

URBAN RENEWAL SEMINAR

a report of a meeting held in Ottawa, September, 1959
under the auspices of
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation

FOREWORD

This booklet contains the full text of the principal papers read at the Urban Renewal Seminar which was held under the auspices of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in September 1959. In order to give an indication of other comments made at the Seminar, the editor has prepared a brief account of the discussion sessions which formed a most important part of the Seminar.

The Corporation extends thanks to the City Planning Department of Montreal for arranging and conducting a tour of renewal projects in the city and to all those who took part through the preparation of papers and in discussions at the Seminar.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Welcome to Participants.	1.
Opening Session.	2.
"Highlights of Urban Renewal Studies" - E.A. Levin. Discussion.	
Second Session.	6.
"Urban Renewal in the Dynamic City" - S.H. Pickett. Discussion.	
Third Session.	13.
"Problems and Techniques in Getting Urban Renewal Projects Moving"	
a) A Municipal Viewpoint - M.B.M. Lawson.	13.
b) A Provincial Comment - J.F. Brown.	18.
c) A C.M.H.C. Opinion - A.E. Coll.	19.
Discussion.	
Fourth Session.	21.
"Urban Renewal - Municipal Organization and Policy" - G. Sutton-Brown. Discussion.	
Fifth Session.	32.
"Prospects for Urban Renewal in Canada"	
a) Gerald A.P. Carrothers.	32.
b) Patrick Horsbrugh.	37.
Discussion.	
Appendices.	
I. Program of the Seminar.	39.
II. List of Participants.	42.
III. Urban Renewal Studies under NHA Section 33(1)(h) Published to 1st June 1960.	45.

Welcome to Participants

Mr. Stewart Bates, President of C.M.H.C., welcomed the participants to Ottawa. In the course of his comments Mr. Bates said that despite the size of Canada, the number of cities was small enough to permit virtually all the planners interested in renewal to assemble in one room. This direct discussion was invaluable and the opportunity to provide it was perhaps the principal reason why the Corporation had arranged the seminar. Mr. Bates spoke briefly of a visit which he had recently made to Pittsburgh. He had been deeply impressed by the magnitude of the downtown renewal already completed and had returned with renewed conviction of the urgent need for bold action in Canadian cities.

Mr. Secord, Vice-President of C.M.H.C., added his welcome to that of the President. He recalled that in 1956, when the National Housing Act was about to be amended to encourage urban redevelopment, the Corporation had held the first renewal seminar. Now that over twenty urban renewal studies had been undertaken and several large projects were in course of construction, the time was opportune for a second meeting of the professional planners who were deeply concerned in all renewal activity. Mr. Secord mentioned changes in C.M.H.C. which had been made to facilitate the carrying out of the Corporation's responsibilities in the field of renewal. These included the establishment of an Urban Renewal and Public Housing Division and the appointment of an Adviser on Urban Renewal.

Opening Session - Chairman: A.E. Coll, Director, Urban Renewal and
Public Housing Division, C.M.H.C.

Paper, "Highlights of Urban Renewal Studies" by E.A. Levin, Architectural
and Planning Division, C.M.H.C. ★

Twenty cities have to date undertaken 23 urban renewal studies across the country. Of these, 9 have been completed and reports published. This is a considerable number and it is very likely that many of you have not had the opportunity to examine the work that your colleagues in other cities have produced in dealing with what is basically the same problem. We thought it would be useful if the reports could be reviewed and discussed by the seminar as a whole, and my presentation this morning is designed with this in mind. It has been conceived as a construction of a hypothetical urban renewal study, using material from the reports which you yourselves have produced. We have had prepared a series of slides from selected reports, and these have been arranged in a sequence to illustrate the kind of material which might be contained in a model or idealized urban renewal study.

I would like to explain that the material was taken only from those reports which have been published in final form. Reports in their draft stages, and still in preparation were not used, for obvious reasons. Nor is there a value judgment implied in the fact that a given report was selected for illustration. We are not attempting to praise or to find fault with any particular study. The illustrations were made more or less at random from the available studies. There was obviously a limit to the number of slides which could be made and presented, and accordingly there was a large element of chance in the selection of one particular study rather than another. Finally, I think it should be quite clear that no actual study covered all the items, which we have included in our hypothetical construction. Some studies emphasized one set of factors and neglected others; for example, some were very comprehensive in the condition of building survey but were relatively unconcerned about the wider planning context of their redevelopment proposals; some reports made a very thorough analysis of the sociological factors but did not include any sketches showing how specific projects might look after redevelopment, and so on. This is, of course, as it should be, since each city has its specific problems and its own way of solving them. It cannot be expected that what is considered of first importance in one municipal situation will be so considered in all others. Our idealized report however, includes all of these items and is really a composite of the salient points of all the reports. We do not offer it as a perfect model, but rather as an inventory or check list from which a municipality might select for consideration those items which are most appropriate to its own situation.

★ The opening and concluding remarks of Mr. Levin are reproduced in full. A tabulation has been made of the contents of the slide lecture which formed the core of Mr. Levin's paper.

- Editor.

CONTENT OF SLIDE LECTURE

Section of Study	Content of Study	Reports Used in Illustration by Mr. Levin
1. Sketch Municipal Plan	Topography. Communications. Residential Areas. Industrial Areas. Civic & Commercial Areas. Parks & Open Spaces. Cultural & Special Purpose Areas. Program for Housing.	Moncton, N.B.
2. Physical Survey	Land Use. Age & Condition of Buildings. Residential Density. Delineation of Areas for more detailed study.	Vancouver and Hamilton
3. Social Survey	Residential Density. Incidence of Disease. Police Cases. Juvenile Delinquency. Location of Relief Cases. Overcrowding. Delineation of Areas for more detailed study.	Halifax
4. Detailed Study of Selected Areas	As required from the items listed in 2 & 3 above. Establishment of Priorities for Renewal.	Saint John, Van- couver, Hamilton and Toronto
5. Project Plans	Residential Rehabilitation. Residential Redevelopment. Central Area Redevelopment.	Toronto Vancouver Moncton, Hal- ifax & Saint John
	Relocation Housing (i.e. on clear site).	Saint John
6. Program for Implementation and Financing	Timing of Development. Sources of Capital.	Vancouver & Halifax

At the beginning of my presentation I suggested that each city has its own peculiar problems, for which it must find appropriate solutions. In the reports which have been prepared, we have in fact found that each city

has devoted considerable attention to local problems of this kind, and the final section of the hypothetical study deals with these problems of special consideration.

One of the most serious of these is the problem of ethnic minorities, Vancouver, Windsor, and Halifax afforded particular illustration in this connection. There are perhaps two major difficulties arising out of redevelopment proposals for an area occupied by an ethnic minority. The first of these is the fact that these small out-groups have their own characteristic folkways, which are inevitably threatened by redevelopment, and the group therefore resists the proposals. A simple example can be taken from Vancouver where a significant number of single Chinese men are found in the proposed redevelopment areas. These men live in Tong houses, a type of accommodation the equivalent of which cannot be provided under the National Housing Act. Redevelopment would destroy this fundamental pattern of association. Even more disturbing is the fact that the society knows the virtually impossibility of re-establishing the pattern elsewhere, and hence there is resistance to the redevelopment not merely from the men themselves, but from the group as a whole.

The second difficulty is the fact that these groups have over a period of time provided themselves with cultural facilities such as churches, clubs and meeting places which are an integral part of their way of life. In these cases it is most important that the group be rehoused on the site so that any new housing project can utilize the established facilities and amenities. Often this is not possible, plans require that the new housing be provided in a different area. This situation also provokes resistance from the members of the group. Windsor, which has both Negro and Oriental minority groups, and Halifax which has a Negro minority group, both face problems of this or a similar kind.

Special problems often arise from the social composition of the population of a proposed redevelopment area, apart from ethnic considerations. There are often high proportions of aged people, or young single people whom it is difficult to accommodate in a redevelopment project. Problem families, or what the socialologists call troubled families, must also be recognized as requiring special treatment. St. John's, Newfoundland, may be cited as an example in this regard.

Fringe blight was a special consideration in the Moncton and Regina studies. In Regina, a large area in the North-West sector of the city was so serious a problem that a special study had to be undertaken to deal with it.

In Trail, B.C., the location of the C.P.R. line created a problem of the first magnitude by forcing the pattern of both the street system and the housing development into a torturous and constricted form. The report gave special consideration to this virtually unique local problem.

Sarnia had a special problem in its Bluewater Area - A residential area of some 10 acres which has gradually become completely surrounded by Industrial development and is now an island struggling desperately to maintain its residential character.

Some reports have laid stress on a particular approach to the redevelopment study. Winnipeg, for example, emphasized the architectural aspects perhaps more than the others, and carried its architectural studies farther. Hamilton was unique in devoting a map to its Regional Setting.

This quick glance at the completed urban renewal studies, though the device of a composite mosaic, will not answer all the questions on the subject which you must have in your minds. However, I hope that these will all be resolved during the forthcoming sessions, and in your own informal discussions. That after all is the purpose of the Seminar.

Discussion following Mr. Levin's paper

The Chairman initiated a lively discussion by criticizing the complicated and over-elaborate nature of some of the reports. Mr. J.F. Brown agreed that in city-wide studies there was a tendency to collect too much social data and perhaps too little physical and economic data. In project studies however, Mr. Brown maintained that comprehensive social data is essential. Both Mr. M.B. Lawson and Mr. G. Sutton Brown thought that some of the social data obtained had been unnecessary, as well as being unconvincing. Mr. Sutton Brown said that it was impossible to generalize. In some cases the reports may not be detailed enough. The needs of each city are different and he thought that any formula for a study was undesirable. In any event the cost of the studies was negligible in relation to the cost of the program arising from them. Mr. H.S.M. Carver was surprised to hear criticism of social surveys. He thought that in many cases this is the really telling evidence of the need for redevelopment. Mr. D. Buchanan summed up by examining the role of the city planner in a municipality. He said that this role was all too rarely understood and that in consequence, the planner tended to justify his recommendations by an elaborate structure of survey data.

Dr. E.G. Faludi thought there was a need for a guide to the contents which C.M.H.C. expects to see in a study, although he agreed that the varied problems of individual cities made uniformity difficult. Mr. J.F. Brown drew attention to "Urban Renewal Notes" published by the Ontario Department of Planning and Development in 1958 and "Steps in Urban Renewal" published by the Community Planning Association of Canada in 1957. Both these publications contained a fairly detailed guide to the content of both renewal studies and redevelopment applications.

Mr. Sutton Brown urged C.M.H.C. to undertake and promote more research into urban affairs. He thought much time and money could have been saved in the studies if the results of research had been available. He considered research into basic questions such as the relationship between slums and their inhabitants, was quite inadequate.

Second Session - Chairman: George Rich, Assistant Director, Metropolitan Planning Commission of Greater Winnipeg.

Paper, "Urban Renewal in the Dynamic City" by S.H. Pickett, Adviser on Urban Renewal, C.M.H.C.

The theme of this paper is simple. It is that integration of any renewal program with the urban or urban regional plan is an essential prerequisite to the complete success of that program.

Urbanization and the City

Rapidly increasing rates of urbanization are one of the most striking phenomena of the twentieth century. Burgeoning growth has changed the form and structure of our cities and has posed tremendous technical and administrative problems. In most of the large manufacturing centres the problems of increasing population have been compounded by an attendant growth in the number of automobiles to a level which taxes the ingenuity and resources of city administrations to the utmost. No working solution to the dual problem is in sight although there have been many palliatives. The city size limiters, the traffic excluders, the traffic undergrounders, the rapid transit renaissance prophets have all had their say. Many cities throughout North America are tied in webs of expressways, but to little avail.

The effect of recent growth on urban structure has varied of course with the individual circumstances of each city. In general, however, the effect has been to throw around the old city a broad bank of low-density suburbs of reasonable structural quality and design. Outside that band, in areas which are often under the control of secondary authorities, there is frequently found a loose ring of rather poor houses, sometimes arrayed in ribbons along highways, accompanied by a variety of industries and commercial undertakings which are either of recent establishment, or have been forced out of the central city by the complex pressures of change.

In consequence of rapid peripheral growth, striking changes have taken place in and around the city centre. The people from substantial residential areas have moved out to the new suburbs. The big old homes have been divided into apartments or used as rooming houses or for non-residential purposes; the smaller houses have been sold or leased fairly cheaply and in the scramble for cheap accommodation have inevitably suffered from overcrowding. There has for too long been profit in neglect and overcrowding, as the resulting slums stand witness. There were of course sub-standard houses in the city before the rapid increase in urbanization. Too many of them still remain, and are now the worst slums, located in areas where much of our effort in urban renewal has so far been concentrated. This breakdown in the residential pattern has been accompanied by the inevitable spread of conflicting land uses into residential areas. The pattern of blighted homes, overcrowded factories, inconvenient offices, all overlaid by a tangle of railroad tracks and streets designed for horse-drawn traffic is familiar to us all. It is such blighted areas which have brought the need for redevelopment into prominence.

At the core of the city stand those commercial, cultural and governmental buildings and spaces from which the city receives identity in the minds of men. This area, the central business district as it is so often inadequately named, is a true heart from which the life blood of the whole metropolitan community flows. Yet here also there is usually some blighting influence; it may be an old and inadequate street pattern, it may be a shortage of open space to give rest to the spirit amid the bustle of commercial life, or buildings which are no longer suitable for their uses and are in need of replacement; it may be an intruding land use, such as that elevated railroad which used to run to the very centre of Philadelphia, casting the shadow of blight all around it; or it may be lack of parking space, with the usual accompaniment of congestion, confusion and danger.

The Dynamics of Urbanism

A town planner is essentially motivated by two forces: firstly, the economic force which urges the development of a place in which industry and business, or special purposes such as government or higher education, can flourish, and secondly, the social forces which make men seek to create a city in which fruitful, comprehensive and varied human lives may be lived. To these ends planning strives to establish conditions in which improvements, change and growth will take place in correct relationship, at the right time and to the physical and social benefit of the whole city or urban region. The pursuit of these ends through town planning follows upon a political decision. The direction in which any community will go depends upon a policy formulated by one of the levels of local government. Whatever the level of government, it is the decision of elected representatives which establishes policy and permits the planner to employ his skills on the fabric of the city.

The Need for Integration

In the period of rapid urbanization we have seen that new growth has wrought changes in old areas. Similarly, in the application of planning measures to the implementation of development policy, each new action will have a variety of subsidiary effects and consequences. A well known example of these consequences comes from the City of Philadelphia which over a period of eight years carried out a series of slum clearance and redevelopment schemes as well as some interesting attempts at rehabilitation. The city tried to eliminate the worst slums first in the belief that the existence of good quality redevelopment projects amidst large areas of blight would encourage the natural improvement of those areas. The results were unfortunately not too encouraging. People displaced from the cleared sites overflowed into the surrounding areas, still further overcrowding bad houses. It was found that when these areas were subsequently cleared in their turn, they posed greater problems and were more costly to redevelop as a direct result of the initial clearance project. Early in 1957, the city's Development Co-ordinator recognized that the 'islands of good' had failed to benefit the 'swamp of bad' and announced a change to a balanced policy of new housing, redevelopment in areas which are not necessarily the worst and rehabilitation of areas which can be given a further useful life. This simple example could probably be matched in any city with experience of large scale slum clearance. Much more complex consequences could follow from redevelopment with a new land use or at very different scale. These consequences may be good; new incentives to maintain and rehabilitate abutting property, a rise in land value sufficient

to encourage private redevelopment, the creation of neighbourhood open space. Conversely redevelopment can bring overloading of adjacent traffic arteries, over-use of available playgrounds and parks, the spilling over of people into already crowded buildings. The important point is that these consequences must be anticipated, so that the city plan can allow for the effects of renewal action through an integrated planning program. The project approach, where planning and design stop at the boundaries of the site is never likely to be fully successful, for unless understood and guided, the mutual effect of the project and its surroundings on each other will be detrimental to both, and may prejudice continuing action.

Provisions for Renewal Integration

The only positive statements in Canadian legislation relative to the integration of renewal projects with an urban plan occur in the National Housing Act and the Ontario Planning Act. Section 23 of the National Housing Act allows the Minister of Public Works to enter into an agreement with a municipality whereby Federal financial assistance can be made available for a redevelopment project in the city. This agreement must provide for the development to be "in accordance or in harmony with an official community plan satisfactory to the Minister". Section 20 of the Ontario statute, the redevelopment section, provides that "no redevelopment plan shall be approved by the Municipal Board unless it conforms with the Official Plan".

Redevelopment is mentioned in one other Act, the Town Planning Act of British Columbia, Section 4 of which provides for the designation on an official town plan of "areas for special projects, including those which require development or redevelopment as a whole". In all other provincial planning acts, the contents of the official plan are so broadly set out that, while they appear to permit renewal proposals to be included in the plan, they neither demand nor even encourage inclusion. Typical of these broad provisions is Section 66 of the Town & Rural Planning Act of Alberta which states that the general plan may include proposals relating to "the manner in which the land. . . . should be used or developed, whether for public or other purposes".

Content of a Typical General Urban Plan

The general plan exists under many names - master plan, development plan, municipal or official plan - but with very little fundamental variation in content. It usually includes a survey and analysis of the physical community; of its economic background; its industrial and commercial activities; of the people and their homes, work, recreation, education and entertainment; of the pattern of communications and of transport. From these facts a detailed analysis is made which indicates the probable rate and direction of growth, the deficiencies which can be recognized in all the functions of the city and over the whole range of land uses, and the new needs of the developing community. It is during this analysis that the general location and approximate boundaries of blighted areas, in their various degrees of urgency, are first recognized.

The general urban plan also contains a map of proposals for physical improvements of all kinds: highways, parks, industry, housing. It indicates new or changed uses of land in both developed areas of the city and areas for future growth. These distributions of land use may include the re-use of areas subject to renewal action.

So much is common to virtually all general urban plans. It has been widely recognized for some time that for a plan to have influence, for it to be faithfully followed by an administration in pursuit of their policy, the plan must acknowledge the factors of time and cost. Some general plans are therefore restricted as to time, with the proposals phased over designated periods in the order in which they will be of most value to the city. Cost, where it is taken into account, is usually examined in relation to the possibilities for capital investment in the city. Expenditures on public works proposed in the plan are included in long range capital estimates and in the immediate capital budget of the city administration.

The Renewal Plan and Integration

The contents of a renewal plan are limited to proposals for a specific area, be it a relatively small clearance and redevelopment project, or the redevelopment of a neighbourhood. The plan shows the area to be cleared, buildings which are to remain, the new street pattern, and proposals for the re-allocation of land uses. The site plan for new buildings may be developed in detail and may include an architectural study. The renewal plan will be accompanied by a mass of detailed information on families and their relocation, on methods of implementation, on cost and the financial participation of various levels of government.

Legislation, where it provides for the contents of a general city plan at all, makes little or no mention of renewal. The general plan may be little more than a negative zoning map with few positive proposals, and those unrelated to a phased program or to a capital budget. The renewal plan may be dominated by the idea of the 'project' and be unmindful of the teeming city around its boundaries. Yet the introduction of new work into the old structure of the city, be it in one block or a hundred, brings about secondary effects which may be felt across a metropolitan area.

In Montreal we will be able to see Place Ville Marie, an office complex at the heart of the city, the central feature of which is to be a tower forty stories high, in which as many as 10,000 people may work. The area is designated for commercial development on the Montreal master plan. The project does not conflict with other major proposals and there can be no doubt that it will add immeasurably to the visual excitement of the city. It is an acceptable scheme within the framework of the general urban plan yet, even in our largest metropolitan city such a project will do far more than dominate the central area in a visual sense. It will affect all the complex, interlocking relationships of the centre. It will change the habits of people and the pattern of movement throughout the metropolitan area. To their credit, the designers of Place Ville Marie have made extensive studies to determine the effects of the development on the city and have made whatever allowances are possible in their plans. But only the city administration can make plans to adjust the community to the stresses which this development and others of its magnitude will impose.

This extreme example serves to illustrate that integration with a master plan may not be enough. I suggest that there is a need for an intermediate level of planning between the urban plan and the renewal project plan which will take into account complex inter-relationships, subtle shifts in habit and emphasis and the radiating secondary effects of renewal proposals as far as they can be anticipated.

Planning Districts

This intermediate stage involves the planning of districts within the city, in much the same way as new neighbourhoods are planned in developing areas. The boundaries of planning districts could be drawn to cover the whole jurisdiction in such a way that respect is paid to natural boundaries and features such as river valleys and escarpments, to man-made dividers including railroad tracks, main highways and expressways, and to the land use pattern of the city. The resultant pattern of contiguous areas would have some affinity with an attempt to define neighbourhoods in the city, although it would also include areas of predominantly non-residential use. The delineation of planning districts inevitably involves many compromises with the ideal of areas of like development separated by natural or man-made dividers, but upon the district plans could be developed an indivisible plan of urbanism and renewal.

The planning district plan would, within the framework of the general urban plan, show in detail major proposals affecting the district. It would include all positive and agreed public works in the area as well as those which are in the final stages of design and certain to be implemented. It would make broad allocations of land use in accordance with the general plan. The planning district plan would show areas for clearance and redevelopment, rehabilitation areas, and areas where conservation measures could be applied. It would designate sites for special land uses and for public buildings. It would allow for the development of a park and playground system appropriate to the needs of the area. It would balance the new and the old with all their complex inter-dependence over the entire area. But, more important still, the preparation of such a plan would permit consideration to be given to the influence of abutting planning districts. In this way plans which are both practical and creative can be developed over the whole urban area, having regard not only to the provisions of the general plan but also to the consequences of renewal action. The steps in the municipal planning process would then be: the general urban plan; the delineation of planning districts; the preparation of plans for those districts based on a system of priority; the preparation of renewal plans for individual projects.

We have seen that intermediate plans of this kind are already being developed in one or two cities, notably Toronto and Vancouver. An illustration of a planning district given high priority in the Toronto renewal study is the Don Planning Area, covering about one square mile immediately to the east of the Central Business District. This is a predominantly residential area which includes the two big Regent Park clearance and redevelopment projects carried out during the past decade, as well as a fairly small proportion of commercial development. The boundaries of the area are a river valley on the east, a ravine on the north, the central area on the west and an area of completely different use and character on the south towards the harbour.

The reasons why the Don Area was given priority over others were: that it contains areas of blight; it lies between Downtown and the Don River and was continuously attracting the attention of developers to whom little positive guidance could be given by the city council. The area is affected by two expressways, one now being constructed and one proposed within the

next few years, which will together bring serious traffic problems into the area. These factors compelled consideration of the whole range of renewal and construction works and of their mutual relationship. At the present time the planning of further redevelopment proposals and consideration of rehabilitation measures within the general provisions of the district plan is being carried out.

To sum up, I believe it to be a serious error to put urban planning and renewal in separate compartments. The fundamental fact about their relationship is that they are indivisible, merging liquids in the stream of urban development. Under the inspiration of the United States with its agencies, legislation, citizen groups and political pressures, there has been some success in setting up renewal apart from planning. Whilst this separation may have helped to get interest in, and support for, action in some cities, I believe it is both unnatural and unfortunate. We should be sure that in each city there is the closest integration between proposed renewal action and the plans which are prepared for the growth and nurture of the living city.

Discussion following Mr. Pickett's paper

Group 1 (Reporter: Mr. A.R. Davey)

The Group agreed with the need for integration of renewal action into the pattern of municipal planning. It was felt however, that some municipalities, interested in making use of Section 23 of the National Housing Act, were not prepared to employ staff and undertake planning on the scale which would be necessary if Mr. Pickett's proposal was effectively implemented.

The Group also thought that there was uncertainty about the basic purpose of the amendments to Section 23. Had these the sole objective of encouraging redevelopment? The Group suggested that other kinds of renewal should also receive consideration for Federal financial aid. There is an urgent need for an experimental rehabilitation project in Canada which would provide data of value to all our cities. Furthermore the problem of single people in redevelopment areas necessitated the construction of rooming houses in some cities. The Group urged a more varied and experimental approach to the construction of rental accommodation.

Group 2 (Reporter: Mr. D. Buchanan)

This Group thought that not only was a renewal program part of a general development policy as suggested in the paper, but that it is a continuing operation. The Group thought that all levels of Government were prone to think of renewal in terms of projects.

This Group agreed that district plans, as suggested by Mr. Pickett, may prove inflexible in the face of a fresh concept developed by private enterprise. The Group doubted whether municipal planning proposals or urban renewal project plans were flexible enough to accommodate new ideas during the course of implementation.

Group 3 (Reporter: Mr. J. Preston)

This Group agreed with the theme of the paper while regretting that at the Seminar Mr. Pickett was speaking to the converted. The integration of planning and renewal needed to be better known and understood in the municipalities which are responsible for both local planning and initiating redevelopment or other renewal proposals. The Group considered that there was a need for urban regional planning. They recognized that this could be initiated by provinces although it would be dependent upon the goodwill and co-operation of municipalities within the region. The Group asked whether it would not be possible for the Federal Government to contribute to regional planning either financially, or by the direct conduct of planning work at the request of the Province responsible.

Group 4 (Reporter: Mr. D. Henderson)

The Group were pessimistic about the relationship between planning and renewal. Mr. Pickett has used the word 'dynamics'. In their view, the Group thought there was little consideration of dynamic factors in the formulation and assessment of renewal proposals. The Group considered that full use of the redevelopment provisions of the National Housing Act was inhibited by the housing origins of the legislation. They thought it was difficult to define renewal objectives pertinent to varied local situations which would be acceptable for Federal financial participation. The Group thought Mr. Pickett was correct in warning against the setting up of renewal as a separate self-contained activity. They viewed with concern the evidence of "empire building" in renewal agencies in the United States and urged that as renewal activity became more widespread in Canada there should be the fullest measure of co-operation between municipal officials, planners at all levels of Government and those charged with the administration of urban renewal projects.

Third Session - Chairman: Murray Zides, Director of the Town Planning Commission of Metropolitan Saint John.

Three papers were presented on the general theme "Problems and Techniques in Getting Urban Renewal Projects Moving":-

- (a) 'A Municipal Viewpoint' by M.B.M. Lawson, Director, City of Toronto Planning Board.

Urban renewal has been accused of being many things, from building a new apartment to the wholesale clearance and redevelopment of a city centre. Perhaps it does not really matter how we use the term so long as we behave sensibly and do whatever needs to be done. But the term is becoming part of the public vocabulary, a shorthand symbol which can convey a great deal without lengthy explanation. Once it achieves common currency we must accept whatever meaning it may have acquired, and it is worth our while to try to give it the most constructive meaning possible.

It seems to be inevitable that the public role in planning and development should proceed by a process of evolution and extension and that new terms such as urban renewal should take their place in this process. Thus, when it became apparent that not only redevelopment was needed in cities but also the preservation and improvement of very extensive tracts, an expanded, more varied programme was conceived. This has been termed an urban renewal programme and is commonly thought of as including redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation.

Yet surely it is evident that this is only another step upon the way, an inadequate approach to the situation faced by our cities to-day. At the very least we should include all the public measures which affect the fabric of the city, all the measures for the care of the flesh which clothes the fundamental skeleton of its structure. Better still, we should include all those measures which affect the total development of the city, since nothing short of this is adequate in our situation. We should revert to the clear, simple and fundamental vision of Patrick Geddes when he called for a synoptic view of the situation, a realization that we are dealing with a process of constant renewal of the entire city in all its parts. If this view could be conveyed to the public and embodied in a simple term like urban renewal we would have done much to establish public popular appreciation of the basic situation we must face in years to come.

GENERAL CONCEPTS AND DISTRICT PLANS

Our cities are expanding at a phenomenal rate, constantly outgrowing the pattern of roads and buildings that served when they were smaller. They are aging: parts decay, and must be repaired or replaced. And all the time society is changing, creating new demands and new forms of development.

To meet this situation cities must constantly be adapting themselves to the changed circumstances, and as they do so they must remain healthy - pleasant, satisfactory and interesting places to live and work. Cities do not adapt easily: the tremendous investment in the existing

establishment, in money, installations and people's lives, necessitates caution and respect in tampering with it. The utmost value must be obtained from what we have and where changes are made, they must capitalize on existing assets as far as possible. Good husbandry is essential, but it must be applied with intelligence, using available resources where they will do most good.

This problem must be tackled with thoroughness, intelligence and good sense. Ideally a complete set of plans for the adaptation of the city should be worked out incorporating all aspects of public and private development. This should lead to an urban renewal programme, setting out all the things to be done and the timetable for doing them. In so doing it must be recognized that when we put our finger on any spot in the city, we touch not only a maze of interests and responsibilities but also people whose lives will be affected.

The problems are immense. First, and probably foremost to the planner, is the working out of the plan. What aims should guide us? What concepts do we believe will be valid for our city in the future? Strangely enough this question is frequently ignored, perhaps because it is so difficult to answer. The only way to find an answer is by thorough study of the city, its nature, situation and how it can develop, and by appraising what its future role may be and what may happen to the different elements which make it up. In short, a thorough analysis with emphasis on a problematical future, followed by a determination of plans which will meet the anticipated situation.

Having accepted some general concepts these must be turned into a whole series of plans, setting out in considerable detail how each part of the city is visualized and what action is needed. The sheer mass of material involved poses a problem in organizing it so that it will be intelligible and clearly related to the overall concepts of the city. In Toronto we have adopted the planning district system to help overcome this. The city is divided into twenty-five districts, each large enough to allow statistical projections and calculations but small enough to be readily comprehensible in some detail. Against this chequerboard, problems are examined. City-wide concepts are presented in a generalized city-wide plan which is elaborated in specific plans for each district. Naturally there are also many detailed plans of items within the planning districts and of others which cross the district boundaries but it is the district plans which constitute the basic coverage of specific plans. This system, incidentally, stems from the Toronto urban renewal study of 1955. It has also been adopted by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, the planning districts in this case being considerably larger than those in the city. The total planning picture for Toronto will thus ultimately be set out in a generalized plan of the Metropolitan planning area (larger than Metropolitan Toronto) supplemented by plans of the Metropolitan planning districts; and within the city there will be a generalized plan, probably in slightly greater detail than the Metropolitan generalized plan, as well as a series of specific planning district plans supplemented by detailed plans as necessary. The planning district plans will incorporate all items known to be planned within each district whether city, metropolitan or other, and should constitute a basic reference for residents of the district.

One aspect of the problem of making studies and keeping the information in usable form has been tackled by initiating a data sheet system. The usual practice in surveying an area is to obtain a selected list of information about each property. This is analyzed, perhaps mapped, and filed. But it is extremely difficult to re-use or adapt it to any other problem and usually it tends to be one-purpose information. In Toronto we are recording standard information for each property on punch cards. These can readily be analyzed in many different ways and comparisons made between situations at different times. Being cross-referenced to assessment and other records they can be kept up-to-date with reasonable certainty. Properly maintained, they should be a permanently valuable source of information readily used for a variety of problems whenever the need arises.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF PLANS

Having made the studies and produced the plans it is necessary to have public support if the plans are to be implemented. If the public does not regard them as important and necessary it is unlikely that the politicians or anyone else will. Of course it is not a simple matter of producing a plan and then seeking support for it: members of the public, and many officials, businessmen and politicians are involved all the way through the process. In studying districts in Toronto we make a practice of contacting numerous public and private organizations, as well as individuals, for information and their views on known problems. Civic officials are consulted and, where appropriate, provincial and federal officials also. Private companies, public utilities and professional groups are canvassed. Politicians are informed and their views sought. The aim is to contact anyone who can be useful, within the limits of time and the objectives of the study.

A general acceptance of the idea of planning the development of the city is necessary if these contacts are going to bear fruit and this, basically, depends on public attitudes created by the press, radio, and other media. The planner can stimulate interest but rarely create it entirely himself. If this acceptance exists the contacts usually yield a great deal of information and are very valuable in preparing people for the plans to be produced.

The plans themselves must be well presented and ample opportunity provided for their discussion. Our experience in Toronto is that interest is generally widespread and that people should be adequately and accurately informed at the time of the first public announcement. If possible everyone in the area affected should be given a precis of the plan and the opportunity to see the complete report. A brief statement should also be given widespread circulation, possibly through press and radio though these are unreliable channels. Ontario law requires public discussion and this in any event is sensible. In Toronto we have preceded the general public sessions by more detailed discussions with the executives of the more representative and important organizations and this has proved to be very useful in achieving a better understanding of the plans and a greater feeling of trust in the work being done.

PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Once plans are adopted their implementation must be set in motion. Generally the groundwork for this has been laid during the preparation of

the plan. The various officials and others who will be responsible for carrying out the different parts of the programme will have been consulted and, if possible, their concurrence obtained before the plan is presented. The implementation after adoption of the plans should be a continuation of a process already under way. It should be written into the capital budgets and policy decisions of the various governments and agencies. Experience in Toronto shows that there are many difficulties. First it is necessary to consult all the people who will be involved in making the different decisions. It is not always easy to find out who the right people are, since some of the organizations involved work in mysterious ways, especially the large ones. But the effort must be made since nothing is so fatal to the chances of a proposal being executed as to offend the amour-propre of someone in a position to affect its chances, by not giving that person's authority and position due recognition when the proposal is being discussed. Holders of office are very touchy: if they participate in a decision they will usually support it: if they are presented with someone else's decision they will often exercise great ingenuity in finding flaws in it.

When these people have been brought together they must be given adequate information to understand the situation and have the issues accurately and clearly set before them. This is the planners' job although others will be able to make valuable contributions. Naturally it is rarely, except in small areas, that all those responsible for all aspects of a plan can be brought together at one time: there are just too many involved for this to be manageable. In practice a combination of meetings with individuals on specific items and with committees on joint operations, such as slum clearance, seems to work quite well. The planner faces a heavy task in keeping all of these going, ensuring that the whole range is covered and that adequate records are kept. It is important to be clear, and in agreement, about what has been discussed and decided as work progresses.

In the course of developing plans and discussing them many issues have to be decided in the light of the policies of the governments, and other agencies, involved. Often these policies have not been spelled out so clearly that there is no doubt about them and consequently there may be some uncertainty about the plans. Unfortunately the test of whether the policies were understood rightly or not only comes after the plans have been adopted and submitted for implementation. If they were misunderstood the plans must be reconsidered and submitted in a revised form: a cumbersome procedure which makes the politician and laymen suspect that someone has blundered.

This situation is most likely where the plans call for something differing from past experience. In Toronto the Regent Park South redevelopment project was a fairly conventional one and went through with little difficulty. The Moss Park project, on the other hand, broke new ground in that the proposed re-use of the area was different from previous projects. New policy decisions had to be made and this contributed to delays and confusion in getting the project under way.

The Riverdale project, at present being worked on, introduces a much broader and more varied programme than has previously been attempted. It includes the reorganization of the road and property pattern in places, new parks and parking, extended schools, housing by-law enforcement, slum

clearance both in tracts and in isolated properties, and new housing. It is not yet clear how this will be received or how it will fit existing legislation. It will require much hard thought and study on the part of all involved to determine what their roles and policies are going to be. Until that is settled the programme of implementation can hardly be finally determined.

To try to meet this sort of situation every effort is made to consult all those who will be involved while the plans are being prepared and the programme drafted. However, this is a group of officials most of whom understand the objectives and agree with the plan whether they feel it will finally be acceptable to the politicians or not. There is much to be said for the plan they accept being a sound and clear planning document so that the subsequent political decisions are made in the light of a well-presented argument. But if the political decisions do not permit the plan to be executed then the problem of re-shaping it arises. Perhaps there is no certain way of avoiding this problem: it is characteristic of a rapidly evolving situation where governmental machinery, policy and legislation constantly need revision in the light of new understanding of the needs, and are always following rather than leading.

As plans and programmes become more comprehensive they inevitably become more complex and varied. This creates enough difficulties on the planning side but is even more complicated when programmes are being implemented. This is the crucial time for relating all the people and interests affected and co-ordinating the work to be done. Generally the planner can do little more than advise at this stage, particularly if his office is set up to produce plans and advise council, rather than to implement decisions.

Following advice from management consultants the City of Toronto has recently recognized this situation by establishing the Department of Buildings and Development. The Planning Board's role is to prepare plans and advise council on the future development of the City. Once plans have been adopted by council the responsibility for their implementation shifts to the new Department. It is too early yet to say how this will work but it fills a conspicuous gap in the City's organization to handle comprehensive programmes, and there seems no reason why it should not be successful as long as there is continuous co-ordination between the Department and the Planning Board.

One last aspect of the situation must be touched upon. The more widely it is recognized that government must take a leading role in shaping, developing and renewing our cities, the more comprehensive will our plans and programmes become. These plans affect a great many people, touching both their lives and property. It is imperative that we work out plans and procedures which recognize this and are intelligible, justifiable and fair to those affected. The plans and programmes must clearly carry conviction. But in addition we must aim at a situation where people have reasonable assurance of property tenure. Perhaps the ideal would be that detailed plans requiring the acquisition of specific property would not be published until implementation was imminent, say a year or two in advance of actual work, and that once they were officially adopted, owners would have the right to approach the municipality to purchase their property if the proposal

caused them any hardship. This principle was enunciated in the Toronto urban renewal study of 1955 and events have indicated its validity even though it has not yet been adopted.

These are some of the problems that come to mind arising out of the very limited work already done on urban renewal, and some suggested ways of handling them. Above all is the realization that we are only at the beginning of a period and that a vast amount remains to be done before we are in any way equipped to meet the need. The fundamental problems of new forms of urban development, the growth, aging and renewal of our cities, must be recognized as a major future issue of not only municipal but also provincial and national significance. Senior governments must set the stage, appraise the overall situation and see to it that resources are made available to do the essential work. Municipalities are best equipped to appraise local conditions, elaborate plans and programmes within their boundaries and implement them. An urban renewal programme should become a normal part of city government, a clear, understandable process, not a hit and miss affair going by fits and starts. It should become an accepted background of renewal against which the life of the city can change and develop in response to new needs.

(b) 'A Provincial Comment' by J.F. Brown, Redevelopment Officer, Department of Planning and Development, Province of Ontario.

The principal problem from a Provincial viewpoint is that of money. The Province makes contributions to municipal development in many ways, including schools, roads, housing and services. Redevelopment is just one among this list of contributory items and there is therefore concern about the supply of money for redevelopment projects which are recognized to be necessary.

Mr. Brown saw a need for increased understanding. At municipal level, understanding that urban renewal does not necessarily mean public housing and that public housing in turn is not necessarily modelled on Regent Park South and Regent Park North. At citizen level, there is a need for increased understanding of the processes of city development as a whole, and for co-ordination between a wide variety of existing citizen groups.

The third problem, in Mr. Brown's view, is the complication of the Federal Provincial relationship. He suggested that liaison and co-ordination at several levels delays procedures, although he agreed that such consultation is necessary. Lastly, Mr. Brown spoke of the Provincial contribution to the cost of redevelopment and said that in order to encourage municipalities to make use of Section 23 of the National Housing Act, the Province of Ontario had decided to make a 25% contribution.

In closing, Mr. Brown commented that if the first ten sections of the Ontario Planning Act were consistently implemented, the need for urban renewal would seldom arise.

(c) 'A C.M.H.C. Opinion' by A.E. Coll, Director, Urban Renewal and Public Housing Division, C.M.H.C.

Mr. Coll said that the National Housing Act placed a limit of \$25 million on Federal contributions to redevelopment projects. If this limit is a gross amount, it would be possible for acquisition and clearance up to \$50 million to be undertaken. If, however the limit is net, and if a write-down of 50% is assumed, the amount would permit acquisition and clearance to a value approaching \$100 million. To date the Federal commitment under Section 23 amounts to \$5.6 million gross and \$4.6 million net. Including applications soon to come before the Corporation, this commitment may be raised to between \$10 million and \$15 million during the next six to twelve months. Mr. Coll thought that if these applications materialize, Section 23 would have been reasonably successful. Four of the potential applications were from Trail, Saint John, Halifax and Sherbrooke. The mention of Trail and Sherbrooke brought Mr. Coll to the problems facing small municipalities where supporting data to accompany an application is rarely available and where there is no professional planning staff. In these municipalities, the Corporation has had to carry a degree of responsibility for the formulation of applications which should properly be borne locally. He noted that with few exceptions, the skills needed in formulating applications were not yet available in consulting services to municipalities.

Mr. Coll expressed satisfaction in the number of municipalities which had undertaken studies of housing conditions and the need for redevelopment. The Corporation had so far contributed over \$1/3 million towards these studies.

It was of interest to recall that the idea of making urban renewal studies had developed during discussions between Mr. Lawson and Mr. Carver, following a visit to the famous 'Baltimore Plan'. The first study had, of course, been that conducted by Mr. Lawson in Toronto.

In earlier discussions, Mr. Coll noted that there had been criticism of the lack of definitions of terms commonly used in urban renewal and the lack of a framework within which studies could be carried out and applications prepared. These omissions were deliberate. They were done to obtain the maximum flexibility in the use of the renewal sections of the Act. It is agreed that the omissions may be the cause of administrative difficulties but flexibility is of paramount importance.

At the stage of implementing projects, Mr. Coll thought that the Corporation's recent decentralization of urban renewal administration would speed processes. The real problem in his view lay at municipal level. Municipalities undertaking projects must organize for efficient acquisition and clearance of the site. They must undertake effective sales programs for cleared land. He thought that these and other problems were due to municipal inexperience in urban renewal although he agreed that with the limited number of projects so far, the best techniques and procedures at any of the levels of Government involved in redevelopment had not necessarily been found.

Discussion of papers on Problems and Techniques in Getting
Urban Renewal Projects Moving

These papers were discussed by three small groups. The principal points which were raised included the necessity for a clearer outline of study requirements from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and for a more detailed indication of the requirements of the Corporation when applications for Section 23 aid are made. This comment about lack of guidance received considerable support, although in reply Mr. Brown and Mr. Coll both mentioned the fairly detailed list of requirements put out by the Planning Branch of the Department of Planning and Development in Ontario and by the Community Planning Association of Canada.

Discussion followed on the organization required in a municipality to implement an urban renewal program. It was agreed that a strong system of administration must be established although opinion varied as to whether this should operate through a special division of local government as in some cities in the United States, or whether it should take the form of a renewal division within the city planning department.

The importance of capital budgetting for urban renewal was stressed by a number of speakers.

In responding to the discussion, Mr. Lawson said that he sensed a community of thought amongst the participants. There was a great deal going on across Canada and he felt that some of the frustrations which had been expressed stemmed from thinking on renewal being well in advance of organization, particularly at local level. He again stressed the need for renewal to be comprehensive and said that this necessitated a broad organization capable of coordinating the many activities which make up urban renewal.

Fourth Session - Chairman: Georges Potvin, Land Use Consultant, Toronto.

Paper, "Urban Renewal - Municipal Organization and Policy" by Gerald Sutton-Brown, Director of Planning, Vancouver.

In setting up any organization and administration, I feel it is extremely important to bear in mind at all times the function of this organization and the philosophy underlying its actions. In Vancouver, we understand urban renewal as not only a social instrument for relieving poor housing conditions, but also as an essential element of city growth. A city grows not only by the addition of new development on its periphery, but also by the replacement of worn-out buildings and services within its heart. We call this replacement "redevelopment". In many cases this redevelopment is carried out by private enterprise under normal incentives, but there are those parts of a city which for one reason or another have failed to attract private redevelopment capital and it is these areas which require public attention, and which we believe are suitable areas for urban renewal under Section 23 of the National Housing Act. The organization and administrative processes, which I will discuss are based, therefore, on this philosophy of urban renewal.

It seems to me that there will be three political factors affecting the particular organization in any particular city. In the first place the relationship between municipalities, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government will vary from province to province. In British Columbia, for example, the Provincial Government have enabling legislation permitting them to contribute to redevelopment projects.

Incidentally, their contribution is 25% of the net loss so that we do not receive any financial help at the initial stages of purchase except for any installments which we might arrange.

This all means that our organization has to be set up to deal with two other senior governments, not only as far as approval is concerned, but also to satisfy them that the money they will be spending is spent for a worthwhile purpose.

Second, the organization within any particular municipality will vary, and in this connection I should like to explain our Vancouver set-up. The Planning Department forms part of the normal civic organization and report to Council through a Board of Administration in the same way as all the other civic departments. There is a Town Planning Commission, who act in an advisory capacity but they are not an executive body.

I said that the Planning Department reported directly to the Board of Administration, but this is not strictly speaking true. All our reports are actually reports of the Technical Planning Board rather than reports of the Planning Department, and this influences very strongly the type of organization that we are evolving in Vancouver. The Technical Planning Board consists of all the Department Heads, the two salaried Commissioners who are members of the Board of Administration, and the Superintendents of Schools and Parks. The Chairman of this Board is the Director of Planning and its purpose is to ensure that all plans for the development of the City are fully co-ordinated

with all other departmental activities and interests, and there is no duplication of effort. I will return to the relationship of the Technical Planning Board to redevelopment projects later.

The third local factor influencing any renewal organization is whether or not a Metropolitan Government exists and in what form. I can think of three reasons why a Metropolitan agency should have a major role in redevelopment:

1. It is important that land is reused for its most appropriate purpose after clearance, and this can only be answered with confidence in a metropolitan context.
2. Housing for people displaced from redevelopment projects may not necessarily be best located in the same municipality where clearance takes place, and unless a Metropolitan agency exists I cannot conceive one municipality willingly accepting deportees from its neighbour.
3. In many cases the causes of blight may be a direct result of overcrowding and bootlegging substandard accommodation. In this case solution of the local problem is merely a palliative, which may transfer the problem from one place to another unless it is accompanied by a positive housing policy on a metropolitan basis, aimed at alleviating crowding by providing low and moderate rental housing in sufficient amount.

Bearing in mind intergovernmental relationships, and also bearing in mind that redevelopment is considered an essential part of city growth, what is the most suitable body to initiate and carry out a program.

The Federal Government in the person of C.M.H.C. have a very real interest in any redevelopment program in that they contribute 50% of the net cost and 75% of any rehousing costs. They also have considerable experience to contribute which should not be overlooked by any municipality.

Indeed they represent the municipality's main hope that there will be original research, and an examination of world experience as a guide in the redevelopment of Canadian cities. Nevertheless, in any particular redevelopment project they are concerned mainly with that project itself and not with the wider implications of redevelopment as a normal and natural part of city growth.

The Provincial Government in the case of British Columbia are content to limit their interest to supplying the necessary funds and once having agreed to a project intend to leave supervision of their interest with C.M.H.C.

It seems inevitable, therefore, that either the City or Municipal Government is the most appropriate body to initiate and carry out redevelopment projects, and this of course is reflected in the National Housing Act.

Having accepted this viewpoint, what is the most appropriate agency to handle redevelopment; should it be done by one of the existing civic departments; should a new development be created; or should there be a separate elected Board or an appointed civic agency as is done in the United States. This last method may be very tempting in cases where it is useful for an elected governmental body to have a buffer between itself and the irate electors when the issue may involve unpopular actions.

If we accept the policy that renewal is a normal aspect of city growth and development, and many other facets of the Civic administration are involved in the consideration of redevelopment projects, one can reach only one conclusion that it must be an essential part of the city's normal organization.

In Vancouver it has been decided that the Planning Department will be wholly responsible for the redevelopment process. Approval has been obtained from Council for the establishment of a redevelopment division of the Planning Department under the control of an Assistant Director of Redevelopment, and the Director of Planning would also be the Director of Redevelopment. There seems to be a point of discussion here as to whether such a division should have its own Land Sales, Legal, Engineering and other specialized personnel, and there are arguments in favour of such a course. However, in the case of Vancouver, largely because of the successful functioning of the Technical Planning Board as a co-ordinating and integrating body in all planning and development activities of the City, the usual procedures will apply in that the specialized services of the other departments will be used rather than special redevelopment personnel within the division.

We feel that this is in line with the concept that redevelopment is a normal process of city growth. We have also found that it has had the advantage that the other departments in the Civic Administration have had to become involved and interest themselves in the redevelopment program whether they like it or not. In this way we hope to establish the atmosphere that a redevelopment program becomes as natural a part of the city's normal function as say a paving program or a street lighting program. In addition, of course, there is already existing in these other departments a wealth of experience in similar problems which can be brought to bear on redevelopment.

The Redevelopment Division, therefore, will initiate redevelopment projects in accord with the City development plan; will co-ordinate the activities, not only of the various civic departments concerned, but also of the other two levels of government and their dependent agencies which have an interest in the program. In addition, the Redevelopment Division will look after the information and public relations aspects of redevelopment which we consider to be extremely important, and one aspect of our own program which has lagged for lack of personnel. As an example of this last point, there was a fair amount of publicity given to our Redevelopment Study with its broad proposals when it was first published late in 1957, and much favourable comment was given by the press. Now in September, 1959, we are just completing the volume of work necessary for an application to C.M.H.C. for an actual redevelopment project and are encountering local opposition. To a large measure this opposition is due to misunderstanding of the processes and safeguards and is also due in part to some prejudice. Had we been able to proceed more quickly with our project and had we been able to establish an information centre in the redevelopment area, I feel sure that this problem would not have arisen to the same degree. I do not think that this opposition is going to prejudice the redevelopment program, but it will cause unnecessary difficulties. The Assistant Director of Redevelopment will have to be a sort of Admirable Crichton who must combine a high standard in all of the administrative and technical qualities with that of an accomplished speaker and soother of ruffled feelings.

Probably one of the most important functions of the Redevelopment Division will be the co-ordination of the activities of all the other bodies concerned to make sure that the program goes ahead without hitch. This is fairly straightforward within the Vancouver City Hall administration where we have the Technical Planning Board, but we have also proposed to establish a co-ordinating committee composed of representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments, as well as the City, to meet at regular intervals while a program is being carried out. We have had many meetings of such a Committee established on an informal basis during work preparatory to our first submission, and this has proved invaluable in seeing that everyone's interest is taken care of at all stages. In the case of Vancouver, where public housing is administered by a housing authority appointed by the Provincial Government, the housing authority may also be represented on the co-ordinating committee in the person of their manager, at an appropriate time.

So much for the administrative arrangements which we believe will best suit our purposes. Until there is more experience of redevelopment in Canada, we cannot be certain that any particular arrangement will work better than any other. I am sure that those cities which have already carried out redevelopment, and those cities where redevelopment is contemplated and studies are under way, will contribute further ideas.

I would like to conclude this paper by discussing some of the problems we have encountered in Vancouver, with particular relationship to the philosophies I have been propounding and to underline our administrative arrangements.

To establish the extent of the need for redevelopment and to set a program as part of our 20-Year Development Plan, we carried out a study in 1956 and 1957. The result of this study was to set boundaries for the redevelopment areas and to assess what cost would be involved and what related problems would be raised. I believe that this is now a fairly common sort of pattern for these studies which in some cases are carried out by consultants. We, in Vancouver, felt, however, that such a study should be carried out by the city administration itself on the basis that any redevelopment program should be tied in closely with all other aspects of the city's work.

This study derived the criteria for assessing blight, defined the areas for comprehensive redevelopment, analyzed the social and financial structure of the families to be displaced, and determined the best overall use of land in relation to the City's 20-Year Development Plan. It went further in programming the clearance of blight so that the work would be completed in a 20-year period on the basis of need, and having regard to what would be a reasonable expenditure during that time. Incidentally, it also recommended measures which might be taken to prevent or slow down the spread of further blight and what might be done in the way of rehabilitation.

The study achieved its object in setting before City Council, and the people of Vancouver generally, as well as the Provincial and Federal Governments, the range and scope of the program which should be implemented. City Council approved the recommendations of the report in principle on February 4, 1958, and instructed the Technical Planning Board to take the necessary steps to carry out its proposals.

It might be of interest to know that one of the first steps was to deal with certain of the more urgent rezoning proposals, mainly from industrial to residential, to create reasonable boundaries to what would be new residential districts. The City Council's courage should be commended in that the Public Hearing attracted some 300 persons most of whom were, of course, objectors. Many of these failed to distinguish, of course, between rezoning and redevelopment which is a problem we have had to face.

At the same time the 5-year program of capital improvements for the years 1959-1963 incorporated an amount of \$3,000,000 representing the "City's share of cost of acquiring, clearing and servicing of real property in blighted or substandard areas preparatory to its redevelopment under the terms of the National Housing Act". This was part of a \$72,500,000 capital works program dealing with all the capital works of the City and its allied boards (excluding the School Board). The program was prepared and co-ordinated by the Technical Planning Board in a series of submissions to Council, recommending first of all the global amount and then the items to be included in various degrees of detail. Thus, not only was an amount included representing approximately 25% of our redevelopment program but those expenditures by other departments or boards which would form a necessary adjunct to the redevelopment program was also included in the capital works budget. Incidentally, this is mainly in connection with services. It does underline, however, the functions of the Technical Planning Board as a co-ordinating agency and the fact that redevelopment is being phased in with our other capital works program as an essential part of our City's overall development.

The C.M.H.C. Policy Manual sets out requirements for submission for approval "in principle" and also for "formal" approval which it is stated must precede any grant. The form of these submissions includes a mass of data some of which we had already provided in the redevelopment report. I cannot conceive that all of this material will be read and digested by the people who will make decisions on whether a redevelopment project will go ahead or not and it seems to me that a much simpler type of submission must be devised if delay and frustration are to be avoided. The only value that I can see in the present procedure is that it must ensure that a city has thoroughly studied its project before submitting it. In fairness to officials of C.M.H.C., I should add that they are aware of this problem and have indicated that their requirements can be somewhat more flexible than indicated by their Manual.

Among the material required for this submission are estimates of the cost of acquisition, clearing of property and the resale value of the property after clearance. These are probably the most important considerations in deciding on a project. We were told that a building by building valuation was required and that this would have to be in some detail for a "formal" submission. I suggest that this is one instance where some approximation could be allowed as any estimate of acquisition cost, no matter how carefully carried out, will be conditioned when actual purchase takes place by all sorts of influences which cannot be anticipated when the appraisal is made. Therefore, it seems to me that the simplest possible form of appraisal should be used. In addition, cost estimates are required of the construction of new services or changes in the existing services, and again I suggest that these need in fact only be on a very approximate basis.

Even so these cost appraisals and engineering estimates will entail considerable extra work on the part of civic staffs and in the case of Vancouver extra personnel have had to be hired to handle the project. These costs are in fact part of the cost of a redevelopment project, but until a project is approved there is no way apparently of sharing these costs. In the case of Vancouver, we had to obtain a special grant under Part V of the National Housing Act to get help before we could hire the extra people needed to carry out the extra work, and this naturally caused some delay in putting forward the project. Most cities already have such heavy commitments for their present staff that they will not look kindly on providing extra staff entirely from their own resources to initiate a project which will be a partnership responsibility.

My second suggestion, therefore, would be that C.M.H.C. should have a simplified form of preparatory grant enabling them to share in the municipality's costs of preparatory work. I am not trying to indicate that we had any difficulty in obtaining a Part V grant, but that the current procedure is unnecessarily time consuming when an overall study has proved the need for redevelopment.

Another and more serious problem which has become apparent in the last few months is the necessity for safeguarding future redevelopment projects by the purchase of key sites when premature development would be prejudicial. If one considers that redevelopment is part of a continuing program, this program will likely involve radical changes in the physical shape of the city by re-locating streets and changing subdivision patterns to provide a more useful environment than previously. Having prepared the overall plan each individual clearance project will be fitted into the master plan. However, because of the fact that changes in the physical pattern are involved there will be cases where new development of a substantial nature taking place within the existing physical framework could make the achievement of the changed pattern at some future date extremely expensive or even impossible.

A simple illustration of this comes from our own Redevelopment Area "A" where we propose to take an existing residential grid iron subdivision with lots 25 feet by 120 feet deep, and through closing certain streets and lanes, and the establishment of trackage on parts of those roads which are closed, create a new industrial area. Obviously, if the owner of a property fronting one of the streets to be closed develops his site with an expensive structure, the ultimate redevelopment will be more expensive through the necessity to purchase this structure. Its construction should be avoided if possible.

In Vancouver, we have a system of index maps marking planning projects of all types and any development permit application is checked against the index map. In this way we can always see what effect new development might have on future proposals and there have been a number of applications for development of various types in our redevelopment areas. Most of these have been minor, but to date City Council has authorized purchase of two properties which would have prejudiced impending redevelopment. At the present time there is no way for C.M.H.C. to share in the cost of purchase of these properties and the City has bought them on its own. Over a long period this could become a very serious problem by tying up the capital resources of one of the partners in the redevelopment process and might even prejudice the overall program.

I suggest that this is a case where C.M.H.C. policy might be altered to help municipalities with this problem. Otherwise they will be very tempted to let development proceed irrespective of the consequences, on the basis that a 25% share in the ultimate acquisition, even though in total it would be expensive, would be less onerous than 100% share in a cheaper purchase at this time.

The City of Vancouver covers this type of contingency quite simply by having included an amount of \$5,000,000 in their 5-year plan for the purchase of property in advance of the need of a capital project. In other words, if a capital project is included in the 5-Year Plan, the cost of the necessary land is of course included. However, to avoid unnecessary expenditures at cost to the taxpayer at a later date, this fund enables the City to buy any pieces of property which would prejudice a future improvement not included in the current 5-Year Plan. The amount we have for the protection is of course limited and covers every public service. Again, this links in with the general administrative arrangements I have already defined.

In some cities in the United States, I believe, that where clearance of slum areas has taken place and sites have been offered for sale to private enterprise for industrial or similar use, in some cases these sites have remained vacant for many years, either due to over optimism on the part of the people putting forward the project, or for other reasons. It seems, therefore, that if a purchaser can be secured for a site before any clearance in fact takes place the best interests of all parties concerned would be served. We had this in mind in setting up the principles to be followed in our redevelopment report and recommended that there should be three criteria for establishing clearance areas:

1. The incidence of public works.
2. The demand for land.
3. The quality of housing.

In the case of (2) above, we suggested that where an enquiry was received for a specific cleared site an arrangement should be devised to meet the situation. We had such an enquiry for a ten-acre parcel. In discussion with Provincial and C.M.H.C. officials, we have devised a system which I think will meet the inherent dangers in this process.

Briefly, after designation of the site required by the developer, clearance would only take place following an agreement with the developer that he would meet the full costs incurred by the partnership in acquiring, clearing and re-servicing the property. Following clearance the property would then be put out to tender in the normal way. The initiating developer would have the opportunity of meeting the highest bid if this high bid exceeded the actual cost to the partnership in acquiring the property. In this way any suggestion that the municipality was using its expropriation power for the benefit of an individual would be avoided. At the same time the rehousing provisions of the National Housing Act could operate, which would not be the case if the municipality undertook the project on its own. The developer from whom we have had the enquiry agreed in principle to the above proposal, unfortunately they could not wait for the proposition to mature.

To date redevelopment in Canada has been limited to complete clearance projects and as far as I know there have been no "limited" projects involving spot clearance throughout an area. Our first submission will include one such

area and in the particular context it seems to make very good sense. This is an area which has been zoned for industry for many years, but which has only been redeveloping at a very slow rate. It also contains some of the worst housing in the city. We are proposing to include all the residential structures in a clearance project but only to clear initially sufficient to provide a team-tract and get rid of some of the very worst housing. We feel that this should provide a stimulus to private redevelopment which might make public clearance of the remaining residential properties unnecessary. However, through including them all in a project we can keep the pump primed from time to time with new industrial sites. It remains to be seen how C.M.H.C. will react to this suggestion. In the United States, I gather from talking to other planners, the Federal Housing Authority make administration of projects of this type so difficult as to be virtually impossible.

I might mention few other problems which arise when redevelopment is attempted as we are doing on the basis of a continuing program with the objective of realizing comprehensive redevelopment:

- (a) The City is enabled to judge its future expenditures in the area. For example, certain expenditures on public improvements have been stopped because of the prospect that streets will be closed eventually.
- (b) In deciding the program for services and utilities, provision can be made on the basis of a master plan for these necessities. In other words, any services or utilities required as part of the scheme, or which might be necessary because of the scheme, can be designed in such a way that they can be continued later to form a more logical network than now exists in relation to the proposed comprehensive plan.

Although we have now some knowledge of the administrative problems up to the submission stage, we have attempted to organize our work to the completion stage. Our submission on Section 23 for a gross area of 47 acres representing approximately 2/5 of our 5-Year Program will be submitted shortly. The City Council have agreed to the procedure whereby:

- (a) On approval of the scheme, the separate division of the Planning Department will be established.
- (b) Temporary offices will be set up in the project area, attended by staff who will seek to answer or obtain answers for all enquiries received. This office will also serve as a base for all other civic employees working in the area, and might eventually have an extended use for other groups who will follow.
- (c) The City would apply for an expropriation order over the whole of the areas to be acquired. Unfortunately, it is thought that application to the courts to obtain immediate possession may not be successful.

- (d) Negotiations would be opened with the Property and Insurance Department for the purchasing of the property at a date established for the determination of the amount of compensation.
- (e) The first clearance areas and any surrounding area forming part of the overall development proposal such as a super-block would either be adopted as part of the official plan under the Charter or zoned as a comprehensive development district which would mean that development proposed by property owners must be either in accordance with the proposals of the overall scheme or the property be subject to purchase by the City.
- (f) On the dates the ownership of any property vests in the City, the Housing Authority will be required to obtain full particulars of the occupants and whether they require rehousing. The supervision of the tenants will be the responsibility of the Housing Authority, together with the maintenance of the property until demolition with them requisitioning on the Property and Insurance Department for essential repairs.
- (g) Any reshuffling of tenants to enable early demolitions, and prior to final rehousing, will be carried out by the Housing Authority on a program devised by the Redevelopment Division.
- (h) The Housing Authority will arrange for the removal of tenants to the "banks" of new housing as soon as this new housing is ready.
- (i) Following clearance of property, survey, resubdivision and servicing prior to sale will be organized by the Redevelopment Division.

As we get further into the processes of redevelopment, undoubtedly the list of problems will grow and undoubtedly most members of this group can, and I hope will, add problems of their own to the discussion. What I have said may in many cases sound like criticism of C.M.H.C., but this is not by any means intended. Redevelopment in Canada is a very new field of endeavour and though administrative procedures have been laid down these have not really been tested by experience. I have found that the officials of C.M.H.C. have been extremely helpful in discussing our problems and have been more than willing to discuss changes to improve present administrative methods. The fact that this conference is being held under the sponsorship of C.M.H.C. indicates their desire to listen to our beefs.

I hope that this paper will spark discussion and that out of this discussion will come a gathering of our corporate experience which will be used to improve methods and systems which after all are only useful when they are serving the purpose for which they are set up, that is, to facilitate urban redevelopment.

Discussion following Mr. Sutton-Brown's paper

Group 1 (Reporter: Mr. G. Muirhead)

This Group was concerned about the validity of preparing a long range renewal program as had been done in Vancouver when the National Housing Act does not contemplate any long range commitment of financial aid, but is designed to give assistance project by project. The Group asked Mr. Sutton-Brown what function the Town Planning Commission had filled in Vancouver and asked whether in such an integrated system of control of urban development there was a role for an advisory commission.

Group 2 (Reporter: Mr. G. Sunderland)

This Group stressed that local organization for renewal must be undertaken in the light of local tradition. They thought that one of the functions of an urban renewal study should be to set out the kind of organization needed.

The Group questioned the placing of all powers of implementation in a division of the planning department, as they doubted whether the acquisition of land and the clearance of buildings could be thought of as part of the planning process. The Group asked Mr. Sutton-Brown whether there was any means of preventing new development in areas designated for renewal in Vancouver.

Group 3 (Reporter: Mr. G. Rich)

Commenting on the previous Groups' statements, Mr. Rich said that in his view the only means of preventing premature development in an area designated for future renewal, was for the municipality to buy the site. The Group had discussed the problems which owners face once an area is designated for future clearance. They stressed the importance of acting quickly after plans have been disclosed in order to reduce these problems to a minimum.

On the question of where renewal organization fitted into the municipal structure, this Group stressed that planning itself was not a departmental function in some cities and practical alternatives to the system outlined by Mr. Sutton-Brown had to be sought in those cities.

In a brief reply to the discussion, Mr. Sutton-Brown agreed that urban renewal studies should consider how recommendations were to be implemented. He stressed that the Redevelopment Division in Vancouver was not to be a property buying and selling agency but was to be supported by other divisions of municipal government, under the co-ordination of the Technical Planning Board. Mr. Sutton-Brown deplored the establishment of separate agencies for urban renewal.

He went on to stress the value of the Town Planning Commission. He said that the outstanding contribution of the Commission was its ability to move to the high ground from which it can take a completely independent view of

the renewal process. At any time the Commission enjoys freedom to take a stand and express an informed, independent point of view. In conclusion, Mr. Sutton-Brown stressed the importance of officials at all levels of government being able to resolve the many problems which must arise in urban renewal. He thought it essential that officials agree after full discussion and asked how elected representatives at any level could be expected to resolve problems which had defied competent officials.

Fifth Session - Chairman: Ralph Borrowman, Engineer in Charge of Planning,
City of Ottawa.

- a) Paper, "Prospects for Urban Renewal in Canada" by Gerald A.P. Carrothers,
Division of Town and Regional Planning, School of Architecture,
University of Toronto.

It is obviously difficult to appraise the prospects for urban renewal in Canada; not simply because it is difficult to foretell the future, although this is difficult enough, but also because of the difficulty (already evidenced in this seminar) of agreeing upon what it is we are appraising. It is one thing if we are discussing renewal projects under the National Housing Act. It is quite a different matter if we mean not only these projects, but also projects for which there is no federal financial support. It is still another thing if we are discussing the general concept of urbanism and the inherent processes of change, guided or unguided, which are the basis of urban renewal in the broadest sense. I think it is important to distinguish each approach from the others; not because the activities implied should be separate and independent - they certainly should not - but rather to be quite clear that one concept does not necessarily embrace the others in actual application. It is the first of these concepts (that is, projects under the National Housing Act) which has tended to become identified, at least in the public consciousness, with the term urban renewal. If we mean something else by the term we should be sure we are understood, because this in itself can have a real impact on the prospects for urban renewal - particularly if we are, in fact, discussing the broad concept of renewal. It is in distinguishing between concepts where, perhaps, the commonly heard plea for "public relations" in urban renewal may be valid.

When thinking in terms of public projects, there is a natural tendency to dissociate the essential elements of urban renewal. Fresh development is as much renewal, in the real sense of the word, as is redevelopment. Private renewal is as important as public renewal. Of the cities in Canada which have government renewal projects underway I suspect everyone is currently enjoying a far greater private investment in renewal. I think it is fair to ask if this investment would have been more effective in terms of the quality of environment if it were made to as careful a public plan as in the case of government renewal projects? I think we should also ask the associated question - are the standards of our public plans sufficiently high?

I think by now it is obvious that I am in sympathy with the broad concept of urban renewal. I detect at this seminar what I consider to be a healthy tendency to question the validity of the more narrow concepts as the ultimate objective in the public renewal process. In fact, what most participants of the seminar have been describing in the name of renewal has been the planning process - the preparation of a plan and its implementation. Indeed, in these discussions we have had more emphasis placed on the importance of a plan - a recognizable document available to the public - than I have found at most planning conferences in Canada in recent years. If this attitude proves to be more than traditional public opposition to sin, and if it develops and spreads, it augurs well for the future comprehension and understanding of urban renewal in its broad sense, if not necessarily for its effective accomplishment.

I want to turn for a moment to renewal in its more limited aspect of projects with federal financing. This is probably a more realistic approach to take because in this way it is possible to establish comprehensible limits to renewal. Here it is possible actually to move toward the physical accomplishment of an objective with some hope of success. But I think we must be honest in identifying what that objective actually is. By and large, I think the real objective of those directly involved in renewal is to change the appearance of our cities. We say comforting things about welfare issues and impressive things about the forces and implications of urbanism. But I think the real truth is that none of us likes to see squalor - we are embarrassed by it. Moreover, some of us with sharpened senses of aesthetics (good or bad, it doesn't matter) just don't like the looks of our cities - they offend us. We therefore seize on any opportunity to remould the city in our own images - the welfare issue is secondary. This is not necessarily bad: but it should be acknowledged if it is true. Indeed, I have great sympathy with this view, both intuitively and because of our obvious lack of knowledge of the real and underlying welfare issues of renewal. In fact, in our present state of inadequate knowledge it is probably the only justifiable approach to urban renewal.

I do not pretend to understand the whys and wherefores of our schizophrenia. But I think one cause lies in our attempts to do so much in the name of housing. The housing implication in urban renewal is historical and is closely associated with the implication of slum clearance (residential slums, that is). Neither of these is the necessary content of renewal in its broadening sense. I have already referred to the tendency to dissociate essential elements of renewal. I think the traditional emphasis in renewal on slum clearance and housing may well be one of the reasons for this difficulty. Perhaps the time is coming when we should recast our legislation to free urban renewal from its present necessary association with housing.

But what of the traditional belief that the only possible justification for the intervention of the Federal government in urban renewal lies in these very "welfare" issues of housing and slum clearance? What of the notion that the Federal government should only assist because the individual is not able to help himself and because junior governments do not have the resources to do the job? These arguments do not seem to come forward for certain other activities of the Federal government, but it may well be that it would be politically unfeasible to attack head-on the issue of housing vis a vis renewal and that we must resolve the problem in other ways, as we are now tending to do.

There seems to be almost universal lip service paid to the notion that urban renewal is properly a Provincial and, primarily, a local function and not really a Federal government function at all. The British North America Act is usually cited in evidence. Let us be quite clear that the British North America Act does not exclude the Federal government from participating in urban renewal. It does not exclude the Federal government from participating in a great many activities associated with urbanism. In fact, the British North America Act specifically gives to the Federal government powers over much of the so-called planning function at the local level. If we really believe that renewal is exclusively a local function then the Federal government should not be in the picture at all. The obvious counter point (already made) is that only the Federal government has sufficient financial resources to do the job. Then, to be consistent, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, as the Federal agent in urban renewal, should have no requirements in approving renewal schemes and should give requested monies to every municipality which asks for them.

But what, then, of local responsibility? The argument is that the current share of the cost of renewal required from the municipality is intended to instill local initiative and responsibility. This argument is insulting to local officials, both elected and appointed. We have already learned from Mr. Sutton-Brown that the Vancouver City Council deliberates just as carefully over expenditures comprised entirely of Federal money as it does over expenditures of local money, and I am convinced this would be true across Canada. If not, we are faced with another problem quite irrelevant to urban renewal. Moreover, the proportion of cost represented by the municipality's share in renewal is really quite small (although in many municipalities even that is an impossible financial burden).

But we don't really believe that renewal is exclusively a local problem. I could be completely cynical at this point and argue that the conscious process of urban change is called renewal (rather than urbanism or something else) because this is believed to be necessary in order to obtain money for the purpose from the Federal government. Unfortunately, there is some truth in the argument. But there is also a more fundamental reason why renewal is not purely a local issue. Underlying the whole Federal program of renewal assistance is the notion that our cities are an important national investment and represent an asset which should be protected on a national basis. By and large, I don't think there is the same recognition on the part of Provincial governments of the importance of urban investment. I think this accounts for the lack, already noted in the seminar, of direct and active participation on the part of the Provinces in urban renewal activity. Most Provincial governments are prepared to allow their municipal creatures to accept money from the Federal government for almost any purpose because it relieves some pressure from them. Moreover, Federal participation in urban renewal does not seem to impinge particularly on provincial prerogatives. In the instances where Provincial governments also contribute to renewal the absolute amount is not sufficiently large to strain their financial resources and, certainly, the return to the municipalities from Federal funds more than outweighs provincial expenditures. Therefore, in general, Provincial governments acquiesce in urban renewal activities and play only passive and permissive parts.

Nonetheless, we must not underestimate the potential role of the Province in urban renewal. The situation may well change. One of the reasons the Provinces have not been particularly conscious of the problem of urbanism lies in the peculiarities of the electoral systems of most of our Provinces whereby the legislatures are predominantly rural in interest. But as the urban proportion of the population increases these interests are bound to change. In spite of the truth of what I have already said about the British North America Act, municipalities are the creatures of the Provinces. While a Province cannot prevent the Federal government from giving money for urban renewal it can most certainly prevent its municipalities from accepting money. Alternatively, of course, the Province could be a very strong positive force in the processes of urban renewal. I think we may expect the Provinces to play an increasing role in urban renewal if and as they more fully appreciate the significance of their urban institutions.

But the financial resources of Provincial governments are not unlimited. Neither are those of the Federal government, even though these

resources are considerably greater. This fundamental fact determines what I consider to be the real issue of urban renewal. We continually refer to governments as "they". "They" will do this - "they" will do that - "they" will pay for everything. Somehow, "they" are an omnipotent and inexhaustible source of wealth and authority capable of doing anything and everything (and if things don't get done it is all "their" fault). We forget that our governments have no resources other than those obtained from or on behalf of every individual of the nation. We are they. The real issue of urban renewal is that resources are, in fact, limited and that the public urban renewal program is merely one way in which these resources are allocated. We also forget that money is simply a means of converting resources from one form to another. Unlike nature where, theoretically, energy is not lost but merely transformed, in the economic conversion of resources it is quite possible to have wastage, in the social sense. Whether this wastage is greater or less when the agent of conversion is government or private enterprise is probably an unanswerable question. The issue is not whether there will be a redistribution of resources. The issue is who is to do the distributing. If that part of the redistribution represented by urban renewal is to be done by government, then we must be quite clear that to that extent resources will not be available to private enterprise. Monies drained by government through taxation or through borrowing must come from private enterprise. What impact this has on private renewal I would not pretend to know.

I am convinced that the real prospects for urban renewal, both public and private, are directly associated with the long run prospects for economic development of the area concerned. These prospects vary from one part of Canada to another. The only legitimate interests of the Federal government in renewal are the protection of a national resource and the redistribution of the benefits of economic development of the nation. The best estimate of the prospects for national economic development in general are to be found in the Gordon Report^{*}.

What are the prospects for Federal action in redistributing the benefits of economic development through the agency of urban renewal? By the same token, although to a lesser degree, what are the prospects of action on the part of the Provincial governments? We must assume that governments will not be arbitrary, irresponsible or whimsical. With this assumption, there are a number of possible ways in which urban renewal might proceed in the future.

1. The Federal government might make grants available to municipalities for renewal projects, on demand. I think we can safely reject this possibility as being essentially irresponsible in the light of limited resources.
2. The Federal government might make grants to municipalities for the planning and carrying out of all aspects of urban development and redevelopment. This alternative is politically inexpedient.
3. The Federal government might make larger unconditional (or conditional) grants to the Provinces in the anticipation that the monies will be used for broad renewal purposes - and, after all, almost all provincial activities are related to urban renewal in its largest sense.

^{*} Reports and Studies of the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1956 et. seq.

4. We might continue much as at present, playing essentially by ear; that is, by carrying out pseudo slum clearance projects with gradually increasing use of public powers for private purposes.
5. Finally, we might see accelerated governmental programs of investigation and research, in an attempt to establish the welfare and economic efficiency basis for urban renewal, leading to somewhat more clear-cut ground rules for urban renewal projects.

I suspect these last two possibilities represent the realistic prospects of urban renewal in Canada in the near future.

There is a sixth alternative which I believe will represent our eventual, if not immediate, attitude to urban renewal. Some of the major technical difficulties in the way of effective urban renewal at the present time arise directly from our systems of land ownership and property taxation. Only when these are reappraised will we develop an effective approach to urban renewal in its broadest sense. Our present systems of urban land speculation and taxation constitute a truly ludicrous basis for the redistribution of the benefits of a national resource, if indeed our urban areas do represent a national resource. Suggestions that fundamental changes are required in land ownership and taxation are generally dismissed off-hand as academic, theoretical and politically unrealistic, especially if they are put forth by a university professor. I was therefore delighted to hear a similar review suggested earlier in the seminar by Mr. Sutton-Brown, an eminently practical man intimately associated with a highly practical urban administration. Eventually, I believe, we must face up to this issue, unpleasant as the task may be. But by the time we do, I suspect that the situation will call for even more drastic "nationalization" of our urban assets than even the most unconservative thinker would seriously propose today.* In the meantime the least that is needed is a much more thorough investigation of the real welfare and efficiency issues of renewal before an intelligent (as compared to intuitive) redistribution of economic benefits is possible. This is especially true if the indicated trend of the use of public powers for private purposes increases.

I would like to conclude my comments with a word or two about the "climate" for urban renewal in Canada. Attitudes and possibilities vary across Canada as do economic prospects - and, in fact, they are not unrelated. I sense increasing concern with urban problems on the part of governments throughout the country. The peculiarities of our political structure has permitted the federal renewal agency to develop uniquely - few governmental organizations elsewhere in the world are able to take the essentially intuitive approach of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This, of course, has its obvious disadvantages as well as advantages. The greatest immediate danger to a healthy climate for urban renewal lies in a natural (if unfortunate) inclination toward "empire-building" in governmental institutions. This tendency can be seen currently at all levels of government, but so far in Canada we seem to have been able to resist the temptation to create completely separate renewal empires.

★

It may be amusing to note at this point that my suggestion for the accomplishment of a National Capital of imagination and significance would be for the Government of Canada to expropriate the cities of Ottawa and Hull and the necessary adjacent territory to do the job. The suggestion is, of course, politically unrealistic, but, by the same argument, so is the idea of having a National Capital at all.

Whether this will continue to be the case is problematical. But if we subscribe to "Parkinson's Law" in renewal administration in Canada then the outlook for effective urban renewal will dim.

I don't think there will be a great ground swell of support for urban renewal on aesthetic grounds. Standards of taste in general are low. (This is one reason most of us are only too anxious to get out of our houses and into our automobiles.) I am quite sure most of the inhabitants of our cities don't really care what their environment looks like. But I think standards are gradually improving and every improvement in the urban environment helps raise the standard of the public taste. But aesthetics will not be an immediate force of any great impact in encouraging renewal.

As experience in formal renewal activities increases so will the climate for renewal improve (assuming we don't make any drastic mistakes). The real force in improving this climate will be the economic impact of renewal activities, and in this regard I sense increasing general awareness of importance of urban development.

★ ★ ★

In my comments I have taken the term "seminar", as applied to this group, in its literal sense. I have assumed we are not interested in uncritical acceptance of all ideas nor in the propagation of cliches. I have not pulled my punches, and I trust I will be thoroughly challenged for what I have said.

b) Comment on Urban Renewal in Canada, by Patrick Horsbrugh, Deputy Director of Planning, Hamilton-Wentworth Planning Board.

Mr. Horsbrugh said that the prospects for urban renewal in Canada were good, better, he thought, than anywhere in Europe. He listed five considerations which lead him to this opinion.

1. The current attitude of mind of government and people.
2. A sense of financial stability and developable human and physical resources.
3. A relatively small number of cities in serious need of urban renewal.
4. A small number of professional people able to meet from time to time to exchange ideas and information in an unusually close and detailed manner.
5. Existence of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, a centralized agent of the federal government dealing with both redevelopment and, one of the most important requirements for successful renewal, new housing.

Mr. Horsbrugh thought that in order to stimulate renewal in city centres, drastic measures may be needed. He stressed that the centre of cities is the proper place for urban experiments.

He saw the need for increased urban research, for the definition of renewal terminology and for better public relations in planning generally. He said that no municipality has within itself sufficient resources to undertake adequate research and suggested that urban research funds may be found from Foundations such as Ford or Rockefeller and from large international companies such as Bowaters. Mr. Horsbrugh thought there was some misunderstanding due to a lack of precision in terminology. In Canada there should be clear definitions. As a believer in international co-operation he wished to see a set of definitions generally applicable in all countries where urban renewal is undertaken. He thought that in a continuing program of renewal and development good public relations were essential. He cited the loss of momentum in planned development in the United Kingdom after the war and said that in some measure this was due to the failure of planners to make their purposes understood by the people.

Discussion of papers by Professor Carrothers and Mr. Horsbrugh

In the general discussion which followed there was a sharp difference of opinion concerning the place of public relations in planning. Fears were expressed about the wisdom of approaching citizens through a 'salesman' for planning and renewal. On the other hand it was thought that unless planners take initiative in getting their ideas and objectives into public discussion the action which they propose is not likely to be given public support.

Some speakers considered that too much stress had been placed on the static condition of city centres, and not enough thought had been given to the changes in form of those centres which followed dynamic changes in the urban complex through the development of communications and shifts in basic land use.

One speaker suggested that central area redevelopment under the National Housing Act should not permit the sale of cleared land but rather require that all cleared land be leased for its future use.

APPENDIX I

Urban Renewal Seminar
September 9-11, 1959.

Wednesday, September 9th

- 9.30 Assemble at Laurentian Terrace, Sussex Drive.
- 9.45 Opening Session - Chairman: A.E. Coll, Director, Urban
 Renewal & Public Housing Division, CMHC.
- Welcome - Stewart Bates, President, and P.S. Secord,
 Vice-President, CMHC.
- Introduction - A.E. Coll.
- "Highlights of Urban Renewal Studies".
 A presentation with slide illustrations.
 E.A. Levin, Architectural & Planning Division, CMHC.
- 11.00 Discussion in Plenary Session. This session includes a
 comment on Surveys for Urban Renewal by J.F. Brown, Redevelop-
 ment Officer, Ontario Department of Planning & Development.
- 12.30 Lunch.
- 2.00 Special Event - Presentation of redevelopment housing project
 designed for McLean Park, Vancouver, and Federal
 Provincial Project at Skeena Road, Vancouver,
 by Ian Maclellman, Chief Architect and Planner,
 CMHC.
- 2.30 Second Session - Chairman: George Rich, Assistant Director,
 Metropolitan Planning Commission of Greater
 Winnipeg.
- "Urban Renewal in the Dynamic City".
 S.H. Pickett, Adviser on Urban Renewal, CMHC.
- 3.15 Discussion in Small Groups.
- 4.00 Discussion in Plenary Session.

Thursday, September 10th

- 9.30 Third Session - Chairman: Murray Zides, Director, Town Planning
 Commission of Metropolitan Saint John.
- "Getting Urban Renewal Projects Moving -
 Problems and Techniques".

Thursday, September 10th continued

1. From the Municipal Viewpoint - M.B.M. Lawson, Director,
City of Toronto Planning Board.
 2. From the Provincial Viewpoint - J.F. Brown.
 3. From the Federal Viewpoint - A.E. Coll.
- 11.30 Discussion in Small Groups.
- 12.30 Lunch.
- 2.00 Special Events
- A. Illustrated talk on Lafayette Park redevelopment project,
Detroit (Architect: Mies van der Rohe) by S.H. Pickett.
 - B. An outline of the study of the residential environment
to be undertaken by a Committee of the RAIC by A.H.
Armstrong, Adviser on Community Planning, CMHC.
- 2.30 Fourth Session - Chairman: Georges Potvin, Land Use Consultant,
Toronto.
- "Urban Renewal - Municipal Organization and Policy".
G. Sutton-Brown, Director of Planning, Vancouver.
- 3.30 Discussion in Small Groups.

Friday, September 11th

- 9.30 Discussion in Plenary Session (Third and Fourth Sessions).
- 10.30 Fifth Session - Chairman: Ralph Borrowman, Engineer in Charge
of Planning, City of Ottawa.
- "Prospects for Urban Renewal in Canada".
1. Professor G.A.P. Carrothers, Division of Town and
Regional Planning, School of Architecture, University
of Toronto.
 2. Patrick Horsbrugh, Deputy Director of Planning, Hamilton-
Wentworth Planning Board.
- 12.00 Discussion in Small Groups.
- 12.45 Lunch.
- 2.00 Special Event - Film on the proposed redevelopment of the Barbican
Area, London, presented with commentary by
Patrick Horsbrugh.

Friday, September 11th continued

2.30 Closing Session - Chairman: S.H. Pickett

Discussion of ideas raised in the Seminar, introduced by
Professor Anthony Adamson, School of Architecture, University
of Toronto.

Saturday, September 12th

Travel to Montreal.

12.00 Lunch in Montreal.

1.00 - Assemble at City Planning Office, City Hall, Montreal, for
4.00 briefing, followed by a tour of public and private redevelopment
 in the City.

APPENDIX IIa) List of Participants (Titles and Addresses as at June 1st, 1960)

Professor Anthony Adamson,
Division of Town and Regional Planning,
School of Architecture,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Donald Guard,
Director,
The London & Suburban Planning Board,
516 Wellington Street,
London, Ontario.

M. Jacques Bernier,
Senior Planning Assistant,
City of Montreal,
City Hall,
Montreal, P.Q.

Professor James Hodgson,
School of Social Science,
Laval University,
Quebec City, P.Q.

Mr. Ralph Borrowman,
Engineer in Charge of Planning,
City of Ottawa,
City Hall,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. Patrick Horsbrugh,
(Present address is not known)

Mr. Hans Hosse,
Department of Planning and Works,
City Hall,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. J.F. Brown,
Redevelopment Officer,
Department of Planning and Development,
454 University Avenue,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

Mr. Matthew Lawson,
City of Toronto Planning Board,
129 Adelaide Street West,
Toronto 1, Ontario.

Professor G.A.P. Carrothers,
Department of City Planning,
The School of Fine Arts,
University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia 4, Penn.

Mr. J.J. Legate,
Town Planning Officer,
City Hall,
Sarnia, Ontario.

Mr. A.R. Davey,
Planning Director,
City Hall,
Windsor, Ontario.

Mr. George Muirhead,
Planning Officer,
City Hall,
Kingston, Ontario.

Mr. A. Faintuck,
Department of Planning and Works,
City Hall,
Ottawa, Ontario.

M. Georges Potvin,
Land Use Consultant,
427 Drewry Avenue,
Willowdale, Ontario.

Dr. E.G. Faludi,
Town Planning Consultant,
614 Church Street,
Toronto 5, Ontario.

Mr. John Preston,
City Planning Officer,
City of Regina,
Regina, Sask.

Mr. George Rich,
Assistant Director,
Metropolitan Planning Commission
of Greater Winnipeg,
1100 Electric Railway Chambers,
213 Notre Dame Avenue,
Winnipeg 2, Manitoba.

Mr. Gerald Sutton-Brown,
Commissioner,
City of Vancouver,
City Hall,
Vancouver, B.C.

Mr. Murray Zides,
Director,
Town Planning Commission,
City Hall,
Saint John, N.B.

b) List of Participants from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Mr. D.B. Buchanan,
Prairie Regional Architect,
870 Portage Avenue,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. H.S.M. Carver,
Advisory Group,
Head Office.

Mr. A.E. Coll,
Director,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. D.E. Crinion,
Assistant Chief Architect & Planner,
Head Office.

Mr. K.J. Cross,
Assistant Regional Architect,
CMHC Regional Office,
P.O. Box 2010, Station "O",
Room 204,
940 Cote de Liesse Road,
Town of Mount Royal,
Montreal 9, Que.

Mr. Peter Dovell,
Regional Architect,
CMHC Regional Office,
650 Lawrence Avenue West,
Toronto 19, Ontario.

Mr. E.D. Fox,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. R.A. Garrod,
Manager,
North Bay Loans Office,
393 Fisher Street,
North Bay, Ontario.

Mr. A. Henderson,
Atlantic Regional Architect,
CMHC Regional Office,
P.O. Box 1240,
1032 Gottingen Street,
Halifax, N.S.

Miss F.E. Leeney,
Information Division,
Head Office.

Mr. Earl Levin,
Architectural & Planning Division,
(Now Director of Community Planning,
Province of Saskatchewan).

Mr. I.R. MacLennan,
Chief Architect and Planner,
Head Office.

Mr. C.M. McDiarmid,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. J.A. McKay,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. L. Milne,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. S.H. Pickett,
Adviser on Urban Renewal,
Head Office.

Mr. H.W. Schaven,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

Mr. G. Sunderland,
Regional Architect,
CMHC Regional Office,
2286 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver 9, B.C.

Mr. W.A.T. White,
Supervisor,
Urban Renewal & Public Housing Div.,
Head Office.

APPENDIX IIIUrban Renewal Studies Under NHA, Section 33(1)(h), Published to 1st June 1960

<u>Halifax</u>	Professor Gordon Stephenson "A Redevelopment Study of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1957" "A Redevelopment Study of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1957 Supplementary Volume" (with John McVittie).
<u>Hamilton</u>	Mark P. David "Urban Renewal Study 1958 City of Hamilton".
<u>Moncton</u>	Professor Harold Spence-Sales "Moncton - Renewal" "Moncton - Renewal. Technical Papers".
<u>Montreal</u>	Town Planning Service of Montreal "Results of the Study in View of the Urban Renewal" - City of Montreal.
<u>Saint John</u>	Georges Potvin "City of Saint John Urban Renewal Study" 1956-57.
<u>Sarnia</u>	John J. Legate "Report of a Redevelopment Study of an Area in South Sarnia known as Blue Water".
<u>Toronto</u>	Matthew B.M. Lawson "Urban Renewal. A Study of the City of Toronto 1956" (Short version also available, published by the Community Planning Association of Canada).
<u>Trail, B.C.</u>	Professor H.P. Oberlander and R.J. Cave "Urban Renewal for Trail, B.C."
<u>Vancouver</u>	G. Sutton-Brown "Vancouver Redevelopment Study" Published by the City of Vancouver Planning Department for the Housing Research Committee.
<u>Windsor</u>	Dr. E.G. Faludi "A 15-year Programme for the Urban Renewal of the City of Windsor and its Metropolitan Area - 1959".
<u>Winnipeg</u>	Professor W. Gerson "An Urban Renewal Study for the City of Winnipeg - The CPR-