tenants from downtown to the town centres;
- The overall rate of commercial development will be slower; and
- Many businesses will continue to seek office space outside the town centres.

By 1987 the GVRD (GVRD, 1987) began to realize that the LRP would require adjustments if it was to remain relevant into the next century. The GVRD recognized that changes such as slower population and economic growth, increased dispersion of employment and housing locations due to suburban employment...
growth and additional two-worker households, and an increase in cross-regional commuting all needed to be addressed.

Generally, the 1987 review (GVRD, 1987) supported the framework and many of the themes from the original proposal for the Livable Region Program, with the following exceptions:

- The new strategy would need to emphasize support for regional economic development, unlike the original LRP which emphasized the distribution of job growth;
- Increased emphasis would be placed on preserving the environmental and economic well-being of the region; and
- The regional town centres concept should be expanded to include Richmond Centre and the Lonsdale area in North Vancouver (Figure 1).

1989-1990 Reviews

By 1989 Greater Vancouver was again experiencing a buoyant economy, a growth in migration, increased levels of investment and a construction boom. The GVRD renewed its efforts to create a development strategy for a livable region which included viable regional town centres.

During early 1990 the GVRD commissioned numerous studies to review features of the Livable Region Program, which was now referred to as the Livable Region Strategy (LRS). Two of these
studies are of particular relevance to the Regional Town Centres. One study (GVRD, 1990c) focused on whether the Region's "Living Close to Work" strategy was achieving its objective. The findings of this study are discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter.

The second study (GVRD, 1990b) was specifically directed at reviewing the RTC strategy as one that the GVRD and its member municipalities should continue to support in the 1990s. Unlike most of the previous reviews, this assessment of Regional Town Centre development up to 1989 attempts to provide a qualitative as well as a quantitative evaluation. Besides looking at the amount and share of commercial, retail, office and residential development in each centre, the study also considers aspects such as the mixture of uses and level of activity, the scale and character of the centre, and the movement patterns and connections. The study rightly notes that previously most evaluations of the performance of RTCs have emphasized the development of office and retail floorspace and paid little attention to assessing the centres' qualitative elements.

According to the study (GVRD, 1990b), the "continued development of the RTC Policy is one of the most critical elements in the larger LRS" (p.iii)

and the GVRD must give higher priority to RTCs in the 1990s. After reviewing the various trends which can influence the development of the regional town centres, the study concludes that
"an increasing share of commercial development can be expected to occur in suburban locations" (GVRD, 1990b, p.39)

but to encourage growth in the centres the RTC policy of the future will require a more proactive and visionary strategy.

The RTC review (GVRD, 1990b) proposes a policy framework to support and encourage the development of a network of strong regional centres. Some of the elements considered within this framework include: the pattern and hierarchy of centres, transportation needs, urban design requirements, regional economic strategies, regional government structure, job and housing relationships, ethnic mix, and marketing.

The next section of this chapter examines in more detail specific objectives of the LRP and RTC strategy as they pertain to women working in suburban centres.

3.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE LIVABLE REGION PROGRAM AND REGIONAL TOWN CENTRES STRATEGY

Based on the questions raised from some of the literature discussed in Chapter 2 (i.e. Do suburban offices provide women workers with employment located closer to home?), the following three objectives have been chosen because of their particular relevance to women working in suburban offices:

- "Promote a balance of jobs to population (Living Close to Work)" (GVRD, 1975b, p.1);
"Provide a transit-oriented transportation system linking residential areas, regional town centres, and other major work areas" (GVRD, 1975b, p.1); and

"Increase the variety of services in suburban areas, providing a focus for cultural, educational, and specialized facilities closer to where people live, and more interesting working environments for suburban employees" (GVRD, 1990b, p.1).

This section reviews the success of each of these objectives and establishes some of the criteria used to measure the level of satisfaction of women working in the town centre versus non-town centre locations.

3.3.1 Balance of Jobs to Population

The objective of providing the maximum opportunity for people to live close to work or to work close to home was one of the principal goals of the LRP. The growing imbalance between employment and population growth in different parts of the region was identified as contributing to a reduction in the livability of the region through increased traffic congestion and automobile-related air pollution. Also, the additional time that workers spent travelling to and from work was seen as having a negative impact on their quality of life. The GVRD sought to address these concerns from two approaches, by increasing the jobs in the suburbs so fewer workers would have to commute into the city, and by increasing the housing near employment centres. The GVRD (GVRD, 1975b) also acknowledged that the housing near employment centres should be suitable for a mixture of incomes, household types and lifestyles.
A study by Ley (1985) of employees at B.C. Tel provides support for the GVRD strategy in its findings that there were changes in the residential distribution of the firm's workforce after the head office moved from downtown Vancouver to Burnaby. A greater number of the employees lived closer to work (almost 20 percent of the employees lived in the five postal districts adjacent to the workplace). Further analysis by B.C. Tel in 1989 found that after a 60 percent increase in staff, a similar proportion of the staff lived nearby. These results suggested that the Region's strategy might be effective, at least for B.C. Tel employees.

The first evidence that the "Living Close to Work" strategy had not been totally effective came from the results of the Region's "Place of Work" study (GVRD, 1985), which indicated a change in the region's commuting patterns, a significant increase in suburb to suburb commuting and out-commuting from the city of Vancouver, as well as the emergence of Burnaby and Richmond as net importers of workers.

In 1990 the GVRD commissioned a study entirely focussed on reviewing the "Living Close to Work" strategy (GVRD, 1990c). It noted that the GVRD Program lacked specified criteria for measuring the success of the objectives of the "Living Close to Work" strategy. The study also noted that the GVRD's strategy focussed on balancing the growth of labour force and employment
but failed to consider the importance of other factors, such as housing prices and transportation costs, in influencing an individual's choice of house location.

Based on the following set of measures: ratio of jobs to labour force by area, average journey to work travel time, and housing price, the study concluded that the "Living Close to Work" strategy had not been effective. Although some of the suburban areas such as Burnaby, Richmond and New Westminster had a ratio of employed labour force to resident labour force above the regional average, other areas, specifically Coquitlam and Delta, had shown virtually no improvement between 1971 and 1986 in their low ratio (Figure 2).
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"On the whole, there have been only minor improvements in the balance of employment to labour force within the GVRD." (GVRD, 1990c, p.S-3)

The study found that the average travel time for work trips in the region has continued to be between 20 and 24 minutes since the mid-1970s and there has been an increase in the number of the region's work trips that occur between municipalities. Consistent with the 1985 "Place of Work" study (GVRD, 1985), the "Living Close to Work" study explains this increase as due to more suburb to suburb trips and more reverse commuting from Vancouver. Furthermore, the 1990 study found that between 1971 and 1986 there was a decrease in the proportion of the labour force living and working in the same suburb.

Finally the study's research indicated that the areas with the greatest concentration of jobs (Vancouver, Burnaby, Richmond) were also the areas where housing costs have been increasing the fastest and housing affordability has fallen significantly. Conversely, the areas with the greatest growth in housing and where housing is most affordable are the areas with the lowest increases in employment. The study noted that households in the outer suburbs tend to be larger than those living in Vancouver and the inner suburbs, suggesting there may be lifestyle choices by larger households that preclude living close to work.

The "Living Close to Work" study concluded by reaffirming the GVRD's policy of encouraging a balance of jobs to labour force and recommending that:
The policy be broadened to include criteria for measuring its effectiveness and to recognize that variations in households will require different interpretations;

- Affordable housing be encouraged in areas of high employment opportunities;

- Development of a transportation system that is both accessible and affordable be encouraged; and

- The GVRD's neighbouring regional districts be encouraged to adopt a "Living Close to Work" strategy.

Although this study includes a gender reference when it explains that the growth in resident labour force over the population growth in the City of Vancouver is primarily the result of an increase in female labour force participation rates, it does not include any other specific references to variations in the workforce's composition or explicitly address the implications of the changing labour force composition for the "Living Close to Work" strategy.

Some features of the "Living Close to Work" strategy are particularly relevant to women workers. As indicated in Chapter 2, women's time constraints and transportation restrictions suggest they would benefit significantly from this strategy. However, the findings that housing affordability is mismatched with employment opportunities is especially relevant to female single parents who are more susceptible to high housing costs.
Although there is agreement that it may be difficult to achieve a balance of jobs to population, especially with the increased number of two-income households and variable house prices in the Vancouver region, the objective remains critical to the GVRD's Livable Region Strategy.

3.3.2 Transit Oriented Transportation System

An underlying rationale for the objective of providing a transit oriented transportation system was the GVRD's intention to reduce the region's dependence on the private automobile. Two of the early policies proposed for the Livable Region Program illustrate this intention:

- "More effort should be directed to control automobile usage in urban areas."
- "Discourage autos entering downtown and provide better public transportation alternatives." (GVRD, 1972, p.28)

The GVRD realized that besides requiring costly additions to the road network, an increasing use of automobiles would contribute to worsening air quality and noise pollution, and would be a major consumer of energy resources. Furthermore, the increased traffic caused by the automobile-dependent commuters was reducing the livability of many suburban as well as city neighbourhoods as more commuters used residential streets as alternatives to the crowded arterials. The GVRD expected that a transportation system that was more heavily oriented towards transit would provide the people in the region with a reasonable alternative.
A GVRD policy report on the Regional Town Centres (GVRD, 1975b) specifically identified Light Rapid Transit (LRT) as an important feature for regional town centres. The report said that LRT was required to attract firms [3], workers and customers to the centres. To encourage the use of public transit, the report recommended that automobile parking should be limited to discourage long term parking in the town centres.

A 1980 survey of developers, active in the region, (GVRD, 1981) confirmed that a rapid transit system would be crucial to the development of suburban commercial centres because it would allow businesses to take advantage of the lower lease rates in the suburbs while maintaining their face to face contact with downtown business people. For the developers the advantages of rapid transit were based solely on the contribution it would make to the operation of businesses.

By 1987 the GVRD was suggesting that for a variety of reasons their emphasis on public transit had shifted since the LRP was formed. The GVRD felt that a significant shift towards increased use of transit had become less likely because a pattern of increasing dispersion of resident locations and workplaces made it more difficult to serve the region by transit. Also, middle-aged people, who are the region's fastest growing age group, already had high car ownership and use transit infrequently.

Furthermore, the GVRD saw the high costs associated with
extending the Skytrain system and the increasing operating deficit associated with the bus service as strong deterents to improving the public transit system. The GVRD concluded, however, that some emphasis should remain on developing the transit system to provide transportation to riders with no alternative, the young, the elderly and the poor. The elderly were seen as being a growing segment of the region's population who were more reliant on transit. The poor included the growing number of workers in low paying service jobs who are also dependent on transit for accessibility. Transit was still identified as a necessary component for developing the regional town centres.

Although the literature in Chapter 2 identified women as a group that is more highly dependent on transit, it is notable that none of the GVRD's published work recognizes women as one of the disadvantaged groups with special transportation needs and requirements. Unless she is poor or elderly, a woman's needs are not recognized, although there are, for example, women in two worker households that require alternative transportation because the household only has one car.

The findings of the "Living Close to Work" study, that there has been a growth in suburb to suburb commuting as well as increased out-commuting from the city, confirms the GVRD's conclusions that it is becoming more difficult to serve the region's transit needs. The expanding variety of trips are
becoming more difficult to service with traditional transit solutions.

3.3.3 Variety of Services and An Interesting Working Environment

At the time that the RTC strategy was being developed, the GVRD recognized that the character of the Town Centres was an important element for their development and their acceptance by the community. The GVRD also realized that character can include

"many qualities that are not measurable, including a sense of history, or newness; views; the bustle of activity, or lack of it; sounds, smells and tastes; and whether the place is fun, or dangerous, or exciting to be in."(GVRD, 1974b, p.20)

As the GVRD's description illustrates, "variety of services and an interesting working environment" actually encompasses an assortment of objectives for the RTCs. The following are some examples of how this objective has been described and reinforced over the past fifteen years.

In 1975, proposed policies for the RTC's included the following statements:

- "Regional town centres will be large complexes with a variety of activities, including large offices, department stores and specialty shops, restaurants, libraries and exhibits, meeting halls and theatres, health facilities, education and "close-in" housing.

- Each regional town centre should be unique, responding in character and quality to its natural setting and the needs of the communities it serves."
Regional town centres should be interesting and urbane areas for people. Intrusion of traffic, large areas without activity and other detractions from interest and urbanity have no place in regional town centres." (GVRD, 1974c, p.4)

The GVRD report presenting the Livable Region Proposals in 1975, included criteria for the "design perspectives" for the RTCs:

- A strong pedestrian orientation - activities and facilities should be within comfortable walking distance of one another along a pleasant and interesting street-level environment.

- A widely varied but balanced mixture of activities - a regional town centre should be alive with many different activities from morning to midnight (or later, depending on local preference). It should not be dominated by one activity like office parks or shopping centres.

- A human scale - buildings should not give people a "boxed in" feeling and should not block the sun or views. (GVRD, 1975c, p.19)

A promotional brochure prepared by the GVRD in 1982 included the following comments in its description of the attractive features of the regional town centres:

"Stores, restaurants and service outlets will attract customers from nearby offices and homes...People employed in regional town centres will benefit from a smaller scale, convenience oriented environment...The range of shopping, dining and recreational activities easily accessible during lunchtime and after work..." (GVRD, 1982c)

A 1987 GVRD report identified the RTCs challenges for the 1990s as

"continuing to increase the level and mix of uses...and improving the physical design to provide a
more cohesive town centre atmosphere." (GVRD, 1987, p.51)

And finally, the most recent review of the RTCs reaffirms the need

"to adopt high quality design guidelines in terms of use, activity, size, movement, variety, and character." (GVRD, 1990b, p.45)

The recognition that the RTCs should provide a variety of services and an interesting working environment are further confirmed by results from two additional studies. A review of the region's commercial centres by Goldberg and Horwood (1978) concluded that the RTCs must be supported by recreation and park space in order to further the quality of life of their residents and workers.

Ley's (1985) research of B.C. Tel employees found that the firm selected a suburban location with high amenities to which it could attract its employees. Although, his study also discovered that B.C. Tel's management staff were critical of the low level of services that were available around their suburban office location.

The GVRD's explanation for creating RTCs that offer variety and interest is that the centre will be more attractive to firms, residents and workers. Also the mixture of activities will help to complement each other. However, different groups have various needs and the GVRD has provided very few details on how the RTCs will benefit specific groups. Some of the academic
Research on women workers suggests that due to the multiple tasks that women must perform, women could benefit from the concentration of activities that an RTC can offer if the activity patterns in the urban environment are suitably organized.

3.4 CONCLUSION

The LRP and RTCs have been progressing through changing times, with the result being a mixture of successes and weaknesses. Their major success has been their ability to survive, with there continuing to be a commitment by the region's municipalities to both the LRP and RTCs.

There are three objectives of the LRP and RTCs that may be of particular interest to women working in suburban offices; however, each of these objectives are struggling to be met. For the first objective (balancing jobs to population), there remains an imbalance between resident workers and jobs in most communities. For the second objective (providing a transit-oriented transportation system), suburban transportation has remained automobile-oriented and the journey to work has not declined. For the third objective (providing a variety of services and an interesting work environment), the town centres have been struggling to provide a well designed environment that includes a wide range of services and activities. Furthermore, women have not been recognized as an important component of each objective.
Although most studies and reports from the GVRD have not specifically addressed or identified gender-related issues, the GVRD has sponsored two surveys of regional residents (in 1973 and 1990) that provide insight into their attitudes toward a range of economic, social, mobility and lifestyle issues. The 1990 Vancouver Urban Futures survey (Hardwick et al, 1990), which is part of the GVRD's "Choosing Our Futures" Program, includes information on the gender differences evident in the answers.

Before considering the responses from women working in Burnaby and Richmond about their working environment, Chapter 4 looks in detail at the trends toward suburbanizing offices and employment in the municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond and the development of their town centres.
CHAPTER 4

SUBURBANIZATION OF OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENT:

BURNABY AND RICHMOND

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the suburbanization of offices and employment in two Vancouver region municipalities. The municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond were selected for this study because they provide the region's major amount of office space and employment outside the City of Vancouver, and because they both have designated regional town centres.

The chapter begins by providing a regional context before focussing on the growth of offices and employment in Burnaby and Richmond. Following some general observations about offices and employment in both town centres, the discussion concentrates on their individual development and attributes.

4.2 GROWTH IN SUBURBAN OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENT

Region's Commercial Floorspace

The region's commercial floorspace (definition in Appendix A), of which offices are a major component, has increased significantly during the past two decades. Between 1970 and
1979 the region's commercial floorspace grew from 36 to 74 million square feet (GVRD, 1981). By 1989 there were over 111 million square feet of commercial space in the region (GVRD, 1990a). More than half of that growth occurred outside the City of Vancouver. Between 1971 and 1986 commercial floorspace was growing faster than population in every city and municipality in the region. From 1980 to 1985 the region's population grew by 1.4 percent, while its commercial floorspace grew by 6.2 percent. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the suburban municipalities also saw an increase in their share of the region's commercial floorspace (Figure 3).

Figure 3: SHARE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

Source: GVREB & GVRD, 1979 and GVRD, 1990b
However, most of the region's additional commercial space was for office uses and the majority of this space was added in the City of Vancouver, particularly in the downtown. Between 1971 and 1981 almost 70 percent of the office space built in the region was located in the city. (City of Vancouver, 1984) Outside the City of Vancouver, most of the commercial growth during the 1970s was in retail uses and shopping centres. During the 1980s the suburbs began increasing their share of the region's new office development.

Distribution of Office Space

Inconsistency in the data available has prevented a precise analysis of changes in the distribution of office space in the Greater Vancouver Region. Therefore, any conclusions about the growth in suburban offices have been developed from a variety of sources.

In 1971, 33 percent of the office space in the Vancouver CMA [4] was located outside the City of Vancouver (City of Vancouver, 1984). According to the GVRD's inventory of office space in 1989, the region's suburban share was 36 percent. (GVRD, 1990a) Although these figures are not directly comparable, they offer an indication that the suburbs' share of the region's office space has increased but not drastically.
Characteristics of Suburban Firms

In the early 1980s, a survey of suburban office firms (GVRD, 1982c) identified the following characteristics for the firms who were located in the suburbs. The firms that were highly concentrated in the inner suburbs (Burnaby, Richmond, North Shore) required access to the entire region and included firms such as manufacturing agents, transportation and communications, and consulting services. Many of these firms were serving a metropolitan or province wide area. The offices that located in the outer suburbs tended to be more population-serving firms, such as medical offices or construction and development firms.

Most of the firms surveyed did not specify a preference for a town centre location, although some of their reasons for choosing a suburban location, such as accessibility, could be fulfilled by office space in a variety of suburban locations. Consequently, the majority of the new office space built outside the City of Vancouver during the 1970s and 1980s, was built scattered throughout the suburban municipalities rather than concentrating in the suburban centres.

Regional Changes in Labour Force and Participation Rates

The Censuses of Canada (Statistics Canada, 1971, 1981, 1986) provide the following information about the labour force and
employment changes that have occurred in the region. Between 1971 and 1986 the labour force grew throughout the region, although most of the growth occurred outside the City of Vancouver. Over 85 percent of the increase in the region's labour force occurred in the suburban municipalities. Also during that period, the increase in the Vancouver CMA's labour force (56%) was greater than the increase in population (28%).

Besides there being more workers, there was also a change in the composition of those workers. By the mid-1980s women had assumed a more predominant position in the region's workforce. Whereas there were no significant changes in the male participation rates between 1971 and 1986, there were substantial changes in the female rates (Table 1). Region-wide the female participation rate increased from 43.3 to 59.6 percent between 1971 and 1986. The greatest increases occurred in the outer suburbs. Surrey, for example, had the largest increase in female participation rates which went from 35.3 to 55.7 percent, an increase of over 50 percent in fifteen years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: GREATER VANCOUVER PARTICIPATION RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, CMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, 1971 and 1986
Changes in Employment

Between 1971 and 1986, changes in the type of work became more evident. More people were working in white collar and service sector jobs. In 1971, less than three-quarters of the workers in the region were employed in the tertiary sector, however, by 1986, this figure had increased to four of every five workers. Ninety percent of the new jobs created between 1971 and 1986 were in the tertiary sector. Furthermore, most of this growth in new jobs was in services; finance, insurance and real estate; and government services.

During this same period, there was a 90 percent increase in white collar jobs. The largest share of this increase was in the managerial and administrative occupations. Between 1971 and 1986, women went from holding 15 percent to 32 percent of the region's managerial/administrative jobs. However, in 1986, women continued to dominate four of the region's white collar occupations: teaching, medical and health, clerical, and services. Also during the same time period, women had increased their share of clerical occupations from 73.4 to 79.1 percent.

4.2.1 Office and Employment Growth in Burnaby

In the mid-1970s, when the GVRD was developing its Livable Region Program, there was minimal office development outside
the City of Vancouver. In 1971, Burnaby had only 322,000 square feet of office space in buildings over 5,000 square feet [5] (Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver, 1971). The remainder of the office uses in Burnaby was located either in conjunction with other uses, such as industry, or in very small office developments along major arterials.

During the 1970s, although the amount of suburban office growth remained low, Burnaby was one of the two municipalities (Burnaby and Richmond) to receive the majority of new suburban office development. Between 1971 and 1979, the amount of office space, in buildings larger than 5,000 square feet, grew by 500 percent in Burnaby to almost 2 million square feet (Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver, 1979). This amount represented 7 percent of the region's total office space and provided Burnaby with the second largest amount in the region.

Burnaby's overall growth in commercial floorspace was even greater. From 2.25 million square feet of commercial space in 1974, Burnaby grew to 9.7 million square feet of space by 1986. The municipality's share of the region's commercial space increased accordingly from 3 percent in 1974 to 9 percent in 1986 (Corporation of Burnaby, 1987). By 1986, 48 percent (4.7 million square feet) of Burnaby's commercial floor space was for office use. Between 1983 and 1987, over 800,000 square feet of office space was built in Burnaby (Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver, 1987) and by the end of the 1980s there were
over 6 million square feet of office space located in Burnaby (GVRD, 1989).

During the 1970s and 1980s, much of the office development in Burnaby was spread among several locations throughout the municipality. The local municipal government supported office and commercial development in a number of different areas because it saw each area as serving an important and useful function. Besides Metrotown, Burnaby permitted and encouraged office development in two suburban business centres (Central Administrative Area and Willingdon/Freeway Centre) (Figure 4), numerous commercial arterials, such as Hastings Street, and the industrial areas.

By 1986, 32 percent of Burnaby's office floorspace was located in industrial areas (Corporation of Burnaby, 1987). However, the Municipality expected that the emphasis would begin to move to Metrotown and the two suburban office centres because Burnaby's office and commercial services were expected to take on a region-serving role as their growth exceeded the requirements of the local population.

Although Burnaby's population grew by 16 percent and its labour force increased by 42 percent between 1971 and 1986, the municipality's share of the region's population and labour force declined. Meanwhile, Burnaby saw an increase in employment and an increase in its share as the place of work
for the region's residents. Whereas, 9 percent of the region's residents worked in Burnaby in 1971, by 1981 Burnaby firms employed 10.5 percent of the region's workers (GVRD, 1985). In 1981, over 60 percent of the jobs in Burnaby were held by commuters, that is workers who lived in another municipality.
In 1986, Burnaby had 69,000 jobs within the municipality but there were over 73,000 employed residents (GVRD, 1990a). Clearly with a large number of Burnaby's jobs being held by people living in other municipalities many of Burnaby's residents were required to go outside the municipality to work.

4.2.2 Office and Employment Growth in Richmond

Richmond has been described as

"well-favoured for a variety of office activities, both ancillary to industrial operations, and also "independent" and free-standing, due to such factors as its relative proximity to the City of Vancouver and its CBD, the substantial growth in population and industrial activity...over the last decade, and the location of Vancouver International Airport within Richmond's municipal boundaries." (Ley & Hutton, 1983, p.12)

In 1971, Richmond had 115,000 square feet of office space in buildings over 5,000 square feet (Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver, 1971). However, between 1971 and 1979, the amount of office space, in buildings greater than 5,000 square feet, grew by over 600 percent in Richmond to almost 900,000 square feet. Also, between 1971 and 1981, Richmond quadrupled its share of the region's offices from .9 to 4.1 percent.

As in Burnaby, a large share of Richmond's office development during the 1970s and 1980s was focused outside its town centre. The office development outside the town centre has located primarily in the municipality's numerous industrial areas and business parks or near the airport. Between 1985 and 1989,
more than 50 percent of Richmond's new office space was located in industrial zones because the municipality permits 100 percent office use in some industrial districts. By the end of the 1980s, there were about 4.8 million square feet of office space in Richmond (GVRD, 1989), providing the region's third largest stock of office floorspace.

From 1971 to 1986 Richmond underwent substantial growth in its population and resident labour force. The population grew by 75 percent, while the labour force grew by 129 percent (GVRD, 1990c). Richmond also increased its share of the region's employed labour force, from 6 percent in 1971 to 8.8 percent in 1986, as well as its share of the region's population, from 6 to 7.6 percent (GVRD, 1985 & 1990c). At the same time, the increase in employment opportunities located in the municipality kept pace with the growth in resident labour force. During the decade from 1971 to 1981, 32,000 new jobs were added in Richmond and during the 1980s business establishments increased by over 250 percent (Corporation of Richmond, 1989).

A 1985 origin-destination study undertaken by the GVRD (GVRD, 1985) indicated that Richmond was the only municipality where the proportion of labour force living and working in the same municipality did not decrease between 1971 and 1985. Furthermore, this study revealed Richmond as a net importer of workers, that is more workers were commuting into Richmond to
work than were commuting out to jobs elsewhere in the region. Over 55 percent of Richmond's jobs were held by commuters in 1981.

In 1986, the municipality's resident employed labour force included 56,000 workers, and in 1987, the municipality had jobs for 58,000 employees (GVRD, 1990a). By 1989, the number of jobs had increased to 65,000 (Corporation of Richmond, 1989). The majority, over two-thirds, of the jobs were in the following industries: Services; Trade; Finance, Insurance and Real Estate; and Public Administration.

By the mid-1980s, women had substantially increased their participation in the Richmond workforce. Their participation in the labour force had grown from 44.1 percent in 1971 to 63 percent in 1986. More importantly, Richmond's women were more strongly represented among the residents holding jobs located in the municipality [6]. Whereas women formed 43 percent of Richmond's resident labour force, they occupied 48.6 percent of the local jobs held by residents (GVRD, 1985). Seventy-eight percent of Richmond's female resident labour force were in clerical occupations, but 81 percent of the clerical jobs in Richmond were held by women who lived in the municipality. The corollary of these observations is that fewer women living in Richmond were commuting out of the municipality to work than men.
4.3 REGIONAL TOWN CENTRES

As discussed in Chapter 3, in the mid-1970s the GVRD's Livable Region Program (LRP) identified four regional town centres: Burnaby, New Westminster, Coquitlam, and Surrey. By the mid-1980s two more centres had been added, one on the North Shore and one in Richmond.

The development of the regional town centres did not occur as rapidly as the GVRD had anticipated. A GVRD report concluded that by the end of the 1970s

"suburban office growth has yet to produce the concentrations of office employment required to stimulate growth in the associated service, retail or shopping centre facilities. Nor has it been concentrated enough to create significant municipal transportation foci." (GVRD, 1981, p.18)

4.3.1 Burnaby's Regional Town Centre (Metrotown)

At the same time as the GVRD's LRP was being developed, Burnaby's Municipal Council was designating the Kingsway/Central Park area as a major development centre called Metrotown (Figure 5). The designated area covers 735 acres (293 hectares), of which 238 acres are park, and is located 6 miles (9.5 kilometres) from downtown Vancouver. As Figure 1 in Chapter 3 illustrates Burnaby's Metrotown is centrally located in relation to the rest of the region.
As mentioned in Chapter 3, Metrotown was chosen by the GVRD as a designated town centre primarily because it would be easy to develop. It had been designated municipally as an urban centre and was already attracting offices and other development. In 1973, the Central Park area had over half a million square feet of commercial space. A further argument for Metrotown's selection as a designated town centre was its location along the proposed LRT route.
The GVRD anticipated that Metrotown would be self-sufficient, including more than one million square feet of office space, by 1980. However, by the end of the 1970s, Burnaby's Metrotown had only reached slightly more than half a million square feet of office space. During the period from 1971 to 1979, almost 62 percent of the office growth in Burnaby was located outside Metrotown (GVRD, 1981). Even so, the office growth in the town centre was equal to more than twice the total amount of office space that existed in the municipality at the beginning of the 1970s.

In 1985, Metrotown contained 21 percent of Burnaby's office space, and by the end of the 1980s, Metrotown's share had increased to 25 percent, or 1.6 million square feet (GVRD, 1990b). The largest burst in commercial development has occurred since the opening of the ALRT (Advanced Light Rapid Transit) in 1986, with almost 3.3 million square feet of commercial development added. By early 1991, Metrotown had grown to include almost 1.7 million square feet of offices and, although this figure is projected to reach over 2.6 million by the year 2006, there are currently over 835,000 square feet either under construction or being proposed (Corporation of Burnaby, 1991).

The largest single amount of office space in Metrotown is at the B.C. Telephone Company headquarters (644,000 sq.ft.). Other significant office developments include Metrotown Place...
(293,700 sq.ft.) and Metrotower (308,000 sq.ft.) (Corporation of Burnaby, 1991).

Metrotown is estimated to be home to almost 17,000 people, with a population of approximately 150,000 to 200,000 living within 3 miles of the centre. The majority of the housing within the town centre is multiple family housing, over 10,000 units. Based on the current zoning, the municipality anticipates that there will be an additional 4,000 people living in the area by 2006.

There are two ALRT stations located within the Metrotown area, as well as over 10,000 parking spaces associated with the centre's three shopping malls. Metrotown also contains some major public initiatives, including a recreation complex, a major reference library, a civic square and a municipal parking facility. Besides these public facilities, there are additional public amenities provided by the private sector within Metrotown's core commercial developments. These include daycare facilities (for 148 children), community meeting spaces, information kiosks, and plazas accentuated with sculptures and water features.

Guiding the development of Metrotown is Burnaby's Official Community Plan (Corporation of Burnaby, 1987) that identifies the town centre as a focal point for office development within the municipality. Within this plan, the municipality has
incorporated the objective of the GVRD's Livable Region Program, that is to balance jobs and population. Similar to the GVRD's objectives for Regional Town Centres, Burnaby also sees Metrotown as providing more to the community than simply employment opportunities. To this regard, Burnaby's Official Community Plan identifies the development of Metrotown as providing some of the following benefits:

- "Development of an integrated and identifiable focus of commercial, social, and residential components that will form the basis of the primary urban core for the Municipality"
- Intensified urban character of Metrotown will broaden the range of residential, commercial, employment, entertainment and cultural opportunities within the Municipality
- Provision of substantial employment opportunities within Metrotown will assist in the maintenance of a balanced employment/population ratio...
- Produce reciprocal benefits with Skytrain providing efficient transportation for users of Metrotown who in turn provide additional ridership for the Skytrain system". (Corporation of Burnaby, 1987, p.38)

Based on the current development proposals for Metrotown, the 1990s should see an increase in the mixture of uses included in the centre. Future plans for the civic centre, for example, call for the development of other civic facilities such as an art gallery or performing arts centre.

Future Municipal plans also include further upgrading to Metrotown's pedestrian network. Up to this point, the majority of the pedestrian improvements have been focused on the south side of the centre's major commercial developments and adjacent
to the transit system, and to the interior of the commercial developments. However, municipal staff hope to include improvements to the pedestrian facilities along Kingsway in the future development proposals for the area.

4.3.2 Richmond's Regional Town Centre

Figure 6: RICHMOND TOWN CENTRE LOCATION

Richmond's town centre development was originally set out during the mid-1970s in the Brighouse Core Area Study. Prior to the completion of this study, two major shopping centres had
been developed, the Richmond Centre, built in the mid-1960s, and the Lansdowne Centre, constructed in the mid-1970s. The dispersed development of these two centres was identified as a problem which has continually hindered the cohesive development of the Richmond Town Centre. However as Figure 6 illustrates, the Richmond Town Centre is centrally located in the urban portion of the municipality, serving a population of over 120,000 people in the Richmond municipality alone.

During the early 1980s the municipality refined its concepts for the town centre. Richmond recognized that the original town centre was too large (1,100 acres) and designated a "downtown" subarea of 215 acres and within that a "downtown core" of 43 acres (Figure 7).

As mentioned in Chapter 3, Richmond was not one of the original four areas designated by the GVRD as a town centre in the mid-1970s. The Richmond Town Centre was not chosen because:

- It was already developing without designation;
- It would be too expensive to provide rapid transit to Richmond;
- There would be traffic and noise conflict between a developing town centre and an expanding airport; and
- The competition between commercial development and the preservation of agricultural land and the floodplain would be contrary to regional policy (GVRD, 1974c & 1987).
However, the GVRD formally added the Richmond Town Centre to its list of RTCs in 1987 in recognition of the centre's strong commercial position in the region.

"Certainly, from the perspective of relative market performance in the years subsequent to the publication of the Livable Region Plan, Richmond might have presented a better choice as a designated RTC than Burnaby or New Westminster" (Ley & Hutton, 1983, p.7).
1980s, their comments were based primarily on Richmond's strong population growth rates during the 1970s and its increasing share of the metropolitan office stock.

Over 38 percent of the office space growth in Richmond, between 1971 and 1979, was located in the Brighouse area (280,000 square feet). By the end of the 1970s, the Brighouse area had more than 500,000 square feet of office space (GVRD, 1981). This was double the amount of space in the entire municipality ten years previously. By the end of the 1980s, the Richmond town centre contained 1.4 million square feet or almost 30 percent of the municipality's office space (GVRD, 1990b).

Office development in Richmond has been less dramatic than in Burnaby because highrise type office developments have been restricted by the municipality's requirement that all parking be above grade and by the height restrictions imposed by the municipality's proximity to the Vancouver International Airport. Whereas Burnaby's Metrotown accommodates some ten to twenty storey office buildings, Richmond's town centre is comprised of mainly two and three storey buildings. It has only been during the last few years that Richmond has begun to see taller (six to nine storey) office buildings appear on its skyline as developers begin to use more creative designs to accommodate the municipality's parking requirements. In December 1989, there were 23 applications for 12 to 15 storey office towers awaiting approval by the municipality (Godley, 1990). The municipality expects that high-rise commercial and
residential towers will become common additions to the Richmond skyline as the municipality's population densities continue to increase.

Based on the current development proposals for the Richmond town centre, the 1990s will see an increase in mixed-use developments which include an office component. For example, in July 1989, four out of eleven development applications in the Richmond town centre proposed a mixture of uses which included office, retail, residential and hotel activities. Depending on the type of office space provided, the mixed-use developments offer a combination of activities which are supportive of the objectives of the Regional Town Centre Program.

The Richmond Official Community Plan (Richmond, 1986) recognizes the town centre as a focal point for office development within the municipality. More recently, the municipality has identified the town centre as the location for increased residential and population growth as well. They expect that the majority of the municipality's future growth will be focussed on the centre.

Like Burnaby, Richmond adopted the objectives of the GVRD's Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centre strategy, to balance jobs and population, and to create a town centre that provides a variety of activities and opportunities for a wide range of people. The emphasis of Richmond's first "Town Centre
Area Plan" (Corporation of Richmond, 1989b) was on office development, although it recognized that there are other essential elements as indicated in the goals below:

"To create, in Richmond, an accessible central location for urban activities, in order to develop high quality working and living environments, satisfying both economic and social objectives of the community and the region.

To create a downtown within the Town Centre that increases employment opportunities; increases shopping, recreational, cultural, educational, community, and social opportunities; promotes housing opportunities; stimulates an increase in the use of public transit; and develops an active and vital pedestrian-oriented centre for Richmond." (p.7)

When the Town Centre's Official Community Plan was being prepared in the mid-1980s, there were over 12,000 people working in the Town Centre and a population of 10,000 people living in 6,300 dwelling units (Corporation of Richmond, 1989b). By 1991, there were 22,000 people living and 13,000 working in the Town Centre area (City of Richmond, 1991). The majority of the dwellings in the town centre are in multiple unit developments. In 1985, the municipality estimated that the total residential capacity in the town centre was 10,000 units. The municipality is currently reviewing the residential capacity for the Town Centre and anticipates that the Centre's residential population could triple within the next 20 years to over 60,000 people.

The Richmond Town Centre has tended to include a strong retail component. In 1989, the Town Centre contained 40 percent of Richmond's retail space, and in 1990, an additional 160,000
square feet of commercial space was added to the Richmond Square/Richmond Centre Malls. The Town Centre also offers a variety of other facilities, including a hospital, a community college, a recreation/activity centre, the municipal hall, a live theatre and two group daycare centres.

The Town Centre Plan also identifies a number of features that have yet to be fully incorporated into the development of the centre. Consistent with the GVRD's prescription for regional town centres, the Richmond Town Centre will be included in the region's rapid transit system. Rapid transit to the Town Centre is currently in the planning phase. Initially, construction was expected to begin in 1992 with completion by 1995. Delays in the planning phase have now pushed the anticipated completion date back to 1997.

Richmond recognizes that as the Town Centre develops it should become less dependent on automobile transportation. To further this objective, the municipality has relaxed the parking requirements for higher density development in the Town Centre's downtown core. Richmond has also set a target of 10 percent for the transit modal split into the Town Centre's downtown subarea, and has recognized that the Town Centre's local employment opportunities require an improved level of local service.

Another area of emphasis for the future development of Richmond's Town Centre, as noted earlier with Burnaby, is
improvement to the centre's human scale and urban design. To this end, the municipality has been preparing design principles and guidelines for the centre. Future plans also stress: the development of a comprehensive pedestrian system linking various activities in the centre including parks and open space, such as miniparks and plazas; the creation of bicycle routes; and the reduction of through traffic from the Centre. Finally, Richmond has explicitly recognized that future development in the Town Centre must allow for a diversity of cultural and income groups.

4.4 CONCLUSION

The majority of the Greater Vancouver Region's suburban employment and office space is located in the municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond. However, the two municipalities offer different profiles. Burnaby is a more mature municipality and is experiencing less population growth than Richmond. Burnaby's employment is serving a more regional labour market.

The town centres in the two municipalities contain almost 50 percent of the office space located in the six regional town centres. Both town centres have been experiencing significant growth in employment and population. In the quantitative features, such as office floorspace and employment, the two centres have become established town centres; however, they each require further improvements before they will become vital centres offering the complete range of facilities and
activities necessary to compete with downtown Vancouver.

To determine the quality of working environment that Burnaby's Metrotown and the Richmond Town Centre are providing for women office workers and to establish whether town centres are preferred work locations, interviews were conducted with women working at both town centre and non-town centre firms in Burnaby and Richmond. The next chapter presents the results from these interviews and provides some insight into the requirements and expectations of women working in suburban office locations.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the responses of female suburban office employees in Burnaby and Richmond to interviews conducted during the fall and winter of 1990/91. Following a presentation of the interview results, the responses are analyzed in accordance with the three objectives of the GVRD's Livable Region Program and Regional Town Centres strategy, as discussed in Chapter 3.

5.2 METHODOLOGY

The semi-structured interview format was used to examine the importance of work location and setting to female office workers in four suburban locations. The two suburban municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond were selected because they provide the largest share of suburban office employment in the Vancouver area and they each include a regional town centre.

A sample of four firms was randomly selected from a cross-referencing of a GVRD inventory of all office locations within the municipalities of Burnaby and Richmond and the
publication "Contacts Target Marketing" (1990) which identifies firms by type of activity and size, as well as by location. To ensure confidentiality, only firms with more than six employees were selected in the sample. Selection was based on a random number table. One office firm was selected in the Burnaby regional town centre (Metrotown), one was chosen in the Richmond town centre, and the other two office firms were located in Burnaby and Richmond outside their designated town centres.

The four firms that were selected included: a union head office, a funeral home operator, an insurance company, and a research and development centre. The four firms ranged in size from 50 to over 150 employees, and women workers formed more than 50 percent of the employees at all of the firms, except at the research and development company.

The firm in Burnaby's Metrotown had been at the same location for thirty-five years. The other Burnaby firm had been in the municipality, at the same location since the firm was formed in the early 1980s. The two Richmond firms had been at their present location for less than five years but both previously had been located elsewhere in Richmond.

The office manager or administrator for each firm was contacted by letter to request the firm's cooperation and to obtain a listing of their female employees. Only firms with more than six female employees were asked to participate. A sample of
female employees was randomly selected from each firm's list and each woman was sent a letter of introduction and requested to participate in an interview. Six women were interviewed from each firm. To ensure confidentiality, the firms were not notified as to which employees were chosen or who had agreed to participate.

The interview topics covered: the type of work, basic work history, the method of transportation to and from work, and the level of satisfaction with the office location, its surrounding area and the local facilities and amenities. Each interview followed a general discussion format that focused on the specific topics listed in the questionnaire. The same questions were presented to each participant in the same order. At no time during the interviews were the names of other participating employees or firms mentioned.

5.3 PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW RESULTS

This section presents a summary of the interview results, with some interpretation by the author. The results are presented under the following sub-headings:

- Profile of the Interviewees;
- Work Context;
- Transportation to Work; and
- Workplace Location and Surrounding Area.
5.3.1 Profile of the Interviewees

The majority (almost 50 percent) of the participants were between 25 and 34 years of age (Table 2). Two-thirds of the women were either married or living in a common-law relationship (Table 3) and almost one-half of those couples did not have children. Fewer than 20 percent of the women were single parents (one lone parent per workplace). Only slightly more than 15 percent of the participants had preschool age children (Table 4).

### Table 2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Burnaby Town Centre</th>
<th>Burnaby Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 yrs</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 yrs</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 yrs</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Burnaby Town Centre</th>
<th>Burnaby Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY OR LIVING ARRANGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
<th>Burnaby Town Centre</th>
<th>Burnaby Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple, No Child</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &lt; 6 yrs old</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &gt; 6 yrs old</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &lt; 6 yrs old</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &gt; 6 yrs old</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents provided no significant differences between the profiles of the women working in Burnaby and those working in Richmond, except all of the single women were working in Burnaby and the majority of the married women without children were working in Richmond. There were no noticeable differences between the personal profiles of the women working in town centres and those working in the non-town centre locations.

5.3.2 Work Context

Type of Work

The participants represented women office workers from two major types of industry: Finance, Insurance and Real Estate; and Other Services. Their occupations were concentrated in the Managerial and Administrative; and the Clerical categories (Table 5). Almost 50 percent of the participants held clerical jobs and a large portion of the clerical jobs were with the firm located in the Burnaby town centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Burnaby Town Centre</th>
<th>Burnaby Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Town Centre</th>
<th>Richmond Non-Town Centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof'l/Mgr'l</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The women working at the union headquarters were all involved in clerical activities. The women employed at the firm operating funeral homes were primarily involved in accounting
and bookkeeping work, while the women at the insurance company held positions as clerks and claims adjusters. Those women who worked at the research and development firm represented the widest range of jobs, including computer specialists, administrative managers and clerks.

Length of Employment

The employees' length of employment with the firms ranged from three months to thirty years; however, the median for all the firms was three years. The length of employment varied substantially between the four firms (Table 6). The median at the firm located outside the Burnaby town centre was one year, while Richmond's non-town centre firm had the most long-term employees, with the median being seven and a half years. The median length of employment at both town centre firms closely corresponded with the median for all firms, three years. The recent expansion of Burnaby's non-town centre firm may explain the short length of employment for many of its employees. While, the prestige of working for Richmond's non-town centre firm may account for it long-term employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT WITH FIRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Employment

All of the women interviewed had worked outside the home prior to receiving their current job, and all but two of the women had moved directly from one job to the next. The two exceptions noted, were a woman who had taken a maternity leave between jobs, and a woman who had returned to school to further her education. Slightly more than half of the women were actively seeking a new job when they acquired their current employment. The remainder of the women found their jobs through other means, primarily through personal and professional contacts.

Of all the women interviewed, about 50 percent had been working previously in Vancouver and over 20 percent had worked previously in Richmond (Table 7). In Burnaby, a third of the workers had previously worked in the same municipality, one-third had worked in Vancouver, and the rest had worked in other municipalities or outside the region. In Richmond, over half of the employees interviewed had previously worked in Vancouver and one third had worked in Richmond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY PREVIOUS WORK LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Location Preference

Whereas only 25 percent of the Burnaby employees sought work which was preferably located in Burnaby, half of the Richmond employees stated a preference for finding work in Richmond. All of the Burnaby workers who preferred work in Burnaby worked at the firm in the non-town centre location. Almost all of the workers, who had also considered working in Vancouver when last seeking work, now worked in Burnaby. None of the women interviewed looked specifically for work in a town centre location.

The most common reason given for accepting their current job was the type of work. The second reason was the salary. Although the location of the job, especially in relationship to their home, was of less importance, it was the third most common reason given for accepting their current job. The only other reasons that were frequently stated were the hours of work and existing contacts with the firm.

5.3.3 Transportation to Work

Car Usage

For all employees the principal means of transportation to work was by car. Two-thirds drove themselves and one-third carpooled or shared a ride with someone else. Only 25 percent
of the women who shared a ride worked in Burnaby. Most of the women who shared a ride worked in Richmond. The firm with the greatest number of carpoolers was located in the Richmond town centre, where two-thirds of the women interviewed shared a ride to work. The employees at the non-town centre firm in Richmond noted that their employer encouraged carpooling by providing a ride sharing notice board.

Trip Time

The length of trips to work for all the women interviewed ranged from 5 to 60 minutes, with the median length of travel time being 20 minutes (Table 8). The women employed in Burnaby travelled longer than those in Richmond. The median length of time for the Burnaby employees was over 25 minutes, while for Richmond it was less than 15 minutes. The women working at Burnaby's non-town centre location had the longest trips with a median travel time of 30 minutes. The women at the firm in Richmond's town centre had the most consistent travel times with all but one employee travelling for 15 minutes or less to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF TRIP TO WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-60 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two of the women working in Burnaby and one working in Richmond noted that their trip could sometimes take longer due to the rushhour traffic going into the Vancouver. The two Burnaby women said that they came to work early to avoid the heavier traffic. All but one of the firms had either flex-time or a compressed work week which helped reduce employees travelling time.

Almost all of the women's trip home was by the same method and of the same length as it was to work. Only three women, two in Burnaby and one in Richmond, specified that they sometimes made stops on their way home from work. One Richmond woman said she usually stopped at the babysitters to pick up her child.

**Transit**

Less than 50 percent of the interviewees ever used an alternative method of transportation to work. Of those who occasionally used another method most used transit, but that was fewer than 25 percent of the women interviewed. The women who occasionally used transit all worked in either the Burnaby or Richmond town centres. Their transit use was usually restricted to bad weather (snow) and they complained that the trip was at least two or more times longer than travelling by car. In all cases, transit as the alternative method of transportation resulted in a longer travel time to work or to home. The transit trip lengths ranged from 30 minutes to 2
hours. The median transit trip lengths were 30 minutes for the Richmond women and 60 minutes for the Burnaby woman. None of the women working in either of the non-town centre locations ever used transit because in most cases it was not available or the trip was too long.

Most of the women said that car was their preferred method of travelling to work, however, on further consideration many of the women (almost 50 percent) admitted that they might consider transit if the system was more convenient (better connections, fewer transfers) and the trip was shorter.

**Other Transportation Alternatives**

Fewer than 10 percent of the women occasionally walked to work (one woman in Burnaby and one in Richmond) and less than 10 percent sometimes travelled to work by bicycle. The bicycle riders both worked in Richmond and complained about the poor facilities for cyclers (i.e. insufficient road allowance for safe travel).

5.3.4 **Workplace Location and Surrounding Area**

**Location Satisfaction**

The final series of questions concentrated on each employee's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the location of their
workplace. Overall, the majority of the women (75 percent) said they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the location of their place of work. The Burnaby women were slightly more satisfied than the Richmond women, but the difference was marginal. The overall level of satisfaction was essentially the same for the women working in town centre and non-town centre locations.

Each woman was asked to identify the features that could contribute to her satisfaction with the location of her workplace. The features that were identified by almost all of the interviewees as being important were the amount of free parking available, the travel time between home and work, a park or open space, lunchtime eating facilities, and a surrounding area that feels safe and secure. The features that were regarded as least or not important included dinnertime eating facilities, entertainment activities, education facilities for either the employee or her family, and daycare.

Parking and Travel Time

Almost all of the women were satisfied with the parking that was available to them. All of the firms provided free parking to their employees. Most of the women were satisfied with the time it takes them to travel between their home and their work irrespective of the length of their journey. The few employees who were dissatisfied all worked in Burnaby and were commuting the longest distance.
Parks and Open Space

Most of the women who were satisfied with their access to park and open space worked in Burnaby. Most of the Richmond workers were dissatisfied, particularly the women working outside the town centre. All but one of the women at Richmond's non-town centre location were dissatisfied with the open space available.

Lunch Facilities

For almost all firms the majority of the women were not satisfied with the lunchtime eating facilities available to them. The greatest dissatisfaction was in the two non-town centre locations where all of the women were dissatisfied, although there was also some dissatisfaction in both of the town centre locations as well (one-third of the Burnaby and Richmond town centre employees were dissatisfied).

Safety and Security

Over half of the women were satisfied with the feeling of safety and security in the area around their workplace. Of the women who were not satisfied, all but one worked for the firm in Richmond's non-town centre location. These women did not like the isolation of the workplace, especially at night and felt that the truck traffic made the area dangerous for pedestrians.
Contributing Features

The only feature about their workplace that some women felt may have contributed to their decision to accept their current job was "the time that it takes them to travel between their work and their home", although as mentioned previously this was not a primary consideration for the majority of the women when seeking employment.

Workplace Area Descriptions

As an indicator of their satisfaction with the area in which their workplace was located, each woman was asked to describe the area. The women's descriptions all tended to emphasized the physical character of the areas, however, some of the descriptions were more subjective than others. For example, some women said that "the area is pleasant and peaceful", while others commented that "the area has lots of trees".

The descriptions given by the women working in Burnaby were more positive than those given by the Richmond women. The women working in Metrotown commented on the nice park, the peace and quiet of the park and the neighbouring residential area, and the traffic and noise of Kingsway. The women working in Burnaby's non-town centre location appreciated the area's natural setting but also saw the area as non-descript and as being located in the middle of nowhere.
The women working in the Richmond town centre and non-town centre locations described the surrounding areas as industrial business districts. Both areas were also described as having poor pedestrian facilities and heavy truck traffic.

Availability of Services and Facilities

The women were asked to identify the facilities that were presently available to them (within a ten minute walking distance from their office) and how often they used them. The women were also asked to identify the activities that were unavailable but that they would like access to. As expected the women working in the two town centre locations identified the most facilities as being available to them. However, in both town centres there were some women workers who did not recognize some of the existing facilities as being available to them.

In the Burnaby town centre everyone agreed that there were restaurants, medical and dental facilities, parks and open space, and outdoor seating areas nearby. Most of these women also recognized that they had access to stores for groceries, stores for their own clothing and personal needs, banking, daycare and postal service. However, more than 50 percent of the women did not think they had access to stores for children's needs, stores for browsing, theatres, library, hair salon, drycleaning, educational facilities, fitness, indoor
seating areas or other business activities, although some of these facilities were within a ten minute walk of their office. Six of the facilities identified as being available were used by more than half of the women interviewed at the Burnaby town centre firm. These included stores for groceries, stores for clothing, restaurants, banking, the park, and outdoor seating. Because the women working for the firm in Burnaby's town centre only had thirty minutes for lunch, and yet most women said that their use of local facilities would occur primarily during their lunch hour, may have limited their awareness and use of the facilities that were available to them.

The women working in the Richmond town centre had a similar level of awareness, although there was only one item that all of the women agreed was accessible, a nearby park. The other facilities that were identified by the majority of the women as being located nearby were stores for children's needs, restaurants, a library, medical and dental services, educational facilities (a community college is nearby), fitness facilities, and indoor and outdoor seating areas. Very few of these facilities are used by any of the women interviewed at Richmond's town centre firm. The only facilities that were used by at least 50 percent of the women were medical and dental services and the park. Some of the women noted that the area's poor pedestrian environment was not conducive to walking to places during their lunch hour.
The women working at the firms in the non-town centre locations identified very few facilities as being available but all used what they identified. In Burnaby everyone used the nearby park and the outdoor seating areas around their building, although this use was seasonal. Only one woman identified and used the fitness facilities at the nearby YMCA. Most of the other women seemed unaware of the existence of this facility.

There was only one activity that the women working at Richmond's non-town centre firm identified as available and used and that was the fitness facility that were provided by the firm for its employees. Half of the women also used outdoor seating that was provided by the employer, but the women complained that the area was noisy due to airplane traffic and smelly because of the local farms.

Services and Facilities Required

The number of facilities that the women identified as required related inversely to the number they saw as already available. The women working outside the Burnaby and Richmond town centres identified the greatest number of activities as being required. The majority of the women in Burnaby's non-town centre location wanted stores for groceries, stores for browsing, restaurants, drycleaning, banking, and a post office. Everyone wanted banking facilities, even if it was only a bank machine. Almost everyone wanted a post office.
The women working in Richmond's non-town centre location identified the most facilities that they would like to see near their workplace. Like the women in Burnaby, everyone wanted banking facilities. Everyone also said they would use a library. Some added that access to a library would benefit their work. The other facilities requested by the majority of the women included stores for groceries, stores for clothing and other personal needs, stores for browsing, restaurants, medical and dental services, daycare, a post office and a park or other accessible open space.

The women working in Burnaby's town centre required almost no additional facilities. On the other hand, a few of the women working in Richmond's town centre identified facilities that they wanted to see available that already existed. For example, half of the women requested banking although there are a number of financial institutions located at the Richmond Centre Mall about a ten minute walking distance.

Overall the facilities which were most often identified as lacking by all of the women interviewed were banking facilities, a post office and stores for groceries and other household necessities. More than 50 percent of the women interviewed said they required these facilities and, except for the post office, they said they would use these facilities on a regular basis.
Other facilities which were requested by almost half of the women interviewed were stores catering to women's clothing or other personal needs, stores for browsing or window shopping, a library and a drycleaners. However, most of the women who requested these facilities said they would use them only on an occasional basis. Almost all of the women said their use of facilities near work would occur primarily during work hours, such as their lunch break.

Pedestrian Environment

Because the preceding questions concentrated on the facilities that the women could walk to, it was important to establish how the women perceived the pedestrian environment around their workplace. In almost all situations, the pedestrian experience was described as a negative one.

The women at Burnaby's non-town centre firm were the most satisfied with their pedestrian experience, although most of these women admitted that they did not do very much walking in the area because there was nowhere to go. The women working in Burnaby's town centre described walking along Kingsway as very unpleasant but appreciated the nearby residential areas that offered a more relaxing pedestrian experience. Of course, walking through the residential areas would not get them to most of the local facilities.
At both Richmond firms the women had no positive comments about walking around the adjacent area. They noted that the lack of sidewalks and traffic conditions discouraged them from walking around the areas. The women at Richmond's non-town centre firm also commented that the lack of any destinations also prevented them from walking in the area.

5.4 ANALYSIS OF ACTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

The following analysis is presented under sub-headings which correspond to the categories used to analyze the objectives of the GVRD's Regional Town Centres Program.

- Balance of jobs to population (Living Close to Work);
- Transit-oriented transportation system;
- Variety of services and a more interesting working environment for suburban employees.

5.4.1 Balance of Jobs to Population (Living Close to Work)

Only 25 percent of the Burnaby workers were living in Burnaby. More Burnaby employees lived in Coquitlam than in Burnaby. Meanwhile, 66 percent of the Richmond women employees lived as well as worked in the municipality.

Almost 80 percent of the women interviewed thought it was important to work near home. But most of the women indicated
that when seeking their current job their main concerns were
the type of work and the salary offered and that finding work
close to home was a lower priority. For most of the women the
location of the job was a secondary consideration.

All of the women had worked at previous jobs, the majority of
which had been located in Vancouver. However, the women who
had worked previously in either Burnaby or Richmond had
remained in those municipalities. Although some of the women
still are commuting in to work from the outer suburbs (eg.
Surrey, Coquitlam), overall most of the women are commuting
less distance. The increase in the number and range of
employment opportunities in both Burnaby and Richmond is
allowing more women to work closer to home. The interview
results also confirm the shift in employment from the City of
Vancouver to the suburbs, as well as supporting the GVRD's
findings (GVRD, 1985) that Burnaby is increasingly becoming an
alternative to Vancouver as a place of work for some of the
region's residents.

The overall distribution of trip times for the Burnaby and
Richmond women was similar to the distribution for the women
surveyed by the Vancouver Urban Futures project (Hardwick et
al, 1990). Furthermore, the median length of journey to work
for the women interviewed in Burnaby and Richmond was
consistent with the travel times reported in the study "Living
Close to Work", averaging at 23 minutes. However, the majority
of the Burnaby women interviewed had trips longer than 23 minutes and the majority of the Richmond workers had trips that were substantially shorter than 23 minutes. Although the total sample reflects the regional patterns, the individual municipalities provide two very different examples. The women working in Richmond are living close to work but most of the women working in Burnaby are not.

5.4.2 Transit Oriented Transportation System

As the interviews indicated, none of the women use transit regularly to travel to work. For the Richmond workers outside the town centre, transit was not available. Even the women working in the Richmond and Burnaby town centres, which are better served by transit, would only consider using transit under limited (emergency) conditions. All of the women regarded transit as inconvenient. The women in Richmond who lived close to work (within a 15 minute drive) described the transit service as inadequate. These responses are consistent with the central (downtown) focus of Greater Vancouver's transit service, including routes and scheduling, and confirms the increased need for inter/intra suburban transit service.

When first questioned about transit most of the women said they would not consider using transit but further enquiry indicated that their response was based on their experience with the existing service. Some of the women said they would consider
transit as an alternative if the service improved substantially. Women at the Richmond non-town centre firm suggested that a shuttle-type service, for example, could be an improvement.

5.4.3 Variety of Services and A More Interesting Working Environment

As noted in Chapter 3, the GVRD's objective that town centres provide "a variety of services and a more interesting working environment" encompasses an assortment of features and characteristics. Therefore, for the purpose of this section, this objective is analyzed within the following three subcategories:

- Availability of Services and Amenities;
- Attractive Location; and
- Pedestrian Environment.

Availability of Services and Amenities

The range of services and amenities available to the women at town centre and non-town centre locations varied a great deal. The women in the town centre locations had almost any service or amenity that they might require, although the women were not always aware of what was available. Many of these women did not use regularly most of the services and amenities. Women
working in Metrotown were the most satisfied with the facilities and services available but they also identified fewer items as directly contributing to their level of satisfaction with the location of their workplace.

The women at the non-town centre firms had almost nothing available in the way of services or amenities. Women in Richmond's non-town centre location were the most dissatisfied with what was available and identified the most items as potential contributors to improving their satisfaction with the location of their workplace.

The women who had the services and amenities available often did not use them. Whereas, the women who had few services available had higher expectations about using the service if it was provided. The following are the four common explanations for why the services near work were not used:

o Prefer to use services and amenities located closer to their home. For example, late night shopping has provided women with additional opportunity to fulfill their multiple responsibilities or dual roles.

o Pedestrian facilities limit their access to services because the route is noisy, dangerous or incomplete.

o Short lunch breaks limit the distance the employee could go
or restrict the number of activities that could be accommodated.

- Lunch break only used for eating their lunch and personal relaxation (eg. going for a walk).

There were, however, a core group of services and amenities that most of the women felt would be beneficial near the workplace. These included banking, a post office and a convenience/grocery store. Consistent with some of the women's desire not to spend their lunch breaks running errands, many of the women also specified that a variety of lunchtime eating places and parks or outdoor open space are also very desirable near the workplace.

Noticeable by its absence was an expressed need for daycare facilities near any of the workplaces. The women without children or with older children regarded daycare as unnecessary. A couple of women said it might be useful although none, including the few women who had children, expressed a concern about the absence of daycare facilities near the workplace. Few of the women realized that there was any daycare available, although Burnaby's Metrotown and the Richmond Town Centre each include at least two group daycare centres, and childcare was available at the YMCA near the offices in Burnaby's non-town centre location.
The women who did have young children either used daycare near home or had childcare provided by other family members. Some women noted that they did not want an institutionalized form of daycare but preferred the more personalized daycare offered in a family's home within residential areas. Although none of the women specifically mentioned the cost of childcare, it is important to note that many of the women interviewed likely did not earn salaries sufficient to support licensed group daycare which can cost as much as $12,000 per year in the Greater Vancouver area (Ward, 1991).

Attractive Location

The women were all asked to describe the area around their workplace. As mentioned previously, the Burnaby descriptions tended to be positive and in Richmond they tended to be more negative. The descriptions varied by municipality and not according to whether the workplace was in a town centre or non-town centre location.

The Burnaby workers' descriptions placed more emphasis on the general quality of the area e.g. pleasant or non-descript, while the Richmond workers tended to emphasis the specific attributes e.g. industrial, poor pedestrian facilities, near highway. It was apparent by some of the responses that some of the women had previously not given much thought to the appearance of the area around their office, while other women
were very aware of their surrounding area.

The descriptions of the Metrotown area stressed the positive contribution of Central Park and the negative impacts of Kingsway. The descriptions of the Richmond town centre did not include any words that could be vaguely interpreted as describing an attractive location. The area was described as flat, boring and ugly.

**Pedestrian Environment**

The women were asked to describe the experience of walking in the area near their workplace. The pedestrian experience was described negatively for every area except for Burnaby's non-town centre location. The pedestrian facilities at this location included a pedestrian overpass which facilitated the women worker's access to nearby open space.

Some of the comments of the women working in the other locations highlighted their concerns about the poor pedestrian environments, and the experience of going for a walk was frequently described as busy, noisy, dangerous and uninteresting. Kingsway was described as a problem by the women working in the Burnaby town centre. Besides the noise and traffic, there was the added problem of harassment by passing drivers.
For the women at the firm in Richmond which was within the town centre, it was almost impossible to walk around the area because of the heavy traffic and the lack of sidewalks. Even Richmond's non-town centre firm, which was located in a new business park, lacked basic pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks.

5.4.4 Summary

Based on the responses of the women interviewed, in most cases the town centres have been no more successful at achieving their stated objections as they apply to employees than have the non-town centre locations. The objective of providing jobs close to home has been more effective in Richmond than in Burnaby irregardless of whether the jobs are located in a town centre or a non-town centre location. Transit is more accessible to the women working in the town centre offices but is still used very infrequently and is not highly regarded. In fact the women in the town centre offices may be less optimistic about transit than the women in the non-town centre offices because they have had more negative experiences using the system.

There are certainly more services and amenities available to the women in the town centre offices, however, many of the facilities are used infrequently and often there is a lack of awareness about what services and amenities are available. The
women in the non-town centre offices may be more optimistic about the services they would use, if available, because they are looking at an ideal, rather than an actual, situation. There are some services and amenities however that the majority of the women at all locations consider as necessary.

Some women do not require an attractive location for work. For other women this is an important feature although not required. The attractiveness of a location may be its physical character or its atmosphere. Town centres were not seen as more attractive than other locations.

Almost all of the women at all locations were interested in an area with some pedestrian features. Passive activity, such as going for a walk, was highly regarded by many of the women, much more so than activities such as shopping. The pedestrian environment must be safe and accessible. Neither of the town centres were highly regarded for their pedestrian facilities.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The interview responses show that there is as much similarity and difference between the women working in Burnaby and Richmond, as there is between those working in town centre and non-town centre locations.

None of the women specifically sought work with a town centre
rather than a non-town centre firm, whereas some of the women definitely had a preference for work in a specific municipality. Contrary to what some of the literature suggests, many women place greater emphasis on the type of work and its related features than they do on the location of the work and its relationship to transit, services or amenities. However, the location of their workplace is important as a secondary consideration and should contribute to their working life.

The final chapter recommends policies and actions that the GVRD and the local municipalities should strive towards in order to improve the quality of life for the workforce in general, and in particular women working in suburban offices in Greater Vancouver and its Regional Town Centres.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The research on women workers in suburban offices located in Burnaby and Richmond has revealed that women employed in offices located in the town centres are no more or no less satisfied with the location of their workplace than women working in other suburban office locations.

There are four objectives to the final chapter. First, it responds to the four questions raised in the literature review in Chapter 2:

- Do suburban offices provide women workers with employment located closer to home?
- Do women have a preference for work near home over other features, such as career opportunities or salary?
- Are suburban transportation systems adequate for women employed in suburban offices?
- Can suburban office centres assist women in performing dual roles by providing a wide range of facilities and activities?
Second, this chapter addresses existing assumptions from the academic literature about women workers' needs and requirements. Third, it recommends adjustments to the GVRD's RTC strategy, as well as local municipalities' implementation of that strategy, to meet the specific needs of women office workers. Finally, Chapter 6 suggests the contributions of this thesis to the literature on suburban offices, women workers, and gender research.

6.2 RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

The principal interest of this thesis has been whether regional town centres provide women office workers with a working environment that is more responsive to their needs than other less centralized office locations. Some of the literature suggests that suburban offices provide workers employment opportunities closer to home. Furthermore, suburban centres are seen to provide a variety of other services and facilities to workers.

The literature suggests that a spatial concentration of activities will benefit women by allowing them to perform multiple tasks within a shorter period of time. However, there is no guarantee that women will take advantage of these opportunities, or even seek the concentration of facilities that a town centre may offer.
This thesis shows that suburban offices are providing women increased employment opportunities closer to their homes in the suburbs, thereby reducing the need to commute to jobs located in the city centre. The research indicates that, at least for the women working in Burnaby, the jobs may be closer but they are not close to home.

The research also concludes that for many women the location of their work is less important than the features of the job itself. Women want jobs that are interesting or challenging, provide advancement opportunities, offer a reasonable salary and include sufficient benefits. Although this thesis has not dealt specifically with the quality of the work being done by women working in suburban offices, their expressed interest in the features of their work indicates that they may not be willing to accept lower quality jobs in order to work closer to home.

According to the research, the region's public transportation system has proven inadequate for women working in suburban offices. Offices located outside the town centres are usually poorly served, if at all, by public transit. Even the women working in the town centres find the transit system inconvenient because of the system's routing and frequency. Consequently, women in the region who are transit dependent may be restricted in the range and location of jobs available to them.
Although the town centres provide a variety of services and activities, the research found that in most cases the women who had access to the town centres did not take advantages of the facilities to fulfill their multiple tasks. Some women seemed interested in keeping their dual roles separate by not performing their domestic tasks during working hours. Many of whom preferred to use their breaks for rest and relaxation, perhaps because for some of them this time was their only opportunity for such a personal activity.

There are assumptions about working women that the results of this research seem to contradict. A tendency for the requirements of women's dual roles to overlap and consume their daily routines is not confirmed. Many of the women want to keep their two roles separate and do not want to fulfill their household responsibilities during their lunch or coffee breaks. The low number of women with children in the research sample may have adversely affected the results by underrepresenting the women who have the greatest number of responsibilities.

No outstanding need for daycare or concerns about its availability are reported. Again, the shortage of women in the sample with preschool age children may have negatively influenced these results. Fewer than 20 percent of the women interviewed had children under 6 years of age. Meanwhile, statistics indicate that in 1989, 62 percent of the working women in B.C. had preschool age children, and estimates of B.C.
preschool children requiring daycare show that over 80 percent of these children currently receive non-licensed care (Ward, 1991).

A further assumption that women place higher priority on the location of their work over the features of the job itself also is not borne out by this research. Perhaps, as women are becoming more firmly established in the paid workforce, they also are becoming more concerned about their position as employees.

The conclusion that women live closer to work than men is neither confirmed nor contradicted. Because no men were interviewed there is no comparable data available for male employees, although the results from the Vancouver Urban Futures project reveal that men who travel to work by car tend to have longer trip times than women (Hardwick et al, 1990). If 1985's average journey time for all workers (GVRD, 1990c) is used for comparison, women working in Burnaby live further away than the average worker and women working in Richmond live closer to work than the region's average.

In the family situations where there was only one car available, the research verified that the husband was the principal user and these women usually relied on sharing a ride or using other means of transportation to work.
Many women referred to the stress that they have to cope with because of the increased complexity of their lives.

6.3 RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

Underlying many of the regional policies, such as those associated with the Regional Town Centres strategy, is the implicit expectation that these policies will provide the residents of the Greater Vancouver Region with a more livable environment in all aspects of their daily lives. However, these policies often fail to recognize the variation that exists within the members of every community. In order for these policies to be effective for all people, there should be increased recognition of the variety of needs that must be addressed.

Rutherford and Wekerle (1988b) emphasized the need for greater public participation in the city by women when they wrote that

"the extraordinary increase in the labor force participation of women over the past decade...creates demands and requirements on the urban system that have scarcely been considered." (p.6)

At both the regional and local level there should be further efforts to ensure that policy and decision-making include consideration for the different requirements of women and men, as well as the other sub-groups within the community.

One method of broadening the awareness of women's needs and ensuring that their input is provided is to include them in
policy and decision-making activities. To this end, there should be equal representation provided on local commissions and advisory bodies throughout the region.

To oversee the effectiveness of providing equal representation and ensuring that women's issues are adequately dealt with on the public agenda, this thesis recommends that there should be a regionally-focussed women's advocacy body, such as a Greater Vancouver Commission on Women. Specific issues that this Commission should focus on include the following policy recommendations:

- **Provide a transit service that is more responsive to the needs of women.**

  Although the research did not identify a strong desire for transit as an alternative method of transportation, as Michelson (1985) states

  "The fact that some segments of the population do not now use public transit is no reason for their needs to be ignored in transit planning." (Michelson, 1985, p.162)

  Women require a system that is safe and secure and additionally, as this research suggests, they require transit service that is dependable, affordable and flexible. Because women have traditionally been more dependent on alternative means of transportation, their specific needs should receive more consideration in any future transit planning exercises. Transit planning is one
area that certainly requires more input and involvement by the major client group, women.

- **Increase the range of daycare opportunities available at an affordable price.**

  The group daycare centres that are being provided more frequently with major commercial developments are not necessarily the preferred type of childcare that women require or available at a cost that women can afford. At the same time private home care may not be providing children with the quality of care that they require. These concerns require increased interest and further emphasis at a regional level. Although this study did not reveal a strong demand for daycare opportunities, other research (Ward, 1991) indicates that further emphasis is necessary in identifying what the region's women require to adequately meet their childcare needs.

- **Expand the diversity and choice of housing types available near employment centres, to allow women of differing incomes, lifestyles and household composition to secure affordable housing that is suitable for their purposes.**

  Besides providing women with more work opportunities closer to home there should also be further interest in providing more varied housing opportunities closer to the jobs. As
the research indicated, women do not want to forfeit the quality of their jobs for a better workplace location. Therefore, increasing the range of housing opportunities near employment centres would allow more women the possibility to live closer to work.

- Ensure that basic services and facilities are provided at locations and a scale that is best suited to women's requirements.

The women interviewed tended to prefer using services and facilities located closer to home. Therefore, regional and local plans should recognize that centralizing services and facilities may not be an appropriate action for women. Increased efforts should go to identifying the urban forms that are best suited to women's activities.

The previous recommendations present issues that require addressing at a broad regional level with coordination between the individual cities and municipalities. There are also more locally-based concerns that require further attention at the local level. To this regard, this thesis also proposes the following recommendations for the consideration of the cities and municipalities:

- Develop a promotional program to increase the awareness of town centre residents and workers of the wide range of services and activities available.
Information should be dispersed to local businesses as well as local firms. Information kiosks could be located at areas where workers tend to frequent. Many of the women interviewed were not aware of the facilities and services that were already available. This recommendation enables women with time constraints, such as a short lunch break, to be made aware of what is available and reduces the effort required to search out this information.

- Encourage developers and employers in remote office centres to provide employees with transportation alternatives, such as shuttle service between the centre and public transit facilities.

This action could increase the employment opportunities for transit dependent women as well as contribute to the GVRD's objective for a transit oriented transportation system.

- Encourage developers of remote office centres to include ancillary services and facilities, such as a banking machine, postal substation, and small convenience outlet.

A significant share of the region's suburban office employment continues to exist outside the Regional Town Centres, therefore some basic facilities are required to serve the women and other workers at these locations.
Require attractive pedestrian facilities and usable open space with all major office centres, whether in town centres or elsewhere.

According to the research, women at all work locations want outdoor areas and pedestrian routes for relaxation purposes.

Provide a variety of destinations by linking centres or activities with pedestrian facilities.

Many of the women interviewed suggested that they preferred walking when they had a destination. Furthermore, an improved pedestrian network could encourage and allow more women to walk to work.

Include affordable housing and a range of housing types as an integral component of regional town centre development.

Although already discussed as a regional issue, this recommendation is also included here because of the significant role that local governments play in providing support for this objective within their municipality.

The thesis recognizes that to some extent many of these recommendations are currently being pursued by the Region and its member communities. However, the research has found that
further emphasis is still required in all of the areas mentioned above.

It is also recognized that the findings of this research and the conclusions and recommendations presented are based on interviews of small groups of female suburban office workers. Therefore, a further recommendation of this thesis is that more attention should be focussed within the region on identifying the specific needs and requirements of its women workers.

Although this research has tried to discover women's satisfaction with their current position as well as to identify their ideal situation, it has been more successful with the former than the latter. Consequently, further research should be undertaken to identify the form and elements of an urban environment that are best suited to women's activity patterns, personal needs and social responsibilities, and can provide them with a working environment that contributes to an improved quality of life and increased livability.

6.4 RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

Although there has been growing recognition of the need for including a gender perspective in urban research and policy, to a large extent the office literature has failed to adequately address this issue. To this regard, the findings of this research contribute to the literature on suburban offices and employment by:
Identifying reasons for women choosing suburban office employment;

Offering insight into employee's attitudes about suburban office locations; and

Complimenting existing literature on the transportation and commuting patterns of women working in suburban offices;

By linking the requirements of women with the features and characteristics of suburban employment centres, this thesis also attempts to provide a bridge between two fields of research - suburban offices and employment, and working women.

This thesis has strived to increase awareness for including gender considerations in studies about suburban offices and employment. Contributions are made to the academic literature supporting a gender perspective by confirming that the GVRD's objectives for town centres could be more effective, as well as more relevant to women workers, if they included a gender component.
FOOTNOTES

[1] Richmond was designated as a City in December 1990. It was previously The Corporation of the Township of Richmond.


[3] A GVRD survey of public and private corporations' future locational plans identified rapid transit as a precondition for relocation. (GVRD, 1974c)

[4] The Vancouver CMA covers a larger area than the GVRD (the region).

[5] A 5,000 square foot building is approximately equivalent to a one and a half storey building on a standard city lot (33' by 120').

[6] Comparable statistics are not available for the women who live and work in Burnaby.
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APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF COMMERCIAL FLOORSPACE
Definition of Commercial Floorspace

Based on the GVRD's definitions (GVRD, 1981) commercial floorspace is divided into three broad categories: office, retail and shopping centres, and personal service facilities. The following list provides detailed examples for each category:

A. OFFICE includes:
   FINANCE - Banks, credit unions, security brokers, investment companies
   INSURANCE
   REAL ESTATE
   MEDICAL/DENTAL - Doctors' offices, health services
   ACCOUNTANT/LAWYERS
   GOVERNMENT
   OTHER

B. RETAIL & SHOPPING CENTRES include:
   FOOD
   GENERAL MERCHANDISE - Department and variety stores
   AUTO RELATED
   CLOTHING & DRY GOODS
   HARDWARE - Building materials, paint, wallpaper, etc.
   LUMBER SALES
   HOUSEHOLD FURNATURE & APPLIANCES
   DRUG STORES
   OTHER RETAIL - Secondhand, antiques, art dealers and supplies, retail nurseries, shoe sales, books and stationary, florist, jewellery, liquor, tobacco, sporting goods, photography shops.
   SHOPPING CENTRES - Includes all commercial activities located in shopping centres (retail, office and service). They are isolated from other retail uses because they often include services and offices in a primarily retail environment, and partly because of their 'lumpiness' or tendency to develop in large blocks over a short period of time.

C. PERSONAL SERVICE includes:
   REPAIR SHOPS
   RESTAURANTS
   HOTELS, MOTELS
   TRAILER COURTS
   RENTAL SERVICES - Furniture, T.V., appliance, car, truck, machinery and equipment.
RECREATION - Theatres, bowling, billiards, golf clubs, tennis clubs, health spas, marinas, etc.
PERSONAL SERVICES - Barbers, beauty salons, laundries, cleaners, tailers
OTHER SERVICES - Radio, T.V. and electrical appliance repair, watch and jewellery repair, shoe repair, funeral services, caterers, building and dwelling services, clubs and lodges.
APPENDIX B

LETTER REQUESTING FIRM'S COOPERATION FOR EMPLOYEE INTERVIEWS
January 15, 1991

Name
Position
Firm
Street
City, Province
Postal Code

Dear:

SUBJECT: INTERVIEW ON THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK LOCATION AND SETTING FOR FEMALE OFFICE EMPLOYEES IN THE VANCOUVER REGION

My name is Lynda Challis, a graduate student at the University of British Columbia, working under the direction of Dr. Walter Hardwick. I am presently conducting research for a thesis assessing female office employees' satisfaction with the location of their suburban work place. The specific purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the objectives of the Greater Vancouver Regional District's Regional Town Centres Program. In order to determine the similarities and differences between how office employees in town centres and in other suburban locations perceive the location of their work place, I will be interviewing employees who work in different locations within Richmond and Burnaby.

As a firm with office employees working in Richmond's town centre, I am requesting an opportunity to interview some of your female employees. I will need to interview six employees and the interview should not take more than twenty minutes. I am willing to schedule the interviews within whatever timetable you feel would be appropriate.

Because University of British Columbia policy requires written subject consent for participation in interviews, a sample consent form has been attached for your information. As the consent form indicates, individual survey responses will be kept confidential and your employees have the right to refuse to participate in this interview or to withdraw at any time.
APPENDIX C

LETTER REQUESTING EMPLOYEE'S PARTICIPATION
January 28, 1991

My name is Lynda Challis, a graduate student at the University of British Columbia, working under the direction of Dr. Walter Hardwick. I am presently conducting research for a thesis assessing female employees' satisfaction with the location of their suburban work place. The specific purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the objectives of the Greater Vancouver Regional District's Regional Town Centres Program.

As a female employee of a firm located in Richmond, you are invited to participate in an interview. Your name has been randomly selected from your employer's list of staff. It is expected that the interview will not take more than twenty minutes of your time and your employer has agreed to allow the interview to occur during your work hours.

Because University of British Columbia policy requires written subject consent for participation in interviews, a written consent form has been attached. If you agree to the interview, please fill in this form. I will telephone you during the week of January 21-25 to determine your interest in participating in this study. The individual survey responses will be kept confidential and you have the right to refuse to participate in this interview or to withdraw at any time.

A summary of the findings (not individual responses) will be made available to you upon request.

Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Your truly,

Lynda Challis
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO WOMEN SUBURBAN OFFICE WORKERS
INTERVIEW
ON FEMALE OFFICE EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS
OF WORK PLACE ACCESSIBILITY AND SETTING
(THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK LOCATION FOR EMPLOYEES')

EMPLOYEE'S WORK CONTEXT

The first group of questions are interested in what type of work you are doing, how long you have worked for this firm and why you chose this company. Some of my questions will ask for specific answers and others will be phrased as statements that I'd like you to complete.

1. Please tell me your present occupation or job title?

2. Now, briefly describe your job.

3. How long have you worked at "name of firm"?

4. Please tell me your reasons for accepting your job with this firm and please start with the most important reason.
5. When you obtained this job, had you also been looking for work elsewhere?

6. Please tell me where else you had looked for work.

   I would like to know which municipalities you considered working in?
   1 Vancouver
   2 Burnaby
   3 Richmond
   4 Surrey
   5 Delta
   6 the North Shore
   7 New Westminster
   8 Port Coquitlam/Coquitlam/Port Moody
   9 Lower Mainland (all of the above)
   10 other areas, such as...

7. Did you look for work in a town centre (such as Metrotown, Richmond Town Centre)?

   Which town centres did you consider?

8. Before this job did you work outside the home?

9. If you worked in the Vancouver region, please give me the nearest street intersection to your previous place of work.
10. How important is it for you to work near each of the following places or activities?

Please tell me if it is important (1), not important (2), or neither important nor not important (3).

- home
- buses or Skytrain
- shopping
- daycare
- entertainment activities

11. What other activities do you think are important near work?

**TRANSPORTATION TO WORK**

The next set of questions are interested in how you travel to work and how long it takes for you to go from your home to the office.

1. Please tell me how you usually travel to work and how many minutes the trip usually takes. When you travel by car do you usually travel alone? Do you drive directly to work or do you make any stops along the way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Is your trip home the same?

3. If you use a different method of travel home or if the trip is longer or shorter, please tell me how do you usually travel home and how many minutes does that trip normally take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If at least once a week you use a different means of travelling to work, please tell me how you travel and how long that trip usually takes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Are you using your preferred method of transportation?
   If you are not using your preferred method for travelling to work, how would you rather travel?
   1  car
   2  carpool or shared ride
   3  transit (bus or skytrain)
   4  taxi
   5  motorcycle
   6  bicycle
   7  walking
   8  other...

6. Why don’t you use this method of transportation?

WORK LOCATION AND SURROUNDING AREA

Now I would like to ask you about the location of your office and the area around it.

1. Please tell me your general level of satisfaction with the location of your current place of work.
   Would you say you are:

   Very Satisfied (1)
   Satisfied (2)
   Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied (3)
   Dissatisfied (4)
   Very Dissatisfied (5)
2. The following is a list of things that could contribute to your satisfaction with where you work. For each item please tell me if you think it contributes to your workplace satisfaction and how satisfied you are now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contribute</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The time that it takes you to travel between your work and home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The amount of parking available near work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Access to free parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frequent bus service to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A variety of types of stores for shopping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fitness facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Entertainment activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Daycare opportunities for my children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Educational facilities for myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Educational facilities for other members of my family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A park or other outdoor open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A variety of restaurants to use at lunchtime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A variety of restaurants for going to dinner after work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Access to personal services, such as banks, a post office, drycleaners, or hair salons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medical or dental services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Interesting places to go for a walk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A surrounding area that feels safe and secure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did any of these things contribute to your decision to accept your current job?

3. I would use the following words to describe the area around the building that I work in:
4. I have a list of activities which may be located within walking distance to your office. If any of these activities are near your office please tell me how often and when you use them. You may use them before work, during work hours such as lunchtime or coffee breaks, after work or during other times of the week, such as weekends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ques 4</th>
<th>Ques 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stores selling groceries and other household necessities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stores catering to children's needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stores catering to your clothing or other personal needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stores for browsing or window shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theatres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hair salon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drycleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical or dental offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daycare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fitness centre or facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks or outdoor open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indoor seating areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outdoor seating areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business activities related to your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Some of these activities are not located near your office. Ideally, would you like these activities located within walking distance of your place of work? If they were, how often and when you would use them?
6. If you walk to activities near your office, what words would you use to describe the walk and the area that you walk through.

7. Given your experience with working in your present location (or Metrotown/Richmond Town Centre), if you changed jobs would an area with similar amenities (or a town centre location) be an important requirement?

8. Please mention any additional concerns or comments that you have about the area around your office.
PERSONAL HISTORY

These final few questions will provide me with some basic information about you and your family.

1. Which age group are you in?
   1  15-24 years       2  25-34 years
   3  35-44 years       4  45-54 years
   5  55-64 years       6  65 years and over

2. Your marital status is:
   1  Single
   2  Married or Common-law
   3  Other (which includes separated, divorced, widowed)

3. How would you describe your present family or living arrangement?
   Do you live alone or do you live with other people?
   Do you live with other adults besides your husband?
   Are they related or not related to you?
   Do you have children?
   How old are your children?
   1  Live alone
   2  Live with my parent
   3  Live with others who are related to me
   4  Live with others who are not related to me
   5  Couple with no children at home
   6  Couple with at least one child under six years
   7  Couple with children all over six years old
   8  Lone parent with at least 1 child 6 years or under
   9  Lone parent with children all over 6 years old

4. What is your postal code? _____________

5. Do you have any other comments or questions about this survey?