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ABSTRACT

In many North American Cities various levels of government are faced with pressing accommodation problems. In seeking to resolve these problems major investments in land and structures are taking place with potentially significant impacts upon the urban core. The study undertaken in this thesis examines the nature of these investments in terms of their potential contribution to the revitalization of the urban core. This goal has been frequently expressed of the location criteria formulated in conjunction with the investment.

Two complementary concepts are presented which provide a theoretical basis for the utilization of the location decision as a tool for urban revitalization. The concepts take into account not only basic functional linkages between urban
activities, but also values motivating individual and group behaviour.

Characteristic social and economic behaviour is presented pertaining to the social and economic environment of the urban core. These behavioural characteristics provide a basis for expecting that a location decision will have a desired effect upon core revitalization. Social behaviour is discussed in terms of the individuals' personal, social, and cultural relationships to the urban environment. Economic behaviour is discussed in terms of investment motivation pertaining to the use and ownership of real property under general conditions of the real estate market and under specific market conditions created by a public investment.

Empirical application of the theoretical planning concepts is examined through a study of the impacts emanating from the location for the City Hall, Victoria, B.C. The investment is examined in terms of changes in social and economic behaviour at the level of the location neighbourhood and throughout the city. Evaluation of these changes is made in the context of planning policy within the city at a time of the investment decision. Conclusions derived from the study of behavioural changes indicate that the investment fostered desired revitalization through changes in both actions and attitudes with respect to the study neighbourhood. Conclusions
derived from examination of the planning context within which the decision was made indicate that certain unplanned consequences have also emerged as a result of the decision.

The behavioural characteristics associated with public administrative buildings in the urban core and the successful stimulation of these characteristics in an empirical situation is submitted as evidence of the potential of a location decision to be used as a planning tool to foster core revitalization when the location decision is an integral component of a comprehensive approach to urban development.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STUDY OUTLINE

STATEMENT OF INTENT

It is the intent of this thesis to explore the relationship between location decisions for Public Administrative Buildings and the development and environment of the urban core. Specifically it is the intent to show that in both a social and economic context a Public Administrative Building is a significant component of the structure and environment of the core; as such, through a location decision, the planner may direct and influence the private redevelopment of sections of the urban core.

THE PROBLEM

From the point of view of government, faced with an investment decision for accommodation, a location decision must attempt not only to resolve the accommodation problem, but also to take maximum advantage of its decision for other benefits.
Throughout Canada and in the United States there is a proliferation of governmental complexes recently completed, under construction, or in the planning stages as all levels of government expand with urban growth.

In outlining planning goals for the creation of new administrative centres, common goals are evident in location criteria: to make a significant contribution to the environment of the city and at the same time provide an impetus to private development and/or redevelopment in the adjacent area for improving its economic viability. Inherent in the expression of such goals is the belief that public buildings perform social and economic functions as well as other functions. It becomes of prime importance to identify these significant functional characteristics:

1. to understand why they justify such expectations; and
2. as a basis for putting these attributes to more effective planning use.

The problem may be more fully stated with respect to the locational requirements for Public Administrative Buildings, and with respect to the evolution of the urban core as a dynamic component of cities.

THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

Historically, seats of government, whether national, provincial, or civic have been key components in urban design. Their longevity has in many cases far outdistanced private
structures, with the result that the functional efficiency of many administrative buildings has declined. At a time when many cities find their administrative accommodation in critical need of expansion, the role of the Public Administrative Building is being re-evaluated in the contemporary urban context.

A recent (1971) symposium of the provision of accommodation for government indicates the contemporary problems facing planners of public administrative buildings and critical factors in their resolution. Some points made in summary include:

"During the past several decades Government growth has been considerable and geographical decentralization of offices common. In many cases the result is multiple locations of space of varying suitability and an absence of integrated plans for Government offices in individual locations.

"Special purpose facilities are often more difficult to plan than office space because they are not normally amenable to alternative usage or obtainable/disposable on the commercial market.

"Consolidation of most Government office space in a community normally increases public awareness of Government services, reduces travel time for visitors and civil servants, permits space savings and administrative economies to be realized, and can represent a valuable input into urban renewal and transportation planning.

"Site selection analysis for office space, as well as being based on site economics, servicing, size, etc., must consider accessibility to:
the central business district, major transportation routes, parking, local access, public transit, other Government offices, (Provincial, local, Federal), employee-client services, etc. The site should also be examined with reference to its capability of maximizing public awareness, and contributing to the planned development of locality."

(Government of Ontario, 1971, p.iv)
The cogent points to be gained from this review are: (1) internal centralization of activity is critical to operating efficiency; and (2) external benefits are possible and desirable results of centralization. The latter point provides the basis for the research to be undertaken by this thesis.

While space requirements constitute the principal reason for a public investment in land and structures, the potential for external benefits or impacts adds a further significant dimension to location planning. These impacts may occur at two scales, both of which are represented in the subsequent research. First, impacts may occur at the level of the neighbourhood or the immediately adjacent area which is the subject of locational analysis. Second, impacts may occur at the jurisdictional level or throughout the political/administrative unit served by the building. It is at the first level that public decision makers anticipate that external impacts will appear: it is therefore at this level that their goals are expressed most clearly. However, it is the impacts accruing at the second level which provide the impetus for concrete results at the neighbourhood level. The intangible nature of these impacts constitute a major factor in the nature and location of the public investment decision: their manipulation for maximum benefit becomes a key component of the investment decision.

URBAN CORE REVITALIZATION

The urban core, by customary definition, is the Central Business District - a title indicative of its prime
economic function in the city. Gruen (1964) disagrees with the narrow focus of this description; by analogy to the human body, he describes the urban core as the heart of the city, performing a universal life-giving function; he maintains that in character the heart of the city should be its most highly urbanized area, containing the broadest range of the highest productive uses and most significant urban functions, as well as the best, the rare, and the unusual.

This description is consistent with the recognized trends in the evolution of the urban core as urbanism evolves towards post-industrialism; the function of the urban core, particularly of metropolitan regions, is evolving towards a specialized centre for the performance of tertiary and quaternary activities: "a highly specialized machine for producing, processing and trading specialized intelligence" (Hall, 1966), or "a central intelligence district" by recent description (Mann et al, 1968).

The physical form of the urban core frequently belies the above trend as whole sections of the core and its fringe areas remain untouched by this regenerative long-range trend. Concern expressed for the present state of the environment and the economic viability of sections of the urban core is based upon dissatisfaction with the selective and inherently slow change wrought on their physical character. Solutions have been suggested under the assumption that some areas are not "capable of regener-
ation on their own, within the time preferences of society, and must have financial and/or other help either publically or privately in order to regain lost potential" (Mann et al, 1968, p.44).

The foremost solution has been publically sponsored urban renewal programs in both Canada and the United States focusing upon redevelopment, frequently involving the exercise of the rights of eminent domain to provide large areas of cleared urban land for private redevelopment in the considered anticipation that further private action would be stimulated and the process of decay reversed. The association of "urban renewal" with "redevelopment" as a process of physical clearance and rebuilding has contributed to some of the more critical appraisals of urban renewal activity (Bellush and Hauskneckt, 1967). Criticism has been largely directed at urban renewals' achievements as a relief of symptoms rather than a cure of the causes of decay. Forrester (1969) and others maintain that urban revival is more aptly to be obtained by recognizing that the city is a complex system: that intuitive solutions may generate more problems than they solve, and that management, in full recognition of the complex structure and behavioural relationships within the city, is the solution to the chronic problem of decay. This view is given further support by reference to the properties of ecological systems and their similarity to complex urban systems. These properties indicate a great potential for gross disruption of the balance inherent in ecological and urban
systems such that actions in the systems should be limited in scope and diverse in nature to preserve the resilience of the systems in order to insure that success also minimizes disastrous and unplanned consequences (Holling and Goldberg, 1971).

A systems approach to urban development and redevelopment is one which recognizes that the evolution of urban areas is characterized by linkages amongst all urban activities, each having interactive and feedback capabilities. In such a system inherent equilibrium is recognizable; the potential exists, therefore, for disruption or strengthening of complex linkages. Further, a systems approach to urban renewal is one which recognizes that "an attempt to influence any one factor or sector...will produce secondary and tertiary consequences, and they, in turn, will effect the outcome of the initial effort... therefore...ameliorative programmes should be designed with as full an awareness as possible of the systems linkages...to be modified." (Committee on Social and Behavioural Urban Research, 1969, p.18).

Banz (1971) focuses the systems approach to the urban environment at a comprehensible level which takes into account the time factor as an inherent regulatory phenomina of the urban system. He states:

"A metropolis is...never designed in one single step; its form evolves over generations from a vast number of minor decisions that are often unrelated. The problem is therefore not to plan and design an urban environment in its entirety...(but)...the parts of such an environment...in such a way that they are mutually compatible in every sense...
"With this holistic concept in mind it is possible to consider any one project space within the urban environment as isolated from the total urban environment so long as its boundaries are clearly defined...The total urban environment, in other words, must be regarded as the systems environment of the project space.

"The dominant functional form determinant within such a project space is almost invariably...people...(having needs which)can be expressed in terms of man's sensory, intellectual and functional links to an environment..." (p.164).

This systems context, based upon man's multifaceted behavioural linkages to his urban environment, is the context in which research is undertaken in this thesis. Urban renewal as an ameliorative program for physical, social and economic change, must be initiated and evaluated in the context of the urban system; to the extent that a Public Administrative Building is intended to be an urban renewal device its context in the urban system is of prime importance. The decision to locate an administrative building may be treated as a systems problem having the potential to affect man's sensory, intellectual, and functional links in the urban environment, thereby fostering the achievement of core revitalization.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research undertaken is restricted in scope and content by the limitations of time and resources to, first, a literature review comprising Part I, and second, an empirical study constituting Part II. The scope of each part is outlined below.
Literature Review

The review of literature is intended to present relevant material from diverse sources which when considered as a whole provides the conceptual verification that a location decision for a Public Administrative Building may be used as a valid planning tool in the revitalization of the urban core. The review is presented in three chapters.

Chapter 2 presents two concepts which provide a theoretical frame of reference for the utilization of the location decision as a planning tool to achieve developmental and environmental goals. The concepts, Chapins' (1957) "values-behaviour patterns-consequences" framework relating values to land use, and Guttenberg's (1964) "Tactical Plan" for plan implementation, are behaviourist in nature, taking as their base the fundamental motivations of individuals. The concepts are inherently complementary, the former providing an operational framework for the application of the latter.

Chapter 3 presents characteristic social behaviour of individuals and groups as it influences and is influenced by the urban environment in general, and by public buildings in particular.

Chapter 4 presents characteristic economic behaviour evident in the practices of real estate investment as it occurs in the urban core under general market conditions and under specific market conditions created by a Public Administrative Building.
Empirical Study

The case to be investigated, City Hall and Centennial Square, Victoria, B.C., is a vehicle by which the concepts outlined in Chapter 2, and the behavioural characteristics outlined in Chapters 3 and 4 may be illustrated and examined in practice with reference to developmental and environmental goals expressed in a contemporary situation.

The methodology applied to the case study (Chapter 5) consists of the following:

1. A description of the location decision-making process, indicating the role played by developmental and environmental goals in site selection.

2. Description of goal achievement evident ten years after the location decision in terms of social and economic responses to the public investment. Social responses are presented through evident trends in behaviour within the study neighbourhood and by attitudes evident throughout the city. Economic responses are presented through three phenomena which indicate first hand impacts on the economic environment:

(a) Transfer of property ownership within the neighbourhood, indicative of changes in investment motivation;

(b) Changes in the physical environmental quality of the neighbourhood, indicative of attitudinal changes towards the neighbourhood environment; and
(c) Changes in land and structure use, indicative of functional change within the neighbourhood.
PART I

A LITERATURE REVIEW
CHAPTER 2

A PLANNING PERSPECTIVE

The research to be undertaken in this thesis is predicated upon its relationship to the theoretical concepts against which evaluation of conclusions may be made. Two concepts are evident in Planning Theory which provide a theoretical framework for the utilization of location decisions for public administrative complexes to achieve public goals with respect to the development and environment of the urban core.

The first concept is a schema which emerged in an attempt to provide a common base from which to view the fragmented approaches of human ecologists to man in his urban
setting. The schema has been loosely named by its author a "Values-behaviour pattern - consequences framework" (Chapin, 1957). It is a conceptual framework to describe some of the major elements and dynamics of human behaviour as it relates to land use. The framework is used in this thesis as a conceptual tool in the analysis of planning problems pertaining to public land use investments.

The second concept is an approach to plan formulation and implementation based upon recognition of behavioural characteristics of urban man. Called by its author the "tactical plan" (Guttenberg, 1964), the approach is one by which planners may indirectly elicit private response toward the achievement of public goals. The concept is used in this thesis to describe an approach to public land use investment.

CONCEPT I - A BEHAVIOURAL FRAMEWORK

By way of preface to his publication Urban Land Use Planning, Chapin (1957) proposed that a theory of urban behaviour would serve a valuable purpose in giving a common perspective and direction to the numerous theoretical constructs of disciplines concerned with land use. In the absence of such a theory, Chapin proposes a theoretical framework within which to view the factors shaping the pattern of land uses in urban areas, if not in fact to control them; in this framework the common denominator amongst factors shaping the pattern of land use is held to be human behaviour.
Chapin broadly classifies human behaviour as either economic or social. This artificial distinction is based upon the conceptual separation of societal behaviour and organization for the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services from societal behaviour and organization for the maintenance of orderly relations between individuals and groups within a society. (Beals and Hoijer 1965). In either context, human behaviour is based upon values and ideals which are:

"the product of human experience in a specific cultural, economic and physical setting...Human behaviour is two-directional. It conditions and is conditioned by this setting, and in turn, actions in relation to the setting motivate and are motivated by values, both the unexpressed subconscious ones and the expressed conscious values."
(Chapin 1957, p.30)

From this value-base originates a cycle of individual and/or group behaviour consisting of four recognizable phases: (1) experiencing needs and wants; (2) defining goals; (3) planning alternative courses of action; and (4) deciding and acting. Through this process values, having either social or economic ends in view, are rationalized to produce desired actions.

When exposed to behaviour cycles of other individuals or groups a pattern of interaction is created. Planned and/or unplanned consequences may occur as a result of value interaction.

The behavioural cycle concept is applicable to numerous areas of human interaction; in applying it to land use in
particular, Chapin capsulizes the concept as follows:

Land goes into use as a consequence of a myriad of individual and group actions. Motivated by values, ideals, and resultant articulated attitudes held by the various organized and unorganized segments of the urban population, these actions follow a defined behavioural sequence that culminates in land use changes."

(Chapin, 1957, p.67)

He further states that:

"The attitudinal bases of these actions have been broadly categorized as stemming from profit making, livability, and culturally rooted values. Looking at the complex result, the mass impact on the land of the actions that grow out of these values of many individuals and groups, we may think of these actions in two categories....'primary actions' and 'secondary actions'. We may conceive of land development as a consequence of certain priming actions which precondition and establish the broad framework for the mass of secondary actions that follow and make up the bulk of the pattern observed."

(Chapin and Weiss, 1962, pp 430-431)

With reference to their schematic presentation (Figure 1) the implications of actions motivated by any one of the above-mentioned value classes may be seen. The "values-behaviour pattern consequences" framework permits both pure and modified consequences of action as well as complimentary action. As Chapin points out:

"Each of the three forms of urban behaviour tends to have pure consequences, but because of side effects the ultimate consequences to land use may be quite different from the originally anticipated results."

(Chapin 1957, p.67)

The framework is thus a conceptual tool with which to approach problems pertaining to land use. It has an inherent
FIGURE 1

INTERRELATION AMONG LAND USE DETERMINANTS

THE "VALUES - BEHAVIOUR PATTERNS - CONSEQUENCES" FRAMEWORK
neutrality which enables it to perform its conceptual functions; it recognizes that human values are the basis of behaviour and therefore of actions, but does not stress group values at the expense of individual values and vice-versa; it recognizes that individuals and groups hold different values which motivate their behaviour when they act in different capacities, but does not emphasize one capacity to the detriment of another; and it recognizes that under conditions of perfect knowledge value-based decisions can produce planned consequences, and vice-versa.

In its behavioural emphasis, Chapin's framework takes as its prime source components of the field of Human ecology. The ecological approach to man in his environment emerged through the "use of biological analogies in the study of human populations which provided the initial impetus to the theory of human ecology" (Robson 1969, p.8). However, the human ecology of cities has evolved as a more complex set of relationships than that originally conceived by the so-called "Chicago" school of urban ecologists: Park, Burgess, Mackenzie and their adherents. Their approach was based upon a distinction between two aspects of human life: the communal and the societal; the former a "biotic" phenomenon emanating from Darwin; the latter a purely "cultural" phenomenon pertaining to the human capacity for communication and concensus. By this distinction the societal aspect of man was viewed as "a superstructure lying above the more basic competitive biotic level of community" (Robson 1969, p.10). Having its base in the biotic level of activity, the
analogy with plant ecology emphasizes the fundamental competitive process, which in human terms is invariably associated with the economic competition. As a result theories pertaining to urban growth and structure focused upon economic competition for desirable relationships in space; space being an medium for activity. Thus, economic behaviour in cities has formed the nucleus of the major theories of urban growth and structures presented by Burgess (Concentric Zone Theory 1923), Hoyt (Sector Theory 1939) and Harris & Ullman (Multiple Nuclei Theory 1945).

In reaction to the economic bias of location theory as it emerged form the work of the Chicago School, theoretical criticism by Alihan (1938) and empirical research by Firey (1947) maintained that:

"man's culture and the mesh of social stimuli surrounding his actions and decisions could not be ignored or thought away in an attempt to carry through a biological analogy to account for the structuring and patterning of towns".

(Robson 1969, p.18)

While a social dimension was added to the concepts of human ecology, further separating it from plant ecology, and more fully indicating behavioural relationships of human beings, the fragmented nature of the field of human ecology has been examined by Michelson (1970) with the conclusion that "physical variables and their interrelation with social variables has been very largely neglected" (Michelson 1970, p.16). Four reasons are given for this: (1) a primarily deterministic approach to
behaviour treating space as a medium for interaction rather than as a variable component of interaction with a potential effect of its own; (2) a tendency to conceive of the urban population in terms of aggregates, thus negating individual behaviour and its inherent multifaceted relationship to the physical environment; (3) a narrow focus upon man's relationships to other men rather than to his environment; and (4) a relative lack of awareness of the formative pressures of social behaviour in the face of changing urban conditions.

By implication, Michelson suggests that by encompassing the above neglected facets of behaviour, urban ecology as a discipline would conceptually satisfy current needs to explain and anticipate man's relationship to his environment. In the light of its principal origins in the concepts of urban ecology, Chapin's behavioural framework stands up to Michelson's criticism:

1. Inasmuch as values form the basis of actions with respect to land use and values are a product of human experience "in a specific cultural, economic and physical setting" (Chapin 1957, p.30), the framework considers the physical environment/space as a determinant variable in human behaviour.

2. The framework is predicated upon behaviour patterns which may or may not be an aggregation of individual behaviour cycles; with its inherent neutrality the framework commits equal emphasis to individual action and reaction in relation to
either other individuals or groups.

3. While the framework emphasises human interaction, it is interaction focused upon resulting land use, the significant formative element of the urban environment; the framework is predicated upon interactions as a result of man's awareness of his environment in terms of his values.

4. The separation of social behaviour into personal and public components, giving them equal status with economic behaviour recognizes the public interest as a source of action with respect to land use and the environment. It recognizes the importance of social action when men in groups act in a public capacity separate from their personal capacities.

Chapin's framework, in meeting Michelson's criticism, effectively achieves at a general level the comprehensive approach to man and his environment that Michelson takes as his goal at more specific levels of interest. The overt focus of Chapin's framework, land use pattern, is readily interpreted as the physical environment. Actions pertaining to land use decisions need not necessarily be other land use decisions but attitude stances toward the environment created by the land use. The versatility of the framework makes it an ideal vehicle with which to study behaviour emanating from values as it responds to the actions affecting the urban environment, specifically a public investment in land use intended to influence the urban
environment. The foregoing review reinforces the applicability of the framework as a conceptual tool in the analysis of current planning problems.

CONCEPT II - A TACTICAL PLAN

As a basic precept of democratic society, individual freedom of action is accompanied by the exercise of private initiative. Private initiative may be directed towards any goal within certain legal constraints devised in the public interest. These legal constraints stand as guidelines for individual action, a means of resolving conflict amongst individuals, and for the protection of the community from actions of individuals and vice versa; initiative, however, remains for the most part a matter of individual or corporate choice.

This fact has particular significance when applied to the objectives of urban planning and to the planning process itself. Planning is a public function which in our society is dependant upon private actions or initiative for effectuation. The process of urban development is becoming increasingly subjected to a sophisticated planning rationale which, in its ultimate manifestation, is encased in a legal framework to prevent its erosion by strong, dynamic private forces. The need for such institutionalization is evidence of the generally divergent goals of government as custodian of public welfare and individual and/or corporate entities in their pursuit of economic
self-interest. The dominant position of private initiative in urban development dictates that means be devised to align public and private goals without significant modification of sound public goals and, concomitantly, the realization of private goals through complementary channels. The economic nature of private goals is such that positive action will take place in the presence of effective inducements.

The search for effective inducements has been an aim of planning since the introduction of zoning as a technique of land use control. Essentially zoning is a "negative" inducement to positive action; it specifies the limits of what may be done in accordance with set standards. It is one of many regulatory concepts which attempt to align public and private goals with respect to land use and the environmental quality of urban areas. Dissatisfaction with these techniques has increased with the growing realization that their negative nature inhibits creative solutions to problems of urban development and redevelopment (Feiss 1961). On the "positive" side, public monetary policy has aided in inducing limited private response in urban development; and urban renewal programs, likewise, have attempted to stimulate private response, with varying degrees of success.

The search for effective inducements has resulted in one conceptual approach to planning and plan implementation which incorporates the desirability of creating effective inducements which will influence the private sector.
The Tactical Plan

In formulating the "tactical plan" Guttenberg (1964) maintains that there are only two methods of securing the cooperation of private individuals or groups without coercion: persuasion and tactics. Each is briefly described by the author:

"Persuasion works on the motive of the individual so as to confirm it in the public point of view. By education and argument he is made to see that in the long run self-interest is better served when private action encompasses the public good....

"The essential method of tactics is not to divert the individual from his pursuit of self-interest, but rather to change the field in which he acts, so that his private actions are more likely to follow paths which contribute to the realization of the public objective." (p.198)

Guttenberg incorporates the concepts of persuasion and tactics as the basis of two types of community development plan - the goal plan and the tactical plan - in order that the role of individual social and economic initiative in moulding urban form may be examined (Guttenberg p.199). The plans are complementary in nature; the former specifying a form to be striven for, the latter providing a means of achieving that form.

The nature of the goal plan is such that it elicits support in principal and is, therefore, successful as a persuasive device; however, lacking explicit measures to ensure realization
in a society dependent primarily upon private initiative, the probability is high that the plan will be left behind by events over which the community has only limited control. The long-range public goal, to which tacit agreement has been given, may easily be overwhelmed in the pursuit of market-oriented goals (Guttenberg p.203).

The tactical plan is, first and foremost, an adjunct to the goal plan; its primary feature is its emphasis upon the control of present trends to guide them towards the eventual realization of the goal plan. This control factor is emphasized by comparison with conventional capital programming as a device for plan implementation:

"Conventional programming...is concerned with carrying out the various elements of the plan, subject only to considerations of present or anticipated need, whereas tactical planning addresses itself to shaping actively the background conditions required by the plan, i.e. those general market orientations and locational preferences of the metropolitan community which are consistent with the features of the goal plan and necessary for its realization".

(Guttenberg, p.204)

Recognizing the behavioural predilection of individuals to be governed by market forces in the pursuit of their private interests, the principle of tactical planning is to take advantage of the flexibility of the market to redirect its inherent momentum towards the long-range public goal by policies which precondition market response.
The applicability of the approach is illustrated by Guttenberg by application to a theoretical metropolitan problem; it is, however, applicable to the implementation of goal plans in any sphere of urban interest and to problems for which the solution derived is in opposition to the present trends.

Its application is particularly suited to the goals of urban renewal, where the market has directed its interests elsewhere. Much urban renewal activity may be viewed as tactical use of public investment to achieve physical, social and economic revitalization goals. Some projects in attempting to subvert the market mechanism have failed as tactical tools by incurring unjustified costs, both social and economic. The justification for the costs of tactics is based by Guttenberg upon two factors:

"First, the intrinsic merit of the goals or objective on behalf of which a cost may be required....the merit of the objective (is) its power, if achieved, to restore to the individual or to his dependants or successors more than was taken from him, or its power to save him from a greater future loss and this without depriving another individual....the ultimate moral test of any tactical plan.

"The second factor is the aptness of the measures of the plan, their ability to achieve the desired objective. A single tactic, or set of tactics, may be applied at the wrong place or at the wrong time, so that it fails. These failures do not invalidate the objective itself, but they are wasteful, and in this case the cost is not justified....the technical test of the tactical plan".

(Guttenberg, 1964, p.212)
Forrester (1969) presents a concept analogous to the "tactical plan", congruent in its focus on the utilization of forces already in existence in the city of achieve long-range desired results. While Forrester stresses re-evaluation of existing forces in the context of the city as a closed, potentially self-regulating system, analogy to Guttenberg's stress on the possible manipulation of existing forces, appears valid. Forrester maintains that the possibility for two types of action exists: firstly, "a frontal assault with direct-action programs aimed at correcting deficiencies", and secondly, actions "to alter the internal system which has created the deficiencies" (Forrester, p.120). In negating the results experienced by the first approach, and giving emphasis to the latter, Forrester explains with reference to his computer modelled "systems" conception of the city that:

"When the system behaviour is understood, the internal incentives that are creating difficulty can usually be altered at much less expense than would be necessary for direct-action programs aimed at reducing symptoms....The internal forces in most social systems are so powerful that they will likely dominate any effect to treat symptoms if treatment does not reach the true structural causes. Conversely, if causes can be reversed, an internally generated revival can proceed faster and with more lasting effect than if the treatment comes from the outside."

(Forrester, p.120)

The analogy is strengthened by a common emphasis on the modification of recognized trends by administrative action which would change the context within which formative elements of the city operate. While Guttenberg's approach to urban dynamics
implied by the tactical plan does not have its base in Forrester's rigorous computer-oriented systems approach, it is in fact a systems approach at the level of generalization cited previously in Chapter 1, with reference to the Committee on Social and Behavioural Urban Research (1967). Their conclusions are basically the same: in recognizing a problem and formulating a goal to resolve it, the successful achievement lies in tactics or policies which will manipulate existing pressures which, having internal momentum of their own, resist change.

Raquet (1970) provides further support of the principle of "tactical planning when he states:

"The planner is still left with the problem of providing for the descent of the plan....many factors tend to show that it would be unwise to rely on persuasion in its usual sense to provide for the descent of the plan. The problem is to set up a signalling device which will ensure that planees will do the right thing." (p.53)

THE PLANNING PERSPECTIVE: A SUMMARY

A behavioural approach to land use, and by implication to the urban environment, has been suggested through Chapin's schematic framework which translates values (economic, social and public interest) through behavioural interaction to the urban environment. In this manner values have been shown to be the formative element of the urban environment, having the capacity to effect both pure and modified consequences of individual or group behaviour, resulting in both planned and unplanned manifestations in the environment.
Guttenberg's tactical plan expresses an approach to plan implementation which takes into account existing behavioural characteristics of urban man. It is based upon recognition of the often incompatible nature of man's public and private values and goals. The private attachment of the individual to personal economic values (and we may impute here, in many cases to personal social values) results in self-contradictory behaviour with respect to their public interest values expressed through public representatives charged with the general public interest. As a result public actions, initiated in the public interest, and to which approval in principle has been given by individuals, may fail to realize their objectives as private actions in the pursuit of self-interest proceed in opposition to the future goal.

Guttenberg offers "tactics" as a solution short of coercion to align private actions with the public interest. Realizing the primacy of individual motivation in achieving public goals, tactics are intended to change the field of action rather than the basic motivation, so that the frame of reference for individual initiative corresponds to the public goal to be achieved. In order that tactics be effective they must be based upon a knowledge of motivation in order that a frame of reference be devised appropriate to the ultimate goal. Chapin's framework provides a vehicle within which this operation may be undertaken.
Assuming a public goal has been formulated with a desired end product or consequence in view, the question may be asked: "what actions will produce private response to ensure its achievement?" In other words: "what public actions will provide a frame of reference for private actions consistent with the ultimate goal?".

Public actions may be either negative or positive in nature, expressed in terms of either regulation or stimulation of private action. The tactical concept is most compatible with positive action. Chapin's framework indicates that actions taken in the public interest have the potential to interact with and stimulate behaviour patterns of privately motivated action, thereby influencing the final consequences of the public action. In taking positive actions based upon the recognition that certain private responses, based on economic and social values, will take place, planned consequences may be assured.

Application of the tactical method within this framework is the object of the research undertaken by this thesis. The siting and construction of a public administrative complex is here considered a tactical action to achieve expressed public goals of urban revitalization. With reference to the framework, human behaviour, having its origin in certain social and economic values, may be presented, which may reasonably be expected to respond to stimulation by the public action to
achieve the planned goal. The following two chapters represent an attempt to indicate social and economic behavioural characteristics which may be relied upon to respond to such stimulation, thereby validating the location decision as a tactical planning tool to achieve environmental improvement goals.
The purpose of this section is to articulate social behaviour, having as its base consciously or unconsciously held values, which may respond to the environmental stimulation created by a public building. Rappoport (1969) suggests that the study of the individual's behavioural relationship to his environment "may most profitably be done by relating the stimulus properties of the environment to their symbolic manifestations, which are a function of culture as well as individual development, and by examining the effects of the symbolic environments which men create". (p.122)

Man's propensity to think in terms of symbols on both the conscious and the unconscious level is well documented (Mumford, 1961, Jaffe 1964); it is a propensity which has its origins in man's need to bring meaning and order to a world of events and actions, and to express his value-orientations (Norberg-Schulz 1971). The
equation of social values with their symbolic manifestations in
the urban environment is, at best, a complex task necessitating
a selective approach based upon the direction that "there are
times when we want to know only the significant elements of an
environment, those elements that are so central to the full
picture that a change in them would mean that the whole scene
would have different implications" (Michelson 1970 p.36).

In identifying the significant elements of the environ­
ment in question and their symbolic manifestations of social
values, the disciplinary divisions of the Behavioural sciences:
psychology, sociology, and anthropology, provide a natural
framework. Social values, through behaviour may be considered
either personal, communal, or cultural. The distinction permits
a consideration of urban behaviour in terms of the individual as
a product of personality, of social experiences, and of cultural
characteristics. At each level, different symbolic associations
condition and stimulate man's response to his environment.

The environment is by definition the "aggregate of
surrounding things, conditions and influences" (Randam House 1969).
The common medium or element of man and his environment is space;
man exists in space, as do the objects of his attention; further­
more, conditions and influences are transmitted to him through
space. The relationship of man to space or his behaviour in
space has, therefore, a fundamental bearing on all urban activ­
ities. Schneider (1968) in calling space the "urban resource"
(p.182) emphasizes our lost appreciation of the social importance
of urban space while pursuing its economic attributes. As space
is the common denominator of social and economic activity in the
urban environment, it is an appropriate point of reference with which to document the personal, social, and cultural facets of urban behaviour and their symbolic associations and manifestations.

Norberg-Schulz (1971) indicates the multiplicity of spatial concepts and their relationship to man when he distinguishes five concepts: "the pragmatic space of physical action, the perceptual space of immediate orientation, the existential space which forms man's stable image of his environment, the cognitive space of the physical world, and the abstract space of pure logical relations. Pragmatic space integrates man in his natural, "organic" environment; perceptual space is essential to his identity as a person; existential space makes him belong to a social and cultural totality, cognitive space means that he is able to think about space, and logical space, finally, offers the tool to describe the others." (Norberg-Schulz 1971 p.11).

Of these five spatial concepts, the perceptual, existential and cognitive describe man's relationship to his urban environment. These concepts may be aligned to correspond with man's environmental behaviour in his roles as "ego", or "self", as social being, and as cultural member. The distinction is an artificial one, as are those of the behavioural disciplines, as they all exist and take their essential meaning from their relationship to the individual. However, such abstraction and alignment permits the indication of the origins of man's symbolic relationships to his environment, and their manifestation through the medium of space. A parallel process will be presented in the following chapter pertaining to man's economic behaviour with respect to urban space.
Frames of reference may be devised for each spatial relationship:

(1) Perceptual Space and Personal Behaviour
(2) Existential Space and Social Behaviour
(3) Cognitive Space and Cultural Behaviour

These frames of reference provide the basis for the following three sections pertaining to the urban environment in general and public buildings in particular. The sections are based upon evident relationships within each dichotomy:

1. Perceptual space is ego-centred and therefore territorially oriented.

2. Existential space is socially-centred, and activity-oriented as individuals interact or seek to interact with others.

3. Cognitive space is an intellectual abstraction permitting the endowment of meaning to objects and space; "meaning" at a pervasive cultural level.

PERSONAL BEHAVIOUR AND PERCEPTUAL SPACE

The concept of perceptual space presented previously by Norberg-Schulz, is amplified by Soja (1971):

"Each human being creates his own "activity space" which becomes the context for his most detailed knowledge of his environment and within which most of his daily activities are regularly carried out. At the micro-scale, each individual surrounds himself with a portable series of space, or personal distance
zoning, "bubbles" which guide and shape his interaction with other individuals. Thus without formal boundaries, space becomes organized and structured.... (Soja 1971 p.1).

Implicit in this description is the concept of "territoriality", a behavioural characteristic first identified by the field of animal ecology having application to human behaviour. Greenbie (1971) describes territoriality as:

"...The perceived space that surrounds an individual or group which serves to identify it as distinct within a larger group of the same species...it may be defined in an infinite variety of ways. All that matters is that the boundaries are recognizable (to the individual).... Territory is not a "thing", and other kinds of property including vehicles or buildings are territorial only to the extent that they are symbols defining territory." (p.165).

Parr (1965) describes the concept of territory in dynamic motion as "orbit" or the "space through which an individual habitually or occasionally roams" (p.3).

The complexity of territorial perception from the ego-base is infinite, perception being a function of personal motivation and past experience (Norberg-Schulz 1972). In reaction to the complexity of potential territorial associations in the urban environment, man internally simplifies his environment by the selection of elements or symbols which "are used to structure information from the environment which otherwise would become unmanageable due to its fantastically rich sensory bombardment" (Rappoport 1969 p.123). Langer (1967) maintains that the symbol-making process in itself is inately complex and inherently dynamic when she states that "the effect of symbolic expression is prim-
arily the formulation of perceptual experience, and the constant reformulation of the conceptual frames which the cumulative symbolizing techniques - conscious or unconscious, but rarely altogether absent - establish, one upon another, one in another, one by negation of another" (p.80). Despite the complexity of its formulation, symbolic projection is viewed as "the crucial humanizing activity" (Langer 1967 p.80).

It is the characteristic of symbolic projection which underlies the work of Lynch (1960). Taking as his base the individual's perception of his environment, Lynch examines the symbolic characteristics of the city as they emerge in the conscious and unconscious attempts of individuals to humanize or personalize the urban environment. Lynch examines the stimulus properties of the environment with emphasis upon the individual's perception of and response to its physical nature. The elements of urban form which emerged - paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks - constitute the basic symbolic mechanisms by which the individual perceives his space and by which he identifies himself in the context of his physical environment. The environmental image is created by a two-way process between the observer and the observed: "What he sees is based on exterior form, but how he interprets and organizes this, and how he directs his attention in its turn affects what he sees" (Lynch 1960 p.131). The image begins with perception of objects and space which can be identified. The image when complete may be seen in terms of identity, structure and meaning. Identity is created in conjunction with an object as a separate entity;
structure is created through the spatial or pattern relationship of
the object to the individual; and meaning emerges by the practical
or emotional associations of the individual. Lynch stresses the
attributes of identity and structure to emphasize the physical
environment as an independent variable in the construction of
the individual's image of the city; stating his purpose to be:
"simply to consider the need for identity and structure in our
perceptual world, and to illustrate the special relevance of
this quality (imageability) to the particular case of the
complex, shifting urban environment" (1960 p.10). As a result
the elements constituting imageability are purely descriptive
without value attachment indicative of meaning.

The elements of imageability are also the elements
of territoriality or orbit; they are basically orientational
devices. Of the five elements Lynch identifies, none of them exist
in isolation: "Districts are structural with nodes, defined by
edges, penetrated by paths and sprinkled with landmarks."

Under the recognition that man is "centre or place"
and, "foci or object" oriented (Norberg-Schulz 1971, Lynch 1960),
as he purposefully moves about his city, Lynch's concepts of the
node and landmark are singled out for further definition and
examination.

The node and landmark are point-references in the urban
environment. By definition, nodes are "points; the strategic
spots in a city into which the observer can enter, and which
are the intensive foci to and from which he is travelling" (Lynch
1960 p.47). Landmarks are "point references considered to be
external to the observer....(their) key characteristic....is singularity, some aspect that is unique or memorable in the context." (Lynch 1960 p.78).

Two types of node are evident, the junction and the thematic concentration. Lynch's discoveries with respect to junction resulted in the conclusion that "because decisions must be made at junctions, people heighten their attention at such places and perceive nearby elements with more than normal clarity. This tendency was confirmed so repeatedly that elements located at junctions may automatically be assumed to derive special prominence from their location" (p.72-73). Thematic concentrations are characterized by the collection of uses or activities resulting in conceptual anchorpoints, of which Lynch maintains that:

"the first prerequisite of such perceptual support is the achievement of identity by (its) singular and continuous quality....the essence of this type of element is that it be a distinct unforgettable place" (Lynch 1960 p.102).

With respect to landmarks, Lynch concludes that: "there seems to be a tendency of those more familiar with the city to rely increasingly on systems of landmarks as their guide to enjoy uniqueness and specialization...." (1960 p.78) and further, that landmarks "become more easily identifiable if they have a clear form; if they contrast with their background; and if there is some prominence of spatial location. (p.78-79).

A dominant image of a "sense of place" accompanies the node and landmark elements; a sense of place primarily in terms
of physical form as perceived by the individual. Banz (1971) has stated that a sense of place enables "individuals to relate spatially to the aspects of urban life they specifically choose to identify with." (p.118). Thus nodes and landmarks in creating a sense of place become symbols of territorial identification and definition in the manner that Greenbie (1971) has suggested.

As territorial symbols located in the urban core, nodes and landmarks constitute what Richards calls a "collection of symbols and a familiar assembly of objects having certain associations and reviving certain memories" (1952 p.61). Ultimately meaning must be attached to physical form. Lynch has not pursued this field, other than to say of landmarks in particular: "once a history, a sign or a meaning attaches to an object, its value as a landmark rises." (1960 p.81). In general he concludes that:

"non-physical characteristics....may enhance the imageability of an element....Meanings and associations, whether social, historical, functional, economic or individual....strongly reinforce such suggestions towards identity and structure as may be latent in the physical form itself." (1960 p.108).

The application of meaning to significant urban form is the subject of the following two sections.
The previous section has been based upon man's personal relation to objects in space; this section is based upon his social interaction through space.

Norberg-Schulz' concept of existential spaces provides the medium with which to relate man's social activity to his urban environment. The previous definition of existential space may be expanded by contrast to the concept of perceptual space. While perceptual space is characterized by its dynamic nature and objective focus, existential space is characterized by its stable nature and objective focus. Norberg-Schulz explains that "The 'personal space' defined in the concept of 'territorality' should not...be confounded with existential space, which to a large extent has a 'public' character, bringing the members of society together in common places" (1971 p.20).

Existential space, therefore, is a medium for social integration as the individual "discovers a structured whole which he shares with others, and which more than anything else gives him a sense of identity" (Norberg-Schulz, 1971 p.29). At a level above his perception of space as it pertains to his orientation in his environment, the individual experiences interaction in space which further defines his environment and himself. Gideon (1952) aptly describes the relationship of man's perception of space to existential space when he describes the city as "an expression of intimate relationships between man and man, between the spheres of
the individual and the community" (p.162). The city is the epitome of existential space: a man-made device to facilitate interaction on an unlimited number of levels.

Being space-bound within the city, human interaction traditionally takes place at points in space which have been variously called nucleii, cores, foci, centres, etc. Paulssen (1952) discussing the psycho-social functions of "cores" as they relate to activities performed outside the family group maintains that all non-family activities are performed within some sort of urban institution, each with its own core, or indigenous focus: a market place, a religious core, an administrative core, depending upon the individual and community needs. Paulsson concludes that "every group activity outside the home gives life to a core of some kind. The cores existing in a community condition the orbits of its inhabitants." (1952 p.29).

Man's propensity to organize his activities in terms of cores or nucleii is well documented. Mumford (1961) describes certain physical manifestations of urban institutions as being the "activating nucleus of the urban implosion" symptomatic of the general nature of urban activities as cities were in their formulative stages. The statement has applicability to the contemporary city under the pressures of expansion as there is a corresponding implosion of social activity into "institutionalized" nucleii: for example, schools, shopping centres and recreation centres. Carver (1961) supports this view, he maintains that man's
need for a traditional focus for his activities must be met in the suburbs as well as the central city: "The focal points in the residential city must be contrived out of the interests people share as consumers, citizens and householders. These interests take physical form in the institutions that serve a community." (p.64).

Man's need for physical foci to correspond with his space-bound circumstances survives despite Webbers (1964) assertion that: "it is interaction, not place that is the essence of the city and city life." (p.147). (that the city as a communication device must be freed from any sense of place). It is exactly man's sense of place that defines and humanizes his interaction with others. While he has increasingly sophisticated communication techniques for interaction, he requires a stable, place-based physical environment which facilitates face-to-face contact amplifying personal identity.

The urban core potentially satisfies this human requirement at the highest level in the hierarchy of urban activity centres being the most intense concentration of human activity in cities. As a place of work and a service centre it contains the broadest range of urban functions having the broadest range of potential participants or users in a relatively small space. It is the urban social-centre.
The concept of cognitive space is one pertaining to the expressive content of space. In the hierarchy of man's urban spatial relations so far presented, it exudes the highest degree of "informative" content at the most pervasive level of recognition. Norberg-Schulz aligns the concept of cognitive space with what he variously calls "expressive", "aesthetic" or "architectural" space, thereby linking man's ability to think about space with his ability to create it and endow it with meaning. Paralleling the previous descriptions of perceptual space and existential space, cognitive space may be described as having a stable nature and subjective focus.

The articulation of urban space by physical form is more than the creation of objects for orientation or places of activity, it is also the conscious expression of ideas with respect to the nature of the city and urban life.

Urban form by one contemporary definition is the physical pattern of land use, population distribution and service networks (Wurster, 1963 p.75). Such a definition is indicative of a technical approach to urban form and the physical environment. Urban form, by traditional definition, has been a primarily architectural definition indicative of an intellectual approach to the physical environment. Bacon (1967) defines architectural form as "an expression of the philosophical interaction of the forces of mass, and space, which in turn reflects
the relationship between a man and nature and man and the universe" (p.16). This latter definition has equal validity when applied to urban form in as much as urban form is the result of conscious creation of objects and spaces in a particular cultural context. "Urban form" in its technical definition suggests nothing of the inately cultural forces which combine to produce the visible result.

Historically, urban form has emerged according to cultural values and behaviour. One need only compare the Occidental city with the Oriental city to see basic differences in form which have their bases in cultural propensities (Rappoport 1969). However, despite physical differences in form, there are abundant parallels evident between cultures indicating that there has been a pre-occupation with "form" in its intellectual connotations (as above) as a means of expressing deeply held cultural values. Form, therefore, has an ideographic nature; it may be a visual representation of ideas or values and thus a symbolic device.

It has long been recognized that ideographic representation is a significant function of cities and one which contributed greatly to their initial creation and viability. In Mumford's words: "The ability to transmit in symbolic forms and human patterns a representative portion of a culture is the great mark of the city: this is the condition for encouraging the fullest expression of human capacities and potentialities...." (1961 p.93).
The ideographic nature of pre-industrial cities was facilitated by its relatively compact physical nature and its specialized role in a dominantly agricultural society. Examples can be drawn from any cultural background in the history of pre-industrial urbanization to support the ideographic nature of urban form. Smith (1935) recounts that the artistic approach of the builders of ancient Egypt's religious urban complexes was "persistently ideographic, dealing always with the fundamental communal ideas." (p.241). The existence of communal ideas or values is accompanied by the desire to express them, to communicate them, and to reinforce them through a medium compatible or consistent with the values themselves and one which fosters value-stabilization. In their search for expressive and stable media, the pre-Guttenberg urbanite was limited to architectural form primarily because of its availability and durability as a medium. However, its suitability was reinforced by the universality of its audience. Banz (1970) provides perspective on the lasting effect architectural form has had as urban symbolism:

"The successful expression of functions and aspirations within the urban community must have strengthened the very forces which resulted in urban forms in the just place. The act of building represents in itself an effort by an individual or a community to establish and preserve values. Thus as the urban community found its fitting form, it became an institution. Form itself, particularly monumental form, became a dominant force in the stabilization and eventual ossification of the traditional urban social structure." (p.8).
With respect to the stabilizing effect of form and particularly monumental form, it is held by some historians that the concept of "media as message" fostered by McHuhnan was inherently understood and utilized to a high degree of sophistication by the formative elements of pre-industrial society; while media have changed, the functions performed by them have remained constant throughout the evolution of human expression. Gowans (1970) outlines four functions of expressive media, one of which is the expression of conviction and persuasion. Of the expression of conviction, he states:

"(the arts of conviction are) images intended to carry self-conviction to their makers - tangible symbols..., which establish and define things experience has established to be true. Because the image exists, the truth it embodies exists also in a more convincing and tangible form; so such symbols become means for coping with and controlling the world..." (p.307);

Further he states:

"Arts of conviction will tend to be ideographic in form" (p.308).

The utilization of architectural form as ideographic symbols of conviction is clearly seen during Europe's Renaissance, Baroque and Neo-classic intellectual periods, when large scale urban design projects manipulated the urban environment for conscious effect. A carry-over is evident in America.

The urban forms of Colonial North and South America were initially conceived as physical representations of ideas, either based upon entirely new communal concepts or associated with the
ideology of their European points of origin. Reps (1965) and Mumford (1961) have elaborated extensively on this phenomenon. The North American urban tradition, therefore, grew from a cultural emphasis or urban form through urban spatial design and architecture. Jefferson's search for a truly American urban form, expressive of the values inherent in Democracy and cohesive in its expression of conviction and concomittant powers of persuasion, succeeded in instilling a cultural identification with specific architectural forms by promoting them as ideographic symbols of the powers of unity in a country of great size. The nature and structure of democracy is such that it lends itself to the dissemination and proliferation of symbols supporting the values of its citizens. The result in the United States, and in Canada, where a similar evolution occurred (Gowans 1966, Kalman 1968) has been the consistent and conscious creation of architectural ideographs to symbolize the society-state relationship.

These forms have been challenged by the most dynamic and pervasive force in America: commerce and the artifacts of commerce. Tunnard (1955) aptly isolates three significant forms on the urban skyline which he calls the Temples of Commerce, Temples to God, and the Temples of Government. All three forms compete to communicate through form values entrenched in the institutions which create them. Gowans (1970) describes such artifacts as "our equivalent of those ancient monuments made by common consent to serve community needs carrying compulsive symbolism implicit in their forms" (p.309); they are images of conviction. The desire
to create such images is increasingly evidenced by the physical forms of the urban core in its metropolitan context, as the "temples of commerce" vie to communicate stable and prestigious images in increasingly monumental form.

This propensity is not limited only to commerce, but also is evinced by social institutions at various levels. The highest level perhaps being a hybrid global-national phenomenon known as World's Fairs; at a lower level national and provincial capitals perform this role; at the community level civic buildings express the continuity and stability of the social system through local government. Banţ (1971) describes this propensity as the "will to form", of which he states:

"Urban symbolism is inherent in the major communal structures in which a collective will to form has found valid expression. In such buildings widely different subcommunities may recognize their common roots and dominant artifacts may continue to condition the urban environment and, through it, collective attitudes. This relationship roots individuals directly in the past, permits them to draw on the collective values of former times, and offers them orientation in time." (p.112).

The technique involves the expressive use of style and form as "elements of communication: that is they are types of environmental language which sends out meaningful messages" (Jencks 1972 p.6). The meaningful message is one of conviction and, latterly, persuasion. By endowing urban form with symbolic meaning man inherently strengthens his image of the city and reinforces his personal identity.
URBAN BEHAVIOUR AND THE PUBLIC BUILDING

On three levels, the personal, social and cultural, urban behaviour has been presented, indicative of man's relationship to the built environment through his actions in space.

At each level of behaviour, urban man encounters uses and relates to the "temples of government". The specialized role of government buildings does not discount its integral function as part of the form and activities of the urban core. Following through with the separation of behavioural and spatial concepts, man's relationship to public buildings, specifically buildings for the administration of government, taken here to include the legislative and judicial functions, may be presented and examined as a logical extension of urban behaviour.

THE PERCEPTUAL LEVEL

Lynch (1960) has presented five elements of the urban image; it is obvious through his research that the administrative and cultural facilities of government play a significant role in the image of the city as orientation devices. He presents examples from three major American cities of diverse character and form. Public buildings emerge as landmark elements on the basis of architectural form and their articulation of urban space.

Unique architectural characteristics both of mass and detail set them visually apart from their surroundings. This was clearly evidenced with respect to the Boston State House and the Los Angeles City Hall.
Added emphasis was gained by their association with formal and informal open spaces or squares: "nodes" in Lynch's terminology. This was further amplified in the case of Los Angeles City Hall by its being the focus of a "district" created by civic buildings combining to present a distinct unforgettable place.

The combination of landmark and node: of public building and public square is a strong element of imageability. Lynch maintains that: "Single landmarks, unless they are dominant ones, are likely to be weak references by themselves" (p.101), and the node "more remarkable if provided with one or two objects which are the foci of attention (p.102). In combination they fortify each other. Norberg-Schulz indicates this phenomena when he states with respect to squares:

"Because of its size the square provides the necessary perspective in which to admire main buildings of the town, whose functions as physical and psychological 'landmarks' are thereby accentuated." (1971 p.85).

He amplifies this statement by maintaining that:

"To remove important public buildings from the core of the urban structure is therefore to destroy it." (p.85).

Admiration in this case is cogent for its perceptual connotation. As landmark and nodal elements of the individuals' "territory", the public building is a stable symbolic manifestation defining an individual's orbit. Having universal recognition it may be taken as constituting a prominent element in the orbits of all core users.
Lyman and Scott (1967) distinguish four territorial concepts: public territories, home territories, interactional territories, and body territories. These concepts are differentiated upon the basis of "access"; they conclude: "Although man's domination over space is potentially unlimited in contemporary society, it appears that men acknowledge fewer free territories for themselves" (p.66). Public territory provides the highest degree of individual freedom of access; public buildings, as objects defining public territory offers universal access.

THE EXISTENTIAL LEVEL

"Landmarks often correspond to centres in existential space" (Norberg-Schulz 1971 p.39) and the public administrative building is first and foremost an activity centre, qualified only by its specialized function.

As an activity centre it functions in two directions: (1) as a goal or specific urban destination, and (2) as a point of departure. As an employment, business and visitor destination, it draws randomly from all areas of a metropolitan region independent of its role as a service building for one political component of an urban region (even though it would be safe to assume that the highest proportion of employees and visitors come from within the political boundary) (further its relationship to the political district it serves necessitates a "central" location, i.e. one within the district core). With respect to
its internal function, it is a destination for all segments of the urban population, at some point in their lives due to the "public" nature of the activities which take place within. (In contrast, landmark centres performing primarily "private" activities, may draw from select and exclusive segments of the urban population.) Having attracted both regular and intermittent users (employers and visitors) it is a point of departure: employees at regular, peak periods; visitors sporadically. Employees with their midday departure and return are "captive" contributors to the social and economic life of the core; visitors, both on business and pleasure are incidental contributors.

If, in addition to its capacity as a centre of activity based on its internal function, it is also an element in an urban node, its value as an activity centre is increased. Public spaces or squares, in conjunction with public buildings, have traditionally been centres of urban "outdoor" activity; "a gathering place for people, humanizing them by mutual contact... a psychological parking place" (Zucker 1959 p11). A symbiotic relationship emerges between public building and public square with respect to human interaction in much the same manner as previously indicated with individual perception. The building gives life to the square, and the square in turn provides a setting for the building and security for its users through its pedestrian orientation, fostering interaction.
THE COGNITIVE LEVEL

Of the "public" architectural forms consistently found in cities, public administrative buildings at the civic level are those universally manifest, having rich ideographic connotations recognized by all.

The creation of every political urban unit has eventually been accompanied by a community desire to give "suitable" concrete form to their actualized citizen-state creation of urban government. That is to provide more than just a structure from which to administer government but a form which will express "government". This need and desire is universal, having its base in the need to express stability and continuity by:

"a building which will proudly express its function as the centre of civic government...a building that suggests government, continuity of certain democratic traditions, and service to the community." (City of Toronto 1958).

It is thus a static expression of consciously held conviction. In addition an action component exists: a persuasive goal. This goal has recently been expressed in statements such as:

"All efforts must be made to create both a sitting and latterly a structure in which to embody the civic government so as to both invite citizen interest (and) participation and engender a feeling of pride and belonging to the city" (City of Regina 1969 p.2)

In their symbolic context public buildings fall into an active social context expressed by Barber when he states:
"because they do take their meaning from the expression of sentiments, social symbols... are not endlessly rigid and stable. Their significance has to be continually defined and affirmed by manifestation of the relevant sentiments. When they are not forthcoming, symbols lose their meaning." (1972 p.329)

As the expression of national, provincial or civic sentiment, public administrative buildings are firmly rooted in an on-going process which maintains their relevance; adaptability and transfer-ability is implicit in the sentimental attachment as it (sentimental attachment) is not only directed towards physical form, but also towards function. While the form may change as utilitarian circumstances dictate; the basic function endures.

THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL CONTEXT

The composite nature of the Public Administrative Building suggests it has significant value pertaining to the form and activities of the urban core.

Historically, public buildings have stood aloof from the general activities of the urban core, primarily as a result of conscious and contrived separation to project its ideographic nature which dictated that it stand as a separate symbol of state. This view has been perpetuated not only on its intrinsic merit alone, but also because of a belief that it was inherently separate from and detrimental to the commercial life of the core and therefore, should be physically separate. Tyrwhitt (1952) expresses a view which indicates this general feeling with respect to the life of the urban core:
"Designing a Core for village or town, neighbourhood or city, is not the same thing as designing a group of civic buildings together with their related open spaces. The civic Centre, that monumental group of buildings, is not what is meant by the Core. The Core is not the seat of civic dignity; the core is the gathering place of the people." (p.103)

Burns (1963) amplifies and perpetuates this view when he states that: "local government offices will normally be planned in a separate area...so that...different character of the civic area does not affect the vitality and excitement of the shopping centre." (p.123).

Gruen (1964) emphatically discounts this approach as segregationist thinking; with respect to the components of the urban core he states:

"Segregators are destroyers of urban qualities and urban activity; by making communication as difficult as possible they are keeping people away from people." (p.106-107).

It would seem that the proponents of the segregationary viewpoint did not take into account that they were in fact isolating a large number of regular "dwellers" and frequent visitors to the core. This makes it difficult for the visitors to partake of the activities of the core, thereby limiting potential social and commercial interaction.

In the context that segregationary thinking was applied, the function of the urban core had not evinced its present trend towards its specialized tertiary and quarternary service functions. The Public Administrative Building, alone or as part of a Civic complex, has always, in effect, been a tertiary and quarternary activity centre. With the adoption of increasingly more sophisti-
cated techniques by the government and greater liason with the private sector, in the newly evolving context of the urban core it is inherently compatible with the dominant urban function. Public Buildings no longer warrant separation solely on the basis of function.

However, while functionally compatible on a general level, the origins and particular nature of the function of public buildings are distinct from the commercial orientation of core service functions. Its particular function necessitates concentration for efficiency of operation and a specialized form to house it. As a result its form remains a unique physical manifestation in the urban environment having physical functional and representational connotations. Together these attributes form the essence of a complex urban symbol, recognized by all inhabitants and having for them diverse meaning. Banz (1971) provides perspective on the role to be played by this symbol when he indicates:

"Total urban form is no longer within reach of objective evaluation but is perceived differently by individuals...only a few, if any, positive elements of the total form are recognized by all inhabitants as being part of their image of the city. These few elements are the formal common denominators which define the public image of an urban environment, the greater their number, the greater is the probability of social cohesion based on civic pride." (p.100)

Planning, as it is concerned with urban design, is concerned with the urban image. Planning is also concerned with social cohesion or the lack of it and objects having high "imageability" improve social cohesion.
Lynch has made a good case for the viability of his proposal that through urban design "we are now able to develop our image of the environment by operation on the external physical shape as well as by an internal learning process." (1960 p.12). By such actions or management we may achieve what Carr (1966) presents as an aim of planning in creating environmental form:

"(to) increase the relative exposure of city elements and settings of highest common significance, both functional and social. This will increase the amount of real experience of these settings and thus increase the realization of their personal meaning and value for more individuals. It will also tend to reinforce their common significance adding to group solidarity." (p.222).

In the context of urban design, the use of the significant form and the connotation of a public building to foster civic unity and pride corresponds to what von Eckardt (1971) maintains is the prime function of urban design:

"It (urban design) is supposed to give all citizens a sense of belonging, an identity, and be the instrument for the exercise of civitas, the dynamic creative order that makes civilization." (p.65).

He further states:

"How we build and rebuild, how we use urban space... is a result of our collective behaviour, a manifestation of our caring or uncaring response to the range of factors that constitute the city and its people." (p.66).

Of this range of factors, the Public Administrative Building has been shown to be endemic to human activity on the personal, social and cultural levels. On these levels it may continue to play a significant role in the changing context of the urban
The physical characteristics of a public building in the contemporary urban context indicate that its value as an urban orientational device may only increase.

As indicated at the outset of research (Government of Ontario, 1971) the Public Administrative Building, unique in function, requires a unique form. The economic realities of the production of a unique or special purpose structure having a relatively narrow range of adaptability to commercial requirements results in high initial costs and concomitantly a requirement for long term use. This is accompanied by relative increases in quality of construction to ensure longevity, and a need for architectural design which will not belie the function performed by the structure as architectural fashion changes.

The economic realities which underly the physical form of the public administrative building are complimented by the opposite economic realities of commercial structures resulting from increasingly standardized structures predicated upon adaptability to changing tennancies. As a result a marked physical contrast in form increases.

As urban landmarks commercial structures are rapidly losing their potential to affect orientation as even from a distance single elements are subsumed by the proliferation of tall anonymous structures. At street level in the urban core these
structures become increasingly alienated from human comprehension and perception due to their overwhelming size. Further, their increasingly homogeneous design provides correspondingly less detail to attract the individuals attention at his perceptive level. Thus, public buildings, of unique physical form, articulating space comprehensible to human perception, provide unique stable points of reference in an anonymous environment.

At the same time a reverse phenomenon is also evident at the street level perceptive sphere of the individual. The dynamic and relatively transitory nature of commercial activity, having high mobility and constantly changing accommodation requirements, is accompanied by a profusion of commercial symbols which has tended to produce a visually intricate and at times visually confusing environment. The public building lends clarity to this environment by its stable physical form. In an environment of constantly changing uses it may provide an orientational touchstone not only for the consumer seeking the location of services, but also for producers of services seeking to make their presence known. (It is not an uncommon advertising device to relate commercial location to significant features of the urban environment recognized by all).

The Existential Level

The functional characteristics of the Public Administrative Building in the contemporary urban context as an employment and visitor centre are based upon the fact that in most cities it is the most stable and consistently expanding human resource centre.
As an employment centre, the Public Administrative Building may be considered to be one of the largest single employment centres in urban cores, its size having a proportional relationship to the size of the urban area for which it is responsible. (A considerably higher proportion is naturally evident in centres of regional, provincial and national government.)

By nature, the employment centre is relatively fixed, yet it is continuously expanding in population with the expansion of government responsibility. While highly dependant upon human resources for the functioning of its bureaucratic hierarchy, its demographic character tends towards highly educated professional and clerical staff, a high proportion of clerical staff being female.

As a fixed and expanding employment node, the potential contribution of its employees to the vitality of the core appears great, as each one spends a significant portion of his or her daily life in the core. Seeking to utilize non-working time to personal advantage, they give additional life to retail, professional and entertainment service establishments, to the extent that it increasingly conditions the types of retail and professional services found in the urban core.

As a visitor destination the public administration building attracts a broad segment of the urban population for purposes ranging from the transaction of business to the monitoring of or participation in legislative sessions.
The pervasive nature of government regulatory power increases the necessity of business interaction requiring "in person" transactions. In addition closer liaison with private and other public entities make it a natural meeting place.

As interest in civic affairs increases with the complexity of urban problems of planning, development and management having significant effect on all citizens, City Hall increasingly becomes the focal point for political interaction and education, thereby reinforcing its role as a social centre.

The Cognitive Level

The ideographic nature of the Public Administrative Building in the contemporary urban context is clearly split between attachment to the past and optimistic expression of the future. Cities utilize their civic buildings in appropriate form to express their civic image. Historically this image has been governed by association with stability through democratic principles implicit in architectural detail (Jenck, 1972). Increasingly, it is evident that the contemporary civic ideograph attempts to incorporate a "grass roots" expression of civic democracy, emphasising personal participation in a regional and local context as well as a universal philosophical context. As a result the symbolic language chosen to give ideographic expression to civic values is one having particularly local overtones of culture, environment and history. Finey (1946) has maintained that "sentiment is one of the strongest community-building forces that any city can have" (p. 331); it follows that forms embodying and expressing local characteristics and goals incite sentiment and
therefore build community spirit or pride.

At a time when accommodation requirements have outgrown existing structures the problem arises of the resolution of the role, if any, to be played by an existing structure in resolving the accommodation requirements. Such resolution is a function of the structures' ability to represent contemporary community feeling. A community with strong historical associations which play a vital role in present city life may choose to retain and incorporate the structure to provide historical continuity; a community with strong future aspirations may choose an entirely new form when the time comes that obsolescence necessitates conservation, rehabilitation or renewal. Whatever the choice, it will represent contemporary concensus and will therefore be a contemporary symbol of civic values.

In review, the contemporary social context of the public administrative building is found in:

1. Its marked physical contrast to the increasingly homogeneous nature of the urban core, emphasising its role as a symbol of territoriality common to all core users;

2. The diversity of its role as an activity centre, both as a destination and subsequently as a point of departure which reinforces the prominence of the urban core and gives added life to its activities; and

3. Its continuously valid expression of democratic principles accentuated by an expression of civic character of an individual and locally unique nature based upon local sentiment.
In this context it achieves a degree of sophistication which Banz (1971) maintains is essential to create viable urban form with a strong sense of place. He concludes:

"....sense of place in a pluralistic society must be based on multiple spatial relationships...." (p.118)

The spatial relationships utilized here, pertaining to man's orientation and activity in, and communication through the medium of space, strongly indicates that human behaviour on the personal, social and cultural levels is stimulated in association with a building, the function of which is to house the administration of government. Further, in the contemporary context of the urban core as it progresses towards the functions of "post-industrial" society, the Public Administrative Building is an inherently integral component.
CHAPTER 4

ECONOMIC BEHAVIOUR AND THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

The purpose of this chapter is to present economic behaviour, evident in the principles of Urban Land Economics and the practices of Real Estate investment, which stands as a basis for expecting the private sector to respond through investment to the economic environment created by a Public Administrative building. Wheaton (1964) maintains that: "Metropolitan areas grow and take their peculiar form as the result of decisions to invest by public, private and non-profit agencies of widely varying types and the decisions to move by individuals, businesses and others". (p.154). The focus in this chapter is upon the behaviour of private agents having a profit motive with respect to land use in the urban core.

It is inevitable that private investment initiative in economic activities focus upon an interest in land, either
as a goal in itself or as a means of accommodating the pursuit of other economic goals. For this reason investment in Real Estate provides a vehicle through which to indicate the effect of the public investment decision upon private economic behaviour.

The concept of "real estate" is a legal one pertaining to rights to land and buildings emanating from the institution of "property" (Ring & North, 1967). The acquisition of rights to possession is facilitated through the concept of "ownership" expressed in terms of "interests"; interests in real property or real estate may take two basic forms: freehold and leasehold, the former having rights to possession by virtue of title, the latter having contractual rights to possession (Lane, 1971).

In common usage "real estate" denotes a commercial article: land and all interests therein (Ring & North, 1967).

As an economic good, real estate is dependent upon the intrinsic natural and economic characteristics governing its use to determine its value; the possession and use of the economic good is, further, a function of investment motivation (Ratcliffe, 1961). The following discussion is intended to show that private investment motivation is such that a public investment in land and structures for the accommodation of government can create a variety of investment conditions which will eventually lead to private investment and, therefore, to the revitalization of areas of the urban core. In this way the integrity of the city as a "self-regulating system which generates its own evolution through time" (Forrester, 1971,
p.29) may be fostered with a valid requirement in one sector activating the existing, but dormant, characteristics of another sector.

As investment in land is ultimately site-oriented, the locational basis of land value becomes the basic criterion for investment motivation and strategy. Urban land, returning to Schneider's (1968) approach, is inately tied to the concept of space as the urban resource: "when cities today occupy land, what is important is not the land itself, but the space it affords". (p.183). The terms "urban land" and "urban space", in this context, are synonymous; they are indicative of the three-dimensional qualities of urban areas as opposed to the traditionally two-dimensional nature of land originating from a rural heritage. Economic behaviour with respect to urban space is a function of motivation and strategy within the bounds of economic principles.

THE LOCATIONAL BASE OF URBAN LAND VALUE

The value ascribed to urban land is a complex function of physical, social, economic and institutional factors in a constant state of flux through time or in uncertain equilibrium at any one point in time.

The natural physical characteristics provide the inherent base of land valuation: 1) its three-dimensional existence in space; 2) its immobility; and 3) indestructibility; and 4) its non-homogeneity or the unique character and
relationship of any one parcel to every other parcel on the earth's surface. (Ring & North, 1967, Ratcliffe, 1949). These characteristics stand as a "given" factor, having no intrinsic value; value, a man-made concept, accrues when land has utility for man's purposes. (Ratcliffe, 1961).

Having utility, certain economic characteristics compliment the natural ones, recognizing: 1) the scarcity of land for specific utilizations; 2) the requirement for modification or "improvement" of the natural state; 3) the "fixity" or relative permanence of investment in modification and improvement, and 4) the relationship of a parcel of land to the total environment in which it exists: "Situs" (Ring & North, 1967).

Of the economic characteristics of land, "Situs" or location in space, is the prime arbiter of value. The concept may be further defined as:

The total urban environment in which a specific land parcel functions and with which it interacts at a specific time. Total urban environment can be conceived of as including the economic, the social and institutional structure, the physical setting and design of the urban area, and the psychological reactions of the populace to these variables." (Andrews, 1971, p.31).

Andrews distinguishes three levels of association in relation to the above variables:

1) Association with the Macro-environment of the city and urban region;
2) Associations with the route access environment between the site and the macro-environment.
3) Associations with the micro-environment of the site and its immediate neighbourhood.

Location decisions for land uses select the significant associations from these three levels which satisfy the environmental needs of the activity to effectively fulfill its function. The result is a "situs" pattern indicative of all the necessary environmental relationships. At the micro-level, which is the ultimate focus of real estate investment, Andrews indicates that the following elements serve as a guide to "situs" value:

1) The use environment based on broad standards of compatibility and complementarity of function;

2) The physical environment or the quantity, quality and appropriateness of site for a particular use.

3) Economic environment or price-cost relationship of the site to the activity it will perform.

4) Social environment or psychological attachments to neighbourhood.

and

5) the institutional environment or legal controls on use.

Recognizing that "situs" is in fact a dynamic concept, these elements are in a constant state of flux through time. At the microlevel of the neighbourhood and specific site the qualities of a "situs" are at their most active level. The concept of Land Use Succession provides a vehicle with which to describe "situs" variation through time. "Situs"
qualities change in response to neighbourhood transition; the theory of land use succession pertains to the cyclical nature of neighbourhood and site transition.

By definition "land use succession" refers to "any major change in the use of an existing urban structure or of a parcel of urban land without a structure" (Andrews, 1971, p.95). Andrews takes the view that the concept should include all use changes within a major land use class rather than just the changes between major use classes. This fine grain perspective enables the evaluation of sequential change on a localized scale and in terms of neighbourhood influences, as well as city wide influences.

Viewed as a process of development from growth to maturity to decline and succession initiating another cycle, neighbourhood transition modifies investment potential within the neighbourhood. At any one point in time the stage of development may be ascertained and its "situs" quality with respect to the macro-environment judged in terms of investment uses. Uses reflect the stage of transition of the neighbourhood precisely because investment is keyed to the evident stage in transition which indicates that certain uses are able to derive a profit of a certain nature. The availability of alternate opportunities for investment in land or other fields emphasises this point.

Neighbourhood transition is qualified by site transitions within it. Site transition pertains not only to transition of uses of particular parcels with their affixed
structures, but also to the ability of the structure to perform uses which realize profit. Structures have both a temporal and an economic life which are congruent only to the extent that the relationship between physical maintenance and investment produces profit. Structure use is a variable having the ability to maintain profit level.

The implications of structure use as a variable to maintain profit under conditions of transition is twofold, pertaining to the nature of the interest in the land and structure. First, as an economic good or spatial commodity in itself, real estate is both highly sensitive and adaptable under conditions of transition to changes in mode of profit-realization. Secondly, as a vehicle facilitating economic activity its users are inherently mobile. (This second point is valid in principle when applied to economic activity which succeeds or fails upon its own merit; in practice, where social factors are involved "mobility" may not be taken as a "given" or even desirable factor).

The following section elaborates upon the nature of real estate investment, both in the economic good and in the use of the economic good under the conditions of neighbourhood and site structure transition.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT BEHAVIOUR: MOTIVATION AND STRATEGY

Interests in real estate may take only those forms previously mentioned: freehold and leasehold. Investment in real estate as an economic activity is based upon this differentiation
of interests signifying the relationship of the investor to the ownership of rights to use and possession in the present.

Investors in real estate may be distinguished on the basis of their primary motivation, including:

1) Investor for use
2) Investor for Regular Return
3) Investor for Capital Gain
4) Credit Investor

(Ratcliffe 1961, p.104)

The equity investors (Nos. 1-3) constitute the prime producers of urban form and structure as they seek to locate their investments in a "situs" environment capable of achieving their economic goals.

Investment decisions may vary in their approach from the whimsical to the rigorous calculation of variables; Ratcliffe (1961) outlines the following components which should accompany sound real estate investment decisions. They include analysis of:

1) potential productivity, or the most probable level and pattern of investment return;
2) business risk, or the degree of certainty of the predictions of productivity;
3) financial risk, or risks involving fixed obligations to financial backers;
4) the estimation of investment value or determination of the upper limit of the investors' bid for a property, considering estimated productivity and personal judgement.

Sound estimation of each of these factors should logically result in a sound investment eliciting the desired type of, and rate of return.
Return on investment, whether purely monetary (income or capital gain) or in use value, is the common motivating force for acquiring interests in real estate.

The above components are the basis of Wheatons' (1964) investment approach to urban change, of which he states: "the controlling criteria for these (investment) decisions are market forces or their absence, professional standards and value judgements" (p.154)

Investors for Use

Investing for use may be categorized in terms of the nature of their interest in the real estate: either freehold or leasehold users. In either case investment strategy is predicted upon the ability of the real estate concerned, either as land or as "improved" site with structure, to provide the appropriate locational quality, or "situs", which enables the performance of activities dependent upon location for their successful operation. The acquisition of interests in real estate is viewed as a cost incurred in acquiring a suitable location and facility to house other economic activities (or social activities). Real Estate is considered here to have a "use" value independent of its value as a "commodity".

Investors for use having a freehold interest in real estate differ from thos having a contractual right to use only to the extent that their mobility is impeded by virtue of their equity when use requirements change and are not able to be satisfied by the present facility or location.
In as much as "situs" quality is perpetually changing, investors for use seek locations with potentially stable or improving "situs" environments; the activity undertaken reaps advantages from its stable location in terms of customer recognition and association. Having equity, the freehold investor for use is more concerned with the stability of the neighbourhood than the leasehold user.

Return on investment is measured in terms the "use" value of land which through location enables profit to be realized through the activity performed.

**Investors for Regular Return**

Investors for regular return acquire freehold interests in real estate for the production of regular income in association with investors for use on a leasehold basis. Real estate in this case has a "commodity" value pertaining to the transitory use of space as an economic good. (Investors for regular return may also acquire a leasehold interest which may subsequently be re-leased to produce income). The production of income from space as a commodity is directly a function of the "use" value modified by the economic-life of the structure on the land.

The economic life of a structure is that productive period within which return on investment surpasses the cost of maintaining the investment (Ratcliffe, 1949). Investors for regular return maintain or support a structure
to the extent that it produces a desired regular rate of return; at the point which the structure as originally conceived no longer provides for the achievement of this goal its economic life is over. Economic life may be prolonged through modification and/or use change where feasible or permitted; the alternative is demolition and possibly replacement. The investor has these options to the extent that the "situs" quality justifies use change or structure replacement. Increasing age and decreasing "situs" quality, for example, may combine to make the investment worth less in its present use as a source of income. (The classic illustration of the result is the demolition of structures and the subsequent use of the land alone for parking purposes to prolong and maintain income).

Under conditions of improving "situs" quality, potential for higher returns may lead to improvement or replacement of structures to attract users able and willing to pay for higher "situs" quality.

Investments for regular return are relatively immobile, having high sunk-costs in freehold commitment; however they are adaptable under changing "situs" conditions to the extent that that return on investment may be maintained or increased. For this reason investments for regular return function best during development and maturity phases of land use succession, where locational quality is increasing to stabilization. Factors catalyzing development and subsequently maintaining locational stability are cogent factors in
determining locations for investments for regular return based upon specific uses.

**Investors for Capital Gain**

Derbes (1964) in describing the function of real property as one of use, development or the production of income, maintains that property not typically held for present use, development or income is speculative property. There is a speculative nature to all investments in real property. However, motivation for present use separates this distinct class of property:

"Speculative real estate is the real property which is normally acquired or held primarily because of the potential for increased value. Speculative property is that which is not immediately ready for a use higher than its present use, but which higher utility may be reasonably expected in the future...
Circumstances are present which indicate the possibility of future use above that of the present.......

(Derbes, 1964, p.218)

Investors in real estate through freehold tenure for capital gain are speculative investors; present use and/or regular return on investment is incidental to the goal of significant capital increase through resale. The "situs" environment of a site in the process of transition favours speculative investment in the late decline phases of succession in anticipation of cyclical change towards new use. It is the dynamic quality of "situs" that makes speculation possible; furthermore conditions indicative of swift changes towards
"situs" improvement (i.e. of an increasing quality differential between present and future states) is also indicative of capital gains to be made by investment in real estate.

Investment Relationships and Progression

Wheaton (1964) has indicated that investment decisions with respect to the use of urban space are the arbiters of urban form. These decisions are made with respect to an imperfect real estate market, an imperfect economic market and on the basis of professional standards and subjective value judgements often having political overtones. Thus the investment decision is infinitely varied in its criteria.

With respect to the Land Use Succession Cycle a degree of coherence exists with respect to the timing of investment decisions as a product of motivations given that succession occurs under conditions of growth and decay. Investment in rights to real property in the three categories of motivation presented above are accompanies by strategies which correspond to phases of the succession cycle, in accordance with the ability to realize profit in a desired form through a desired activity at a desired time.

Investors for use and regular return are assured profit realization, to the extent that location can promote it, during the development and maturity phases of the cycle. A time may exist, when the decline phase is evident, that
location no longer becomes an asset for that particular use in trying to promote the activities undertaken.

Investors for capital gain are reasonably assured of pecuniary gain by investment during the decline phase of the cycle in anticipation of a new development phase involving intensified use and increasing quality and in the early growth phase anticipating profit in the maturity phase. Having a future time horizon, investors for capital gain may ride out a period of depressed land value to make significant capital gains in the new cycle. Typically, this type of investment is made in the latest possible period of the declien phase to gain the highest differential return of profit over original outlay.

The effects of these decisions during cycle phases is evident not only upon the resulting urban form, but also upon urban activity. Investors for use and for regular return, having a prime interest in the performance of present activities to gain investment return, inherently foster urban activity by their decisions to build or use built space; in doing so they take into account both social and economic behaviour of the urban dweller to the extent that that behaviour conditions the achievement of their investment goal. Their investment in real property is an adjunct to the performance of a service; therefore location and its quality in relation to the market for the service becomes a critical factor in investment in the present.
Investors for capital gain, having a speculative interest in real property for its ability to facilitate future activities inhibit urban form and activities. This phenomena is most evident at the urban fringe where the succession cycle offers considerable potential appreciation of land value as it changes from extensive agricultural use, to intensive urban use. Speculation on the urban fringe accounts for the irregularity of the urban-rural interface as speculators acquire and withhold land from the market to inflate value. Here speculation creates idle land in anticipation of future profit. The increasing value makes it too costly for any but urban uses, but demand for urban uses has not yet become strong enough to provide the return on investment desired.

While not as overt as at the urban-rural fringe, speculation is a strong component of inner-city change. Inner-city speculation is a complex process in comparison with that of the urban fringe where land first enters the urban cycle and becomes subject to complex urban market forces and regulations. Speculation in the urban core involves real estate in transition, already well on its way to changing in character. The succession cycle itself is inhibited by non-market forces which control transition. Zoning and building regulations particularly make speculation not just a passive form of investment, but an active one predicated by achieving revision of regulations to initiate a new growth cycle through the artificial creation of value afforded by
zoning. (The issues attendant upon zoning changes are not to be discussed here, however, they constitute a planning problem which has its basic origin in speculation).

In review, investment in rights to real property may be considered to occur at recognized stages in the succession cycle. With respect to investment in the urban core under conditions of transition, which is the subject of the following sections, investments occur in logical order from Speculative to Use and Regular return. Speculative investment, where it occurs, precedes other investments anticipating that they, investments for use and for regular return, will follow logically if conditions initially exist for speculative investment. The following section indicates the nature of this progression.

THE CORE AND REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT

The urban core under the current conditions of land use succession, indicative of its changing function, will now be considered in its relation to the three basic motivations for investment in urban real estate.

Speculative Investment

As the recognized trend in the process of change in the core involves not only a change in function but also an intensification in use, the conditions for speculative investment are generally ripe.

Anticipating that the new functional needs may not
be satisfied by existing structures because of age, size, and amenity, and recognizing that institutional criteria for control of land use is evolving in accordance with the recognition of a higher and better use which expands potential developer options (an example being the recent uses of contract zoning), speculative investment in committed improvements (i.e. existing improvements which economically frustrate a higher use at the present time. (Derbes, p.222) may occur in anticipation of future re-merchandising of the property in either smaller or larger parts. Derbes (1964) describes this characteristic:

"the accumulation of small lots or properties on the fringe of the downtown district may be lumped together into a more attractive speculative property. The revenue from most old buildings in downtown speculative areas is usually not attractive enough or without a long enough expected life, to warrant their current market value. Recognizing the probable expansion of the business district, typical purchasers accumulate such properties and pay prices above those which are warranted by the current economic returns...."

(Derbes, 1964 p.220)

In this way, speculation pre-conditions the re-use of urbanized land prior to the resolution of conflicting use-controls where they exist and would frustrate a higher use. (Speculative investment in urban redevelopment is considered to have been carried to its ultimate level by the actual acquisition of use-control changes when possible prior to re-merchandizing. It is the source of considerable planning controversy.) (Campbell 1966).
Speculative investment in the urban core is predicated upon recognition of market influences, spatial or aspatial which will eventually attract investors for use and regular return.

Income Investment

Income investment in real estate in the urban core is subject to pressure from two directions. First, the nature of the market for space in the core is undergoing a change corresponding to the emerging function of the core as a service centre based upon office use and complimentary specialized retail and professional services, rendering obsolete existing space. Second, the demand for space under conditions of high land value emanating from both limited desirable supply and speculative investment, requires intensified use to realize economies of the scale able to produce desired income-return on investment.

As a result, new construction is undertaken utilizing a minute portion of C.B.D. real estate, absorbing the immediate market and adversely affecting older capital in the core unable to make adjustments in an already absorbed market. Wingo (1963) indicates that this process accelerates decay in the core, decimating tremendous book-values.

Use Investment

The increasing specialization and expansion of the
urban core creates new markets for new use-investments and renders obsolete or unprofitable other investments for use.

The succession cycle, viewed in the fine grain perspective suggested by Andrews (1971), reflects both metropolitan decentralization and core specialization, expansion and intensification of use. Investors for use increasingly turn to leasehold tenure on two accounts. Firstly the high cost of C.B.D. land, and concomitantly, building construction, necessitates the large scale economics mentioned above pertaining to income-investment in real estate. Secondly, mobility and adaptability to changing needs is facilitated more easily when equity in real estate is not involved.

Being less tied to location by necessity, locational amenity becomes an increasing important factor in investment for use. The core offers the most diverse locational amenity for meeting the demand for urban location having increasingly greater dependence upon the environmental component of "situs".

INVESTMENT BEHAVIOUR & THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

Investment behaviour has been presented as a function of motivation and strategy, having particular application to the circumstances of the urban core in transition. The Public Administrative Building as an urban artefact is the result of an investment for use by Government. As such it may be considered purely as an element of urban form, a
product of an independent investment. However, its inherent social and economic characteristics previously presented indicate that it is a generator of urban activity and a conditioning agent in the urban environment; as such it generates urban form through investment decisions in the private sector seeking markets and locational environments suitable to the realization of investment profit. These private sector decisions may be related to the Public Administrative Building in terms of investment motivation.

Investment for Capital Gain

The economics of construction of Public Buildings, with their high material cost, and concomitant requirement for long term use by comparison with construction and marketability in the private sectors establishes the probability of a stable environment for investors for use and for regular return in the immediate future, with prospects for a long phase of maturity. Depending upon the character of the neighbourhood at the time of the public decision (i.e. its stage in the succession cycle) speculative potential may be recognized and the advantage taken.

Investment for Use and for Regular Return

The stable investment environment created by the Public Administrative Building is complimented by the diverse locational quality also created.

Activities both directly and indirectly related to
the functions performed by the Building find locational advantage in the environment created, fostering investments for Use and for Regular Return. These investment opportunities are inately tied to the social characteristics previously outlined, recognizing that proximity to the Public Building as an urban landmark and node, as an activity centre, and as a recognized symbol of civic prestige, provides significant advantages to the realization of investment profit for certain types of investment activities which complement the social functions of the Building.

The Contemporary Economic Context

The segregative approach to the Public Building in the urban core presented previously in the context of social behaviour had its origin in a basically economic viewpoint which had broad social implications, impeding human interaction. The economic justification for such separation was based upon the assumption that physical continuity of commercial uses and services was essential for economic viability. With respect to the potential interference of public land uses upon the investment opportunities in the urban core, Burns (1963) sums up the segregative view of role of the Public Building by stating:

"In a cultural or civic building area ... one is not concerned with progressively building-up any special pedestrian or vehicular flow pattern, or with creating new land value." (p.104 - 105)

Such a viewpoint is the antitheses of the concept of compro-
hensive planning; it eschews the basic realities of private initiative which constitute the greater proportion of urban development action; it ignores the characteristics of public buildings as they exist as generators of urban activity; and further, it avoids the opportunity to achieve what Ratcliffe (1971) maintains are the two most important ends of urban land policy:

"(1) to establish conditions conducive to land use cooperation and controlled competition, and (2) to establish a temporary or dynamic equilibrium between these co-operative and competitive states." (p.6)

Competition for land use is predicated upon the existence of potential investment profit; cooperation implies maintaining or fostering situations conducive to competition for reasonable investment profit.

Pedestrian flow patterns and land values constitute two basic economic components governing investment in urban space. With respect to the ability of the Public Administration to foster these requirements, Wendt (1961) in analysing the economic character of the City of Oakland, California, drew the conclusion that:

"the location of the Civic Centre completely outside the C.B.D. contributed to the scattering of employment and to the decline in foot traffic in downtown" (p.49)

Implicit in this statement is the fact that economic activity generated by Civic Centre employees and visitors as pedestrian traffic in the C.B.D. contributes to the economic
viability of the urban core, and concomitantly to its investment potential.

In as much as the Public Building is capable of stabilizing the investment environment for investments for Use and for Regular Return which constitute the activity generating investments in the present, the creation of new land value is a function of the location decision. The degree to which it fosters speculative investment may be justified by the subsequent Use and Income Investments.

In the context of the changing nature of the urban core, a necessary public investment in land and structure(s) to house Government Administration has the ability to play a role in determining the form and environmental quality of the core. This role is based upon its intrinsic social and economic characteristics as they condition investment motivation; in effect the role is one of fostering investments for Use and Income, recognizing the existence of speculative investment and its attachment to future use to provide capital gain.
PART 2

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY
The Central Business District of the City of Victoria contains four public "precincts", defined by public buildings which stand as their major focus. These precincts, in various stages of development, have degrees of special status within the city by virtue of agreement and law. The precincts include:

1. The Legislative Precinct, evolving about the Provincial Legislative Building with its ancilliary office structures and the Provincial Museum and Archives.

2) The "Cathedral Hill" Precinct containing Pioneer Square and a collection of public and quasi-public buildings (the Provincial Courthouse and Land Registry, the YM-YWCA, and the Anglican Cathedral).
3. Bastion Square, historically the site of Fort Victoria, subsequently the site of the Provincial Courthouse, which structure once served as City Hall and presently serves as the Maritime Museum. Use of the old courthouse as interim City Hall from 1962 to 1964 fostered rehabilitation of the Square in 1965-66.

4. Centennial Square, the long-standing site of City Hall and the public market, the development of the square received its impetus from the decision to restore City Hall to functional use as part of a Centennial project in 1972.

Each precinct exists as the result of a determined attempt to retain and emphasize distinctive characteristics of the city. For the purpose of this thesis, one example, that of City Hall and Centennial Square Civic Precinct, is examined in terms of its effect upon its immediate neighbourhood and the Central Business District, particularly with respect to physical, social and economic revitalization in that section of the city core.

BACKGROUND: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Site Selection

At the time of its construction in 1891, the Victoria City Hall was intended to be the administrative centre for a city of 14,000 inhabitants. By the 1950's, with a city population of over 50,000, the accommodation
provided by the building was no longer adequate. One major addition in 1951 and numerous internal modifications and alterations were not able to satisfy growing needs. (Times, 1962). Requirements became such that some departments were provided with accommodation outside City Hall.

In response to this recognized need, sites were proposed from time to time throughout the 1950's and early 1960's. In conjunction with the Municipality of Saanich, sites were analysed for a joint venture; no fewer than nine downtown sites and nineteen suburban locations were examined by the Capital Region Planning Board (1957). While consideration of a joint venture lapsed, one site, that within the Cathedral Hill Precinct was recommended by the Board as a suitable location for a new City Hall to form part of a civic centre as a joint project of the Province and the city (Capital Region Planning Board 1957).

Recognizing not only the expense of a new structure, but also the time factor involved in constructing a new building, more immediate alternatives were examined including proposals by private developers to build suitable accommodation for long-term leasehold. In addition, the possibility that the nearby B.C. Hydro building could be acquired presented another alternative, an alternative which subsequently waned when its utility and acquisition costs were more fully examined.

Throughout the search for alternative sites, the present site had received only passing attention. However,
Council became aware of the potential of the existing building on a number of levels. In 1961, City Hall was repainted under the direction of the newly formed Urban Renewal Committee. "It was designed to add a touch of colour to the otherwise drab downtown scene, and encourage businessmen in the area to do the same" (Street, 1962). Response indicated that there was a widespread attachment to the building, which the painting had increased. The inauguration of a new mayor, who had an inclination for historic restoration resulted in a survey of the building proving it to be basically sound and could be renovated and expanded to meet projected needs at less cost than constructing a new building. A proposal was put before Council to restore and expand the existing City Hall as the focus of a new Civic Centre. The approval of Council was unanimously given and rate-payer approval sought and received in December, 1962, by 75% of voters.

The feasibility of the project was underscored by the high incidence of publically owned property involved (2 1/2 of the 3 1/2 acre site), including existing roadways not considered essential as traffic arteries. Further, the existence of significant financial support in form of a bequest of two large sums of money from the estate of Mr. T.S. McPherson (to be expended, under the terms of his will, on "civic endeavours in the greater public interest" (Crisp, 1972), insured financial feasibility. Further impetus to the project was received from the McPherson estate by the donation to the City of the Pantages Theatre, strategically
located adjacent to City Hall. Initiated in 1962, the entire project was virtually complete within three years.

The Revitalization Goal

Throughout the process of site selection over the years, the provision of accommodation for civic government appears to have been the prime concern. However, the decisions, when made, incorporated two additional goals. The first, and the goal which originally fostered the decision, was the provision of a suitable symbol which would be: "a source of regional pride to the capital city of B.C. and a worthy permanent memorial of the 100th anniversary of ... (its) incorporation" (Toone, 1962) - a goal which recognized the public attachment to the existing building. The second was revitalization of the adjacent core area in the firm belief that the civic investment would touch off a chain reaction of property improvements in an area where environmental quality and economic vitality had noticeably declined.

Finance Committee Chairman Dowell capsulized Council's unanimous belief in stating:

"We are now at the era of civic redevelopment and expansion and the question is no longer whether we should improve, but how" (Times, 1962). The decision was intended as an improvement device by setting an example of high standard in public investment, an investment which would activate public imagination and renew interest in the city core.
As Council's chosen device to foster revitalization, the concept of Centennial Square was based upon public and quasi-public facilities which would draw people to the square in particular, and to the core in general. By including a civic parking garage, public safety centre, senior citizens activity centre, a civic theatre, restarant and shops all focused upon a public open space domination by a civic landmark, the city aimed at a broad Regional cross-section of potential core users. In addition, the rapidly expanding tourist industry, estimated at over a million visitors in 1962, would find the City Hall and Square a major attraction, giving further impetus to its revitalization.

NEIGHBOURHOOD HISTORY

The Neighbourhood Defined

The neighbourhood defined by Centennial Square is, for the purpose of this study, taken to be that area immediately adjacent to the square consisting of the 10 city blocks which encircle it. More specifically, it is that part of the above 10 blocks area which directly abuts the perimeter of the Square. An arbitrary boundary to the neighbourhood has been indicated upon the accompanying plan (Figure 2) upon the assumption that the most overt and therefore measurable effects of the development will be felt within this area. (Clearly discernible effects occurring outside this boundary are noted where feasible.)
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Growth and Decay

The localism of the study area with respect to the Central Business District is shown by Figure 3.

Four elements have continuously characterized the study area in its relation to the C.D.B: Chinatown, the Hudson's Bay Department Store, the Public Market, and City Hall. Historically, each has played a significant role in the expansion limitation and activity of the C.B.D. Ultimately they contributed to the relatively compact nature of the core by comparison with other Canadian Cities (Capital Regional Planning Board 1965). They also were strong factors in the process of decay.

Chinatown

Chinatown in its present form, is virtually contained within three of the 10 blocks. Its unique ethnic residential and commercial character created at the same time a unique activity nucleus and a barrier to the expansion of commercial activities.

During Victoria's period of fast expansion around 1910, Chinatown was at its peak of prosperity and it formed a vital part of core activity. Although culturally segregated and self-contained, it was not economically isolated (Lai, 1973). The decline of Chinatown may be attributed to many factors outside the scope of this discussion; however, assimilation into Occidental society may be considered the chief factor contributing to the contraction
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of Chinatown to a small nucleus of residential and commercial activity on Fisgard Street.

Contraction of the community left behind considerable derelict space. The 1961 Capital Regional District "Urban Renewal Study" indicated that there was "approximately 45,000 square feet of derelict space in Chinatown, or about forty-four percent of the total derelict space in downtown Victoria" (Lai, 1973).

The Public Market

The Public Market, until its demise, occupied land now in the centre of Centennial Square. It formed a vital link between the urban and rural components of the region as the fresh produce centre for the city from the 1930's to the early 1950's. It was a popular and necessary commercial establishment at a time when C.D.B. functions were all-inclusive.

The changing regional context of the C.D.B. affected the viability of the Public Market, also contributing to the decline of Chinatown since an inherent link existed between market gardens and the Chinese community. Suburbanization, with the appearance of the suburban supermarket having the capacity for volume buying and retail decentralization, was the prime reason for the decline of the Public Market.

Physical disrepair followed; the market's demise was given further impetus by the demand for parking in the
neighbourhood, It was used to house city-owned vehicles, until, along with the adjacent Fire Hall, it was demolished for public parking under the recommendation of the City Engineering Department (1958) in an attempt to compensate for one of the prime factors impeding C.D.B. vitality - lack of parking.

The Hudson's Bay Department Store

The Hudson's Bay Department Store defines the north-east corner of the study area, and the north-eastern extremity of the C.B.D. From the time of its construction (1913) it has marked the limit of northward pedestrian activity. At the time of its construction, it was considered to be "too far out of town" in relation to the commercial centre of activity (Helmecken 1972), and in fact, stood empty for several years after its completion. However, it fostered a process of in-filling along the east-side of Douglas Street, resulting in commercial continuity. Its existence as a northern anchor of the C.B.D. maintained the economic viability of commercial establishments fronting upon Douglas Street while the remainder of the Study area experienced economic decline. However, despite economic viability, the physical quality of this section of Douglas Street declined with the rest of the study area. This was due to a general lack of environmental concern accompanying the uncertain future of the neighbourhood during its period of decline.

City Hall

From its inception in 1891, "there is no doubt that
its location had a strong influence on the direction of growth downtown" (Clack, 1962). However, its previously indicated functional obsolescences, accompanied by the imminent prospect of a new location, did not enable it to reverse or impede environmental decline in the neighbourhood as functional change in the core progressed. Rather, by example, it contributed to the decline as little was done to enhance its exterior appearance beyond basic maintenance until 1961.

As a prime source of parking demand in the neighbourhood, City Hall further encouraged the spread of demolition for parking space.

By 1961, the need for urban renewal policy and action was publically recognized. The Capital Region Planning Board, upon City request, undertook extensive surveys of economic and environmental quality of the city. The western portion of the study area, containing Chinatown, exhibited all the criteria constituting blight as defined by the Board, indicating a need for renewal actions. The eastern portion with its commercial continuity supported by the Hudson's Bay Company's presence exhibited less blight than the western sector. However, structure age, and the long established nature of some of the commercial activities contributed to a generally unkempted physical environment. (The urban renewal report underscored the actual and potential physical decay when it indicated that all but three structures within the study area were constructed prior to 1941, and that the majority of these predated 1917). In such an environment
it was reasonable to expect that a major public undertaking would have significant impact upon the neighbourhood.

**Impact Documentation: Description**

The documentation of the impact of City Hall and Centennial Square on the neighbourhood, considered in terms of behavioural change, proceeds upon two levels: social and economic. Social and economic behaviour have been treated separately in Chapters 2 and 3; their separation here is also made for parallel reference. However, social and economic behaviour, when focussed upon one phenomenon, are inherently related and, are at times, virtually inseparable. The following evaluation will reflect this situation.

**Economic Behaviour**

Documentation of changes in economic behaviour is presented through three evident phenomena which reflect economic motivation with respect to the use and ownership of real estate. These factors are: 1) changes in property ownership; 2) changes in the quality of the physical environmental; and 3) changes in land and structure use. These three characteristics give first hand evidence of change within the study area; in addition, they reflect the origin of such change since they pertain directly to the economic motivation of the investor.

**Property Ownership Transfer**

Chapter 3 has indicated the existence of real estate
investment activity corresponding in general terms with
phases in the Land Use Succession Cycle. Property transfer
characteristics, particularly the frequency and volume of
property transfer, is considered by Andrews (1971) to be a critical
indicator of the decline and succession phases of the cycle.
Ring (1970) reinforces this belief when he states that:

"Excessive property sales, no matter how
valid the reason, create a feeling of
investment insecurity, as a climate of
speculation, resulting in distorted
market prices that reflect a transitory
time-position along the ever-moving real
estate business cycle" (p.87)

The obvious decline of the study neighbourhood and
the initiation of a succession phase by public action should
be reflected in property transfer characteristics.

All registered transactions within the study area
were recorded between the years 1945 and 1972; thereby
encompassing the major period of neighbourhood decline prior
to the introduction of the new public investment and
permitting examination of the subsequent trend in property
transfer as it has so far emerged in the succeeding ten year
period. (Figures 4, 5 and 6 indicate properties transferred.)

Two characteristics emerged when property transfers
were examined within the study area: 1) Property transfer
accelerated during the 10 year period prior to the development
of the square and has so far remained at the same level of
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activity in the corresponding 10 year period subsequent to the development. Property transfer prior to 1945 was infrequent enough to warrant its exclusion from considerations here. During the 1945 - 1950 period, 20 of the 81 properties in the neighbourhood were transferred; 44 neighbourhood properties were transferred between 1951 and 1961. Subsequent to the introduction of the Square 45, properties were transferred between 1962 and 1972. 2) Prior to the introduction of the Square only one significant instance of land assembly is evident. This, in the block bounded by Douglas, Government, Blanshard and Pandora Streets, took place for the most part outside the study area, with only a small segment of the assembly involving neighbourhood property.

Subsequent to the introduction of the Square, land assembly projects within the study area have taken place, as indicated by Figure 7. These instances constitute examples clearly evident through title registration procedures. Other instances may exist where title is vested in seemingly disassociated entities. Transfers of contiguous lots shown on the 1962 - 1972 property transfer map (Figure 6) may constitute assembly projects.

Thus, speculative land assembly described previously by Derbes (1964) is evident and may be ascribed to the introduction of the Square into the neighbourhood environment. In terms of economic behaviour this speculative action is indicative of the conviction in the private sector that the neighbourhood has an increasing economic potential. The
short duration since the introduction of the Square has so far not produced re-sale of land assembly projects within the neighbourhood. An estimated increase in land value accruing to properties within the study area is between 75% and 250% depending upon the location as a result of private investment (Toone, 1965). A direct comparison of land value increases in other sections of the city was unavailable; however, the increases in the study area were considered to be significantly greater than those generally accruing throughout the C.B.D.

Physical Environmental Quality

Change in the physical environment (building facade & structural improvement and modification, and landscaping) provide the most overt indications of the revitalization induced by the Square.

The immediate catalyst to facade improvement was the repainting of City Hall, prior to the construction of the Square, to emphasise and highlight its architectural qualities. It thus became the prototype example for the civic "paint-up" campaign which emerged in 1964 after initial reaction to the improved appearance of City Hall had been noted in the neighbourhood. Thus City Hall set the pace for the paint-up campaign objective which was: "to capitalize on the existing architectural or historical character of ... downtown buildings as a foundation for conservation and beautification."

(Victoria, 1966). The Central Business District was divided
into five areas for purposes of fostering private paint-up initiative. Of these five zones, the one containing City Hall and Centennial Square required the least promoting by civic officials to produce results. (Zuhling, 1973).

Cosmetic facade improvement constitutes a prime and most pervasive indication of environmental change as it is most readily perceived by all neighbourhood users or visitors. However, cosmetic facade improvements alone, particularly those applied to aging, if architecturally valuable structures, is a superficial element of environmental change. It may be as transitory as the weathering ability of the materials used. Renovation activity as well as structural addition is evident throughout the study area. Figure 8 indicates structural changes subsequent to the introduction of the Square. (The Appendix presents these changes in a more detailed form pertaining to individual structures: Columns 8 and 9.)

The most significant improvements in the physical environment wrought by the private sector are seen in those structures directly facing City Hall, the Theatre and the two major entrances to the Square, (i.e. on the East, facing Douglas Street, and on the South-West corner). The less visible, and more specialized components of the Square (the Police Station, Provincial Court and the Senior Citizens' Activity Centre) appear to have had much less impact upon physical environmental improvement. Private structures flanking the North and North-West perimeter of the Square
exhibit little facade improvement.

**Land Use Change**

Andrews (1971) has argued for a fine grain perspective on land use change to discern successive trends. The fine grain perspective is applicable to the study area as its predominantly commercial character, not withstanding the residential character of Chinatown, has not changed. The fine grain perspective upon building occupants and users clarifies changes not overtly indicated by site changes.

Changes in the land use pattern of the neighbourhood have been minimal, being confined to those instances of demolition and replacement indicated in Figure 8.

Only two instances of replacement have occurred within the study boundary. One, involving the demolition of a 10-storey office tower and an adjacent 2-storey structure and their replacement by a 7-storey office structure, may only tenuously be attributed to any direct effect of the civic precinct as its location is also closer to the centre of core, nearer the peak land-value intersection and on the major downtown traffic artery.

Directly to the north of the study area considerable new construction is evident in recent years.

While land use within the study area has recorded only minor changes, tenancy change has been active. Tenancy changes are recorded in Appendix 1. (columns 3, 4 and 5).
Commercial use categories exhibit several characteristics pertaining to tenancy change and change in commercial activity.

1) Tenancy change has been active, but vacancy has been minimal. Where individual structures exhibited high vacancy prior to the Square they have been demolished. (537-49 Pandora) and in one case replaced (1705-9 Government).

2) Tenancy change in the Chinatown sector of the neighbourhood has been as active as in the rest of the neighbourhood.

3) Tenancy change has been more frequently accompanied by environmental improvement, such as facade renovations and general remodelling.

4) Longtime tenants have tended to expand into adjoining buildings; notably a neighbourhood bank and some specialty stores.

5) Tenancy change, involving new tenants and the expansion of existing tenancies, indicates an increasing specialization. This is particularly evident with respect to clothiers and gift-oriented retail outlets, restaurants and specialty-food retail outlets.

6) The stock of residential accommodation primarily contained in Chinatown has declined only minimally. Transient or tourist accommodation within the study area has remained constant. However, immediately north of the study area new transient accommodation facilities have appeared recently.
and proposals for others have been mooted. This area, while not examined as part of this study, is the logical direction for core expansion fostered by the Square as it has previously been part of the core.

Changes in the quality of transient accommodation constitute the most significant aspect of use change. The three major hotels have changed hands, undergone extensive renovation, and (in two of the three instances) further land has been assembled for parking purposes. These circumstances of land assembly for parking provides evidence of both investment for current use as well as speculative investment for future redevelopment.

The new owners of one of these hotels bordering the civic precinct attributes his renovation to the civic action, maintaining that: "improvements will keep pace with the development of the civic precinct". (Hutchinson, 1962). Contemporary commentary maintains, with respect to this renovation, that" "the transformation of the 96 room Westholme Hotel will brighten a rather dingy section of Government Street and Broad Street and strengthen the impact of the civic precinct project in revitalizing the area". (Mika, 1962).

Social Behaviour

The documentation of change in social behaviour attributable to the development, both within and without the study neighbourhood, is limited by time to a brief recounting of
evident trends in behaviour which have emerged since the introduction of the Square.

Evident trends in social behaviour attributable to the development are presented through the following points.

1) The concept of the Square, based on historic preservation and rehabilitating to functional use, has fostered a widespread interest in historic and architectural restoration within the city as well as with beautification. Awareness of the potential historic and architectural restoration gave rise to several interest groups, perhaps typified by the Old Town Study group.

Beautification, initiated by the 1961 articulation of the architectural detail of City Hall and fostered through the subsequent "paint-up" campaign, based on the Norwich Plan has become a regional phenomena. The campaigning was so successful that the paint-up Committee was prompted to report that: "downtown results have generated interest throughout Greater Victoria and we frequently become hard-pressed to assist apartment building owners and private residents outside the target area with paint plans." (City of Victoria A 1966). Astles (1972) maintains that the bounds of the study area is one which generated responses as far afield as Vancouver, where interest in historic preservation was catalyzed as a result of Victoria's success (p.166).

2) On a regional basis the City Hall and Centennial
Square project has emerged as an object of civic pride (Gregson, 1970) on a par with the Legislative Buildings and the Empress Hotel, which previously constituted the most significant elements of the resident populations' "sense of place". Attachment to the civic precinct increases with the extra-regional publicity and praise which has been lavished upon the development. Design awards, notably the Park and Tilford Award in 1971, have increased the sense of civic accomplishment, furthering civic pride.

The City Hall and Square is featured prominently in tourist promotion and publicity emanating from both public and private organs, to the extent that the City Hall and Square also stand with the Legislative Buildings and the Empress Hotel as widely recognized symbols of Victoria.

As a result, businesses, especially those catering to tourism have consciously associated themselves with the development through their advertising. (In Vancouver an illuminated Billboard announces "The Century Inn, the Inn on Centennial Square").

3) As an activity centre the Square and its constituent buildings have increasingly become integral parts of regional social activities in a manner and on a scale, previously impossible and exceedingly unlikely.

As the scene of indoor activities, traditional uses of structures have lapsed, replaced by innovative
civic uses. A report on the utility of the development (City of Victoria, 1965) concluded that: "the rebuilt City Hall and the Legislative Wing has, indeed pioneered a new concept in use of civic buildings and civic affairs in the Greater Victoria area" (p.3). This is particularly evident with respect to public attendance at meetings of Council and with respect to informative public displays in City Hall and the Civic Playhouse pertaining to current civic issues.

With respect to the Playhouse, the report indicates diverse use by the regional community through a use-policy which has become the envy of larger centres (Sun, 1964).

As a scene of outdoor activity use of the Square has been seasonal to a large extent and its users representative of select segment of core users. Consistent with seasonal changes in climate, use intensifies in summer, compounded by the influx of tourists. As seasonal climate permits, the Square has become a vital centre of outdoor activity and social interaction as a result of its pleasant environment and pedestrian orientation. However, although it obtains intensive seasonal use, its users have consisted of the elderly, the young, and the tourist, with tourists being its most consistent users. While general public attitude towards the development is one of pride, the use of the Square as an activity and meeting centre by the young has been a source
of civic controversy (Times, 1968). This controversy has fostered an ambivalent mood towards the Square depending upon individual attitudes and vested interest. Gregson (1970), as a social commentator, views the Square in the context of harmonious social interaction when he states:

"Beauty spots like... Centennial Square... formerly the preserve of those in the autumn of their lives, were now redolent with serious, polite young men and girls... Age was offset by youth, mostly well-behaved impecunious youth..." (p.225).

Others, particularly neighbourhood businessmen have viewed the Square as a potential source of trouble, a breeding ground for the undercurrent of social change, exploited by individuals without the means to contribute to the economic viability of current commercial undertakings. This latter attitude has accounted for the relatively narrow cross-sections of users evident in the Square as the outcry of the neighbourhood businessmen fostered an atmosphere of tension causing many core users to avoid the Square. With the subsequent lapsing of the reactionary stance of the neighbourhood businessmen the Square has been the scene of a variety of "happenings": commercial, cultural and personal.

4) As a generator of pedestrian activity and as a facilitator of pedestrian movement, a behavioural change is implicit in the Square and, while not directly documented, evident.
Analysis of pedestrian activity on Douglas Street (University of Victoria, 1963), immediately prior to construction of the Square and subsequent to vacating City Hall for renovations, indicated that pedestrian movement on the West side (The City Hall side) of the street accelerated due to the vacated City Hall and the relative lack of specialty shops at that point. Accelerated pedestrian movement was considered indicative of a lack of objective or focus within a pedestrian traffic area.

The expansion of City Hall and the inclusion of specialty commercial space within the precinct will have considerably altered the speed and volume of pedestrian flow indicative of points and activities of interest. In addition, with the emergence of new commercial activities on the circumference of the Square and the possibility of a cross-flow of pedestrian movement through the Square, neighbourhood cohesiveness is fostered by increasing access.

In review, social behaviour relating to the Square and to City Hall is overtly noticeable through general trends in activity. In addition, Rappaport (1969) has concluded that:

"Form and space organization may not have immediate effects on overt behaviour. Rather they may effect people by changing their images through the effects of mood or feeling, irrational, non-logical, unconscious and subconscious reactions". (p.124)
The evident trends in overt behaviour would suggest that such internalized image-making and attitudinal changes have occurred as a result of environment created by the investment. The isolation and identification of internalized image making above would constitute an undertaking of large scale; however the existance of such changes may be hypothesised as a complimentary and positive changes in attitude towards the study neighbourhood.

Planning Context: Evaluation

The evaluation of the behavioural changes indicative of renewed social and economic interest in the study neighbourhood is made in terms of Planning approach, or the context within which the development was planned with respect to planning policy within the City of Victoria.

The previous two sections have indicated the extent to which behavioural change has emerged and the extent to which it indicates revitalization consistent with the expressed goal attached to the location decision for the public development. The decision was ultimately a "tactical" one to foster renewal action by the private sector. However, on two accounts the success of this tactical action also constitutes failure. Firstly, pertaining to the relative success of the goal; Secondly, pertaining to the existence of unplanned consequence. Both are a function of Planning approach.
Tactical Planning, Comprehensive Planning and the Urban System

In Chapter 1 the distinctive was made between tactical and comprehensive planning. Guttenberg stresses that tactical planning must be carried out in conjunction with a Goal Plan, the former complimentary to, and aiding in the implementation of the latter. The former without the latter constitutes the difference between ad hoc and comprehensive planning.

The Planning history of the City of Victoria clearly indicates that comprehensive planning is only just emerging within the City and Metropolitan Region (Lee, 1969). In 1962 the location decision for City Hall and the Civic Precinct was, in fact, an independent ad hoc action. Despite a programme of "precinct" developments initiated or contemplated by the City, its planning approach was one characterized by Special Projects with respect to developments within the core.

Attempt to formulate a comprehensive approach to downtown development failed in both 1959 and 1965 when Council refused to endorse plans prepared on its behalf, both plans became flexible advisory instruments to guide local development rather than legally binding documents. The 1965 Overall Plan for Victoria (CPRB 1965) in an unofficial capacity has only just become the guide line for Council's action in the 1970's with the appearance of Council members intent upon making a
comprehensive approach to the central core as well as the urban region (Crisp, 1973).

The absence of a comprehensive approach gives rise to qualifications of the success of the location decision as a planning tool. In the absence of an official plan for core development, let alone city or regional development, public policy vacillated between attempting to maintain the economic health of the C.D.B. and promoting economic development in other areas of the city to attract investment capital. As a result, developments, such as the Mayfair Centre location a mile from the core were approved to ensure investment within the city boundaries and this entered into competition with the core, competing for large numbers of core activities and users. In this manner, the City worked against itself. It accounts in part for the low pace of redevelopment action in the study neighbourhood.

In addition, the lack of a comprehensive planning policy also accounts for the speculative climate evident through property transfer and land assembly. Property owners were able to recognize the existence of a force in the neighbourhood which was turning the tide of decline and initiating succession. However, the unwillingness of Council to determine an overall course of action which would include the study area and vicinity was a boon to speculators dealing in land transfer for capital gain, and a deterrent to city building use-investors who could not count upon a stable course of action by the city.
The result has been a predominance of cosmetic improvement without, in many cases, substantial physical rehabilitation or replacement of structures in the most blighted western section of the study area.

In the absence of a comprehensive approach to planning within the city, the impact of the civic precinct as a focus for core development was weakened.

Chapter I has stressed the need for a "systems" orientation to renewal action in the manner suggested by Holling and Goldberg (1971). That is, actions within the urban system should be limited in scope, fostering continuity to ensure planned consequences. Notwithstanding the comprehensive nature of the site development itself, the rather superficial level of planning evident with respect to the Civic precinct has produced unplanned consequences.

The whole-hearted enthusiasm with which the venture began was accompanied by a failure to look critically at the implications of its stated redevelopment goals: it failed to recognize that certain aspects of redevelopment are inherently incompatible. In particular the effect on Chinatown is important.

The revitalization goal pertained equally to Chinatown, which was recognized as a unique and desirable component of the neighbourhood for social and economic reasons primarily tourist-orientated. Rehabilitation of Chinatown, rather than redevelopment was considered feasible and desirable by the Capital Region Planning Board in 1961 (Chuen-Yen Lai, 1973).
In 1965 the Overall Plan for Victoria reaffirmed this conviction stating:

"Development of adjoining Centennial Square has made this rehabilitation more desirable and there has been no evidence of a rapid decline in the number of residents". (p.50)

However, the very existence of Centennial Square has fostered activity which may easily culminate in the demise of the present community both as a residential community and a unique economic centre. The climate of speculation complemented by increasing land values within the study neighbourhood has added impetus to the dissolution of Chinatown, as economic realities weaken an already tenuous social community. Chuen-Yen Lai (1973) concludes that:

"Although Chinese, who seem to be apathetic, still own about seventy percent of the properties in Chinatown, they will likely sell them to the highest bidders and will retain less and less control over its destiny". (p.126)

Thus without full recognition of the implications of its decisions, the City in effect reduced the probability of the achievement of one goal in promoting the achievement of another. In this case the unplanned consequences may yet be halted; however significant damage has already occurred through the creation of a speculative environment more conducive to exploitation of Chinatown than maintenance of its unique social community.

The example underscores the innate interrelationship between a "systems" orientation, comprehensive planning and
tactical planning. Any renewal action, public or private must recognize the existence of complex responses which may be inherently incompatible with respect to the achievement of the initial goal. This dictates that a comprehensive plan be the basis for any renewal action so that the tactic may be calculated in advance to resolve conflicting responses. A systems orientation in the formation of a comprehensive plan would have indicated in advance the probable effect of the investment upon Chinatown, permitting protection to be devised if the maintenance of its character was desirable.

**Summary and Conclusions**

In retrospect, the development has been highly successful on several accounts including:

1) Initiating a new self-image for the city core;
2) fostering widespread and innovative use of public buildings and open space;
3) Imbuing the neighbourhood with new pedestrian activity and vitality;
4) increasing the neighbourhood tax-base through concomittant increases in land value and intensification of use;
5) being instrumental in commercial revitalization of a "specialty" service nature, accelerating functional change within the core necessary for its survival.

However, these successes suffer relatively by the lack of an overall perspective or comprehensive plan. The "precinct" approach to core revitalization, effective as it
may be with respect to the above successes, cannot be considered a substitute for comprehensive planning on a city-wide and regional basis.

The case has illustrated the potential of the "tactical" approach to planning mooted by Guttenberg (1964). The context within which the decision was made underscores the detrimental aspects of our ad hoc approach to public investment; as a result it supports the adverability of a comprehensive approach to planning to ensure that public investments make maximum contribution to urban development.

The intention of this thesis has been to present characteristic urban behaviour which justifies the expectation of decision makers that urban revitalization may be catalyzed as the result of a public investment.

The planning concepts presented in Chapter II provide a theoretical basis for expecting that behaviour, emanating from values, may be significantly influenced by an action of government having specific goals.

Urban behaviour presented in Chapters III and IV provides a descriptive base for the use of a public building, specifically a public administrative building, as a tactic for catalyzing revitalization. Social behaviour indicates that individuals relate to public buildings on a personal, social, and cultural level pertaining to its significant physical form in the urban environment, the extent to which it enables or promotes social interaction, and the ideographic
content of the building as a representation of community values. Economic behaviour indicates that investors in the use and ownership of real property find investment potential created in conjunction with public buildings.

In retrospect these social and economic behavioural characteristics have been negated by planning philosophy which has tended to segregate public buildings from the general commercial component of the core. The changing function of the core now suggests that integration with the commercial fabric is not only viable but also useful.

Through the vehicle of an empirical study (Chapter V) the impact of a new public administrative building has been examined with respect to behavioural change indicative of revitalization of a depressed core area. The study indicated significant social and economic change as a result of the investment. Furthermore the study indicated the relative nature of the revitalization by virtue of its relationship to comprehensive planning in the subject city.

The literature review and case study elicit the following conclusions with respect to the public administrative building and its role as a catalyst to revitalization of the urban core:

1. The public administrative building influences social behaviour as an urban landmark, an urban activity focus, and as an urban ideograph. In these capacities the building may contribute to the revitalization of the core under the following
circumstances:

(a) The physical form of the building has significant architectural singularity and spatial prominence to ensure its adoption as an urban landmark. This characteristic will ensure that it becomes an element within the territorial orbit of core users, permitting locational associations to be made to the benefit of adjacent private establishments.

(b) Innovative and widespread use of its internal facilities and site amenities is encouraged; the building becomes a social activities focus complementary to its function as a specialized office structure, thereby giving life to the activities of government and commerce alike.

(c) The physical form, name, or location emphasizes its ideographic function as a community symbol. The value reaped by the neighbourhood may be an intangible but evident change in attitude involving citizen pride and private prestige.

2. The public administrative building preconditions economic behaviour by virtue of the investment climates created by the economics of public investment involving high initial cost, high quality, and the concomitant requirement for long term use which establishes a stable element in the neighbourhood. The investment climate created is characterized by a progression from speculative investment for capital gain to neighbourhood-building investment for use and for regular return on investment. The progression from speculative
investment to neighbourhood-building investment is either aided or impeded by City policy with respect to investment throughout the city, thereby influencing the rate of neighbourhood revitalization.

3. As a logical extension of the above conclusions, the public administrative building may be used as a valid planning tool for fostering revitalization within the urban core. It is concluded that the most advantageous results may occur when the location decision is taken in the context of a comprehensive plan for the incorporated community to ensure that the social and economic behaviour thus catalyzed will contribute to the ultimate achievement of the comprehensive plan.
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A P P E N D I-X

NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSITION INFORMATION

Information pertaining to each street in the Study neighbourhood is presented in tabular fashion. Each side of the street is considered separately to maintain linear continuity. The Square itself is not considered, nor is that block containing the Hudson's Bay Co. They are considered to be "given" elements.

COLUMN I: STREET ADDRESSES

Includes all street numbers which apply to any one building; in addition, where buildings have been demolished, the former street number(s) are included for continuity.

Source: City of Victoria Directories (1960 and 1972) and the Canadian Underwriters Assoc. Insurable Plan of the City of Victoria (1957 - 1967).

Street addresses provide the basis for indicating use changes.

COLUMN 2: LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

The legal description of all lots (with or without affixed structures) correlates with street addresses past and present.


Legal description is the basis for indicating property transfer and land assembly.
COLUMN 3 & 4: USE CHANGES

Structure uses are recorded by street address for 1960 and 1972. The symbols used to indicate use are divided into four main Commercial categories, qualified by thirteen descriptive categories:

Major Use Categories:

O - Office Use
R - Retail Use
S - Service Use
A - Accommodation Use

Qualifying Description:

p - private or personal
b - public
v - specialty (gift, jeweller, antiques, notions)
f - food
ge - garment/drygoods
m - transportation
a - automobile and/or appliances
c - community meeting places/clubs
t - transient
r - residential
s - storage/parking
x - garden supply
(I) - manufacturing/production

Use 1960 (column 3) and use 1972 (column 4) may be directly compared. For example: 1410 Broad St - 1960 - Op - Private office. 1972 - Sf - Food service or Restaurant.

SOURCE: City of Victoria, Department of Planning, and the Victoria City Directories (1960 & 1972).

COLUMN 5: TENNANCY CHANGE

Tennancy change is recorded in terms of its occurrence or lack of it: yes or no.

Change in use invariably is accompanied by a change in tenancy. However, a change in tenancy is not always accompanied by a change in use. Column 5 indicates the extent to which tenancy change has accompanied use change and vice versa.

**COLUMN 6: PROPERTY TRANSFER**

Property transfer is considered in prior and subsequent to the introduction of the Square in terms of transfer periods:

1 - indicates title transfer subsequent to the Square (1962-72).

2 - indicates transfer immediately prior to the Square (1951-61)

3 - indicates transfer initial period of area decline (1945-50)

Source: British Columbia Land Registry Office, Victoria, B.C., Applications for Registration of Fee-Simple for all properties within the study area between 1945 and 1972.

**COLUMN 7: LAND ASSEMBLY**

Through examination of title transfer, evidence of land assembly through the vesting of title in one or more related entities is indicated for the periods (1945 - 1961 (P) and 1962 - 1972 (S). Instances may be related through their common suffix number. Eg: S-4.

Source: Applications of Registration of Fee-Simple and local Newspaper reports.

**COLUMN 8: SITE CHANGES**

Site changes are denoted for each legal parcel of land
within the study area subsequent to the introduction of the Square in terms of Demolition (D), Replacement (R), and Addition (A).

Source: City of Victoria Planning Department; The Canadian Underwriters Assoc. *Insurable Plan of Victoria*.

**COLUMN 9: ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CHANGES**

Changes in environmental quality pertaining to each legal parcel of land is denoted by (X). Changes are qualified by their nature as: (p) - paint; (d) - design; and (l) - landscaping.

Source: City of Victoria Planning Department and Personal survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS DESC.</th>
<th>LEGAL USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Broad Street between Johnson &amp; Pandora: West Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Lot &quot;B&quot; Op Sm yes 1,2 Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402 &amp; Lot Sc Sc no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410 658 (s.30') Op Sf yes Plan 492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 658 Sc Aa yes 1,2 S-6 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Lot 659 (par.&quot;C&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416/20 Lot 659 Ra Ra yes 1 Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(par.&quot;A&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Lot 660 (e.80')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Broad Street between Johnson &amp; Pandora: East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403 Lot 664 Ra Sp yes 1,2 Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405 &amp; Lot 671 Sm Sp yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w.60')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407/09 Lot 665 Sa Sa no 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411 Sm Sc yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417 Lot 666 Sc Sc no 1,3 Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL USE DESC.</td>
<td>USE 1960</td>
<td>USE 1972</td>
<td>TENNANCY CHANGE</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cormorant Street between Douglas &amp; Blanchard: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Lot 672 At At no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 (s.90') Op Rg yes 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 &amp; Lot 673 Sa Op yes (s.90')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728 Lot 674 Aa Aa no 1,2 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732 Lot 675 Sc Sc no 2 &amp; Lot 676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fisgard Street between Store &amp; Government Streets: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538 Lot 456 Sf Sf no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Sc Sc no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542 Rg Rg no 1,2 Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542.5 Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Rg Rg no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546 Lot 457 Sf Sf no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548 Sf Sf yes Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552 Rg Rg no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Rf Rf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544.5 Ar -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556 Lot 2 Sm - yes Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556.5 Plan 8952 Sc Sc no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558 Sc - yes Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Rf Rf yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564/66 Lot 459 Sf Sf no Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568 (s.80') Sf Sf no 1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572 Rg Op yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL USE</td>
<td>TENNANCY</td>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
<td>LAND</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESC.</td>
<td>1960 1972</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>TRANSFER</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fisgard Street between Store &amp; Government Streets: South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Lot 444</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>(w.20')</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>&amp; Lot 445</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541.5</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543.5</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545.5</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Lot 443</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549.5</td>
<td>(w.30')</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>&amp; Lot 444</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>(e.40&quot;)</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555.5</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557.5</td>
<td>Plan 17268</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565/67</td>
<td>Lot &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Plan 17268</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fisgard Street between Government &amp; Douglas Streets: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602/04</td>
<td>Lots 9÷12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Lot 14</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612.5</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Lot 13</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614.5</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL USE</td>
<td>TENNANCY</td>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
<td>LAND SITE</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719,21</td>
<td>Lot 688</td>
<td>Sa, Sa</td>
<td>yes, yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 689</td>
<td>Aa, Aa</td>
<td>yes, yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 690</td>
<td>Rx, Op</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 691</td>
<td>Ra, Rv</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 692</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 693</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 694</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 695</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Lot 604</td>
<td>Aa, Aa</td>
<td>yes, yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624.5</td>
<td>Lot 605</td>
<td>Ar, Ar</td>
<td>yes, yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Lot 606</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630/36</td>
<td>Lot 607</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 608</td>
<td>Sc, Sc</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL USE</td>
<td>TENNANCY</td>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
<td>LAND SITE</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESC.</td>
<td>1960 1972</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>TRANSFER</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>CHANGE IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cormorant Street between Douglas &amp; Blanshard Streets: South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Lot &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Aa Aa no 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 Lot 14</td>
<td>Sc Aa yes D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 Lots 1,2,3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 10192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Store &amp; Government Streets: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Lot 438</td>
<td>Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Lot 439</td>
<td>Ar -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w.20')</td>
<td>Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Lot 439</td>
<td>Ar - 1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.40')</td>
<td>Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546 Lot 440</td>
<td>Op Op no 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/52 Sp Sp no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Store &amp; Government Streets: South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537 Lot 531</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Lot 532</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w.40')</td>
<td>Aa yes 1 S-2 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585 Lot 533</td>
<td>Sm yes 1 S-2 D Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pt.of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL DESC.</td>
<td>USE 1960</td>
<td>USE 1972</td>
<td>TENNANCY CHANGE</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Government &amp; Douglas Streets: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTENNIAL SQUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Government &amp; Douglas Streets: South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Lot 1 Plan 7110</td>
<td>- At yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Lot 659</td>
<td>Op Ob yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>(Par.&quot;B&quot;) Op Ob yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Lot 660 (w.40')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street intersects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Lot 667 (w.60') Sf Sa Aa yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Lot 667 (e.60') Op Aa yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Douglas &amp; Blanshard: North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Lots 1,2,3. Op Aa yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pandora Avenue between Douglas and Blanshard: South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Lot 1 Plan 13830 Ar Ar yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ar Ar no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Lot 158 (Rem.) Rg Rg no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
<td>At At no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Lot 157 Sf Sf no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sf Sf no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Lot 156 Ar Ar yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rf(I)Rv yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Op Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL DESC.</td>
<td>USE 1960</td>
<td>USE 1972</td>
<td>TENNANCY CHANGE</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Douglas Street between Johnson &amp; Pandora Streets: West Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402 Lot 671 (e.60')</td>
<td>Rf Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404 Lot 673</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>Sf Sf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410 Lot 1</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412 Plan 23213</td>
<td>Rv Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420 Lot &quot;A&quot; Plan 12000</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450 Lot 668</td>
<td>At/ Sf/ Op</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Douglas Street between Johnson &amp; Pandora Streets: East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405 Lot 1 Plan 21972</td>
<td>Op/Ob Rg</td>
<td>no/yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407 Lot 139 Plan 13830 (s.60')</td>
<td>Op/Ob Rg</td>
<td>no/yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409 Lot 139 (n.60')</td>
<td>Rg Rv</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417 Lot 139 (n.60')</td>
<td>Ar Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425 Lot 139 (n.60')</td>
<td>Rf Rf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429 Lot 139 (n.60')</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435 Lot 1</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439 Plan 13830</td>
<td>Sf Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441 Lot 139</td>
<td>Rg Rf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447 Lot 139</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453 Lot 139</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469 Lot 139</td>
<td>Rv Rv</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Xd: Xerodermic Deposits
- Xp: Xerodermic Potential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE 1960 1972</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Douglas Street between Pandora &amp; Fisgard Streets: West Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Sa -</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Plan 11299</td>
<td>- Op</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Op</td>
<td>yes 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Rv Rv</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Douglas Street between Pandora &amp; Fisgard: East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Ob Ob</td>
<td>no 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 8665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Lot &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Rv Rv</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Plan 8665</td>
<td>Rf(I)Rf(I)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Rf(I) Ob</td>
<td>yes/no 2</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormorant Street intersects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Lot 672</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s.90')</td>
<td>Rv Rv</td>
<td>no 3</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Lot 673</td>
<td>Rv Rv</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s.90')</td>
<td>Rv Rf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Lot 672</td>
<td>Rf Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n.30')</td>
<td>Rv Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Lot 690</td>
<td>Rf Rg</td>
<td>yes/1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rem.)</td>
<td>Rg Rg</td>
<td>no/1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Lot 691</td>
<td>Rv Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s.60')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL DESC.</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>TENNANCY CHANGE</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>SITE CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Lot 690 (n.60', exc. e.10') &amp; Lot 691 (n.60')</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Douglas Street between Fisgard & Herald: East Side)

HUDSONS BAY COMPANY

(Douglas Street between Fisgard & Herald: West Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Lot 609 (s.70') &amp; Lot 610 (s.70')</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Lot 609 (n.50') &amp; Lot 610 (n.50')</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Lot 611 &amp; Lot 612</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Lot 612</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Government Street between Johnson & Pandora Streets: West Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400/50</td>
<td>Lots 533, 534, 1258 &amp; 1259(e.10')</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL DESC.</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>TENNANCY CHANGE</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>SITE CHANGE</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Government Street between Johnson &amp; Pandora: East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 7492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>Plan 7110</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 7110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>Plan 7110</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Government Street between Pandora &amp; Fisgard: West Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Lot 441</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Lot &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618.5</td>
<td>Plan 17268</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620.5</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td>Rf</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Government Street between Pandora &amp; Fisgard Streets: East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Government Street between Fisgard &amp; Herald Streets: West Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706/08</td>
<td>Lot 459</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s.80')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>LEGAL DESC.</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>TENNANCY</td>
<td>PROPERTY TRANSFER</td>
<td>LAND ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Lot 459</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710.5</td>
<td>(n.40')</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rf(I)Rv</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716.5</td>
<td>Lot 460</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Lot 460</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ra</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722.5</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Ra</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Government Street between Fisgard & Herald: East Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>TENNANCY</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Lots 9-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713.5</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>Sp(I)Sc</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Rv</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717.5</td>
<td>Plan 2779</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan 2779
Plan 17152
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY PROPERTY</th>
<th>LAND SITE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Lot 1261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Lot 1260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Lot 1259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>(w.50')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Johnson Street between Store & Government Streets: North Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY PROPERTY</th>
<th>LAND SITE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Lot &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 7492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Lot &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 7492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Lot 658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s.30')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Broad Street Intersects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL USE</th>
<th>TENNANCY PROPERTY</th>
<th>LAND SITE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Lot 664</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>&amp; Lot 671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>(w.60')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Johnson Street between Douglas & Blanshard Streets: North Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE 1960</th>
<th>USE 1972</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Plan 21972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Lot 140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Lot 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Lot 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Herald Street between Store & Government Street: South Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE 1960</th>
<th>USE 1972</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Lot 463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Lot 462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sc Sc no</td>
<td>Plan 8952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Herald Street between Government & Douglas Streets: South Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LEGAL DESC.</th>
<th>USE 1960</th>
<th>USE 1972</th>
<th>TENNANCY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROPERTY TRANSFER</th>
<th>LAND ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SITE CHANGE</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Lot 617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Lot 615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>&amp; Lot 615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>Lot 614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Lot 613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Herald Street between Douglas & Blanshard Streets: South Side)

HUDSON'S BAY CO.