BEYOND THE WHITE PAPER:
PLANNING FOR PEOPLE IN THE 80's

Proceedings of a Conference

Edited by
John Hitchcock
and
Judith Kjellberg

Major Report No. 17

Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto
October 1980

ISSN 0319-4620
ISBN 0-7727-1233-6

PREFACE

Ontario's Planning Act became law in 1946 and, while it has been amended many times, the basic elements remain largely the same. A major study of the operation of the Act and related planning procedures was undertaken by the Planning Act Review Committee which issued its report in 1977. After a suitable gestation period, the Province of Ontario issued its White Paper on the Planning Act in April 1979. The Province since then has been reviewing comments on the White Paper with a view to enacting new legislation.

It appeared to the Conference sponsors that some of the most important issues involved either were not dealt with, or were not given extensive treatment in the Report of the Planning Act Review Committee or the White Paper. The objective of the Conference was to open a new round of debate, raising questions about the tasks which planning will need to undertake in the 80's, and the kinds of strategies and institutional mechanisms which will be required. These are large and uncomfortable issues, but it is urgent that they be discussed; the Proceedings represent an attempt to stimulate that discussion.

* * *

The Conference was held at the University of Toronto on March 14, 1980. It was sponsored by the Ontario Welfare Council, and the Department of Urban and Regional Planning and Centre for Urban and Community Studies of the University of Toronto.

CONTENTS

Part III: Planning and Government

Planning Opportunities at Three Levels of Government

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCEEDINGS

John Hitchcock
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto

Two principal themes pervade the proceedings. The first concerns the need to develop modes of planning which are not arbitrarily divided up into physical and non-physical compartments. Taken together, the contributions to the Conference provide a useful explanation of what is meant by the integration of physical with social or economic planning. Discussions about the need for integration are frequently carried on at a rather abstract level; for those unaccustomed to these debates the whole issue may sometimes appear to lack urgency. We hope that the kind of review offered here will provide concrete evidence of the importance of the issue and of the need to change our habitual patterns of planning.

The second theme, obviously intertwined with the first, concerns the kind of frameworks that we should seek in order to bring together those elements which most need to be brought together in a planning system.

A brief summary of the views expressed on both these themes will serve as a composite headline for the proceedings which follow. Like any headline writer we will have accomplished our goal if we pique your interest sufficiently to consult the complete text.

Integration of Physical with Non-Physical Planning

"The physical rush is over, and we can demote physical planning to its engineering and building origins". Barry Cullingworth implies that in an era of rapid growth in population physical planning might be a central preoccupation to which other elements are related as needed. With a decline in rates of growth, the management of land occupancy through various forms of development control does not cease to be one legitimate focus of activity, but its scope is necessarily reduced. By way of illustration he suggests the need to consider housing and social security within the same planning frame of reference. "Housing" is by itself a

multi-element focus incorporating 1) aspects of physical form, development and location; 2) economic management of housing investment; and 3) social assistance. Social security is an equally broad arena, but one which is not usually linked directly with physical development.

Economic development:

> I think there is concern that the future development of this community be accomplished with sensitivity. We recognize in Metro that we are not dealing with the development of vacant lands, we are talking about redevelopment.....This will be an extremely interesting problem that cuts across planning issues, social issues, all issues.

In this quotation Don Richmond gives us a variant on the theme that declining growth rates pose new kinds of planning problems which cut across previous distinctions between physical and other planning approaches. There are two facets to the kind of integration suggested here. The first is that redevelopment is a different process from development. The second is that, under conditions of declining growth, government must take a more active role in directing physical development to achieve economic development ends. Physical development can no longer be seen as an autonomous activity.

In his commentary, David Nowlan adds another dimension to the second facet:

> ...We have allowed a tremendous amount of the surplus value, the overall profits that come from the uses of land, to accumulate in the value of the land itself. So there are enormous vested interests in land values, and the kind of scenario that I envisage, in which there is selective development and corresponding selective stagnation, tends to selectively destroy land values. It is the attempt to defend existing land values that brings forth the political pressures [for regulation and centralization] that I have spoken about. We must therefore be careful not to rely on policy instruments, fiscal policy measures and so on, which encourage the continued accumulation of value on land itself, or we shall continue to encourage defensiveness.

In short, we must use policies affecting physical development to further economic development objectives.

Social content: Marvyn Novick rings another change on the concept of redevelopment. His point is that physical development has "social content", whether we recognize it or not. We are now paying for the lack of recognition of this in the past. He suggests, for example, that suburban land use planning principles "could not only be understood as the desire for open space, pastoral living and home ownership; that there were critical issues related to public health and parenting which shaped land use patterns in the post-war suburbs. People in the land use field seem to find that a somewhat foreign approach to the issue of urban development".

We are now suffering from social deterioration because our "land use and service patterns have been insensitive to the profound sets of family, social and cultural changes that have occurred".

In effect we need a process of physical redevelopment to repair some mistakes of the past and adapt to current and future changes in social patterns. Yet again, the division between social and physical seems not only arbitrary but harmful, in light of current needs.

The same principle can be extended to other issues, such as energy. Bunli Yang puts it simply: ..."you don't go about land use planning or physical development for its own sake; you go about it for social and economic reasons. The most energy-efficient house is no house at all!"

Political significance of integration: Michael Goldrick stresses the political significance of the division between physical and social or economic planning. Their separation may serve a political function of disguising the need for various kinds of choices. Their integration, equally, may serve a different kind of political function.

> [W]hether [the proposed Act's] conception of what planning entails is too narrow or not, the fact remains that physical planning now and in the future will have significant social and economic consequences. This is the case both in terms of social relationships, and in relation to the distribution of monetary and other collectively or publicly provided benefits in our cities.
>
> So surely the first thing to do is to insist that these questions are adequately considered -- pulled out of the penumbra of mainstream convention and made explicit. That for a start represents a fairly substantial expansion in conventional concepts of planning.

Financial cost: In Peter Smith's view the case for integration of social and physical planning is not a matter of improving planning. If serious and meaningful attention is paid to the social needs of new communities, important constraints are thereby placed on physical development options. Financial cost becomes the bond which glues the two types of considerations together: they cannot be considered separately.

> This year, for example, was the first in Peel's history when more time was spent in capital budget discussions on hospital services than on roads and sewers; for the first time capital requirements for social services were discussed at great length. Council addressed the fact that the capital expenditure, big as it is, is nowhere near the magnitude of the operating expenditure; and when that aspect begins to be addressed, the official plan process is really circumscribed, since there is a realization that the release of new districts is contentious precisely because of the social and economic costs involved.

Given the Conference theme, its participants and the biases of the sponsors, it is not surprising that there is such a substantial sentiment in favour of more integrated planning. However, the speakers have all added some concrete imagery to the abstract notion of integration. Cumulatively the contributions provide a persuasive case for looking at new ways to divide up planning responsibilities which reflect needs rather than institutional convenience.

Planning Frameworks

On the second theme, a surprising amount of agreement remains on some basic points. Barry Cullingworth stated a general position at the outset which received quite wide acceptance. In diagrammatic terms he discussed two polar opposite approaches to planning: doing one thing at a time and doing everything at the same time. "The conclusion I draw....is that we should not be so modest (and inadequate) as to do 'One Thing at a Time', nor should we be so brazen (and foolhardy) as to attempt 'Everything at the Same Time'. Instead we should make an effort to bring together those bits of public policy which need dealing with together". In short we should not be dogmatic, but should seek ways in which planning frameworks can be established or modified in response to changing needs, rather than letting the frameworks themselves determine what needs shall be considered relevant.

It is interesting to note that while the official embodiment of urban planning in Ontario -- the Planning Act and proposed modifications -- tends to take a relatively narrow view of that activity, there remains what might be called an urban planning ideal which is much broader. Ken Richards reflects this in the final panel:

> I have often thought that an ideal Planning Act should include what I as a planner have been trained to understand as the "Comprehensive Plan", that is the incorporation of social, economic and physical elements into a single document. Having attempted to draft and implement such a document, I have concluded that governments should adopt different approaches to problem identification and issue resolution, rather than relying on a single instrument to fulfill the requirements of an entire assignment.

Comprehensiveness is not automatically a virtue. We may have to modify our ideals as well as improve our practice.

Beyond this general point there is a great diversity of views concerning the kind of frameworks we should be considering in order to address what are currently seen to be the problems of the 80's. These might be roughly grouped into two types: those concerned with institutional structures, and those concerned with planning as a perspective for approaching issues and problems.

Planning as Structure

Official plans: There remains some disagreement about the appropriate role for the official plan and related instruments specified in the Planning Act. Having the first word again, Barry Cullingworth indicates that

> We have had in our minds a conception of planning which is broad, comprehensive, just and humane....
>
> I want to suggest to you that we cannot get anywhere near this ideal by way of the Planning Act or any of the legalistic and physically oriented policies which run along with it.
>
> ...[W]e should be thinking in terms of a central unit at the regional and municipal level which elaborates a comprehensive policy plan for its area; and part of that plan would be reflected in the official plan under the Planning Act.

Bill Thomson develops a more elaborate structure which defines elements at provincial, regional and municipal levels.

> In my view there are several kinds of official plan and none of them is really addressed in the Planning Act.

> However, minor amendments could cover them.
>
> First, there are the broad policy statements that the Province must formulate with our input...
>
> Secondly, there are the plans of Regions, Districts and Restructured Counties. These I call policy plans; they are more than policy statements but short of detailed land use projections...
>
> Thirdly, there are the more detailed physical plans for settlements, communities, neighbourhoods or blocks which are worked out with people and in conformity with higher tier policies.

Provincial planning structures: Thomson is more explicit about the kind of structure at the regional and municipal level than at the provincial level. Maureen Quigley argues that

> ...planning in the 80's requires a process at the provincial level which is interdisciplinary and interministerial in nature in order to assist regional and local municipalities in developing a product (official plan or corporate plan) which is a melding of a well-conceived and well-communicated "provincial interest" and a municipal interest which is broadly, not narrowly, defined.

Her description of one experimental Provincial task force gives definition to the notions of "interdisciplinary" and "interministerial". Ken Richards' description of the current structure of provincial planning provides the context within which this link to municipal planning could be placed.

Participation in planning: While it seems fair to say that there is no direct disagreement with the foregoing outlines of planning structures, there is reservation about having a multitude of planning centres with no single formally defined structure. Ann Barstow notes that voluntary social planning councils are concerned about the fact that plans which are made at various levels of government

> ...have no single place where they can be addressed. There are a multiplicity of levels where "planning" happens, a multiplicity of authorities, ministries, local governments, municipal councils; and through this morass social planning councils are trying to register their concerns and to make known what they feel. This is most important in planning...
>
> It is natural, therefore, that at present most of the thrust of social planning council activity as far as the White Paper is concerned is towards addressing the fact

> that it does not recommend that social objectives be part of master plans...But the Planning Act is the only instrument that has been available. It is an area where there have been clearly spelled out regulations, standards and procedures, where a framework is set...Maybe it is a very imperfect instrument, but when an instrument is available it is perhaps better to try to improve it than to try to find another one.

The moral would seem to be that there has to be a certain degree of comprehensiveness and stability to a planning system if it is to be comprehensible to someone other than the full-time expert or bureaucrat.

Marion Dewar amplifies the point:

> I refuse to accept that every community in this Province is the same, any more than I would say that every neighbourhood in my city is the same. Therefore we must have some tools at the local level to help us to plan for what our needs will be in the 80's, and that process certainly needs to be linked with the Planning Act.

Planning as a Perspective

Two speakers make an eloquent case that a more effective approach to planning would not be achieved by concentrating on structure or formalized processes.

Marvyn Novick begins by noting that

> The opening session was useful because it pushed us away from what I would call "The Mystique of the Magic Structure", the notion that we introduce new elements into urban development by putting new structures in place: that you set up a District Health Council and thus you have integrated health planning....Perhaps we can agree that we are talking not about structures, but about two things when we try to extend the concept of urban planning. We are talking about a framework and we are talking about the kinds of capabilities that we need.
>
> Framework means we have to begin to define the boundaries or the domain of what we are really concerned about....I mean by capabilities the diverse contributions, the diverse activities and the diverse knowledge required. I clearly see the introduction of a social development perspective into urban planning as something to be achieved over time -- more an agenda than a blueprint -- something that evolves.

Political nature of planning: Michael Goldrick and Meyer Brownstone are the only participants to address the political nature of planning explicitly. Goldrick introduces a useful distinction between politics and politics which is worth quoting at some length:

> [A]fter years of kidding ourselves that city planning is a rational, objective, and value-free enterprise, it now is conceded that planning in its narrow sense of land use and property relations is a political process. But despite this significant advance, the politics of planning is generally construed to mean that the process by which decisions are arrived at should be made in a political setting: by politicians, more or less in the open. This, however, is only part of the politics of planning and, at that, one that speaks to how decisions are arrived at rather than to who gets what, why, where and when. Yet conventional planning, and the spatial patterning with which it is involved, is a highly political social function principally because it is highly ideological....
>
> [T]he political nature of planning in such a broader philosophic sense is hardly realized and rarely acknowledged, though it is manifest everywhere around us....
>
> Without explicit ideology, institutionalised in local government in the form of parties, it is unlikely that the ideological glue needed to define and structure value-laden policies respecting social justice and economic equity will be developed.

Brownstone's remarks provide one interpretation of the significance of the general lack of political concern in the Conference. His conclusion suggests the need for a second look at the possibilities for change which lie within the domain of traditional physical planning. It provides an interesting counterpoint to the opening remarks by Cullingworth.

Summary

This, then, is a brief sampling of the range of views and positions expressed at the Conference. Given the variety of vantage points of the various speakers, there is a remarkable consistency of opinion concerning the need to have a more explicit and conscious way of addressing the strategically important problems of the coming decade without an artificial boundary between their physical and socio-economic manifestations.

Participants have chosen to emphasize different points in indicating how we should proceed in the future. Here again, though, it is noteworthy

that there are relatively few points of explicit disagreement. Rather, the cumulative impression is of the need for a broad range of changes in the way we think about the major planning issues of the decade and the way in which we structure our governmental institutions to deal with them.

It is patently evident that the present system of planning has many weaknesses and limitations. The proceedings of this Conference provide a sound base for beginning to develop a systematic program of change. If they can create a greater awareness of this need and stimulate others to join in this task, they will have served their purpose well.

PART I: PLANNING AT THE TURN OF THE DECADE

INTRODUCTION

Max Bacon
Canadian Institute of Planners

Two years ago a significant conference was held on Social Objectives,* involving people active in the social planning field. A lot of very important ideas were put forward on how we can integrate social and physical planning, but most governments seem reluctant to tackle the matter in a holistic way or are determined to ignore the issues posed.

In the future we must integrate social and physical planning, and it is a tremendous disappointment to find that in the new Draft Planning Act the Province is really only concerned with physical planning, now and for the rest of the century. It is strange that this has happened, in a society which is both sophisticated and affluent. By contrast, in the underdeveloped countries, plans are concerned to a very high degree with social and economic as well as physical planning, and their integration. They are concerned with how to make an economy grow while at the same time providing the physical surroundings and social context that will give people a good life. It is strange that we in Ontario should continue to be concerned for the most part with physical planning. The Report of the Planning Act Review Committee [1977] suggests that the real reason why we will continue to ignore social planning is that we want to make sure that development is

---

* Social Objectives and Urban Planning, a seminar organized by the Central Ontario Chapter of the Canadian Institute of Planners, and regional Social Planning Councils, Toronto, June 8-9, 1978. Proceedings published by the Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto.

speeded up. But why are we worrying? There is little development taking place, nor is there likely to be any for a while. Now is surely the time to improve on what we already have, and to deal with the social and economic problems that press upon us.

For years, many people have been urging the provincial government to show leadership in the planning field. By and large the Province has not planned, has never even pretended to do so. The Planning Act has really been something of a misnomer for the last 25 years, in that, with a few exceptions such as the Toronto-Centred Region experiment, the Metro Toronto and Region Transportation Study (MTARTS), and the "new towns", it has really been a Development Control Act. We continue to call it the Planning Act, and there is some hope, at least in the draft legislation, that the Province will show leadership: that it actually will plan. The paragraph "The Minister...will have regard to" social, economic and physical policies, can be read to mean that <u>if there are</u> any social, economic or physical policies of the Province, then the Minister will have regard to them -- among other matters. Or he may disregard them. Perhaps I am being too cynical. Perhaps the Province will in fact think seriously about our social, economic and physical problems, and will address them. Perhaps the Minister will co-ordinate the efforts -- as he is permitted to do by Section 2 -- of the various ministries concerned, and issue policy statements which will provide guidance to the municipalities. If that co-ordination can take place, and if there is a real will to do it, perhaps the Act can in fact work -- concentrating on physical development, but having regard to social and economic matters. If there is leadership from the Province much might be achieved. Let us hope that the initiative will be there; without it the future will not, I suspect, be very bright.

J.B. Cullingworth
Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto

As the opening speaker, my task is to set the scene for the day. In fact the titles and subtitles point up the main features of this. We want to go "Beyond the White Paper" on the Planning Act (and, I shall argue, beyond the new Planning Act as well); we want to focus on "Planning for People in the 80's"-- as distinct from planning for physical construction; and we are "at the turn of the decade". This, in one sense, is of course simply a statement of fact, but there is a sociological significance to the "turn of a decade" which is of particular relevance to a conference which is also concerned with the matters indicated by the other two titles.

I see us wanting to spend our time looking forward to see what "people problems" are likely to arise in the coming decade, and how we can best cope with them.

The decade has opened in a way which can hardly be described as encouraging. Indeed, given trends in inflation, unemployment, energy, we could have a truly miserable day. But there are grounds for optimism; and I want to call attention to two of these.

First, we have cleared (or are in process of clearing) "the decks of outdated machinery". Following the dramatic changes which have taken place since the war, I think it can truly be said that the Planning Act Review and the new draft Planning Act signify a "coming of age" of local government in Ontario. The major thrust here is on a redistribution of powers, with clearer (and more appropriate) roles for the various levels of central and local government.

A second ground for optimism might seem to be a perverse one: it is that of acknowledging social problems. To be more precise, we are accepting that while many of us have done well in recent decades, there are many who have not. Social problems have not simply "gone away" as general living standards have risen: on the contrary they have persisted, even if in changed forms. I

see the acknowledgement of these problems as a ground for optimism since that is the first essential step towards their resolution. As my revered professor, Richard Titmuss, used to say, "every generation has to rediscover poverty for itself".

But my optimism now begins to wear thin. The social problems we face are complex and difficult to come to grips with -- low income housing; the planning failures of the suburbs; the aging population; mental health; high unemployment. Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that it is this type of problem with which public and private agencies will be heavily concerned in the 80's.

All this is certainly "Beyond the White Paper". Indeed, a major criticism of the Comay Report, of the White Paper and of the Draft Act has been that they all embrace a very narrow concept of "planning" -- one which is essentially concerned with property rights and physical development. This narrow, legalistic approach is quite inadequate, but though many of us (including myself*) have been highly critical of it, I now think we have been aiming at the wrong target.

We have had in our minds a conception of planning which is broad, comprehensive, just and humane; which is flexible yet unarbitrary; and which serves all good people, but does not let bad people take unfair shares or obstruct the wider benefits of equitable and sensitive "social planning".

I want to suggest to you that we cannot get anywhere near this ideal by way of the Planning Act or any of the legalistic and physically oriented policies which run along with it.

I suggest, simply, that if we are to "plan for people in the 80's", we should devote our efforts to doing precisely that, and not waste time trying to establish whether Section 16, subsection(2) of the Draft Act gives us the social orientation we want:

> In preparing and implementing an official plan, regard shall be had to such social, economic and environmental matters as appear to be relevant.

If you doubt me, read the Background Paper 2 (which was issued with the

---

* See J.B. Cullingworth, Notes on the Comay Report: Planning in Ontario, University of Toronto, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Papers on Planning and Design, no. 19, 1978.

White Paper) which shows what fun and games can be had with that phrase "regard shall be had to". (The Draft Act confounds the issue by adding the further constraining concept of "appear to be relevant".)

Let us accept the comment of AMO (Association of Municipalities of Ontario), that if this is what Ontario means by "planning", the Planning Act ought to be renamed The Development Control Act.

The essential point here is presented in the White Paper (paragraph 3.10).

> Expanding the scope of municipal planning to embrace social and economic planning would complicate the present system beyond measure. The official plan would become a complex corporate management document containing capital works programmes, environmental impact assessments and social analyses. It would be even less intelligible to most of the public than it is now. With its wide range of subject matter, the plan would have to be amended constantly, and this would further delay decisions on development proposals.

Moreover (paragraph 8.19):

> While.....social, economic and environmental objectives are valid concerns.....the official plan is not the place to address them in a detailed way. Indeed, many areas of human services planning, for example, are not even within municipal jurisdiction.

But, if we accept this argument (which the Province has done), how is the wider job to be tackled? This is a most difficult question; if there were a simple answer, we wouldn't be here today.

There are, of course, lots of different answers possible, but they all present difficulties, for example, of finance, of institutional jealousies and myopia, of political preoccupation with the short-run, and so on. More disturbingly, they also present serious challenges to our social consciences and to our ability to reorganise our affairs to adapt to changing circumstances.

Let me take two extremes: I have had some difficulty in finding appropriate "labels" for these (all the good ones seem to have been used for other purposes), and so I have been forced to use somewhat cumbersome terminology — but hopefully this will have the advantage of making the meaning clear. The two extremes are <u>One Thing at a Time</u> and <u>Everything at the Same Time</u>.

<u>One Thing at a Time</u>

Doing one thing at a time is manageable, comforting and rewarding -- "a job well done" as the phrase goes. On this approach we allow each

service to work out its own salvation. Problems are dealt with in an ad hoc way. If there is a crisis, we set up a commission, task force, or even an interdepartmental committee. Alternatively we can appoint new staff--whether they be new specialists or simply chequer-board deputy ministers or ministers. If public pressure is really intense, a new ministry can be established -- a ministry for housing, or for the elderly, or for "urban affairs". (In changing circumstances we can equally well abolish a ministry -- "urban affairs" at the federal level is a nice case in point.)

Less cynically, there are positive advantages in the focusing of effort on single services. Thus the education authority can concentrate on providing new schools, the health authority on new hospitals, and the roads authority on new roads.

But here lies the major problem. On a wider view we may need fewer of these things, yet it is often the perceived function of the "single minded authority" to provide more of them. Moreover, such authorities will press their case with the public. (Listen to what the Commissioner for Roads has to say in Toronto!) And there will be all kinds of subtle reinforcement of attitudes. If you travel on a Toronto streetcar you will see a notice telling you that the service is financially supported by the Province. You don't find a similar notice on the Don Valley Parkway.

Since I am merely setting a background I must resist the temptation to develop this theme. Let me simply say that it is relatively easy for an authority to provide more of a service (if the money is forthcoming): but what if we want less? What happens when we want fewer schools and hospitals, for instance -- and when we want to transfer resources (and perhaps buildings) to other services? This line of thought leads me to the other "extreme":

Everything at the Same Time

There are few brave souls who believe that this is practicable, but it is possible to have a plan which attempts to bring relevant things together.

To pick up an idea which John Gandy expressed at the 1978 Social Objectives seminar: Could we not

> Create committees within regional governments that have the responsibility for planning and research covering all aspects of regional government. This committee would have a large interdisciplinary research capability that would work with all

> committees and departments in regional government. It would also be expected to look at the impact on people of all plans, and more specifically to undertake, or request that other committees or departments undertake, inquiries into the etiology of special problems, as well as ecological problems, with the specific objective of reconceptualising and aligning services, and developing plans for overcoming problems....

To my mind, this suggests that we should be thinking in terms of a central unit at the regional and municipal level which elaborates a comprehensive policy plan for its area; and part of that plan would be reflected in the official plan under the Planning Act.

Perhaps I've stressed too much (and too soon) the question of governmental machinery. But I've done so because it seems to me that we must first have an adequate capability for identifying problems and getting to grips with them.

What could be a more eloquent example of this here in Metro than housing, where the scene -- to an outsider at least -- seems to be one of warfare between a multiplicity of agencies with overlapping or even conflicting responsibilities and perceptions of the problem which they are supposedly working together to solve.

To take a different example: can we hope to eliminate -- or even to contain -- the problems of unemployment without large scale public investment? And how can we finance that (particularly at the municipal level) with existing tax systems?

There are no simple answers to these sorts of questions; and I don't pretend to have any. All I am clear about is that the issues with which we are to be faced in the 80's (and which we'll be discussing later this morning) --issues of social and economic development -- will demand a different style of government, a different pattern of expenditure, and (more fundamentally) a different outlook on society than that which we got by with (and seemed justifiable) in the great physical development years of the last decade or so.

The physical development rush is over, and we can demote physical planning to its engineering and building origins. This should make it easier for us to view "social planning", or "socio-economic planning", or "corporate planning" as a predominantly social and economic process which will have some important implications for physical planners.

So I'm talking of a wide framework within which the nuts and bolts of

physical planning -- the Planning Act -- is set, and which is one of a number of functions which are run by separate bits of our governmental machinery, just like other bits are -- such as Hydro or hospitals or public transport. At first sight, this looks so obviously sensible that one wonders what's so difficult. The difficulty lies in the fact that there are very many bits and pieces (nuts and bolts) -- and they don't fit together easily. In the real world everything is related to everything else and, if we try to tackle everything at once we are overwhelmed. (Just try making some sense of that bit of our governmental system that is compressed in the pages of the Government of Ontario Telephone Directory -- and, if you're still game -- try the Federal one.)

The conclusion I draw from this is that we should not be so modest (and inadequate) as to do "One Thing at a Time", nor should we be so brazen (and foolhardy) as to attempt "Everything at the Same Time". Instead, we should make an effort to bring together those bits of public policy which need dealing with together.

My time is up and my task is nearly complete: but let me illustrate my point by submitting (there is no time to develop an argument) that we must bring housing policy and social security policy together. Lots of other areas are relevant to each and perhaps to both: but we shall be in real difficulties with both housing policy and social security policy unless we can find a way of dealing with them at one and the same time.

This is but an illustration. My major point is that we should identify both (1) the major issues with which we should be concerned in the 80's and (2) the issues which ought to be considered together.

What these are, and how we should tackle them, are the questions for today: they will certainly take us well "beyond the White Paper".

Ann Barstow
Ontario Welfare Council

I am here as a volunteer and as a citizen. I come from the area of voluntary social planning. In this Province that is where social planning takes place -- at the voluntary level, through voluntary councils, with a few quasi-governmental organisations or social resources councils which are just now being formed.

I looked up the definition of "planning" : to plan is to scheme, or to arrange beforehand, and I think every social planning council in this Province can talk about scheming. Our major problem is that, being community based, and being very much conscious of citizen participation, we have seen so often that citizen participation seems only to be given lip service. A position paper on the Waterloo Region starts by saying: "Citizen participation in government decision-making is one of those concepts which should have moved out of the arena of debate and into common practice by now". And it certainly should have. There is no doubt that there are many physical planners who have paid attention to the concept, and have tried to involve the citizens. But take as an example of the problem the notices of hearing on amendments to by-laws that appear in the newspaper: for a citizen to begin to understand whether the item concerns him requires a tremendous background of expertise, or access to expertise. How should he know?

Another difficulty for the social planning councils is that their concerns about the social impact of plans which are made at a variety of levels of government, have no single place where they can be addressed. There are a multiplicity of levels where "planning" happens, a multiplicity of authorities, ministries, local governments, municipal councils; and through this morass social planning counils are trying to register their concerns and to make known what they feel. This is most important in planning -- which is after all looking to future impacts or future concerns.

It is natural, therefore, that at present most of the thrust of social

planning council activity as far as the White Paper is concerned is towards addressing the fact that it does not recommend that social objectives be part of master plans, that this concept is in fact rejected. But the Planning Act is the only instrument that has been available. It is an area where there have been clearly spelled out regulations, standards and procedures, where a framework is set. It may only address physical planning, but better that than the variety and incredible mixture that would have to be addressed on the isolationist principle that Professor Cullingworth was talking about. Maybe it is a very imperfect instrument, but when an instrument is available it is perhaps better to try to improve it than to try to find another one.

As we enter a new decade, perhaps it is time to look at other possibilities. Professor Cullingworth's concept is a very interesting one, where the varieties of planning are co-ordinated into one platform or mechanism, of which physical planning becomes one part. Maybe social planning concerns could then be addressed at a point where a response would be available to a variety of areas.

Let us look at what is in place right now. Certainly there is no effort to co-ordinate planning per se at any level, no matter how you look at it. For instance, in Toronto there has been major concern over group homes, rest homes and boarding houses. Many people feel that by-laws and so on are causing these homes to be dumped into some communities because other communities will not open themselves to accepting that variety of care situation. Dennis Timbrell, Minister of Health, wrote a letter: the last lines will give you an idea of how things stand:

> Municipalities have access to legislation needed to address the sort of problem that is being described. Municipalities licence and regulate boarding and lodging homes under the Municipal Act, and can enforce certain by-laws under the Planning Act. Also, the municipal Medical Officer of Health is given authority in this area under the Public Health Act.

One area: three acts.

Now this is the kind of thing that makes it extraordinarily difficult to visualize even the modified version of "everything at the same time" suggested by Barry Cullingworth. And yet I think that is maybe where our

hope has to lie. It is probably our major challenge for this new decade: how to create the kind of mechanism that allows that sort of comprehensive approach to be made. Maybe voluntary social planning councils should address their efforts to that instead of concentrating on the Planning Act as being the only available instrument.

To end, I shall read from "Ruthless Rhymes for Heartless Homes":

> Sitting by the fireside
> Nurse fell in the flames and died.
> But what makes it ten times worse
> All the toast was burnt with Nurse.

We must be really careful, as we start facing up to the 80's, that we do not become so involved in this whole affair that we burn toast, Nurse, ourselves and the Planning Act in the process.

Marion Dewar
Mayor of the City of Ottawa

We have spent a lot of time and money in the City of Ottawa to make sure that our citizens became involved in the planning process, and that our neighbourhood plans, amendments to our Official Plan, were developed in conjunction with our Social Planning Council, to whom we gave contracts to give us some idea of what future needs would be, and how those physical plans would work. As yet we have not had a great deal of success. The only thing we have been able to do is to sensitize neighbourhoods to the fact that they will have to start looking at new directions. If we are very careful not to box ourselves in too rigidly with the Planning Act, the 80's will give us a chance to rethink and review our prejudices and biases and see what we can do about them.

The group homes issue is an excellent example of what has been happening. It is the Province which licences the group homes while it is the municipality which gets criticism from its communities, who say that they don't want five group homes on one block; but how does one have control

without the power to license? I hope that is the kind of modified comprehensive planning that Professor Cullingworth is talking about. I get very nervous when we talk about one central body that is going to do this planning; the bureaucratic overtones tell me that maybe we would be creating another special purpose body that I really do abhor. It becomes so much more difficult for the electorate, the community, the people themselves, to get at the decision-makers when they have to confront special bodies that have been appointed by the favour of whomever the government of the day happens to be. Or through the process of who knows whom.

One of the ways in which we have been able to overcome this problem with our volunteer bodies within our own community has been by publicly advertising for applicants; by interviewing, making a recommendation and debating who should be on what committee as volunteer. The volunteers receive no remuneration, but they are willing to put forward their abilities and to stand up and be counted among the rest of their community. That has been very progressive in regard to our social needs in planning.

However, we must have some legal clout. And even though we say we do not want to be too rigid, there has to be something in the Planning Act which addresses itself to social implications. For instance, we are struggling right now with our schools. Many of our inner city schools are facing declining use. We have tried to keep some of them open, saying that they will be for community use and so forth. But we are looking at a population that is changing, where the bulge is moving from the very young to the older community. Surely we should be recycling some of those things for the older community. The municipalities must have the power to do that -- if they have the tax base to do it with. Sometimes the Provincial or the Federal Government has said that they would deconditionalize grants, so that the municipalities would have the power to make decisions, but when that is looked at very closely, the deconditionalizing of grants just means that fiscal responsibility is transferred from the income tax to the property tax -- which certainly does not help the local body as far as either its authority or its ability to do things is concerned.

However I believe firmly that, if we are to look at changes in society, we must have a good measure of the pulse of the local community. I refuse to accept that every community in this province is the same, any more than

I would say that every neighbourhood in my city is the same. Therefore we must have some tools at the local level to help us to plan for what our needs will be in the 80's, and that process certainly needs to be linked with the Planning Act. Once that is done, then we must have some kind of legal clout so that we can implement it.

The Province has been very careful in the White Paper to say that it will protect those areas that are of provincial interest. The City of Ottawa has found the provincial interest to be very interesting when it has come to a matter of who their friends are, reversing in Cabinet some of our recommendations as well as Ontario Municipal Board decisions. The implication is that all those grandiose plans of the neighbourhood could simply be overturned if the Province suddenly decided that it needed a four-lane arterial road; that is the authority the Province is holding on to. We have to be very wary of that kind of thing, because as long as that degree of power is allowed to stay within the provincial jurisdiction, what we are really saying is that we are bringing in a Planning Act which gives lip service to decentralizing, to increasing local autonomy; but when it comes to the crunch really nothing has changed.

It is conferences such as this, it is seminars in communities with planners, with citizens, with local and provincial politicians in real discussion groups, that will start to make people sensitive to the fact that we <u>can</u> have some direction over our own lives, and because growth has slowed down in the 80's we have an opportunity to do something that is very positive.

PART II: MAJOR PROBLEMS OF THE 80'S

INTRODUCTION

Earl Miller
Ontario Welfare Council

The first discussion showed that in many ways the present Planning Act is an inadequate instrument for accomplishing some of the things that we want to accomplish. This suggests, by implication, that we are looking at the Planning Act and similar instruments as tools to achieve certain social purposes which we have in mind. Presumably, planning is a process by which we can increase our capacity to deal with major problems which we will be confronting in the future. The 80's will be turbulent, unpredictable and uncertain; planning is intended to increase our capacity to deal with those problems. However, in the final analysis we are faced with a social choice. We decide that the instruments which we use to plan will take into account the various issues which we feel they should broadly deal with; we advocate that position or we take lesser measures. I think the Provincial government has indicated what its stand is. Ultimately, what we are debating here is not so much administrative procedure, but a position which is in part based upon value, upon our social choice to use planning instruments in a way that we like. But it is also a question of asking ourselves whether or not those instruments can meet the needs which we consider important. One of the aspects of the first discussion was to indicate to us that, at the very least, economic and social issues are among the important ones which are not fully addressed in the Planning Act.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Don Richmond
Deputy Commissioner of Planning, Metropolitan Toronto

I am not at all sure at this stage of the game what "Economic Development" is. I do not know who should carry it out, whatever it is, or where it should be carried out -- at which level of government -- or whether government should be in the game at all. The phrase has become too over-worked; it has no more meaning than that standard Canadian phrase "Industrial Strategy". I have a vague idea that they are somehow connected, but I am not sure how.

However, I do know that Economic Development is "in", that it is one of the more trendy topics of the time. It is definitely the place to be for public administrators, because it represents the growth sector of the economy. If you question that, I invite you to scan through the 32-page Speech from the Throne which opened the Ontario Legislature in March; 16 of those 32 pages are devoted, directly or indirectly, to economic development. So evidently at Queen's Park it is business as usual. Although the Conservative government of Ontario has never downplayed economic growth, there was a time in the 70's when it seemed possible that some of those other issues, such as the environment, housing, possibly even social questions, might be emerging as primary issues for the Province. But the March 1980 Speech from the Throne takes us back to where we really should be; we have been saved from the barbarians, sanity has returned.

This sense of the reality of the primary objectives and goals has been emerging at the level of local government as well. We could never in the past have said, "You know, folks, planning is all very well, but the name of the game is assessment" (that is a very dirty word, passé and old-hat); but I think that is what it's all about. I defend that thesis in light of what has happened, particularly in the 70's. Many of us in local government thought that we would be able to create a better urban environment, that we

could worry about social issues in a very substantive way, getting away from the nitty-gritty of local government. The hope had been triggered by the Provincial government in 1969* that the fiscal problems of the municipalities were somehow going to be resolved.

Unfortunately, in the 70's, all the hopes of local officials and local politicians were shattered; all the promises of fiscal reform suddenly disappeared -- they are on a shelf, collecting dust. This has brought the realization that the old fiscal problems, that the municipalities were certainly trying very hard to resolve, are not going to be resolved by Ottawa and are not going to be resolved by Queen's Park. We have realized that there is no magic money tree, and that we have to get back to basics. We have to look at the tax revenues of the municipalities, and that means real property tax assessment. Assessment has re-emerged on the agenda of local government as a critical problem. In a fiscal bind there are three alternatives: one is to cut services, and no-one wants that; the second is to raise taxes, and that clearly is verboten; so the only other alternative is to press for increased assessment.

One of our difficulties in dealing with economic development in Metro Toronto is that we have neither the legislative base of some of the Regions or area municipalities, nor the necessary expertise. For instance, 1975-77 was a period of rapid growth in unemployment; we spent the better part of two and a half years attempting to get some action to try to resolve this problem in Metro. We received at best <u>some</u> support at the local political level. We had absolutely <u>no</u> support at the Provincial level, and we had in addition the antipathy and antagonism of the federal government. In 1977 we decided that our efforts were not working, that unemployment was not an issue that anyone was getting excited about, and that the private sector would resolve it anyway. So we changed our approach; we redefined the problem. We said we are not really worried about jobs anymore, directly. What we are worried about is declining assessment.

Since that change in definition, the issue of economic development has stirred up a good deal of attention; it has certainly received a lot more

---

* Ontario Budget 1969, Budget Paper E, "The Reform of Taxation and Government Structure in Ontario" accepted some of the recommendations of the Ontario Committee on Taxation, 1967 (Smith Committee) and the Select Committee of the Legislature, <u>Taxation in Ontario</u>, 1968 (White Committee).

attention in the press than any of our other efforts. It has become a very "pop" thing to talk about in Metro and at the area municipal level. It has punch. We hope to get some money from the provincial government to do something about it -- and that really must be the measure of a good thing, when the Province gives money without even a specific program to give it to. The issue is clearly important, and it is perceived as important. It is an idea whose time has come. Clearly, we could not sell it as unemployment, but we can sell it as assessment.

Now, that could be regarded as a very cynical move, but I think there is more to it than that. I think there is concern that the future development of this community be accomplished with sensitivity. We recognize in Metro that we are not dealing with the development of vacant lands, we are talking about redevelopment (and most of our politicians accept that). Therefore we have to be very conscious of the sensitivity of the urban fabric. This will be an extremely interesting problem that cuts across planning issues, social issues, all issues. We are just starting out on an adventure which we hope will have positive benefits to this community.

I do not think we can approach the problem with a master plan or by model-building. I do think that we are trying to create an awareness, an attitude, a style of thinking; it is a consciousness-raising exercise. Because of our constraints at the Metro level we are not trying to use the planning system as an instrument of change: that is an area municipality responsibility which it would be very difficult for us to move into. Metro cannot do the sort of things that the City of Toronto talks about in its selective economic development approach, which is a good start and should be carried out at the area municipality level.

At the Metro level I think we can do something else: we can develop an effective lobby. I am looking forward to the possibility of developing consensus on issues, a consensus that cuts across the area municipal or political structure of local government in Metro, as well as business and labour, and which is used as a lobbying device to get things done in the interests of this community, or stop things being done which are not in our interest. That is not very exciting or challenging, but I recall a most disappointing session several years ago when the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee of Metro attended a meeting in Ottawa with the then

Liberal caucus representing Metro. Both the caucus and the Metro officials bemoaned the fact that almost every municipality in Canada could go to Ottawa and make things happen, but Metro could not. The caucus had no impact; Metro had no impact -- it was the voiceless giant. We at Metro think it is about time that it was not a voiceless giant, and that it started to push for things. It comes down to this: that a GATT agreement can wipe out jobs in Metro. That is happening, and yet there is no unified voice from Metro to defend our interests. Perhaps the economists would tell us it would be a bad thing to do. But the jobs are for people here, and we should be concerned. And we were not. It is time that we were.

So essentially we are trying to find a legitimate role for Metro, and I am suggesting to you that it is not the traditional economic or industrial development role: we are not really set up to do that, nor should we do it. Our role is more in changing attitudes, creating climates, consciousness raising -- and in being an effective lobby for the benefit of the citizens of this community.

David Nowlan
Department of Political Economy, University of Toronto

Don Richmond had a rather more upbeat comment than I had expected: I had hoped that he would play the role of the modern day prophet of the dismal science and tell us, as I know he has told politicians in Metro quite frequently, what bad economic times we can expect during the 80's. He might comment on whether what we have heard suggests a change in his attitude, or whether he has just decided that he is tired of being dismal about the 80's.

There are some issues that I think will emerge rather more strongly in the 80's than they have so far. The economic picture that we will be looking at over the next five or ten years is one in which the shift of economic excitement to the West is likely to continue. It is one, as we know, in which the population growth rate will in all likelihood, unless something strange happens to immigration figures, be less than we experienced over the 60's, and to a certain extent during the 70's. It is a period during which some labour

intensive manufacturing industries will suffer because of increasing competition from low income countries. However, there are some advantages in having, as we have in southern Ontario, the least capital intensive, and the highest capital output ratio, of any area of Canada. This means that we can get fairly high employment bangs for our capital investment bucks. With the right kind of market, the right demand patterns and proper attention to the kinds of industry that we develop in Southern Ontario, there is a potential opportunity for economic strength and even industrial growth.

But in general we must acknowledge that the 80's are likely to continue to be, in Southern Ontario -- not in the gold-mining North -- a period of economic retrenchment. Nonetheless, because of the enormous present and continued future economic strength of Ontario, because of its high technology and competitive industries, there will continue to be growth. But it will be differential growth; much more noticeable will be the areas of decline along with the areas of strong economic development.

So what we are facing in the more industrialised part of Southern Ontario will be a period of selective growth in which there will be pockets of stagnation and decline. The future pattern is beginning clearly to emerge: there will be an enormous degree of defensiveness in those pockets of stagnation wherever they occur, whether within Metro or outside. Whether in an older suburban apartment development or an inner city industrial development that is becoming outmoded, there will no longer be a tendency -- because the times are not economically buoyant -- for new economic developments to replace the old; instead, redevelopment will be much more selective. So we will be left with pockets of stagnation, about which there will be an incredible degree of defensiveness. What will be the consequences of that?

One consequence will be a strong pressure for greater regulation and greater support for the individuals, corporations, the economic actors in general who are being harmed; and there will be pressure for regulations (from whatever level of government) to multiply. There will also be a tendency for more senior governments to want to centralize. Of course, what happens in Ottawa depends a lot on the larger political scene, and other political tensions in the country. But certainly during the 80's there will be a tendency for the provinces to want to take up some of the reins of power that municipalities have been fighting so hard during the 70's to control.

With these kinds of tensions, the danger is that we will succumb to

both these kinds of pressures; that in introducing the regulation that attempts to maintain value and maintain the present relative position of people in society, there will be a strong departure of prices from real social values. We will cease to have an incentive structure that responds to real cost in society. It is during a period of economic retrenchment that it is particularly important not to do that. It is instead particularly important to try throughout our levels of government to ensure that the price incentives that we respond to as individuals, whether on land, fuel, housing or energy, bear some relationship to the cost to society of the resources that we are using. This is precisely the time when we must become more efficient in our economic and social output. So we have to be careful, as the economy ceases to grow at rates we have become accustomed to in the past, not to become locked into an increasingly regulated economy.

From a land-planning point of view, these regulatory pressures are of particular significance. We have allowed a tremendous amount of the surplus value, the overall profits that come from uses of land, to accumulate in the value of the land itself. So there are enormous vested interests in land values, and the kind of scenario that I envisage, in which there is selective development and corresponding selective stagnation, tends to selectively destroy land values. It is the attempt to defend existing land values that brings forth the political pressures that I have spoken about. We must therefore be careful not to rely on policy instruments, fiscal policy measures and so on, which encourage the continued accumulation of value on land itself, or we shall continue to encourage defensiveness.

How can this be avoided? One way, clearly signalled by a number of writers, is to develop a better set of user-cost instruments in society, financing less than we do now through general tax revenue. There are two beneficial effects from moving in that direction. One is that we would have to place less reliance on our standard revenue instruments which, as Don Richmond noted, are going to be under increasing pressure. The other is that by mopping up through user charges some of the value of things like transportation lines or entertainment or amenities in the city, these values do not ultimately become capitalized in land. In this way, one can diminish the capitalization in private land of the value of publicly provided goods.

The other kind of pressure that will ultimately emerge as a result of increasingly strong debate of the sort in which Don Richmond has been deeply

involved, and others of us have been aware of through the 70's, is on the negotiation for shares in tax dollars, wherever the tax dollars are coming from among the levels of government. Here the municipalities have not been conspicuous winners over the last decade or so, and it is unlikely, partly for the reasons I have outlined, that they are going to be any more successful during the 80's. We must not back away from continuing concern about the form of our property tax, which will continue to be an important revenue base for the municipalities. I personally believe that the sort of reform that the Ontario government was attempting -- market-based assessment -- was misguided and, had it emerged in the form that was initially proposed, would have been one of the largest wealth-redistribution schemes that the Province had ever undertaken -- without its ever having been labelled as that; it was introduced in a totally different guise. But there are other forms of property tax reform, which could also have the effect of mopping up some of the value that would otherwise settle on land as a result of public action.

During the 80's we must also maintain a very eclectic approach towards government policy; I suspect it will not be the decade when rigid ideologies will be very productive for us. On the one hand, we are going to have to introduce policies that have the appearance of being made in Chacago -- the intellectual home of old-fashioned, right-wing liberalism -- policies like user fees and getting our incentive structures right in a private society. On the other hand, government cannot back away from taking very explicit action of a socialistic sort when the need is there. I am thinking of such things as actually engaging in structural development and business development, and not simply trying to take a planning act or land policy instrument and opening up an opportunity for something to happen, something that the private sector will have to do.

I am reminded of our old approach to Grade 13 physics exams, which we all thought we could get through successfully if we remembered two things: that $f = ma$ and you cannot push on a rope. Pushing on a rope is exactly what government tries to do when it announces housing policies and industrial strategy and so on, but at the same time has no instruments to accomplish these goals. Government cannot say that in Scarborough Town Centre there can be 8-, 9- or 10-times coverage development, and then just expect it all to happen. There is no particular reason why it should happen if it is left entirely up to the private market. If it is socially appropriate for that to happen, then government has to be prepared to step in with other instruments.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Marvyn Novick
Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto

I would like to set out some perspectives. The opening session was useful because it pushed us away from what I would call "The Mystique of the Magic Structure", the notion that we introduce new elements into urban development by putting new structures in place: that you set up a District Health Council, and thus you have integrated health planning; or that you put a Children's Services Committee into place and you now plan for the needs of children and their families. Perhaps we can agree that we are talking not about structures but about two things when we try to extend the concept of urban planning. We are talking about a framework and the kinds of capabilities that we need.

Framework means that we have to begin to define the boundaries or the domain of what we are really concerned about. That is not as easy as it sounds. Don Richmond confessed to some difficulty in doing that in the economic development area, and I would submit that in the social development, social policy and social planning areas, the domain is not clearly known. Very often when we talk about social development and the integration of social and physical planning we tend to think of it as integrating the planning of services with the planning of land. But there is a second element to social development, which involves the social content of land use, understanding the extent to which land use patterns inhibit or facilitate forms of social development.

The alternative to the magic structure is to identify the capabilities that are necessary. I mean by capabilities the diverse contributions, the diverse activities and the diverse knowledge required. I clearly see the introduction of a social development perspective into urban planning as something to be achieved over time -- more an agenda than a blueprint --

something that evolves.

Once we begin to identify the framework, and look at the kinds of capabilities that we require, what are the imperatives that are propelling us into an enhanced recognition that social development planning is critical to the future of urban government? There are states of social disintegration in our urban communities that are slowly but surely coming to the foreground.

Social disintegration means an inability to secure those public and collective forms of living that people require. The sources of social disintegration, I submit, come from the fact that land use and service patterns have been insensitive to the profound sets of family, social and cultural changes that have occurred. The evidence of social disintegration is our increased concern with vandalism, the rate of mental health problems in our community, suicide, the desperate need for crisis services, the inordinate growth of police and private security services in our community. You do not save money by ignoring social needs, you merely transfer the places in which public spending occurs. In the latter half of the 70's we have ignored social needs in a profound way. The Social Planning Council has looked at the budget of Metropolitan Toronto in the 70's, and it is evident that there was major spending on police services. Our population has not grown substantially in the 70's, yet the police budget grew substantially. The Centre of Criminology at the University of Toronto has described the enormous growth of private security services in our communities; in plazas, apartments, offices and hospitals. We have one school system in Metro which is looking at a private security system for its own school operation. Private security systems have come to approach the size of our public security systems. To me, this is evidence of social disintegration.

We have concerns about how to deal with inter-racial tension in a community whose composition has changed. We have a new awareness of the inter-generational impacts and other implications of neglected child welfare. We are aware that if child welfare is neglected it repeats itself in abuse patterns and deviance. I submit that these sources of social disintegration are one set of reasons why we have to raise questions; because we can no longer afford the old approach -- it's as simple as that. The old approach was a response to problems once they set in. The environment was left to

the private market and the land use profession. Between them they created the physical forms for community life. The social development element was left to the voluntary sector or to the public sector on a problem response basis. We just cannot afford this approach: it costs too much. If we are to secure social stability in the 80's we must look at basic questions about how urban environments can address some of the significant social and cultural changes that we are going through.

There is more to social development planning than the efficient allocation and management of services. Of course it is critical in a period of economic decline that we redevelop and redirect the use of existing social and physical resources -- there's no question that we cannot and should not expect the growth levels that we have experienced up until now. But I think there are more fundamental concerns. I think we need historical and critical thinking that begins to portray the social development role of cities, where and how it is evident now. One of the ideas for which I received the strongest criticism in our Surburban Report* was the notion that there were implicit social development principles in the emergence of the post-war suburbs, that land use forms could not only be understood as the desire for open space, pastoral living and home ownership; that there were critical issues related to public health and parenting which shaped land use patterns in the post-war suburbs.

People in the land use field seem to find this a somewhat strange perspective to the process of urban development. I would submit that these are profound issues which we have to understand. We are now coming to grips with significant shifts in our social and family life. We have the erosion of child-centred adult life. There is the emergence of what is now called the symmetrical family, with balanced sex roles. The life span has been prolonged with active adulthood and independent living extending into the senior years. Urban regions such as Metro are now multi-racial communities. All these social development patterns make corresponding new demands on the public environment. They make new demands on the forms of housing, public services, the kinds of streets and streetscapes that are required.

---

* Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Metro's Suburbs in Transition, Background report, April 1979.

We cannot move into social development planning unless we have some historical and critical framework to understand the shifts in the forms of daily and personal life, and what those will imply for future planning. Will we continue to see schools, libraries, children's aid societies as specialized services, playing limited roles in the experience of communities? Perhaps we may begin to see community services also serving as sources of social contact for people, of informal network development and mutual support. These are issues with fairly significant implications for the structure of community life and urban stability.

Social development planning requires diverse capabilities. I would like to see these emerge:

1. There must be some kind of social policy structure for local government. At present, there is no framework within local government where local government understands and acknowledges its social development role with respect to services and the social content of land use. Such a social policy structure might take the form of a liaison board for human services at the municipal level, between boards of education and municipalities. At the regional government level, it might take the form of a human services department with special advisory councils for adults and children. There has to be some social policy structure for local government. The responsibility at present is not situated at any government level.

2. Local government must begin to develop a social data capability. This does not exist at present. Our Suburban Report seems to me the kind of report that should be the ongoing responsibility of local government. There must be the capacity to assess, identify and review changing trends and patterns in a community.

Two instruments would be highly useful in the domain of local government. First, official plans should be required every five years, to include what I would call a social development assessment. This assessment need not be prescriptive, but should be included as evidence that the local municipality has given some serious thought to the changing sets of social, family and cultural patterns for which its land use plan is intended. This requirement could be met.

The second instrument would be an annual social report. It is critical at the municipal level that the average citizen, the services themselves, local elected officials, and planners know on an annual basis levels of social development spending and activity within the municipality. The annual social report might take the form of a global budget with social trends analysis, or consist of a specialized review. Whatever the form, the annual social report is an instrument for introducing social development frameworks and capabilities into local government that is long overdue.

I have identified two elements of a social planning capability for local government: the social policy structure and the social data instruments -- the social development assessment as part of an official plan process; and the annual social report. The capacity for local government to become involved in social development planning requires a corresponding set of outside capabilities; this is critical. Three outside capabilities are important:

1. There is an urgent need for an historical, theoretical, comparative and critical knowledge base in the social development field. There is not, at present in Ontario, an institute or university centre devoted to social development knowledge and practice.

2. It is important that a base for involvement in social development planning by local government be developed. I do not believe that this comes only from inviting citizens to join a public committee or serve on public services advisory boards. It would be more useful to generate a base of social participation through public support of voluntary initiative at the local community level. Neighbourhood voluntary agencies, equivalent to traditional Y's and settlement houses, are urgently needed in newer communities, not just to provide programs but also to be a source of leadership development at the local community level. This in turn would provide a base for ensuring that social development planning at the municipal level relates to issues of daily life.

3. Although there might be some measure of self interest in this, I believe very strongly in the need for independent, voluntary social planning councils. They provide outside perspectives on issues for social development

planning and, where effective, frame the agenda for public planning at all levels.

I see local government as being able to play an important social development role, even though it does not possess the major financial resources, nor does it have significant responsibility for standards and regulations. Municipal government can play two roles in the social development field: first, it can begin to provide an integrated view of how social and physical resources contribute to issues of daily life for a wide range of groups. Second, it can serve to identify and express social demand for policies and programs to senior government levels. With an adequate framework for social development planning at the municipal level, both inside and outside government, we can begin to articulate the real consensus around social needs and public responsibility that exists within this community. I do not believe that cutbacks in government spending on social needs reflect the prevailing consensus within urban communities of Ontario. Without a social development capability at the municipal level, it has not been possible to respond effectively to severe cutbacks.

In summary, I see the following social development roles for local government: to provide an integrated perspective on the use of physical and social resources; and to organize social demand effectively to senior government levels. If these two roles were undertaken over time, I think we could make some fairly significant progress.

Barbara Black
Social Planning Council of Ajax-Pickering

I support everything that Marvyn Novick has said, particularly the presentation of the need for continual reassessment of the various levels of planning with regard to the changing social nature of the community. There are, however, a couple of other needs that become apparent when viewed from the perspective of a much less mature environment than Metro Toronto or Ottawa.

One is what I consider to be an internal problem, one for which there can be really no legislative procedure to correct. And that is the question of the credibility of the smaller social planning councils when commenting or responding to the physical planning process. There is a frequently expressed feeling of inadequacy on the part of those agencies which lack the resources for sophisticated, quantitative research to challenge development plans. I think we have to face up to the fact that it is highly unlikely that such resources will ever be available. However, that should not be allowed to be a deterrent to any interest group to make their contribution to the planning process. Societal values and perceptions as expressed by such groups are a vital component of the process, and enhance the capacity of the community as a whole to meet the needs of its members. I see, therefore, a need for a heightened self image in the voluntary social planning council fraternity, an awareness that its major asset is its sensitivity to the unique local situations and impacts.

A further encouragement to involvement in community planning is of course easy access to data and information resources, relevant to the particular proposal. Again, the onus lies on us to pursue vigorously our prerogative to such access.

The second need that I see is for a closer relationship between the continual reassessment process that Marvyn advocates and the educational process. We need some reassurance that the principles of planning that are being taught in our schools are indeed reflective of the current state of the art and, in

particular, that the fundamental assumptions that underlie the principles are valid, again in the light of our changing societal values. The increasing complexities of the mosaic of economic, political and social networks that constitute our society, require a very flexible approach in the future of planning, an approach that must have constant regard to the interrelationships of those component networks. It's a challenge of alarming proportions, but one which we must assume.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS

Don Richmond amplified his statement concerning Metro's involvement in economic development. A further exchange with David Nowlan clarified the particular role envisioned for Metro's planning efforts.

Richmond: [Metro should not be involved] in the sense that we do not have at the metropolitan level the instruments required to do the kinds of things that are being done or advocated by the City of Toronto or are being worked out at the area municipal level, using a planning process and planning tools, zoning, what have you. We don't issue building permits, we don't zone, we don't deal on a face-to-face basis with an entrepreneur or industrialist who wants something. That is not our role, nor should it be. In the broader sense of economic development I think there is a metropolitan role; I have suggested one aspect of it, and there are others. They are not the same kinds of activities that would be carried out at the local municipal level, and clearly that is because of the requirements for legislative changes which would be totally unacceptable in our system. The kind of thing the City is doing is a good thing, and important. We should not be trying to duplicate it at the metro level: we should do something else above and beyond it -- what that is has yet to be worked out, but I have tried to point out some directions.

I am not satisfied with [the situation as it] exists. Economic development has not been a matter of burning interest to a lot of municipalities until very recently. It has become an increasingly important issue which they are trying to work out, and it can vary from place to place, from community to community. For instance, we have been working as a staff closely with the Borough of York, trying to figure out how to revitalize Eglinton Avenue as a commercial strip. I don't think there is a grand panacea planning approach to economic development. It's a matter -- particularly at the local level -- of a series of ad hoc decisions where you study

specific problems that have to be dealt with. That's not very glamorous, but it is probably the best way to do it -- at the local level. As you go up through levels of government, you get a broader perspective in your terms of reference; locally, you should be concerned with local issues.

Nowlan: The central point I was making about the way in which we capitalize the well-being of a community in land is that it leads to very defensive postures when we are in a period of economic retrenchment, when some areas of the economy, or society, begin to lose the economic incentive that led to their development. Because of the capitalization of their past well-being in land values, a strong resistance to land use change exists. That was a particular concern, that I was signalling as one of the changes that are already emerging, and will continue more strongly in the 80's.

The other point, though, is perhaps of more interest given some of the previous questions, and that is the question of what Metro can do with respect to economic development. As Don Richmond responded to the first question, a difference was clearly developing. My view is that if Metro continues to deploy simply the instruments that it has so far, it really will continue to push on a rope. I would even be prepared to contemplate things like a Metropolitan Toronto Development Corporation that was involved in capital investment to help support its land use plans and land use concepts. We cannot, I think, continue to neglect the fact that the land use instruments we have do not go beyond the simple provision of an opportunity for certain things to happen. I suspect that during the 80's governments are going to have to be more actively concerned with what actually gets done, and may have to supplement private actions with actions of their own. If Metro wants something to happen in Scarborough or in Downsview, it has to think of more than just what zoning it would like the local municipality to impose. There might well be a more active involvement contemplated. Otherwise one is really just left with a hollow shell of policy at Metro.

Richmond: I agree with everything that David Nowlan says. I am going to try once more to make it clear that the land use instruments at the municipal level are of no interest to us as a vehicle for evolving an economic development strategy for Metropolitan Toronto. We are not going to try to interfere or to use them. Therefore the issue is, what kinds of instrument should we use? David has mentioned a development corporation. That was a very provocative idea that was discussed as part and parcel of the plan process, and I think David will recall some of the discussions we had about that as a vehicle for getting around the single ownership of a large piece of land, namely the Scarborough Town Centre, as one of the devices. These are some of the things we are going to have to look at, and we are at an early stage in knowing what the instruments are. All I have tried to say is that we are not going to go down the land use planning route and use those instruments.

Marvyn Novick commented on the need for new ways to respond to socio-demographic changes, particularly those related to ethnic composition:

Novick: Part of the old approach, that we used through the 70's, was to ignore social and cultural changes, wait for the problem to surface, and then beef up the police budget.

With a social planning capability, some of these changes could be constructively addressed. It is critical that new cultural and racial groups in Metro Toronto participate in local government planning activity. I think this participation must occur collectively rather than individually. Some of the new groups do not have, for a variety of reasons, voluntary or communal associations through which to participate in local municipal life. We must address this issue. There are members of the Spanish community in Metro who are now forming a voluntary council of their own to look at the kind of internally provided services that their community requires, and to comment on how public services -- education, health, manpower -- acknowledge their social and cultural needs. Culturally based

voluntary agencies represent one approach that is required in the 80's to create the leadership and establish the collective presence of new ethnic groups in Metro Toronto.

We need to have some acknowledgement by municipal governments that an integrated planning for social development is part of the local government responsibility. We must encourage new sources of collective leadership in Metro and other urban centres, so that the voices participating in the planning process are not just from the established sectors, but reflect the new social and cultural diversity of urban life.

All three panelists commented further on the relationship of social planning to other considerations:

Nowlan: Municipalities should, indeed, have a sense of the society for which they are planning, of the social pressures that our two other panelists have spoken of, the demographic forces, the big social events that are occurring and that can be predicted. I have personally felt and written many times on the limitations of the official plan for setting municipal policy. I think the White Paper on the Planning Act and the Draft Planning Act simply confirm what a few speakers have noted, that planning is seen to involve only land use control, although some small lip service is paid to other elements of planning. This is not adequate for today's municipalities. I have nothing but the strongest support for that position. My own view is perhaps similar to Barry Cullingworth's, that there is an opportunity to develop plans or planning statements in each of several areas -- I think the notion that these can be integrated into one document is not something that is ever likely to bear fruit. I do not think that we should be aiming -- and I think this was the thrust of Barry Cullingworth's remarks -- for an expanded Planning Act that embraces everything; rather, I think we should be looking for strong policy statements in each of a number of areas. The new Metroplan which has recently passed Metro Council has enormous gaps, which I know the planners are aware of, including some very important things

like garbage disposal and major public works (which are hardly mentioned, other than with respect to surface transportation changes), through to the social planning elements. The type of community we live in, and the evolution that is occurring in that community, are not well responded to in that Plan. The question is, how best to handle those concerns.

Municipalities may have the capabilites to do this now -- they don't need anyone's authority to do it. They should have their civil servants, with the help of social planning councils and others, draft specific policy statements and statements about the evolution of the community. If this is begun, then it will start to have an impact on the instruments that are framed. But there is nothing, except their own inertia, that is stopping municipalities from doing that now.

Richmond: I just want to make it crystal clear that social issues in the planning process are not being ignored in Metro: that within the last several years a very substantial planning capability has been built within the Metropolitan organization, albeit in the Social Services Department, where it probably should be, and not in the Planning Department, where it should not be, and that efforts are being made -- and have been made in the past -- to develop social and other data and to make it available, and that this is a long-term process. Starts have been made, and Marvyn Novick knows about these, but I want to make it clear that it is being done, and that we have not been sitting with our heads in the sand for the last five years. Progress is being made, and we are proud of what has been achieved.

Novick: I think a key issue in social development planning by local government is whether there is some consistent and predictable output. It would be hard to plan for the physical development of a city if there were just a series of occasional policy statements. The existence of an official plan for land use, and secondary plans, articulates an integrated set of land use objectives and a long term responsibility to meet the objectives. If social development planning

is to be serious, a similar stable framework of output is required. Municipalities do not need legislative approval to institute an annual social report. They do not need legislative approval, though that would be useful, for a five-year social development assessment (subsequent to the Census) to accompany official plan documents. When the public knows that this is expected output, this raises the visibility, commitment and accountability of local government to social development planning.

Novick elaborated further on the role of local government in social planning:

Novick: Part II of the Social Planning Council's Suburban Report will be a social agenda for suburban renewal in the 80's. It will look at how local government -- at both levels -- can begin to address questions of social renewal, community services development, and policy co-ordination. It will also look at the social spending question. I am not satisfied with how this was treated by this panel this morning, but we can perhaps deal with that later. With respect to the relationship between local and regional governments, I believe that there is a role for both tiers. The role of the metropolitan (regional) tier is perhaps to give more effective articulation to the needs of social minorities, who get lost sometimes at the local government or neighbourhood level. But clearly the area municipal tier -- North York, Scarborough, City of Toronto -- is the critical source of service and planning initiative. The regional tier can be a check and a balance against homogeneous sets of groups coming to believe at the local government level that they are in fact the total community. It is this interplay between the regional and local government levels that is so important to promote and preserve.

PLANNING AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

William Thomson
Commissioner of Planning, Regional Municipality of Waterloo

The earlier suggested changes to the Planning Act, which appeared to some extent in the White Paper, stressed political responsibility and authority at both the municipal and provincial levels. Municipal councils were to gain all development control approvals including in some cases their own official plans. The Ontario Municipal Board was to become mainly an advisory body to the Minister, who would make the final decisions. Official plans were to be physically or development oriented although they could have regard to social and economic concerns. The new proposed legislation will give development control approvals to all municipalities save those within Regions. The Ontario Municipal Board is retained as the final political voice -- not the Minister. Time limits are placed on municipalities for the planning process, but not on the Ontario Municipal Board or the Province. All municipalities must prepare official plans but the Province is not required to do so -- just issue policy statements from time-to-time. Official plans are still physically oriented.

If we are to plan for people, and if energy conservation is to be given serious consideration, then changes to the proposed legislation will be required.

Before the Province considers policy statements, which are similar to creating a Provincial Plan piece-meal, they should be circulated to all municipalities for input and dialogue after which the new policy statements must be politically issued, published and upheld. Reviews should be automatic as with official plans. Regulations should be treated in a similar manner.

All municipalities should receive delegated authority to control their own development programs under a universal set of criteria and within an approved official plan. The official plan must consider more than physical planning criteria; it must include social, environmental, energy conservation and economic matters as well. It must be more than "have regard to".

If the above is not forthcoming and if the official plan does not include or permit social, economic, environmental and energy conservation policies to give direction for political action and investment, then the needs of people will not be seriously considered in the 80's.

In my view there are several kinds of official plan and none of them is really addressed in the Planning Act. However, minor amendments could cover them.

First, there are the broad policy statements that the Province must formulate with our input, adopt, issue publicly and then stick to. Such matters as economic development, food land, noise, conservation, flood lands, social development, energy conservation are examples.

Secondly, there are the plans of Regions, Districts and Restructured Counties. These I call policy plans; they are more than policy statements but short of detailed land use projections. They amplify Provincial policy statements and create the framework for detailed local planning. They set the policy for the means of preserving the prime food lands, the last remnants of our environmentally sensitive areas, flood plain regulations, residential mix and density, transit, regional shopping centres versus downtowns, social needs of all peoples, economic development, and the preparation of reporting and monitoring social and economic values in a changing society. By placing these in the policy plan there is a political commitment for people to hang on to.

Thirdly, there are the more detailed physical plans for settlements, communities, neighbourhoods or blocks which are worked out with people and which are in conformity with higher tier policies. They are flexible and should change as people and their society change. They are official in the sense that councils at the local and regional levels approve them. This

latter point requires all of Ontario to have two-tier planning systems.

Upper tier policy plans can address the efficient use of energy in that, for example, the waste energy from one industry can be the source of energy for another and thus an influence on location of co-generation opportunities, of district heating possibilities in conjunction with waste resource centres.

Any growth planning needs an awareness of the social issues and problems that may result from a particular growth strategy. Planning for growth, for slow growth, for stable growth, for no growth at all or even a decline in growth also involves economic planning. But economic planning is not included in the official plan definition. Again, I stress the fact that this can be done through policy planning, which encourages priority setting. It is not done by including detailed capital programs in the plan.

Planning for people is missing from the official or policy plan definition so far. The Act stresses regulations and the process, and not planning for people.

Housing policies for various groups of people are very significant parts of a municipality's future and must be embodied in a policy plan. The relationship of parts of a municipality to other parts and to the whole, the mix of housing types for all incomes and family sizes, the facilities people require for their educational, cultural, medical, recreational and social needs, must be part of any planning function— whether it is physical or economic.

Policy is required to assess what is going on at various stages of the life of a municipality-- to commit political people to constantly look at social needs of people and take action and be flexible enough to change. You cannot create a detailed official plan as we know them, to look after all the emerging social attitudes of society.

It is here, with social, physical and economic considerations meshed together to create a policy plan, that energy must become part of the thinking and implementation of planning and of planners, politicians and people. Energy is everyone's concern and must be part of official or policy plans.

When a municipality creates a policy plan that considers economic, social, energy, environmental and physical matters together, it must forward

it to the Province for approval. If the Province does not have a stated policy on any or all of these matters, how can it approve a plan which contains them? Is that why these matters are not included within the definition of the official plan, so that the Province need not plan for itself? I don't think so and I certainly hope not. The Province must publish policy statements for them, then we can paint in the picture for ourselves in the amount of detail each of us requires.

If the policy statements on these major subjects are circulated and discussed with municipalities then formulated and published as we suggest, the Province will slowly create a plan by policy and when it approves municipal plans it will be implementing its own plan. It could be a co-operative effort and a sensible method for the 80's.

Provincial policy statements also depend upon federal policy statements and thus both governments must be encouraged to establish policy not only in economic and social matters but also on energy conservation and the more efficient use of energy. I firmly believe that the legislation will be changed so municipal policy plans can address these matters. I also believe that definite provincial and federal policies will be promulgated on these subjects to help us plan our future better. I couldn't be a planner if I were not an optimist.

Relative to energy, one of our biggest problems is the host of conflicting statements about the extent of our energy resources, the emphasis placed on different energy sources by each province, who really controls energy resources, who profits from energy, and the whole field of research and development of existing as well as newer sources of energy. The first thing this country needs is a clear definitive statement on these matters.

The second thing we need is a sound education program so that all Canadians can understand what is actually happening and what we can expect in the future.

The third thing we must understand is that in the short run and for continuation over the long term, energy conservation and the efficient use of energy is not only the quickest, easiest and most economic method of reaching energy self-sufficiency in this country, but the only thing we can hope to accomplish in the 80's.

At least one third of total energy used in this country is wasted. That could be the difference between self sufficiency and the way we are. As planners, educators, builders, architects and engineers we can hope our politicians and people turn the energy problem around through conservation, giving us the necessary breathing room to develop other energy alternatives and creating the technology to make more efficient use of energy.

The future for most of our municipalities is not what it used to be, due in part to the energy problem as well as to social and economic changes. Few municipal plans in Canada reflect these issues. How can they, when they are too physically oriented and lacking in policy direction? Energy conservation does not require the curtailment of vital services as some would like us to believe; it merely requires the curtailment of energy waste and our politicians should understand that Canadians are ready to curtail waste.

If in the 80's we address first the energy conservation direction then what must we do?

Although energy conservation techniques can commence or be initiated at any time, it would help municipalities to undertake such ventures if the Province were to declare such a major policy in some detail, and make sure that the new Planning Act specifically indicates that energy is one of the factors to be considered when municipal policy plans are developed.

Some of the things, then, that municipalities can do to conserve energy in the near future are mainly in the planning and building area. Creating major co-ordinating committees representing councils, utilities, builders, school boards, transit agencies, planners, architects and engineers for example could create the framework for education and implementation of a major strategy for conserving energy.

In the new developing areas of settlements, orientation of streets and lots must be seriously considered in order to take advantage of solar energy -- passive and active. Development standards need beefing up to include proper landscaping to inhibit the cold winds yet permit the sun's access to homes. Building standards should encourage new design techniques and insulation materials to make buildings more energy efficient. Zoning by-laws could be replaced by site plan and development control to create flexibility of siting and design to take advantage of every energy efficient technique.

In the older parts of our settlements, rehabilitation and redevelopment plans must include energy conservation designs and ideas. The right to the sun must become part of all siting and development standards. Energy conservation must be part of any development funded or subsidized by government.

Senior governments through their oft-stated energy trust should consider funding incentives to help with the redesign of those subdivisions where servicing is not developed and where street and lot orientation is not conducive to solar access. Senior governments must, while we all work on conservation, investigate other new sources of energy and techniques to utilize existing energy sources more efficiently. They must create the funds and the incentives for more research and development in Canada. We are a country rich in talent, but it is neither tapped nor encouraged.

Senior governments should be spending more effort on transportation because in this area considerable energy savings can be made. Increasing the number of people per car when commuting, developing van pools and other methods can save a tremendous number of barrels of oil a day, but moving people better is something that will require much study and demonstration.

In the long term there is even more that we as planners, architects, engineers and others can initiate. Should our new, as well as our older settlements become more compact, particularly through redevelopment, with greater emphasis on multiple use buildings of residential units within the downtown core of settlements or rising out of the roofs of shopping centres, or intermingled with industry? Should parking be eliminated to force the use of transit? These will be energy efficient settlements but will they be socially acceptable -- will people want to live in them? New urban form and design must not only accommodate the needs of people but their desires as well, besides being economic and energy efficient.

A rationalization of transit over larger areas is also required to make even greater inroads on the use of energy to fit the settlements of the future. Higher intensity of uses and densities of people along major transportation corridors must be considered relative to the social needs of people. Research and development money is required particularly for demonstration projects but this is a responsibility of senior governments

and we can only encourage them to get at it.

Short term and long term planning with an energy conservation input also involves a considerable social and economic interaction that must be considered in planning and in policy plans.

The Province holds an important key for our future in the new Planning Act. It must create a positive framework for people and their elected representatives so they can formulate policy for their municipality, but only after they have considered the physical, social and economic concerns of the people and embodied them in a formal politically committed policy plan. The federal government must also co-operate with an energy strategy. Only when these senior partners act to help us in all of these issues can the challenge of the 80's be addressed clearly by society, with any hope of success.

Bunli Yang
Senior Advisor, Transportation and Urban Development
Ontario Ministry of Energy

From the Ministry of Energy's point of view there is no question but that it is a Provincial government responsibility to come up with some overall policy statements on where efficient supply and use of energy fit in at the municipal level. The Ministry of Housing may have somewhat different views from ours regarding the social and economic components of planning and how they affect energy issues. It has always been Energy's view that you don't go about land use planning or physical development for its own sake; you go about it for social and economic reasons. The most energy-efficient house would be no house at all! Energy is only one component of planning policy, and other ones such as shelter or economic development are just as important. Major problems facing our municipalities in the next decade and after will be changing demographic trends and changing economic development problems. Those will not be addressed by the colouring of maps, putting a few densities

here, mixing a couple there. They will be addressed by looking at the economic futures for the municipality as they fit within the context of Provincial policies.

The ways in which energy is consumed within the community, as these affect municipal costs, often have less to do with planning than good management in those areas which are governed by the municipality as a corporation -- its own vehicles, its own buildings, its snowplowing, etc. For a municipality not to take care of the energy efficiency of those kinds of things is just lax wastefulness. Ontario now has a Municipal Energy Conservation Program which tries to address that level of understanding.

But the Planning Act and its administration are the means by which the municipality and, through the municipality, the Province can influence the residents as to how their patterns of energy use are determined. Do you have to travel 15 miles each way to work? We have sprawling subdivisions, some with narrow socio-economic mixes of people. Where do first homebuyers go? Where do the empty nest homebuyers go? Can we mix them effectively? Would it be more energy-efficient to do so?

The answers to questions such as these are shaped in large measure by what happens under the aegis of the Planning Act. We have said to our colleagues in the Ministry of Housing that it would be a mistake to try to focus only on the physical tools, as it were, without worrying about the objectives and goals which made those tools necessary. So we would be delighted to see municipalities pick up this issue with us, to try to persuade Housing that economic and social matters, especially those that influence energy use, do have a valid place under the new Planning Act.

That is not to say, however, that the existing planning framework does not already permit a fair level of municipal control over the patterns of energy use and, to a lesser extent, of energy supply within the community. Under an official plan, a muncipality can pass redevelopment area by-laws, property set-back by-laws, site plan by-laws; all of these things can be turned around with energy efficiency in mind. Municipalities can also be sensitive to the provision of solar access, although solar access, while important, should not be traded off against acceptable market levels of density, because for every set of attached units lost, it is very difficult to make up that density on the ground in providing solar access for detached

units. Medium density housing with indifferent provision for solar access is still more energy-efficient than low density development oriented for solar access.

We feel that the importance of the Planning Act in getting statements from the municipalities regarding efficient energy supply and use is really a symbol of commitment. The way to get councils to do things, even if the statements seem to be motherhood and fatherhood, is really by way of a policy statement which then hardens into a commitment. That is the direction in which we would like to see municipalities move.

During the next year we are hoping, through some of our technical demonstrations and commissioned research work, to be able to illustrate the various different ways in which municipalities can take the bit between their teeth -- if they want to. Eventually, of course, it may be legislated. Given the oil situation, for example, we may in the future adopt a very different way of assigning natural gas distribution areas. At the moment that is done on a purely economic basis as judged by the private sector utility, but maybe governments in the future will adjust that and decide to extend natural gas distribution areas on the basis of long term, greatest benefit to the citizens of the municipality.

There is a lot of research in planning that still needs to be done and to be disseminated, and that people must be educated about in order to understand. That is one part of our job. Another part is to make sure that the effective client groups— developers, builders, home buyers, real estate salespeople, municipal planners-- see it in their own economic as well as political self-interest that energy efficiency is really one of the major issues for the municipal level to deal with.

If we at the Province are going to be serious about cutting back on energy consumption-- we are, and the focus in this decade is going to be on reduction of oil consumption-- it is clear that we will be trying to work through the municipalities. The Provincial government is not the appropriate agent to determine the needs of every medium-sized and small community in terms of what local measures and impacts are likely. For example, the ease of implementing a local measure is one concern; another is its energy impact. We can help on some of those things, but the thrust

is going to have to come from the local level, in terms of what decisions mean to each small community. So while we will try to be innovative, while we will try to get the information out, we certainly need feedback and dialogue from the municipalities.

I hope you will be seeing a higher profile from the Ministry in terms of community planning -- and not just in technical matters. We will be mounting a series of public messages in various forms: "Life is good, Ontario. Preserve it. Conserve it. Harbour your resources so life can be better..." It's a soft message right now. If we have any indication of supply difficulties over the next few years, of course, the senior levels of government will be taking additional actions.

But at the same time we would like to see innovation at the local level so that we know what kinds of guidelines to suggest. At present we are feeling our way in the dark, since there is very little Canadian experience to go on. We are trying to be technocrats assessing some limited U.S. experience and some scattered Canadian experience, but it would be far better if we had more actual test cases on which to base policies.

We recognize that financing is to a great extent the problem, especially for smaller and medium-sized communities. So for the next fiscal year we have set aside a significant amount of money to help out those municipalities that would like to undertake either small or medium-scale investigations, whether they are audits, trial demonstrations, behavioural surveys -- whatever they are, we would like to see a lot more research and activity generated at the local level.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM PANELISTS

Bill Thomson amplified his comments concerning planning structure in local government:

Thomson: For those municipalities that are within Regions, it is my feeling that the Regional Plans should be the policy type plans. That is the format that we adopted in Waterloo -- we even call it the Regional Official Policy Plan. (The Minister could not sign it because the word 'policy' was not in the Planning Act, so we had to add a paragraph saying "wherever you read 'Official Policy Plan', read 'Official Plan'".)

We felt that the upper tier municipality should not get involved with planning at the local level, the neighbourhood, the community, the block. But it should be able to look across the entire area and develop major policies and set priorities. After a lot of debate we came up with a lot of priorities, a major one being that the prime food-growing lands should be preserved. That became Priority Number 1, and from that we came up with our Settlement Plan. Our Official Plan indicates the envelope within which all the municipalities may grow, and beyond which they cannot go because the land outside the envelope is reserved for agriculture. The municipalities will have to find other kinds of policies in future to keep their development within those boundaries, which means that they will have to develop policies on densities.

Our municipalities were all involved with creating official plans when we became a Region, and we felt that should continue. Most of them now have general official plans of their own, most of them with the multi-coloured land use map. But we are concentrating now on what a lot of people call secondary, or community, plans. These are like official plans, but without the official plan process. The secondary plan is worked out in considerable detail with the

people and then is embodied in a book which looks like an official plan. It is approved by the local council before it comes to the Region for approval. That way, it retains a semblance of status with the people. It fits within the official plan of the Region, and that secondary plan, which we call an Implementation Plan of the Region, once approved cannot be changed unless it goes back through the whole process with the community and the change is approved by resolution of the two councils. There was concern about having a policy of accepting a plan by resolution; some legal people felt that it would not have legal standing. But we decided to keep going this way, and it has been working. People now have had a better feeling of what the Regional Official Plan is all about.

I am unsure about those municipalities which are outside the Regions. Many will have problems in developing the major long term policies that they need before they can establish land use within their neighbourhoods. In many of them economic or perhaps even social changes are taking place too rapidly. They are caught up with neighbourhood or block studies and are not able to establish an overall policy or direction for themselves. They cannot even produce a housing policy tailored to their own needs, or a policy in their rural areas for agriculture and severances.

While I do not think that we should create a whole pile of restructured counties to do the policy planning, I find myself in a quandary, knowing how our own regional planning system is working. We are going to make our Regional Official Plan even more policy oriented --we have been politically successful in hanging on to it, with only two minor objections before the Ontario Municipal Board. That gave me a tremendous feeling that perhaps both people and politicians were ready for something different. At the local level, planners are concentrating more on the details because now they have a policy within which to work, and they help me to develop policy at the regional level when they come across problems at the local level.

But how all that could be put into a Planning Act, I don't know.

Bunli Yang commented on the Ministry of Energy's view of the appropriate scope of the official plan:

> Yang: About this question of social and economic components being outside the official plan, the actual Cabinet directive concerning this may have been misinterpreted by some regulatory staff. As I recall, there was a very narrow issue at stake to do with some central specification over the number of psychiatric beds in one hospital, which one municipal plan tried to change. The Housing staff apparently felt at the time, for political and precedural reasons, that it would not be appropriate for Housing to be the repository of other ministries' problems; they did not want to be the place which dealt with clear environmental approvals, or clear social planning proposals which might have impacts on community and social services, or on energy. It is my view simply that we have no other mechanism for dealing with planning at the municipal level, and we may as well try to develop a co-ordinated Provincial front, with the Ministry of Housing as our agent. I think Housing might be moving in that direction -- I am not sure. I certainly feel that there are some very important economic and municipal development issues coming up in the 80's, and if we turn a blind eye to these, not only the Province but the municipalities themselves will wind up with the short end of the stick. The official plan may not be the best mechanism, but it is the only one we have, and we should make the best use of it.

Bill Thomson responded to one questioner who felt that the session had not given sufficient attention to the role of elected representatives as opposed to bureaucrats and civil servants; there is a tendency for elected officials to be not well informed.

> Thomson: The power of the planners bothered us when we were looking at other official plans before writing our own, and we saw the limited involvement of politicians. That is one reason why we took the opportunity to write fairly clear policies into our plan that,

if adopted by the political people, became a commitment. I feel that political people have to become more responsible, at all levels of government; at the federal level, politicians often do not know what is going on inside their own Ministry. They are a bit better at the provincial level, probably because it is smaller. At the regional level I find it most frustrating. I have a lot of sympathy for our regional politicians, who have to get elected at the local ward level, and then are confronted by the wider municipality, with all its many more and separate problems; and then they come on to the regional level. If they cannot understand their own municipality, how will they ever understand the Region? This is a big problem for us. We run a one-day planning seminar each year as an attempt to deal with this.

One of the things that we found with the Official Plan is that it certainly helps to be able to point out policies to the politicians. Our plan is always under review, so our Planning Committee at least is familiar with it. But the system of political representation based on local wards presents a very difficult problem for the regional level.

PART III: PLANNING AND GOVERNMENT

PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES AT THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT: THE MUNICIPAL LEVEL

Michael Goldrick
Department of Political Science, York University

It is of some passing annoyance, or frustration I suppose, that Comay and the Government in the White Paper chose to regard the concept of planning so narrowly. The decision to do so could have rested on a variety of plausible reasons. But to take such a restricted focus, because to do otherwise would "complicate the system [of property rights and physical development] beyond measure", is hardly satisfactory. What is being said, in other words, is: at all costs, though perversely at the expense of other kinds of planning, don't clutter up matters respecting the use and development of land with extraneous issues like social and economic planning.

This simply confirms once again that in the eyes of those who count, the power of municipalities over the use of land is their most important responsibility and so must take precedence over all other forms of planning. Let's face it, the Planning Act is the sacred cow -- or golden goose -- of finance capital, the property industry, lawyers, planners and consultants. With that kind of line-up defending a system that has served them well, why fight it?

No, I agree with Barry Cullingworth when he says that in order to get on with planning for people (that is, people other than those having high stakes in property) we should get on with doing just that and not waste time worrying about whether Section 16(2) of the Planning Act gives the scope that is needed for this task.

Instead, it is more fruitful to focus attention on two matters bearing on the development of plans as community strategies, or comprehensive policy guides-- call them what you will-- that are needed in the next decade. These two matters are, first, making explicit what is now implicit in the operation of the land use and development system as we know it; and second, figuring out a way to formulate and implement, and subject to public debate, a broad range of social and economic policies.

Turning to the former, after years of kidding ourselves that city planning is a rational, objective, and value-free enterprise, it now is conceded that planning in its narrow sense of land use and property relations is a political process. But despite this significant advance, the politics of planning is generally construed to mean that the process by which decisions are arrived at should be made in a political setting: by politicians, more or less in the open. This, however, is only part of the politics of planning and, at that, one that speaks to how decisions are arrived at rather than to who gets what, why, where and when. Yet conventional planning, and the spatial patterning with which it is involved, is a highly political social function principally because it is highly ideological.

To explain this relationship, consider that cities reflect in physical terms the relationships and structures of the societies in which they are embedded and of which they are a monument. Our society is characterized, among other things, by individualism, stratification, competition, tension, differentiation, and continuous change dictated by impulses of the economic system. The concept of private property ownership plays an important part in shaping most of these characteristics, and planning is intimately involved in regulating the use to which private property is put. The traditional function of planning as it is commonly understood is to reproduce these social relationships in spatial terms. It also must accommodate changes between them and mediate conflicts which inevitably arise between competing uses of property rights, or the consequence of different uses. In other words, planning performs a major political role in reproducing and maintaining the social order; a political role that goes far beyond process into the very core of social relations.

Yet the political nature of planning in such a broader philosophic sense is hardly realized and rarely acknowledged, though it is manifest

everywhere around us. Those characteristics of society that I referred to above, individualism, stratification, tension and so forth, are all expressed and implicitly sanctioned by current planning policies. Consider for instance:

- exclusionary zoning -- which, through lot size, building specification, amenities and so on -- effectively builds segregation and inter-community conflict into cities while facilitating the commoditization of shelter.
- industrial dispersion designed to capture narrowly drawn economic efficiency, but which increases time and transport costs of workers as well as opportunity costs of job opportunities for them.
- the sanctioning and encouragement of questionable growth patterns that may maximize property industry profits but do so through massive state subsidies for expensive servicing networks.
- the sanctioning of high-rise, high density dwellings and low density suburban shelter patterns which impact upon family structure and sex roles.

The list could be extended indefinitely. But to return to the proposed Planning Act, my first point is that whether its conception of what planning entails is too narrow or not, the fact remains that physical planning now and in the future will have significant social and economic consequences. This is the case both in terms of social relationships, and in relation to the distribution of monetary and other collectively or publicly provided benefits in our cities.

So surely the first thing to do is to insist that these questions are adequately considered-- pulled out of the penumbra of mainstream convention and made explicit. That for a start represents a fairly substantial expansion in conventional concepts of planning.

The second matter I want to address concerns developing a way to conduct social and economic planning. A couple of preliminary points: one is that I do not accept the admonition that since much of social policy is not in the coin of municipal government, local authorities must firmly grasp their forelocks and await the pleasure of senior government. This position is nonsense, of course, and it is one taken by other governments because the first hand experience of local government is just likely to crowd them and cramp their style. Municipal governments deliver many social programmes or,

if they do not deliver them, they must live with their consequences, or at least witness their effects. They are duly constituted governments which, I would say, have an obligation let alone a right to develop and advocate policies respecting the social and economic circumstances of their citizen members.

Another point is that with the passing of the growth and development boom, it is likely that in the universe of planning, its physical manifestation probably will be of diminishing importance. Other things will preoccupy us and these probably will bear on more explicitly social and economic matters. Particularly today, I suppose, it is easy to be a Cassandra:

- housing starts are lowest since the depression;
- usurious rates of interest are charged;
- de-industrialization is underway;
- an energy crisis bears down on us in terms of supply, price-- and embarassing profits.

Is this a complete litany of despair? Probably not. But it is apparent that Western industrial states are going through a period of long-term structural adjustment. And historically, it is in times like this when tension becomes intense over the distribution of net national income between labour for private consumption, the State for collective consumption, and capital for profits. Under such conditions, distributive questions become paramount since it no longer is possible to buy social harmony with steadily expanding resources. Accordingly, social and economic planning become even more important.

In terms of dividing up the national income pie, how much does the State get to support collective expenditure? How will this portion, however much it may be, be divided up? Will it be spent with a view to equalizing disparities or to intensifying them? Will we spend billions caring for the sick or millions to prevent illness? Will we massively subsidize private transport or put our eggs in the public transport basket? And if we do the latter will public funds go to Dial-a-Bus on the Bridlepath or to expensive, complex systems which give workers access to widely dispersed job opportunities? Do we distribute energy inequitably by price or fairly by rationing?

These are the kind of questions public authorities --and publics-- will be facing in the 80's, and choices will have to be made. How do we come to grips with them? How do we plan for them? How do we build consensus around their resolution? Clearly, they have no explicit place in the Planning Act though as I have noted, the political consequences of that Act's application certainly will remain crucial. But does that matter so much? Is there another vehicle for the consideration of social and economic matters? Perhaps there is. While I do not hold out the City of Toronto or Metro as paragons of anything in particular, perhaps what has evolved here does contain the rudiments of a broader approach to planning for the interests of the majority of the people in the next decade.

Within the past few years --and on the agenda for the immediate future-- studies of the following matters have been undertaken under both private and public auspices.

- a very comprehensive and innovative analysis of and prescription for public health;
- a wide ranging study of energy;
- a series of comprehensive housing studies;
- a major statement on community care and group homes;
- a proposal for the delivery of a range of health, social, recreational and cultural services;
- studies on policing, status of women, special education needs, children's services, and immigrants;
- a major analysis of surburban life;
- a series of studies on English in the Workplace, adult education, community use of schools, and control of schools;
- analyses of needs of the disabled and elderly;
- studies of industrial location;
- forthcoming are studies on recreation, aging, environmental quality, and the impact of planning policies on women.

Now these are not all thorough, systematic or definitive studies. Some are more complete than others. But in aggregate, they do constitute a fairly wide investigation of concerns which are of direct relevance to people in Metro Toronto and the City. In a word, they represent the kinds of issues --

of which official plans are largely innocent -- which must be planned for and debated in the future.

The question is whether they would constitute, together with land use development matters, a comprehensive plan. The answer clearly is that they would not. On one count this is so because of their unevenness and omissions. On another, because as they stand now -- or with refinement and elaboration -- they are a series of unrelated, often responsive, statements that stand in isolation from one another.

But nevertheless they do represent the basis of a comprehensive policy plan that municipalities might prepare. To be more complete, additional statements are necessary -- some in policy areas in which the Province predominates but which municipalities must deliver. As well, such ensembles of individual policy statements must be considered together so that they may be adjusted, modified, and calibrated in response to the internal interaction of one another.

In addition, and perhaps of greatest importance, any such set of policies must be embedded in a unifying philosophy which makes sense of them as an organic whole. Otherwise, they stand as a bunch of discrete, pragmatic mediations of the tensions and everpresent threats of breakdown in social relations that exist in our society; the fragile equilibrium of which social theory is so enamoured. Yet this requirement is most difficult to achieve and it is an objective which currently municipal government is least capable of realizing.

The reason for this is complex, having to do with problems of horizontal co-ordination and policy-making capability at various levels of government as well as between municipal, regional and provincial levels. But it also has to do with the way politics is structured -- or in this case, not structured -- in municipal and regional government; that is with the pervasive tradition of nonpartisan politics which effectively bars anything but a mainstream, liberal consensus from expressing itself in the crucial public setting of municipal and regional governments.

Such a consensus probably would be alright except for the fact that liberalism is chronically disinclined to make its ideology explicit, preferring instead to spring from flash-point to flash-point deftly administering

pragmatic doses of incremental change. Without explicit ideology, institutionalized in local government in the form of parties, it is unlikely that the ideological glue needed to define and structure value-laden policies respecting social justice and economic equity, will be developed.

So, how do we plan for people in the next decade? Let me summarize. First, we are not detained by deficiencies in the Planning Act -- these are endemic in our society. We do, however, scrutinize and make explicit the heavily value-laden and distributive content of traditional physical planning.

At the same time, we go about our business developing statements about social and economic issues, debating them and adopting them as municipal policy. When necessary we vigorously press senior governments to support these positions. Hopefully, at the same time, we modernize our political processes so that they are capable of synthesizing our policy plans within explicit, visible, ideological positions. If we allow ourselves to step beyond hoary tradition and vested interest, we may just start to address problems that concern ordinary people in the 80's.

THE REGIONAL LEVEL

Peter Smith
Director of Non-Profit Housing, Social Services Department
Regional Municipality of Peel

I would like to look at the issues being discussed today from the point of view of those municipalities that are on the fringe of Metro, of which the Region of Peel is one. We are obviously seeing a lot of changes. Michael Goldrick referred to the decline in housing starts: in Mississauga alone there were 15-16,000 starts a year just a few years ago; last year there were 9,000 and probably only 7,500-8,000 this year and next. We are starting to see changes in lifestyle in the suburban communities; changes away from the larger households that suburban municipalites were known for; changes away from a willingness to commute as a result of a whole series of problems that were addressed earlier today; changes in family formation and the requirement for the traditional type of housing form; changes in population structure. The suburban municipalities were viewed as municipalities for the younger age group -- obviously they are not strictly that any longer.

Other changes that are having serious effects are the financial situations and predicaments that many people face, not the least of which is the mortgage interest rate, which has been identified as one of the causes of a lot of family stress and breakdown. Mortgage default has been high over the last several months and the problem will continue over the next few years, specifically with respect to AHOP housing, but also with respect to some normal moderate income and perhaps even upper income housing. There is the dual problem of interest rates and the renewal of mortgages, coupled with problems faced by young couples entering the housing market and getting into a long-term debt situation. Along with the high interest rates and the lack of government programs to encourage private sector housing is the virtually

non-existent rental construction supply in the suburban municipalities. The alternatives seem to be disappearing for younger people, or people choosing to look at alternatives to house purchase; and the house purchase alternative is itself now going out the window for many families.

There are changing lifestyles, changing demographic figures, changing attitudes towards commuting, the tendency to move back into the city, high mortgage interest rates and preference for smaller houses. In addition there are very real concerns, especially in Mississauga, around community completeness. School sites which were optioned by major development companies are going back onto the market because new schools are no longer required, or because the school board has refused to develop based on its existing inventory of unused schools in older parts of the municipality. There are concerns about the undersupply, in newly-developing areas, of capital facilities in health care or social services. In the mid-70's Provincial policy virtually eliminated new capital construction in Ontario, which had a devastating effect on developing municipalities. The alternative is to provide family home daycare, for example, instead of constructing new facilities. But it is very difficult to provide family home daycare in a scattered, semi-rural, or non-urban area.

All of these things together signalled in the mid- to late 70's a growing recognition that the process was changing, that the processing of subdivisions was proceeding more slowly because it was recognized that more and more people were seeking other lifestyle alternatives and because market conditions were changing rapidly. Several years ago I remember being part of a group that identified the mid-80's as the time when Peel would start to see the down-curve on the rate of annual population increase. That projection was inaccurate, because it is starting to happen now. The knowledge that this was going to happen was one of the major pressures for reform of the Planning Act; it was one of the major pressures to speed up the process of subdividing land and of releasing new districts for development. I think the philosophical argument that the Planning Act Review Committee used about who had the right to develop land, and what are personal property rights, was an add-on to the report. It was the justification which was developed afterwards to speed up the process. The process

had to be speeded up because all those who wanted to get in on the action realized that time was limited. To be delayed in getting approvals was a serious threat, especially for the groups or companies or areas that were being considered for phasing in the mid- to late 80's. That kind of fear of the effects of delay and/or phasing had a most significant effect on the need to reform the Planning Act. Discussion around social and environmental objectives heightened that need, because in addition to raising questions about the market constraints that were likely to happen, suddenly groups or agencies were demanding tighter environmental controls and more attention to social concerns in official plans. And that obviously implied a lengthening of the process rather than a shortening.

I am sure there are many other reasons in the more highly organized areas why the Planning Act had to be reformed, but obviously for the regional municipalities surrounding Metro there was a concern about the need to get land on stream, to get unreleased land ready for development. One of the things that agencies did was to band together and begin to develop their position around social planning. I think this was done rather effectively. Numerous briefs were prepared about what social planning was, and previous social planning efforts were criticized for not being able to define social objectives. We tried to move one step closer to getting a clear statement of social strategy that could be incorporated into plans. We began to speak to planners in the same jargon that they used, so that they could no longer criticize us on that particular position. But still there was a reluctance to address social components of planning.

My position today is that social planning has not been left out. Some of the things that a revised Planning Act was to avoid have come about too soon. It certainly is, as someone said earlier today, too late to speed up the process. Now, the only way in which one can move ahead in terms of the community development process, the releasing of new districts, is by justifying it at a social or economic level. Pressures at a market level or at a physical processing level to release new districts have been lessened by recent trends.

Let me talk a bit about what I see as some solutions. In Peel, knowing

that the Planning Act was going to be changed, staff developed what we referred to as a social development strategy. It was an attempt to define the long-term objectives of Peel in terms of community completeness. Within this social development strategy there were sections dealing with physical development, clearly recognizing physical planning as being interrelated with social planning. Some of us viewed the social development strategy in the light of the Official Plan; many of us argued at the time that it should be included in the Official Plan. The fact that it is not included in its entirety is not a failure, because we accomplished what Michael Goldrick thinks should be accomplished -- to raise in the politicians' eyes, and in the eyes of the public, the need to address these issues -- within a framework which had never been established.

Needless to say we did studies on the need for daycare, the need for assisted housing, the need for a comprehensive group home policy. We had identified those kinds of concerns but they had never had a framework. The social development strategy was very successful because the Provincial position to exclude social objectives from official plans created a forum of debate which heightened public awareness of the issue. Prior to this point, only a few people were raising the question of need for social analysis of social objectives. This for the first time gave them a vehicle for addressing social and economic concerns. This year, for example, was the first in Peel's history when more time was spent in capital budget discussions on hospital services than on roads and sewers; for the first time capital requirements for social services were discussed at great length. Council addressed the fact that the capital expenditure, big as it is, is nowhere near the magnitude of the operating expenditure; and when that aspect begins to be addressed, the Official Plan process is really circumscribed, since there is a realization that the release of new districts is contentious precisely because of the social and economic costs involved. This is now a critical issue in Peel. We know that the existing committed areas can accomodate 150-200,000 people in Mississauga alone, without releasing another district plan. And we know that, given our capital works budget, there is no way that the existing committed areas can be serviced in capital facilities alone within the capital budget period.

So we need many years to catch up to what we have committed to date. We also have several years of land supply already committed and serviced in Peel that could bring housing on stream. The fact that it is not doing so is a reflection of market conditions today -- but then one really has to question releasing new districts for development.

The social development strategy therefore has in a sense provided a framework for the way in which physical planning takes place. And our capital works budgets clearly narrow that framework because they give a time definition.

I would like to look at some of the more mechanistic ways in which the Planning Act -- even though we are disappointed with it now -- can be utilized. Despite the fact that secondary plans are not included as legal vehicles within the new Planning Act, there is still room for them; they are still there in Minister's orders. I have contended that the secondary planning level is the level at which social objectives of any sort can be identified, the level at which one begins to describe in idealistic as well as very practical terms what one wants communities to look like, and at what point those communities ought to be released for development. So secondary planning, if it is not put into the Planning Act with legal status, can still be used as a way in which one can define the kind of community and the kind of community completeness that one wants. Releasing secondary planning districts can be a way in which one controls development until such time as community services have caught up with whatever else is happening.

The previous Minister of Housing was dead-set against the concept of phasing for the same philosophical reasons as those used by the Planning Act Review Committee in the first chapter of the Report. Phasing is an awful concept for the market place, but it is one that has to be used now that we are looking at massive capital expenditures, and massive operating expenditures spread over many years.

At the Regional level, control over capital financing through borrowing capacity is a critical instrument in planning. Only by adjusting the mill rate impact can a municipality increase its ability to borrow. As soon as the power of this is understood, we realize that, as always, decisions are going to rest with the taxpayer. To afford the major capital works that would require additional debt financing, taxes would have to rise astronomically.

Clearly the issue of physical versus social development comes right down -- not necessarily to the neighbourhood level -- but to the individual level. And there the trade-off can be made, especially if the schools are not being built, the day care centres are not happening, the family home day care is not being provided through the operational budgets. When people begin to realize that those things are not going to be provided, that the school site proposed in Erin Mills West or Meadowvale will not be developed, that the sign on the land meant nothing because there was never an intent to take up an option on that site; when people begin to realize that while at the same time they are faced with massive increases in property taxes to pay the costs of new capital financing, then the silent majority begins to awaken.

So what has been accomplished is that these decisions are made at a political level, with all the social and economic data available, despite the fact that the Ministry has indicated that social objectives should be out of official plans. I personally do not think that the present Planning Act or the revised Act really exclude the ability to make social statements. Recent experience tells us that as long as there is no chapter entitled "Social Planning", there appears to be little concern. It takes little imagination to realize that the root of any physical planning component can be in social terms, or in human concepts.

In terms of other structural vehicles that can exist, in Peel we adopted a joint social services-planning format expressed through the Housing Task Force, where we deal with planning and social service issues related to housing in the same forum. Also, a proposal was put forward for the development of a Human Services Department, which would encompass both the Social Services and the Health and Children's Services Committees, and the District Health Council. Peel staff have recommended that a similar route to the one adopted by Metro be taken with respect to the assisted housing portfolio and its management*. As a result, co-ordination of the human services -- when that issue is raised at the political level -- has a lot of influence on the way in which decisions are made which will obviously affect the allocation of land.

---

* Establishment of a local Housing Authority to assume direct management and administrative responsibility for Ontario Housing Corporation assisted housing units.

With reference to the Planning Act being simply a development control act, too many in the planning profession have seen themselves as development control people. We have tended to lose the visionaries in the planning process, and there is a real need in the educational system to try to send out messages about the need to educate our planners and our politicians. We have to give our political masters good research; we have to advise them about how these things will affect the community and what kinds of major comprehensive statements have to be made, and I think we have to be prepared to make bold suggestions based on a vision of the future.

We have not taken the time to get the information through to the politicians so that they can feel comfortable about making decisions and can then go out and defend their position realistically. We also need to develop our inter-regional information systems through the RISC Committee (Regional Information Systems Committee). This kind of vehicle must be able to provide us with instant information on what is happening with respect to mobility, population changes, housing starts, need for assisted housing, and need for chronic care facilities and other health and social services.

In summary, perhaps we ought not to be overly reactive to the Provincial position on social objectives in official plans. Recent trends in life-style choices, in the market and in the political arena appear to be defining a very clear role for social planning in new and different ways. Social and economic considerations, after all, are at the heart of individual decision-making. Creating the appropriate vehicles, and reinforcing the existing vehicles for the expression of these considerations seems to me to go far beyond the bounds of a legal document such as the Planning Act. Having said this, however, I am convinced that the Planning Act Review provided an appropriate forum for the crystallization and the expression of these social and economic considerations for community development.

THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL

Ken Richards
Policy Advisor
Provincial Secretariat for Resources Development

One phrase in the brochure introducing the purpose of this Conference appealed to me: it reads "...raising questions about the tasks which planning will need to undertake in the 1980's, and the kinds of strategies and institutional mechanisms which will be required." In this context, I decided that rather than speaking about land use planning, I would describe to you some planning tools in the Ontario government and explain how the government responds to such issues as those that have been raised today. Among those issues are the economic climate of the province, what energy policies should be adopted, what social services are required in anticipation of the change in the age structure of the population; and also the adequacy of environmental policies to deal with problems of waste.

There are two propositions I wish to make. The first one is that there is a process in place in the Ontario government to ensure policy direction, efficiency and effectiveness. Second, like any other institution, the government has at its disposal a number of means for formulating alternative courses of action and problem solving. The combination of these two propositions, together with the political process, constitutes, in my view, a system of planning and policy-making in the Ontario government.

The present planning process dates from the implementation of recommendations proposed by the Committee on Government Productivity which published its reports between 1969 and 1973, significant years in terms of institutional change. The Committee recognised the inadequacies of the system of government of the time to meet the demands resulting from rapid change in society and the increasing complexity of social and economic problems and

issues. It also recognized that a new management style was needed to improve the policy-making capabilities of ministers and senior officials. To achieve these goals, the Committee recommended the adoption of a well-defined and rational process for setting priorities among competing goals and evaluating program results.

The key words that appear time and again in the Committee's reports are "effectiveness" and "efficiency" in the formulation of policies and the delivery of programs. In retrospect those words seem too concerned with the efficiency of the organization itself instead of taking the process a step further and encouraging the organization to review constantly what it should be doing. And yet, government is accountable to the public and must be seen to be applying those criteria in the interest of guarding the public purse.

As a result of the Committee's recommendations, the government initiated two basic changes. First, the Cabinet was reorganized into a hierarchical committee system, with each committee having a clearly defined role in the policy-making process. These committees review policy proposals before the adoption of a final course of action by the full Cabinet. The following were also established: Policy and Priorities Board, Management Board, the field committees -- Justice, Social Development, Resource Development, and the Legislative Committee.

The second major change was the reorganization of the departments. This was done by first eliminating overlapping jurisdictions; second, the creation of ministries encompassing the newly integrated elements of former departments; and third the grouping of ministries related in function within the three policy fields mentioned above.

Briefly, the Committee on Government Productivity envisaged the policy-making process to be in four stages: Stage 1 would be the development of policy alternatives by a ministry; Stage 2, the evaluation of policy alternatives by a policy field committee of Cabinet; Stage 3 for the proposed policy to be considered by the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet and the final stage would be approval by full Cabinet. That system is still in place.

I will now turn to the participants in, and influences on, the system because until now we have been considering a closed system. Some of the

participants include the ministers, their staffs, the civil service, advisory bodies, consultants, the media, the legislature and its members, organised interest groups and the general public. They are the people who influence the process under discussion and who form the political fabric of this country. A very apt description of this process is contained in a recently published research publication of the Commission on Freedom of Information and Individual privacy:

> The policy-making process is not self-contained within government, but operates within a social, political and economic environment from which it draws policy inputs or demands. Here notice must be taken of the various pressure groups or interest groups and their interaction with government, particularly their interaction with civil servants.*

The government places a high value on public participation, although a formal structure does not exist for this to take place nor do I think it possible for such a model to be developed. Instead, a variety of mechanisms can be identified for the public to be involved at different levels of the policy-making process including advisory committees, the solicitation of briefs, the establishment of commissions of inquiry or the publication of White or Green Papers. One other important element is the opportunity to participate in Standing Committees of the Legislature.

At the outset, I described the planning system as consisting of two major components, the process and the means. I will turn now to the second of those, and talk about the different approaches that government can apply to problems and the approaches that can be adopted to deal with them, particularly in the next few years. Turning again to the brochure announcing this Conference, I noted the view--which has been made forcibly clear today--that the White Paper on the Planning Act did not deal with the issues of concern to the sponsors of this Conference.

I have often thought an ideal Planning Act should include what I as a planner have been trained to understand as the "Comprehensive Plan", that is the incorporation of social, economic and physical elements into a single

---

* John Eichmanis, Freedom of Information and the Policy-Making Process in Ontario, Research Publication 13, prepared for the Commission on Freedom of Information and Individual Privacy, February 1980.

document. Having attempted to draft and implement such a document, I have concluded that governments should adopt different approaches to problem identification and issue resolution, rather than relying on a single instrument to fulfill the requirements of an entire assignment. This message has been made clear today by the different speakers.

Consider, for example, the opportunities provided by the Environmental Assessment Act. The approach of an environmental assessment is similar in many ways to comprehensive planning, in that it is designed to achieve the most acceptable course of action with the least impact on the natural and social environment. In my own experience an environmental assessment process combined with a land use planning approach can be used effectively in many of our communities where substantial development impacts are anticipated. The White Paper on the Planning Act recognises the potential contribution of this process.

A case in point is the community of Elliot Lake, the development of which I have monitored for the last two years. In the mid-70's, the uranium mining companies decided to expand their operations in response to growing demand for that mineral. It was anticipated that the community would grow from 9,000 to approximately 25,000 persons by the end of the decade. An environmental assessment was undertaken, and the public inquiry associated with it clarified the impact of the expansion on local government and social services. It also assisted the Ontario government in assessing its own role in relation to the development of the community. In this instance, the government concluded that municipal government was capable of managing new community growth without the need for substantial intervention by its agencies. However, it was felt that the impact of the expansion and the uniqueness of the situation demanded that community expansion be monitored in the event of unforeseen problems arising. The government is currently assessing its role with regard to the impact on the environment of mining expansion itself.

In this case, the land use planning process as it exists or as it is proposed, does not have the capability of dealing with the complexities of the situation. On the other hand, the environmental assessment process provided a valuable perspective on the problems and indicated possible

approaches to dealing with them. In retrospect, I think more could have been said in the environmental assessment report about the impact of the expansion on community life and the Board stressed this point in its final report. The prevailing concern at the time of the public hearings, however, was the pollution of the environment and this is where most of the analysis was focussed.

Another example of a different kind of planning tool the government has adopted is the preparation of a plan for the Niagara Escarpment. There is sufficient background literature on why the government chose to break with the planning conventions of the day by introducing and applying the Planning and Development Act to a resource of provincial significance. The Niagara Escarpment Commission published a proposed plan in November 1979 and the public hearings will begin in April. My prediction for the summer of 1980 is that we will be hearing strong arguments both for and against the need for special legislation to protect the Escarpment, and questions asking whether or not development control is the appropriate means of dealing with development along the Escarpment. Already the major groups involved in this debate have made their views known, and the government will eventually be faced with the difficult problem of resolving these differences in the context of its oft-stated intention of preserving the Niagara Escarpment.

I would suggest again that the White Paper on the Planning Act, and the Draft Planning Act itself, make provision for the incorporation of areas of provincial interest. The question is, should such areas be protected by special legislation, or incorporated in the proposed Planning Act? In the case of the Escarpment, the large number of jurisdictions and the competing interests involved would probably sway the argument in favour of special legislation. But on the other side of the coin are the arguments that there is already too much regulation by government and the centralization of planning power in Queen's Park.

I have described to you two examples of where government has adopted alternative means of dealing with problems instead of applying what at first appears to be the most obvious tool. Given the complex issues facing us in the 80's, we cannot afford to place an emphasis on a single element for the

allocation and management of our social and economic resources. Consideration needs to be given to a more flexible approach using what could be termed a "mixed bag approach". This does not mean a return to ad-hocracy, but advocates the careful selection and design of planning models geared to clearly identifying needs, means, resources and the agencies responsible for implementation. In this approach recognition needs to be given to the inter-relationship between such elements as forecasting, the expectations of the various interests, the past performance of the organization and its future capability, the different tools that could be used for implementation, the efficient allocation of resources, accountability and monitoring.

There are problems in applying this approach to government. It is difficult to model public problems in a realistic way; it is difficult to identify solid measures of effectiveness, particularly in a social context, and it is difficult to deal with the preferences of various groups affected by a decision. Finally, too much emphasis on formal analysis concentrates on numbers rather than process and, more important, the people affected by the decisions.

As we enter the 80's the challenge lies in defining the balancing point between the effectiveness of the tools we select to do the job and the flexibility of the process within which we must work. The policy-making process in Ontario is designed to ensure that decisions are relevant to the problem and that the criteria of efficiency and effectiveness are met. Given the emphasis on the development of our social environment in the 80's, I believe that the sane, objective, managerial approach of the early 70's must incorporate human values to be effective. The flexibility already exists in the policy-making process of the Ontario government, as well as a willingness to adopt an increasing variety of instruments for problem solving and formulating alternative courses of action. Given these opportunities, we can begin to work on the uncomfortable issues of the next decade.

Maureen Quigley
Manager, Planning and Development Unit
Metropolitan Toronto Department of Social Services

My role or legitimacy as a spokesman on planning opportunities at the provincial level is, I am sure, somewhat confusing to those of you who noted that I am now the Manager of the Planning Unit in the Metropolitan Toronto Department of Social Services. The conference organizers asked me to participate in a reflective capacity based on my four years as a policy advisor in the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development. They seemed to feel that I would be able to provide you with a retrospective, some wishful thinking from where I sit now, and a touch of Province-bashing which is the prerogative of all municipal civil servants, particularly those who are reformed provincial ones. I hope that my wishful thinking combined with Ken Richards' real-world state-of-the-art review will provide you with some possible future directions.

There are two matters which I would like to address: planning process and product and, in doing so, I hope to pick up on some of the themes which Professor Cullingworth outlined. Essentially, I will argue that planning in the 80's requires a process at the provincial level which is interdisciplinary and interministerial in nature in order to assist regional and local municipalities in developing a product (official plan or corporate plan) which is a melding of a well-conceived and well-communicated "provincial interest" and a municipal interest which is broadly, not narrowly, defined.

First, I will address process at the provincial level, and it is at this point that I wear my reflective and somewhat nostalgic hat. I would like to describe to you a process which I feel has merit as a model for the 80's. As policy advisor in the Secretariat for Social Development, my primary responsibility was to determine ways and means by which the policies and interests of the ministries in the social development policy field (Health, Education, Community and Social Services, Culture and Recreation

and the Secretariat itself) could be incorporated into the provincial government's regional planning program in the mid-70's. (You all remember TCR (Toronto-Centred Region), Design for Development and the Plan for Ontario.) This initiative arose as a result of an awareness and concern within the social development policy field ministries that as always, they would be expected to pick up the pieces of regional development policies and strategies, which relegated social impact and social infrastructure considerations to the lowest rung of anticipatory planning priorities.

The mechanism which we established was very similar to John Gandy's concept at the regional and local level which Barry Cullingworth referred to this morning. A committee was established in 1975 of officials from the Policy Secretariats in each of the ministries in the social development policy field, representatives from TEIGA (Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs) and myself from the Secretariat for Social Development as chairman. We secured participation from the Resources Development Secretariat and from all the "hard service" ministries as needed, though we would have preferred their permanent membership in some cases.

In the first year, we went through a process of consciousness raising. Not only did we have to educate ourselves as to how the regional planning work was being done and where we might fit in, but also we had to spend a tremendous amount of time with missionary zeal trying to convince the traditional players (TEIGA, Housing and the "hard service" ministries) that we existed, were relevant, and could make a contribution to a more comprehensive planning product. In addition, we sought out every possible opportunity to comment to the Deputy Ministers' Committee on Regional Planning on the likely social impact of both broad regional development plans such as TCR, and specific projects such as North Pickering, Elliot Lake Expansion and several Hydro projects.

In the second year, we wanted and were ready to move from this somewhat reactive role to that of a much more proactive, equal participant in the developmental stages. We were finally challenged by TEIGA to put our money where our mouth was and prepare a social development chapter for the Northwestern Ontario Regional Development Strategy. Our contribution was developed jointly by the Committee members with assistance from field staff in the North from each of our ministries. It was not earth-shattering in its prescriptions for the next 20 years, but in my view it was an essential turning point for

regional planning, in that the social development issues and future initiatives were recognized and adopted by Cabinet as an integral part of the Government's overall strategy for Northwestern Ontario.

Unfortunately, at the zenith of our energy, the economy became tight, restraint set in and the Regional Planning Program fell out of favour politically. Design for Development was replaced by a very pragmatic approach to specific short-term economic development issues without any broad planning framework and certainly without any room for systematic integration of social considerations.

So we turned our attention to the provincial-municipal planning process and the question of human services policies in municipal official plans. In order to assist the government in responding to an increasing volume of interest by municipalities to expand in this area, we attempted to set out guidelines for human services policies within the official plan. The rest is history and we are all aware that it was an idea whose time had not yet come— possibly because at the staff level, our timing was off in relation to the Planning Act Review Committee Report. We also misjudged and overestimated the strength of municipal interest and commitment to this concept. One thing that has always surprised me is that the municipal and voluntary sector outrage which we anticipated following the decision on official plan content never materialized in any organized and meaningful way.

Following the decision on official plans, we turned our attention to developing a position paper on guidelines for human services planning which could be of assistance to municipalities which wished to pursue this area apart from the official plan. It was at this stage that I moved to the municipal level so I am not fully aware of the development of the guidelines since late 1978. However, I sense that there has been very little continuing activity in this area largely because until recently there's been very little expression of interest by municipalities.

Can the Social Policy Field Committee on Urban and Regional Planning be seen as a model for a provincial planning process in the 80's? I think it can for the following reasons:

First, it provided a forum for consciousness raising, information sharing, consideration of interministerial impact, debate and defence of the relevance or appropriateness of policies which would otherwise be pursued in splendid isolation as the prerogative of a particular ministry. In fact, this was the

underlying concept of the 1972 Committee on Government Productivity (COGP) Report on Overall Government Restructuring which we applied to a particular area of government endeavour.

Second, the Committee provided a forum for a collaborative approach to the development of position papers and policy options which cut across ministerial boundaries to allow issues and problems to be addressed as they exist rather than as we are forced to carve them up to fit legislative mandates.

Third, as a coalition of five ministries with Cabinet Committee support, the Committee was able to exert considerably more pressure on the ministries outside the social development policy field (to incorporate social policy considerations into the planning process) than would have been possible by any one ministry attempting to advocate independently for this type of change.

Finally, it had the potential to provide one-stop shopping for access by municipalities, social planning councils and other voluntary sector agencies which were anxious to initiate human services planning. This role was not developed in my time to the extent possible. However, such a forum is, in my view, an essential central resource to municipalities, which could be used as a sounding board for municipal social planning initiatives or a catalyst for joint provincial-municipal social planning which is essential to meet the issues we will face in the 80's. There are those who would argue that such a role for this type of committee is inappropriate, given that each ministry has a mechanism which has a mandate to relate directly to municipal government, i.e., district health councils, boards of education, and children's services committees. While this is true, there is no common denominator among these bodies either in mandate or perception of municipal government. Consequently, they tend to reinforce fragmentation of issues at the local level. Therefore, they require either restructuring to ensure a common approach and philosophy of local government or a counter-balancing central co-ordinating mechanism at the provincial level.

Having touted this mechanism, what agenda priority would I prescribe for it to clarify the provincial role in planning for the 80's? The top item on my agenda would be to flesh out what is meant by "the Provincial Interest" in municipal planning. As a municipal official, I find Sections (2) and (3) of the Draft Planning Act to be infuriating in that they are typical of the parent-child relationship which has characterized provincial-municipal relations in Ontario since the Baldwin Act. In essence, it would appear that provincial interest will prevail in a series of vaguely defined matters to which

the Minister will "have regard" in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act. The Draft Act states further in Section 3 that the Minister may from time to time issue policy statements on matters relating to municipal planning that in the opinion of the Minister are of provincial interest and further that municipalities shall have regard to such policy statements.

This suggests to me that under the new legislation municipal planners and politicians will be expected to be mind readers, trying to second guess those matters which, although unspecified, may be deemed to be matters of provincial interest and therefore must be considered in the development of their official plans or other planning instruments. To date, we have no detailed indication from the Ministry of Housing as to what policies will constitute provincial interest in planning or at what stage they will be made known to municipalities in the form of policy circulars. It is my view that discretionary policy circulars from time to time are inadequate. If the provincial interest is to prevail, then that interest should be spelled out in a catalogue of guidelines pertaining to all ministries and all matters before Sections 2 and 3 of the new Planning Act are proclaimed.

I do not underestimate the enormity of the task. I am fully aware that an inventory and publication of provincial policies which are pertinent to municipal planning is a major undertaking and would likely consume the energy of at least one person in each of the ministries for a significant period of time. But the benefit of such an exercise would be that the Ministry of Housing would soon find that it and the other ministries of the resources development policy field do not have a monopoly on provincial policies pertaining to land use planning. Furthermore, such an exercise would provide municipalities with some assurance that the "policies" which are cited by various ministries as relevant when reviewing and requesting a modification to a municipality's official plan or plan of subdivision are, in fact, official government policies and not simply an individual civil servant's idea of what is good for municipalities.

It would be my interpretation of Section 2 of the Draft Planning Act that such a compendium of policies constituting provincial interest in municipal planning must include provincial policies on human services, quite apart from whether they are or are not to be included in an official plan.

Within the scope of provincial interest, Section 2(g) states "the equitable distribution of educational, health and other social facilities." This would

suggest that the compendium of relevant provincial policies would include those from the social development policy field such as the group homes policy, policies on hospital beds and school spaces per capita, vacant use of redundant schools and the policies on the respective roles of institutions and community-based programs in providing residential care for both adults and children. This is to mention only a few.

Section 2(h) goes on to define as provincial interest "the co-ordination of planning activities of municipalities and other public bodies." I would interpret such public bodies to include district health councils, councils of regents, boards of education, boards of health and local children's services committees, even as they pertain strictly to land use planning. Therefore, the provincial policy on the mandate of each of these bodies and their interface with municipalities must be communicated to municipalities as a component of "provincial interest" in municipal planning.

It is my opinion as a result of my municipal experience to date that municipalities are only too willing to incorporate such matters of provincial interest in their plans and planning process. But they can only do so if they know what the scope of that interest is. Therefore, I would strongly recommend that an interministerial mechanism be set up immediately, first to define in an integrated and comprehensive way the components of provincial interest in municipal planning and secondly, to be accessible to municipalities which are trying to incorporate that interest but have a right to one-stop shopping as they develop their plans.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Meyer Brownstone
Department of Political Economy, University of Toronto

Fundamentally, the discussants addressed themselves to the familiar theme, what is planning? What emerged is also familiar. Planning, as education and practice, despite some pretensions to being much more, is just another element in the division of political and administrative labour. It is a small component working at allocation of space and (sometimes) creative design. It may have other grander potentials, its output may have grave and wide implications touching on societal concerns; but in terms of planners (as professionally socialized), bureaucratic practice, organizational systems, political definition, power, reach and so on, it is nothing more and probably far less than other pièces of divided labour: public works, public health, welfare, parks and recreation, etc. It is no more "radical" and no less "conservative" than other components. This is not to suggest that planners and planning have not struggled for a somewhat transcending role in government and, here and there, represented a conflicting ideology. But it has been a history of failure -- at the levels of both training and practice. It has to date failed almost totally in breaking the traditional political-organizational mould and this is amply reflected by the Planning Act which denies virtually any scope beyond physical planning. More tellingly, as Goldrick points out, planning is viewed as a useful tool by the dominant economic forces in Canadian society and its bias is framed accordingly in the Act and other aspects of public policy. The panel generally tended to conclude: let the Planning Act rest within its narrowness, though Goldrick did urge us to "scrutinize and make explicit the heavily value-laden and distributive content of traditional physical planning". This means presumably that planning should have no special place as a bearer of social justice or as a haven for socially-oriented planners, but

rather should be viewed as one part of the political order in Canada -- all of which should be equally subject to review and critique.

Having relegated physical planning to its "proper" role, status and organizational setting, the panel approached the planning potential in the context of social, economic and environmental situations with somewhat more enthusiasm. Attempts were made to analyze efforts at both local and Provincial levels and to prescribe strategies. In these discussions planning is pictured as an effort to integrate/co-ordinate the pieces into an approximation of a whole -- expressed as the whole government, the whole environment, the whole society and, of course, to produce an effective priority-weighted output. Expressed this way, planning is viewed as a highly complex and sensitive change from existing patterns but still a function of essentially technocratic dimensions which speaks to a rationalizing objective but not particularly to Goldrick's more difficult and interesting challenge: what does all this re-arranging have to do with the basic questions facing human society?

The record of expanded and integrated planning as presented by the panel, although showing glimpses, is not inspiring. For instance, the experience described by Quigley, while promising in its ingredients and its thrust, collapsed before it met any real test. It collapsed because political (electoral) motivation weakened and very little can change without strong political (executive) sponsorship. It collapsed also because cutbacks became fashionable. In the context of Quigley's case, this is either the height of irony or the depths of bankruptcy, because nothing tends to be damaged more than distributive justice in a cutback situation. But this result is quite predictable given the prevailing ideological set.

Clearly, while in the Ontario context the state was prepared to move in the direction of horizontal integration/co-ordination in a limited technical sense, it did so under substantial short-run political pressure and it reverted to traditional modes as soon as it was safe to do so. Little can be said, therefore, about the institutionalizing of comprehensive planning and integrated action, at least from this particular example.

The record from other evidence, Provincial from Richards' comments, in Peel Region from Smith's comments, and in Metro Toronto from Goldrick's

comments, indicate only limited progress, often fleeting, from a technocratic viewpoint, and even less if one is looking for societal change. The most interesting experiences were those mentioned briefly by Goldrick, and they occurred in the context of a group of seemingly random efforts within Metro.

The more massive, rational, systemic efforts at planning, such as those inspired by the Province's Committee on Government Productivity, and efforts by major city planning departments to penetrate the whole government apparatus, all demonstrated grave weakness. In sharp contrast, more isolated and unco-ordinated forays (as illustrated in part by Smith and Goldrick) appeared both more interesting (as critique) and more promising (as action). Such a planning process flies in the face of current accepted practice, dominated as it is by a high degree of centralization and by an insistence on a highly ordered system. Conceptually it is supported by Andre Gorz's "Strategy for Labour". In that work, Gorz argues that a frontal systemic attack on the established order is unrealistic. He also argues that in societies like Canada, the established order is to a degree open and permeable. Because it is permeable, Gorz speculates that progress towards change (if not quite transformation) can be made by penetrating where possible and building from that position -- not in outright confrontation with the system as a whole (an impossible venture) but wherever permeability and challenging strength and intent are available. In many cases, rather than obtaining concrete action results, the participants must be temporarily satisfied with learning and hopefully remembering results plus achievement of mobilization effects. This does not necessarily mean small, impermanent or insignificant forays. The changes in the public library system in Toronto which were instituted a few years ago provide an instructive example of a comprehensive planning and action approach within the context of a single function, which tackled concurrently issues of wealth redistribution, ethnic discrimination, labour relations, centralization and neighbourhood survival. On almost every count, this process reversed existing city and library board policies and challenged embedded structures.

Unfortunately the strategy is not neat, orderly and unified -- it is messy. But if planning as a process is desired for its social potential,

and if social change embracing values such as redistribution and environmental restitution and protection are being sought, it is doubtful that the liberal state as it stands, and is likely to stand, can be confronted head on and holistically. But given this, it is not necessary to abandon physical planning and the Planning Act in toto, as the speakers tended to do, and to discover planning elsewhere. Physical planning is one program (if minor) amongst others in the array of vertical elements in our political-administrative order; like the other elements, it too is permeable. Potentially innovative efforts in planning are possible and could join Goldrick's interesting, if diverse, unco-ordinated list of activities which speak to solving fundamental deficiencies.

Unfortunately, in Toronto, while planners in the muncipal government and allies outside have waged mighty and losing battles to establish a transcending role vis-a-vis the government structure as a whole, they have neglected a full pursuit of a more limited strategy on a much smaller scale. For instance, although permeability was evident, planners have not effectively supported citizen participation as a process seeking to redistribute political power. By and large, they have tended to succumb to a variety of accomodative postures, leaving the essential character of political power and participation in planning undisturbed. It is possible that in such cases a more realistic possibility (the smaller scale innovation) was compromised (in an effort to enhance credibility) in order to pursue the more unrealistic possibility (the frontal attack).