



BUREAU OF
MUNICIPAL
RESEARCH

A bulletin issued by the Bureau of Municipal Research

CIVIC AFFAIRS

SEPT. 1974

4 RICHMOND ST. E.

TORONTO

The Development of New Communities in Ontario

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW COMMUNITIES
IN ONTARIO**

Proceedings of a Seminar
Sponsored by
The Bureau of Municipal Research
May, 1974

©COPYRIGHT, 1974

Charles K. Bens, Executive Director

Anne Golden, Research Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
MORNING SESSIONS	
Morning Session Moderator — <i>Sonja Sinclair</i> , Consultant, Price Waterhouse	
First Panel:	
Redirecting Growth: Political Platitudes or Practical Solutions	
<i>Colin Vaughan</i> , Alderman, City of Toronto	5
<i>Eric Fleming</i> , Executive Director, Urban and Regional Planning Division, T.E.I.G.A.	9
<i>Don Taylor</i> , Executive Director, Local Government Services Division, T.E.I.G.A.	11
<i>Mayor D. Parker</i> , City of Barrie	13
<i>Len Gertler</i> , Director General, Research Branch, Ministry of State for Urban Affairs	14
Second Panel:	
New Communities: Public or Private Impetus and Control	
<i>Peter Langer</i> , Markborough Development Inc.	20
<i>Prof. Shoukry T. Roweis</i> , Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto	24
LUNCHEON SPEECH	
<i>Mr. S. Bruce McLaughlin</i> , President, S. B. McLaughlin Associates Ltd.	29
AFTERNOON SESSIONS	
Afternoon Session Moderator — <i>Allen Bernholtz</i> , Design Consultant	
First Panel:	
If Developers Had Their Way . . .	
<i>Arthur Armstrong</i> , President & Chief Executive Officer, Bramalea Consolidated Development Limited of Toronto	38
<i>Michael Cassidy</i> , M.P.P., N.D.P., Ottawa Centre	41
—Discussion—	43
Second Panel:	
Pickering: A New Community With Prospects and Problems	
<i>W. Wronski</i> , Assistant Deputy Minister of Housing for Ontario	48
<i>Mayor Paul Cosgrove</i> , Borough of Scarborough	50
— Discussion —	52
THIRD SESSION	
Public or Private: The Problems are Many	
<i>Dr. Royce Hanson</i> , Chairman, Maryland-National Capital Parks and Planning Commission, Maryland, U.S.A.	56
— Discussion —	60
CONCLUSION	64



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Bureau of Municipal Research extends its appreciation to all of the participants of our conference for the thought, time and effort which they put into their presentations.

We also gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the following people:

Sonja Sinclair and Allen Bernholtz for serving as the moderators of the morning and afternoon sessions respectively; Mrs. Pat Johnston for helping to arrange the program and prepare background material; Mrs. Judy Milne and Miss Colleen Burns for their efforts in transcribing the tapes of the sessions.

The Development of New Communities in Ontario

INTRODUCTION

The current popularity of the new town concept is not only a modern phenomenon. Back in 1840, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote to his friend, Carlyle, that the enthusiasm for communitarian experiments was so great that "not a reading man but has a draft of a new community in his waistcoat pocket". The excitement about new communities then was part of a search for utopian panaceas and a new social order, a movement which was in large part inspired by religious and communitarian dreams. Our present concern grows directly out of the anxiety which has accompanied the massive urbanization of the past several decades.

The immediate historical origin of the new town movement is to be found in Great Britain, specifically in Ebenezer Howard's concept of "garden cities".¹ The ideal new town, as described by Howard in his book *Garden Cities of Tomorrow* (1902) was to be a planned community made up of some 30,000 people, surrounded on all sides by green belts yet linked by rail to London and to each other. Careful planning would ensure that a harmonious balance would exist between work-places and homes, that the industrial activity would not impinge on the residential environment and that the housing would meet the real social needs of the people. Two early new town experiments were made to implement Howard's ideas (Letch-

worth in 1908 and Welwyn in 1920). However, a "new town" program did not become part of official British government policy until after World War II.²

Canada's own experience with the establishment of new towns and communities goes back some fifty years.³ While most of Canada's new town development has been related to company towns and the opening up of natural resources on remote sites such as Elliott Lake and Kitimat, some have been conceived as attempts to redirect growth and decentralize urban population. In Ontario some of the continent's most ambitious new town experiments are now in progress, such as Erin Mills⁴ and Meadowvale to the north-west of Toronto and North Pickering to the north-east.

Before proceeding to look at the promise and problems raised by new town development, it is perhaps necessary to ask at the outset: What do we mean by the term "new town" or "new community"?

As a recent article has emphasized, the term "new town" defies precise definition; in fact, there are many different types of new towns ranging from "independent" small cities to "satellite" communities to "new towns intown"⁵. The article suggests that any new town definition must include all of the following elements:

1. some minimum population size;
2. development under a single comprehensive plan;
3. a multiplicity of land uses (residential, commercial, office, industrial, recreational, open space).
4. some degree of economic autonomy and
5. spatial distinction from surrounding land uses.

These elements may, of course, be present in varying degrees and combinations which accounts for the fact that new towns everywhere are very different from one another.

Yet at the same time the term “new town” has a very positive connotation to most people and is seen as a potential solution to the growing problems related to unrestrained urban growth. Generally speaking, new towns are looked upon as ideal communities which can provide all of the basic services and amenities which make “the good life” possible: abundant green open spaces, healthy living and working environments, excellent communication facilities and the widest possible choice in life-style.

Three lines of argument are commonly given to justify elaborate new town planning.⁶ First, it is usually argued that new towns are needed in order to cope with the anticipated expansion of urban population which otherwise would increase the pressure on the already overburdened metropolitan areas.⁷ Second, it is alleged that new town life offers a socially “healthy” alternative to the bigness and impersonality of large cities – a style of life which will be physically and psychologically salutary and in which all socio-economic and ethnic groups will live in an integrated community. The third line of argument relates to economic considerations and assumes, for example, that the increased availability of land will lower its price, so that housing will be cheaper.

These justifications are open to serious challenge at almost every point. One of the most forceful arguments

against new town development is that it simply won't work as a remedy for the ills of urbanization – that even if a national policy of settling millions of people in new communities were feasible, which itself is unlikely, such an effort would have but a marginal effect. For example, in Britain, after twenty years of concerted effort, it was found that less than 10% of the annual British population growth was being absorbed by the new towns.⁸ Other counter arguments to new communities are that the poor will not be provided for, that citizen participation will be no more likely, and, above all, that too much emphasis on new communities, in terms of energy and money, will distract us from what we really should be doing – improving our existing metropolitan centres where the growth is occurring and will continue to occur, given present trends.

Thus the central questions about new towns and new communities remain unanswered. From a common point of agreement that the aimless continuous expansion of our sprawling metropolitan centres must be curbed, questions abound on even the most fundamental issues:

* *the rationale for new towns:*

- Can new towns, new communities and new growth centres help to solve the problems of urban congestion and blight to any significant extent? Are new towns really the answer or can they provide at best a possibility for civilized living for a small minority of urbanites? And if a new town program, even if successful, can have at best a marginal effect on the total urban problem, then what priority should new towns have in overall governmental policy and spending?
- Is the notion of creating new successful urban units according to plans and blueprints a valid or mythical idea? The heart of the new town idea is the creation of an urban community as an integrated and harmonious entity – but can this be achieved?

ed by drawing up an overall plan "from scratch"?

* *the responsibility for new towns:*

—Who should initiate and guide new town development — the public or the private sector?

—Within the public area of responsibility, what should be the roles of the various levels of government?

—How should new towns be financed?

—How can citizen participation be provided for?

* *the location of new towns:*

—Where should they be built in relation to major metropolitan centres? Should they be wholly new cities or satellites of existing cities?

—How do we take account of environmental and ecological impact? How do we measure and take account of the potential effects of new towns on both existing living patterns in the area and on the natural landscape?

* *the optimal size and form:*

—How big should they be? 30,000? 50,000? 200,000?

—What density for living is acceptable and desirable?

—How should the new town be structured and what social patterns and economic patterns should the structure serve?

Looking at the experiences of new towns in other modern industrialized nations, we find that they may be somewhat instructive but are not applicable to the Canadian scene in any wholesale way. In each case the pressures and the constraints differ. For example, many European countries and Israel, faced with urgent pressures for population dispersal, have emphasized public development with new towns being encouraged as part of a national urban policy. In America, on the other hand, the tendency has been to rely on private enterprise and private initiative.⁹ Interestingly enough, a shift of opinion is occurring so that in Britain, where

new towns have traditionally been conceived as wholly public ventures since the British Government enacted new town legislation in 1946, private participation is now being encouraged; and in the United States the alternate route of public enterprise is being considered. Both public and private development would appear to have their share of benefits and problems. What the experience beyond our borders seems to suggest without a doubt is that, even given its desirability, there is no easy recipe for new community development.

Debate on the arguments related to new town planning has continued without resolution in both public discussion and in the literature. This very lack of consensus indicated to the Bureau of Municipal Research that a conference to explore some of the major issues about new towns would be welcomed. Our seminar on *The Development of New Communities in Ontario*, held in conjunction with our Annual Meeting, May 9, 1974, was designed to provide a forum for the divergent points of view. To ensure that a wide range of attitudes would be expressed, the selected speakers and panelists were drawn from the development industry, from the federal, provincial and local government levels, including elected and appointed officials, and from the academic establishment. Invitations to attend the seminar were extended to a wide cross-section of the Ontario community in order to secure a heterogeneous audience.

We hope that the arguments put forward in this *Civic Affairs* will help to highlight the central questions about new communities and expose the underlying assumptions of the conflicting approaches. We believe that the presentations which follow will contribute to a general understanding of the issues involved in creating new communities — even if they establish no absolute consensus.

1. For a very helpful account of the history of the new town movement see William Michelson's "*Planning and the Amelioration of Urban Problems*", to be published by General Learning Press in 1974.
2. In 1946 the British government enacted "new towns" legislation as part of its national urban policy. As of 1974, over 30 planned new communities were underway.
3. Professor Norman G. P. Pressman, *A Comprehensive Bibliography on New Towns in Canada*, Council of Planning Librarians, Exchange Bibliography No. 483.
4. Extensive modification in the original scheme has led some to suggest that Erin Mills no longer fits the definition of a "new town".
5. James L. Short, "New Towns or New Communities - Is There a Difference? " *Urban Land* (December, 1972). The concept of "New Towns Intown" was first developed by Dr. Harvey S. Perloff; see "New Towns Intown", *J.A.I.P.* (May, 1966).
6. William Alonso, "What Are New Towns For? " *Urban Studies* (Feb. 1970).
7. As part of this general case for new towns, as a means to decentralize urban growth, it is sometimes argued that new town development will help to conserve productive agricultural land. In fact this is, in part, the rationale behind the Province of Ontario's very recent overtures to certain key heads of development companies and industrial corporations to explore incentives for encouraging industrial growth outside of Southwestern Ontario, *Globe and Mail* (July 26, 1974).
8. Alonso, *op.cit.*, p.39. Alonso suggests further that in the American case, even if the recommendations of the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy (1969) were implemented—producing one hundred new towns, each of at least 100,000 population and ten new cities, each with one million by the year 2000—only 7% of the predicted 300 million national population would be residing in these new settlements. Existing urban areas would still have to absorb the vast bulk of the expected population increase.
9. In the United States there are currently over one hundred new towns under construction with almost all of them under private auspices. William Michelson, *op.cit.*

Morning sessions

MATTHEWS:

Ladies and Gentlemen, it certainly gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome you here this morning. As most of you are aware, the Bureau of Municipal Research has been around for quite a number of years. What I think a lot of you do not realize is that this is our 60th birthday. 60 years for a community public service such as ours is, we think, a notable achievement. Particularly today we have a sense of pride and a feeling of accomplishment in arranging this session. It is our hope that today's discussion will contribute to the awareness of the opportunities and pitfalls that are involved in accommodating an expanding population here in Ontario. This province, and particularly the communities from Oshawa to Niagara Falls have, for the past 20 years been the recipients of a large influx of population. Until recently, new population was welcome just for what it was. However, currently in the press considerable concern is being expressed as to how to best accommodate this population either in existing communities or in new communities. I therefore welcome you and I am pleased to turn the session over to Mrs. Sonja Sinclair who is a public relations consultant with Price Waterhouse.

SONJA SINCLAIR

Thank you Mr. Matthews. We have a large and distinguished panel today. I am going to introduce them one at a time because their claims to distinction are so numerous I think it would be difficult to remember more than one set at a time. Unfortunately, because we have a large panel, their time is

going to be limited. I am going to have to ask them to confine their initial remarks to 10 minutes at the most.

Our first panelist is Alderman Colin Vaughan of Ward 5, City of Toronto. Alderman Vaughan was born in Sydney, Australia, he studied architecture came to Canada 20 years ago in 1954 and practiced architecture for a number of years. He was involved among other things in the planning of the Canadian pavilion at Expo '67 and in Canada's participation at Expo '70. He was very active as Chairman of the Spadina Review Corporation. He was elected to City Council in 1972. As Alderman he is a member of many bodies including the Planning Board, the City's Housing work group and the Core Area Task Force. He was also a member of the Provincial Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy. Although Alderman Vaughan may not remember, we met once before when I interviewed him on the subject "How to Fight City Hall". Ladies and Gentlemen, Alderman Vaughan.

VAUGHAN

Thank you. I will be brief. I will just touch some of the high points that I think are important for a discussion of this sort. I think there are really three things we should talk about when we are discussing this sort of subject. The first aspect we should discuss is what we should do if the existing pattern of growth continues. What sort of strategy should we follow? Secondly, we should talk about supply and demand. The third thing we should talk about, and perhaps the most important subject of all is whether the existing

pattern of growth is going to continue. I think there is a fair amount of evidence around us that perhaps the existing pattern of growth is not going to continue. And I think that a great deal of the planning we are doing at the present time, particularly at the provincial and municipal levels, is directed at a continuation of the existing pattern. I have a feeling that there is going to be dramatic changes in that pattern in a very near future.

To start off, I will just touch on the continuation of the existing pattern. I think there are three regional areas that have to be considered in looking at the existing pattern of growth: first, the city; second, the suburbs and third, the regional area around the city. And I will give you my assessment of what I think is happening in these areas at the present time and what should happen.

I can speak with the greatest authority on the inner city mainly because my day-to-day work now is worrying about that sort of pattern of growth. I can say with some confidence that the policies that are beginning to emerge say something about the inner city of Toronto. The first thing they are saying is that there is a limit to the growth to the City of Toronto — when I talk of the City of Toronto I mean that inner area inside the boundary of the City. There is a limit to the ultimate growth of that area in terms of population, commercial, industrial and other activities. That particular land area has a limit. It's obvious that beyond a certain point you cannot add more people or more activity within that boundary satisfactorily and maintain a quality of life for those that are already there and those that will come in the few years ahead. So in terms of evaluating the quality of life and the quantity—the quantity is a fixed amount. What we can do in the city is perhaps add a certain amount of population—new population on land which is phasing out—we can possibly achieve a small amount of infill in housing in certain sites that are becoming apparent. But somewhere in the next five to ten years the satisfac-

tory number of residents in the City—the satisfactory upper limit—will be reached and at that point I think that the sort of policies that will follow (and they are already beginning to emerge at City Hall and will become public within the next couple of weeks) are recommendations for an extremely close balance in new development between commercial, industrial activity and housing activity within the core area of the City. I don't think we can any longer continue to pack commercial population or daytime population into the City without providing a commensurate amount of housing population at the same time. I'll give you one quick example of this: I was looking at the Metro Centre development—I notice that there is a daytime population projected of 50,000 people and a residential population of 20,000, which means that 30,000 people are going to be commuters in and out of Metro Centre. It is my opinion that in that sort of development, we should be asking for an equality, at least an equality, between the housing component and the commercial component. Not that you necessarily expect every person working in Metro Centre to have to live within the development, but I think that providing the equal amount of housing to the daytime population is a principle that if followed would begin to stabilize and would tend to stabilize the inner part of the city. Okay, that's a very quick rundown of the inner city. In 2½ minutes.

As far as suburban development is concerned, I think that the most serious mistakes we have made in the last 30 years have taken place in the suburbs. I think we have been extremely wasteful in land use, in terms of our allocation of land and the densities we are trying to support on that land, which are much too thin. I think that the nature of the zoning in the suburbs has created unsatisfactory development and I suggested that the Ontario Housing Task Force—I will repeat the suggestion again—we should be looking at

increasing the density of population in suburban areas through suburban infill schemes and through the development of the commercial strips. I am constantly amazed when I visit the suburbs to stand on a street corner and see the incredible waste of land in terms of density when you compare it with the satisfactory residential density levels within the City of Toronto. The densities we have in the centre of the city can support a great range of community facilities which are not supported in the suburbs easily; transportation is one of them, for example, that is easily supported in the city and not in the suburbs. I think that a good deal of re-development can take place without disturbing the existing residential communities along many of the commercial strips and in many of the industrial and other areas of the suburbs and population can be increased.

As far as regional planning is concerned, I never really understood the Toronto Centered Region Plan. I think that the concept that we are going to grow as an urban complex, the concept of the Toronto Centered Region Plan with decentralized satellite communities is the obvious next course. The development of pre-planned and well planned satellites around the main urban core is an important concept. I think that it is going to succeed; however, it has to succeed with a concurrent de-centralization of the commercial and industrial activity outside of Metro Toronto. My suggestion in the development of communities is to not provide satellites 50 or 60 miles away from the centre of the City and expect people to have to travel in and out to the Toronto-Dominion Centre everyday to work. It seems to me that it is critically important that in the development of these sub-cities that the same principle that we are going to use in the centre of the City—that there is a relationship between housing and work—be established as a principle at the beginning and be used as a means of decentralizing activity from the centre of the city to the sub-centres. One

example of this is the discussions which the City of Toronto is now having with the Provincial Government about whether or not it is necessary to double the size of Queen's Park at the corner of Wellesley and Yonge: is that really a good idea? Is that a smart thing to do? Is that a smart place to build a new provincial complex? I can think of one place in Metro where it can be done quite easily and create quite an interesting sort of transportation reversal, and that would be to build Queen's Park in Downsview, or maybe it should be Barrie or Oshawa—I don't know. But they are the sorts of policies that should be pursued by the Provincial Government if it is really serious about a Toronto Centered Region Plan. If it is merely a case of linking up Barrie to Toronto with an enormous rail system to get people behind their typewriters at the Toronto-Dominion Centre, its a waste of time!

The second point I want to touch on: we hear a lot today, in terms of development, about supply and demand. We're told, or I'm told, continuously by a lot of people—I get lots of telephone calls—that all we have to do to regulate the whole process is make sure there is plenty of supply to meet the demand. Everybody who talks to me about this concentrates entirely on the supply side of the formula or equation. They say, "just lets crank up the supply and everything will take care of itself." And nobody ever talks about demand. And if the purpose of increasing supply of anything—whether it be housing or commercial space or whatever it is—is merely to stimulate demand, which it has been in the past and which I suspect it is at the present time, its not going to solve any problem at all. I'm quite prepared as a politician to discuss the supply side of the equation if the people who want to talk about it are at the same time prepared to talk about the demand side; and I mean that in both quantitative and qualitative terms, both the amount of development that might be considered and the quality of that development as to whether it real-

ly will serve social needs. It is very simple in Toronto to open up the gates and provide a heck of a lot of luxury housing—very, very simple. But I don't know that that is really meeting the qualitative demand of the needs of people for housing. So I'm prepared to discuss supply and demand—particularly supply—if people are prepared to discuss demand. I suggest to you that you start to think of demand whenever you think of supply—it's not good enough to talk only about supply. That also relates to population and growth patterns in general.

Finally, —I see that my time is coming up — the third question that I wanted to discuss quickly, is: are the traditional patterns of growth in the urban centre going to continue? Every time I want to think about that, I sober myself up with a little document prepared by the Ontario Government called the Report of the Advisory Committee on Energy. And that is a sobering little document—it's not a fat document—it is quite a thin document—it's in two volumes—it's a set of basic analyses and recommendations and a set of technical back-up papers. As a matter of fact, before I came down here this morning, I took out that little document and I read through it again. Because I think if you are going to talk about urban growth, you've got to read that document. That document suggests that there are going to be very dramatic changes in growth in the future because of upcoming shortages in all the things that urban growth demands—materials, energy, petro-chemical products, electricity—all these things are going to run into short supply. All the heating agents, building supplies, etc., are going to run into short supply. And the reason for it is very simple—people have been talking about it for a long time. It has to do with exponential growth, and exponential growth means that you are using up your resources at such a rate that ultimately you run out of them. The faster you use them up, the quicker the time comes that you run out of them. That little document suggests to me that

very shortly the crunch is going to come. Ask anyone in construction about the cost of building materials. I find that the easiest way to find out where we are going is to read the *Globe and Mail* Business Section and the index down the side every morning. Read all of those little headlines and you'll come away sobered at the sorts of demands we are making on resources, on energy, the sorts of economic problems we are causing for ourselves because of the demands we're making because we want growth. It is my suggestion, I could develop this and develop it extensively, but it is my suggestion that we stop looking at the inevitability of growth in assessing what our future development patterns will be. It is my suggestion that we should be looking at resource allocation, energy allocation, in terms of growth and what that means. In other words, every new development, whether it be a single development or a massive new community, should have attached to it both an energy and resource allocation budget, not just a supply-demand growth budget. As I say, I could develop that quite considerably. But I think that we should look at the planning and growth and development of our urban centres in the future from a quite different viewpoint. If we don't choose a new viewpoint, that viewpoint will overtake us. And I think that the results if it does overtake us, can be an economic disaster in terms of the development of a country like Canada and also the United States. I think that's about my ten minutes. Thank you very much.

SINCLAIR

Thank you Alderman Vaughan. Our next speaker is Mr. Eric Fleming, Executive Director of Urban and Regional Planning at TEIGA. Mr. Fleming is one of two spokesmen of TEIGA who are going to be with us today. Mr. Fleming was born in Glasgow and worked in a number of municipal administrations in Scotland before coming to Canada. He joined the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs in 1964 and was ap-

pointed Director of Municipal Finance in 1967. That Department or Division, I'm not sure which, eventually became part of TEIGA. He eventually became Executive Director of Urban and Regional Planning where he is responsible for, as the term implies, regional planning, local planning policy and government organization. Mr. Fleming:

FLEMING

Ladies and Gentlemen—When the Executive Director of the Bureau, Mr. Bens, asked me to participate in this discussion, my first thought was that it offered a very interesting challenge. I rejected the thought, of course, that it was political platitudes, and of course, it was acutely aware of the difficulty of “solutions”. I don't think there are many jurisdictions in the world that have found a solution to redirect growth—at any rate, an ultimate solution. I still hold that same view, but I thought it might be of interest if I discussed briefly the planning going on in the Ontario Government with regard to redirecting or channelling growth within the Central Ontario Region.

Mr. Vaughan talked for a moment about the Toronto Centered Region and in 1970 the government adopted as its policy an urban structure for this region which was based largely on Growth Plan 2 of the Metro Toronto and Region Transportation Study, but incorporating some of the decentralized aspects arising after the tax report had been published. Principal elements for TCR zone 1 are: a two-tier arrangement of urban communities, defined and linked by a parkway belt and varying in scale and function; reduced emphasis on development to the west of Metro and more emphasis on development in the east towards Oshawa; development along the Yonge Street corridor through Richmond Hill to Aurora-Newmarket was to be held to a minimum. A broad tract to the north—zone 2—was to remain predominantly rural in character. Projected population for all of TCR by the year 2000 was about 8 million. For the zone 1 urban area—5.7 million.

Work began immediately on the definition of the parkway belt and in June 1973 the government introduced legislation joining it in the western portion of the belt; the eastern portion is expected to be announced in the next few months.

In all the studies and work done in central Ontario beginning with the Metro planning area and extending to the present, attention has been focused largely on the Hamilton to Oshawa corridor. This is where the most pressing problems of growth exist—where a large proportion of the Provincial population wishes to live, industry wants to locate, where lake-based servicing makes water supply and sewage disposal relatively inexpensive and where some of the province's most valuable farm land and resources are under heavy pressures. The Advisory Committee on Urban and Regional Planning, which is a Committee of Deputy Ministers of the various ministries in the Ontario Government most concerned with issues related to regional planning, decided that a special task force should be established to define the TCR concept for this area into a more specific structure plan. This study area was called the Central Ontario Lakeshore Urban Complex—CULUC for short—our Minister has made some references to CULUC and COLIC—which consists of Metropolitan Toronto and the Regional Municipalities of Hamilton-Wentworth, Peel, Halton, York and Durham.

The task force is an inter-ministerial group consisting of members from the Ministries of Agriculture and Food, Natural Resources, Transportation and Communications, Environment, Housing, and Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. So even within the Provincial Government, there is a great deal of co-ordination and interrelation involved in this planning; and this, of course, does not include the regional government, Metropolitan Toronto and the individual local municipalities. A steering committee composed of senior members of these ministries directs the activity of

the working group, whose studies and analysis are producing the report. The Regional Planning Commissioners of Metropolitan Toronto and the Regional Municipalities sit as members of the Steering Committee and members of their staffs serve as members of the working group. During the course of the project meetings have been held with other Ministries and agencies, including Community and Social Services, Industry and Tourism, Health and of course, the Ontario Hydro. The terms of reference were:

to prepare a general structure plan for the form of the Central Ontario Lakeshore Urban Complex at full capacity, that is at the completion of the first cycle of development of all urban areas—taking into consideration delineation of definite and conditional areas for urban development, estimates of capacity populations by area, distribution of employment, location roles and accessibility of major nodal points, linkage requirements of the system of centres, and definition of the parkway belt, to recommend such modifications of TCR zone 1 as may be appropriate, to phase the development of the various elements of the structure form, and to identify program requirements or alternatives in relation to immediate needs and issues and to the early stages of planned implementation.

Essentially, the job was to refine the Toronto Centered Region Complex so that it can be used as a common framework by the Ontario Government, by the various Ministries of the Ontario Government, by the regional and local municipalities. The group recognizes that times have changed, public attitudes have changed and that some things may emerge that may lead to a reconsideration of certain aspects of the original policy. But I should emphasize that this particular exercise is not intended to provide for a starting off point for a departure from the original TCR concept or even that changes will be made. It merely points out the

necessity of planning being dynamic rather than static, particularly in this part of Ontario where growth pressures are acute and the rapidly changing society, with changing norms, changing desires, make any static plan probably worse than useless. The plan shows about 20 urban places in a roughly triangular area, bounded by the Oakridges marine, Niagara escarpment and the Lake Ontario shore. Most of the urban places are grouped about an east-west access stretching from Hamilton to Oshawa and in a lesser north-south access along Yonge Street. Those along the lakeshore appear in two tiers—one on the shore itself and the other about 5 miles to the north. Five centres are seen as forming the framework—Hamilton, Toronto, Oshawa, Mississauga, and North Pickering. These in varying degrees are expected to form major centres of influence and services within the area. Thus Toronto will provide the widest range of specialized services, the centre of government—and Mr. Vaughan I don't think was suggesting that the centre of government should be changed, but perhaps that some of us civil servants should be moved to Barrie—research institutions, specialized medical services, major financial institutions, and so on. Hamilton and Oshawa are two centres which might be expected to have post-secondary educational facilities, department stores, large hospitals, and these sort of facilities. The other urban places would provide services and facilities related to their particular size and their particular sphere of influence. The system capacity has a population of 6 to 8 million people—remember, I'm talking now of 40 years hence—sometime after the year 2020 and we call this maturity. By then all the urban places would have achieved their functional population levels. Process similar to that carried out, the preparation of plan preferences, followed by review is being carried out for the years 1986 and 2001, making use of computer models which help to identify the effects of alternative transportation programs, types, services, facilities

etc. Following this process, the plan will be reviewed, if necessary revised, taking into account also the comments made by participating agencies throughout the project.

Central Ontario Lakeshore Urban Complex, of course, is more than simply a system of urban places. Necessary to the achievement of quality of life, which is an illusive term, is open space. The urban area is bounded in the south by Lake Ontario, the major recreation resource, on the west by the Niagara Escarpment, and on the north by the Oakridge marine. The spine of the Parkway belt runs continuously east-west through the complex, while the valleys and the parkway mini-belts run north-south. The lakeshore is being extensively developed as a recreational resource. Protection of the Niagara Escarpment, for example—Niagara has provincial policy status and there is a Niagara Escarpment Commission established with terms of reference to plan the whole area of the Niagara Escarpment; and, of course the parkway belt plan provides preservation of a variety of recreational facilities as well as being a transportation and services corridor.

I think that I have probably been somewhat less than ten minutes—I happen to have something to do with amateur swimming—I'm always trying to be the stopwatch. I think I succeeded. Thank you very much.

SINCLAIR

Nine minutes on the button. Thank you Mr. Fleming. Our next speaker is another key member of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—I find that an awful mouthful—I prefer to say TEIGA. Mr. Don Taylor was born in St. Johns, New Brunswick. Mr. Taylor is a graduate of the University of New Brunswick in Civil Engineering and took his post-graduate training in city and regional planning at M.I.T. and Harvard. He was Director of the Planning Division of the New Brunswick Department of Industry and Reconstruction—then moved to Ontario—good choice—and became chief planner in the Com-

munity Planning Branch in the Ontario Department of Planning and Development, which eventually became part of TEIGA; and in 1972 he assumed his present responsibilities as Executive Director of the Local Government Services Division. He is, among other things responsible for the parkway belt, west and east, which he assures me is one of those extra jobs you take on which take up about 12 hours a day of your time. Mr. Taylor:

TAYLOR

To have two representatives of TEIGA on the same panel may be just too much. I hope that Eric and I don't create several cases of acute indigestion.

My presentation will deal with an aspect of urban growth which is quite different from that which has been discussed or I expect will be discussed by other members of the panel. So different, in fact, that I wondered if I should present it at all. However, I'm committed, so I guess I might as well proceed.

Urban settlements had been forming in Northern Ontario for many years based on the exploitation of renewable and non-renewable natural resources—primarily forest products and mining. The formation of settlements accelerated after the turn of the century, following very rapid increases in population generated by the discovery of new and rich bodies of gold, silver, cobalt and iron. An indication of the pace of growth can be secured by examining the population statistics for the period 1901 to 1931 in the various northern districts. The District of Temiskaming grew at the rate of 27% per year in 1901 to 1911. The District of Sudbury grew at the rate of 15% per year in the period 1901 to 1921. The District of Cochrane at the rate of 25% per year between 1911 and 1931. Compare these rates to the 1.2% per year for York County between 1961 and 1971. In absolute population terms, the picture is quite different from Southern Ontario. In 1971 the total population of the northern districts, occupying about 85% of the total land area of the province,

constituted less than 10% of the province's population. The total population in the north in a 70 year period from 1901 to 1971 was just slightly greater than the population growth in York County in the 1961 to 1971 period. The difference is accentuated when it is realized that York County constitutes less than 1/5th of 1% of Ontario's land area.

The interesting point about urban growth and the great north and the root of many of the problems is not the rate of growth or the absolute population size but rather the physical form assumed by the settlement pattern which emerged. While in southern Ontario the trend has been toward an increasing percentage of the population moving toward a few urban magnets, producing one set of problems, the trend in northern Ontario has generally been toward a larger number of small settlements scattered widely throughout a tremendously large area, producing an entirely different set of problems. The reasons for the particular pattern assumed in the north are many. I'll mention only a few. The extremely difficult terrain, both topographically and geologically which made it impossible, in many instances, to have continuous growth; the almost complete absence of any local government structure, which made the selection of building sites very much an individual decision; the wide physical distribution of employment sources, the limited size of most employment sources, the continual feeling that the jobs were of a short term nature which mitigated against the expenditure on concentrated urban structure which tends to attract population; the nature of industry which tended to push places of residences, in many instances, as far away as possible, within the constraints of the available transportation system; the almost total absence of any provincial hand to guide the nature of the settlements; and in many cases an almost complete lack of applied common sense. The particular population distribution assumed, combined with a lack of even minimal stan-

dards of construction and site configuration, produced just about every problem ever conceived by man in his reaction to the natural environment. Slums which make Toronto's worst look like Rosedale in comparison, gross population of both surface and sub-surface water resources, almost unintelligible land title situations, inadequate educational opportunities, poor health records, inability to attract other than the most dedicated professional staff, extremely high turnover of staff resulting in high costs of production, extremely inefficient transportation systems, very limited shopping choices, narrow range of job opportunities and extremely high costs of public servicing and rehabilitation.

At the later stage when someone finally decided that something had to be done about the problems which were being generated, the consequences of the highly scattered and totally uncontrolled settlements were very gradually recognized. A few of the more responsible industries began to take faltering steps towards influencing the shape and quality of the settlements by actually designing and building settlements for their employees. This helped in some instances in improving the physical shape of things but often produced management-labour problems and social schism which to some were as dangerous as the physical problems which they sought to solve. The problems of company towns have been described in numerous research works in the past.

The province of Ontario is one of the parties concerned about what was happening. For one thing, they were afraid that they were going to have to provide the cash necessary to solve the problems that had developed and which would develop further unless they did something to change the situation. Atikokan was probably the first experience of the province about 1946. This was a federal-provincial planned assembly operation but it was fundamentally a major residential addition to Atikokan—an existing community and not a new town. In 1953 an opportunity came

along for the province to do something comprehensive. Two mining companies, contemplating the development of a copper-lead-zinc mine in the area northwest of White River, came to the province with a proposition which went something like this: "Now look, we don't want company towns and you probably don't want more of what has happened around other mining camps in the North. Why don't you locate, design and build one community which will serve the new population to be generated by our mine, probably other mines yet to be found and perhaps even future forest product operations potential to the area?" It really wasn't as clean-cut as this but in any event, the Province, after much argument, agreed to do just that. Over the next two years, the community, called Manitouwadge was built by the province. It now has a population of approximately 4,000 and serves as the only settlement in a broad geographic area serving a group of mines and an expanding forest produce industry. The settlement pattern is quite unique to the north in that it is a concentrated urban community surrounded by no urban growth for a distance of approximately 50 miles.

This experiment in provincial intervention has been followed by quite a number of others over the past twenty years. I'll mention just a few, Elliott Lake, Ear Falls, Moosonee, Temagami and a considerable number of others on the drawing board at the present time. Some are similar to Manitouwadge and some quite different in approach. But one provincial attitude has been characteristic of them all. The province has made it quite clear by its direct building operations, through its land control mechanisms and its land disposition policies, that it is anxious to secure concentration of new growth in as few urban areas as possible, and these centres will be located at points in space which will produce the maximum social, economic and physical benefits for the people who live in the North and for the benefit of the province as a whole. This attitude is clearly enunciated in

the regional plans prepared and being prepared under the design for development program. The communities which I have mentioned meet, I believe, all the criteria enumerated by J.L. Short in the background paper # 1 distributed in advance of this conference, and can be called new towns. These new towns are particularly strong in meeting the spatial restriction criteria in that they are physically separated from their nearest urban neighbours by greenbelts up to several hundred miles in width, just slightly wider than the parkway belt west. I think I have been dealing with redirection of growth in a sense but I'm not at all certain that I have been dealing with "Redirecting Growth: Political Platitudes or Practical Solutions". Thank you very much.

SINCLAIR

Thank you Mr. Taylor, I must say that I was delighted when Mr. Taylor told me that he intended to talk about northern communities and not the golden horseshoe. I think it is useful to remind ourselves once in a while that our problems here are not the only ones, nor necessarily the most acute. Our next speaker is Mayor Dorian Parker of the City of Barrie, and I'm happy to say that she is a native of Ontario. She was born in Angus and has lived in Barrie most of her life. She tells me she has been interested in municipal affairs since the age of 10. She was an ardent fan of Agnes McPhail and of Charlotte Whitton. She has worked all her life, ever since she was 16 so she did not need a book about how mature women should go about entering the work force —she spent six years on City Council before being elected two years ago as the first woman mayor of the City of Barrie and her main ambition at the moment is to seek another term in the same position. Mayor Parker.

PARKER

Ladies and gentlemen, I am really grateful for this opportunity to participate in this interesting panel, and also to participate in your topic for discus-

sion this morning, namely: "Redirecting Growth: Political Platitudes or Practical Solutions".

We are given definitions of "new towns", "new cities" and "new communities" and are told that new communities are concerned with the problem of insuring that growth will occur in such a way as to maximize social and economic potential. All of this, like the Toronto-Centred Region as well as the proposed Pickering Airport, is based on the *assumption* that the exponential growth of populations and industry that we have experienced in the past will continue far into the future. Let us examine this assumption for a moment.

For some years now, the United Nations, as well as many of the world's leading scientists, have been warning us that our population trend is putting us on a collision course with disaster; our non-renewable resources are being rapidly used up; almost all the world's good farmland is, at present, in use; and our environment is deteriorating at an unprecedented rate. Articles in scientific journals by geologists and geophysicists for the past three or four years have been pointing out that our supply of fossil fuels is very limited and the very recent energy crisis has emphasized this point. Newspaper articles now indicate that world food reserves are very low.

To decide on a course of action without taking these warnings into account would not be planning at all—it would be a failure in our leadership.

Even though we plan to halt growth, it is evident that for a number of years the populations will continue to increase, so accommodation must be provided. Small towns often lack adequate medical and dental services, hospitals, libraries and other amenities. Towns and cities of from 30,000 to 50,000 are capable of providing everything necessary for a high quality of life. However beyond the 50,000 population figure, problems increase faster than benefits derived. There is much to be said, then, for building up the smaller towns, with due consideration for the physical limitations of the area (such as adequate water supplies

and sewage disposal facilities) and the need to preserve our farmland. When the best size for a city has been established, it could be maintained with a suitable greenbelt.

In the pamphlet produced for this meeting, it is stated that: "The ultimate responsibility for determining how growth shall occur would appear to lie somewhere between the various levels of government and the private development industry". With all due respect I do not agree with this statement because since "developers" and "speculators" are the main, if not the only beneficiaries of growth, they should not be allowed to influence the decision. And above all, we must not confuse "growth" with "progress".

Madam Chairman, Members of the Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen, these are some of my comments that are appropriate and apply to the topic for discussion this morning. I hope they are meaningful, unbiased and fruitful. And again, I want to thank you for this opportunity of appearing as one of your panelists. I consider it a personal honour, as well as an honour to the City of Barrie, for an invitation to be extended to the City of Barrie's first lady Councillor and its first lady Mayor. Thank you so much.

SINCLAIR

Thank you Mayor Parker. Our next and final speaker is Mr. Len Gertler, who studied economics and planning at Queen's University, the University of Toronto and at McGill. He is a native of Montreal. He was head of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Waterloo University and he now holds the position of Director General of the Research Branch of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs. He is also the author of a report called "New City" which deals with the process of planning and building of new communities. Mr. Gertler:

GERTLER

Thank you madam Chairman. For even a sometimes Ottawa bureaucrat to

come here in the midst of the professional, business, and political establishment of Toronto is a somewhat terrifying experience. I'm somewhat provoked by the last remarks, the remarks of the charming mayor of the City of Barrie on the growth issue. I can't help linking up a situation which she refers to to the circumstances which we find ourselves in globally at this moment. In the period 1966 to 1971, 78% of the growth in Metro Toronto was due to foreign immigrants. And I think that this was just a symptom of the fact that when we speak of growth with some appreciation of world conditions, that we must be aware that the very circumstances that the good mayor of Barrie has referred to may place special obligations on a country like Canada to relate to that growth and to do something constructive about it. It seems to me that it places certain areas of policy at the highest level of priority—policies related to that situation—the population explosion situation—and of course these policies include trade and aid and technical assistance, participation in international affairs and immigration. So I think that it may well be that places like the Toronto Centred Region for quite some time will have to devise policies to accommodate growth, if in fact Canada is to pull its weight globally.

This leads me into simply identifying those categories of development situations in Canada in which consideration of new communities amongst a number of other policy instruments may be pertinent. The first relates to the urban centered region, TCR, and the kind of regional city concept that Eric Fleming was speaking of. The second relates to achieving a better balance between provinces, to buffer differences in development and opportunities. And the third relates to modifying urban patterns nationally and to the development of new communities in relation to the development of resources.

As we move up the scale from the regional to the national, each level has had its own peculiar conditions of success. At the level of the Toronto Centred

Region there's a very critical problem of timing and sequence, and the creating of an effective mechanism to reshape the form of growth, and this came to mind as Eric Fleming was speaking because I think his emphasis on coordination is "right on." But the question for me is: just what is the mechanism for affecting the really substantial changes in growth patterns that are involved, if you want even to approximate the Toronto Centred concept? But at the other two scales, issues of economic development, of course, become absolutely critical and urban policy begins to merge with regional economic policy.

Whatever type, however, is involved, they all face certain typical problems or challenges. I have identified these as: finding the capital for acquiring substantial amounts of land and financing the basic utilities, transportation networks and social services, before a tax base has been created; this is essential to suppress the tendency of a large urban development to produce, by raising expectations, a level of land prices that is prohibitive; to initiate before development and to sustain throughout quite a long development period an effective planning process; to create by skillful design the best urban qualities of spontaneous growth while attaining a high standard of functional efficiency; and to find a way of administering the development and the ongoing affairs of the new community which is effective in a technical sense but still responsive to the residents and takes into account the future as well as the present.

In this country, both the provinces and the federal government have given the subject some policy attention. We have heard a bit about the Ontario response. I realize anything I say about the federal response today carries a certain connotation. However, I'll take that risk because I did have some involvement at least a year ago in the establishment of a new communities' section in the National Housing Act. And I just want to mention some of the features of that policy instrument. In essence, what the amendment does is to provide

capital assistance, (either on a 90% loan basis or through federal-provincial partnership on a 75 - 25 basis) for assembling land and installing major utilities for new communities and to provide research and planning grants for the development of new communities. There are a number of other features. One is the biasing of the tenure of land towards lease rather than ownership by allowing an amortization period of 50 rather than 25 years. Then there are a number of other provisions which relate to the necessary provincial involvement in this process. Those provisions are that, through agreements with the provinces, the planning context of new communities within the province, the responsible agencies for new community development and the ways and means of assuring that public investments accrue to the public that these things have to be provided for in an agreement. I think that it is also significant that to this date I don't believe that this piece of legislation has been used, which may be a commentary in itself, I don't know.

Now, in looking at new communities as one instrument to deal with the problems of urban growth, it seems to me that it behooves us to look at the experience of other places that have had a little more exposure to this instrument. And there is one thing that I think stands out very clearly: wherever you have had relative success in the use and development of the new community instrument it has been characterized either by this policy having a strong civic basis, such as in Stockholm and Helsinki, or it being an aspect of *national urban policy*, as in Great Britain. And in each case, the people, the agencies, the societies concerned, have gone from their basic objectives to fashion pretty effective processes and institutions for carrying out the planning and building of new communities. I refer to the very sophisticated pattern of the city of Stockholm which has created development corporations of its own which handle the whole development process from servicing the land to welcoming the first entry into the nursery.

I refer to the very interesting experiment of the housing foundation in Helsinki; and of course to the new towns corporations of Great Britain. I think there is a lesson in this because each of these is a very carefully prepared and deliberate process. Now in Canada, we are not quite there—I think that perhaps we don't fully appreciate the enormity of the challenge yet—we're in the process of finding our way. I think that another point that emerges from international experience is that we must use this experience in combination with others. This has come out very clearly in a recent O.E.C.D. Survey of 9 countries which very clearly demonstrated that using the new community instrument without relation to land use, environmental, economic development, taxation and other instruments is just not good enough. There are of course other things that I would like to say—perhaps my main message is that there is some evidence that the new community technique offers some opportunity for us to shape our urban destinies, that it has some very special requirements, that we have to learn to use it with greater skill and given the force of urbanization and the underlying population push, it is very likely that we will have to use the instrument and that we should concentrate on learning how to use it well. Thank you.

SINCLAIR

Thank you Mr. Gertler. Gentlemen, I think we will get started now. Will you please take your seats. The panelists are all here and we have 20 minutes for questions. There is a microphone in the centre aisle and I would ask you to use it please. Who would like to lead off with the first question?

QUESTION:

Mayor Parker, I was interested in your comments about the development of new towns and how you favoured the development to an optimum size of perhaps 50,000. But I was wondering if you could elaborate with regard to the significance of that for Barrie, how you

would personally like to see Barrie grow in the future, and how your aspirations relate to the provincial plans for Barrie.

PARKER

Let's take the first question about the Toronto Centred Region and it is my personal opinion that the proponents of the Toronto Centred Region are now having second thoughts on what they were projecting. My projection as it applies to Barrie is somewhat limited by its location on Kempenfelt Bay. I certainly wouldn't want to see it developed such as Toronto has done around Lake Ontario with six lane highways and expressways and development right on the waterfront. Those are some of my concerns.

I'm personally not for regional government. I think though that our borders have to expand to accommodate if nothing at all, additional industrial land. Adding to the residential population we have now, along with our commercial, I think the established ratio that we all aim for is the 60 - 40 ratio; and in order to do that, of course, you have to keep a close watch on the expansion of your subdivisions and your residential population. Of course, I draw a difference between a growth rate and a population rate. And I think generally, if you could establish a 60 - 40 ratio to apply to any municipality then you're in the ball park. Now in regards to my remarks about towns or cities to 50,000 population, I think that's a nice size to enable a community or municipality to provide the hard core services such as I spoke of—sewage, roads, schools, — these are just some of them. And in order to do this, we would have to call on the sources of revenue and of course, that is the tax payer. And whether you get it at the federal level, the provincial level or the local level—it's you and I. We are the tax payers. These are all considerations that I think have to be taken into account before you jump on the bandwagon and say, "oh yes, let's just grow for growing's sake" without really knowing where you are planning or going. Those are just some of my

concerns and I hope I've answered your question.

QUESTION:

Perhaps I could ask Colin Vaughan how he draws a distinction between the centre of the City and the suburban areas in their potential for future growth. I think that both of them are essentially developed, and in the suburbs in particular, the urban fabric is relatively new. You're talking about urban development in either circumstance. How can you really talk seriously about any major increase in density in areas which are already developed?

VAUGHAN

Well if I left the impression that I was suggesting that there would be a major increase through redevelopment, I'm sorry because I didn't. What I meant to convey was that there was a limitation—a very strict limitation on any new development or an increase in development in the City of Toronto. I suggested that the sort of planning that we should be pursuing is stabilizing the inner city community.

With regard to the suburbs, I still think that they were badly planned and I think that one of the problems of the suburbs—and it is being confirmed by Borough politicians in the City of Toronto—is that their densities are so low that they can't provide adequate level of services in many cases and I mentioned the example of transportation. I wouldn't increase the population of the suburban areas beyond the limit that it needed to maintain adequate community services. I think that one could increase the population of Metro by only a very limited amount. I think in the centre of the city its a case of stabilization—stabilizing the existing growth. In terms of the suburbs, it's a reinforcing of the fabric which is in many cases weak because of its lack of density—and I'm not suggesting any dramatic increase in density, but I am suggesting an increase merely as a reinforcement, and that's it. To a large extent, we've reached the end of

the sort of growth pattern that has taken place in the Metropolitan area and I think we are talking about rehabilitation in that respect. So I'm not suggesting an enormous growth. I'm merely suggesting a stabilization—packing it together again in a different form.

I really seriously question the provincial projections of 6 and 8 million in an urban centre. Frankly I don't think that our resources on economic energy system can handle it. That's why I finished where I did—questioning the whole pattern of growth and whether it's going to continue. And I don't think it is. In the next 30 years, we are not going to be dealing with projections of increases of population growth for the year 2030. We're going to try to find ways to make our economic and social environment satisfactory in the face of very difficult economic and social circumstances. It's going to get worse—its not going to get better. So I think we should be looking at the containment of growth; policy at the municipal level is relatively easy. At the federal and provincial levels we should be addressing ourselves not to how many people can live in the Toronto Centred Region in the year 2020 or 2030. What we should be looking at is how can we obtain a satisfactory sort of minimal standard of living for the people who are here already. In the context of the lack of resources to sustain growth. That's the fundamental question facing us—it's going to get worse too. So I'm sorry if I left the impression that I was suggesting any major increase—I'm really not.

QUESTION:

I'm Lorne Almack—I would like to ask Mr. Gertler if he seriously thinks that the accommodation of immigration growth in the Toronto Centred Region is really beneficial or helpful to the world population explosion.

GERTLER

I'm glad you asked that question because it gives me an opportunity to clarify a very complex situation. I was

not saying what you were inferring by your question. What I was saying was this—that the fact is that in the recent period of rapid growth in the Toronto Centred Region about ¾ of it came from immigrants; and this I simply cite as a symptom of the fact that Canada has played some role in relation to the world population situation. There are very severe limits to anyone being able to control the absolute level of world population. I'm not inferring from that observation that the Toronto Centred Region should have 6 million or 5 million or what have you. What I am saying is that as a country we have to be a bit careful about how we deal with the growth concept, because in terms of living standards, we are relatively favoured. As long as in this world the per capita income between wealthy countries like ours and the poorest is in the ratio of 50 to 1 we just can't keep a low profile on this issue. I think we have to ask ourselves whether our attempts to apply no-growth on a parochial basis is a position of privilege and protection of our own goodies. Now by the same token it seems to me that what are absolutely central in Canada are policies on the pattern of distribution of population in the country; we suffer from too great a disparity in the distribution of population and that disparity has been increasing and the typical pattern is the centralized one. And this has some correlation—(I think this is clear—I could cite figures on the relationship between city size and per capita income.) This has a correlation to the distribution of opportunities of all kinds and so I would agree that in dealing with this whole issue the questions of distribution of urban development as between Toronto and Northern Ontario are key issues.

SINCLAIR

I believe Alderman Vaughan would like to comment on this point.

VAUGHAN

I agree with Mr. Almack. I think that can be developed quite dramatically. Mr. Gertler stated a role for Toronto

and sort of expended a little bit into provincial development. It seemed to me that what he was promoting was the idea that there was a responsibility on Toronto and, through decentralization, the provinces to solve world problems of population and poverty through growth and expansion.

I think that the problem was that he didn't take it back a further step. He didn't start to deal on an international level between countries and I think that to suggest that the city of Toronto, or Metropolitan Toronto or southern Ontario or New Brunswick or British Columbia should be used as the excuse for justifying immigration because of the activities of multi-national corporations that are ripping off the countries where the people are coming from is just damn stupid! The classic example of this is Jamaica where 2 or 3 large multi-national companies are stripping out the resources of that country and causing a great deal of pain and poverty and social problems in the country itself, and those goods, those little pieces of that country are being shipped up here to be translated into aluminium goods; and in order to increase the market for aluminum goods which are being stripped out of Jamaica, we're transporting Jamaicans into Toronto to use up the aluminum goods. Now that's a really stupid way of equalizing income! It's really insane. And the thing that I'd like to see Jamaica do is take the bauxite mines and start to distribute the wealth at source rather than try to use that sort of system in distribution of wealth. I think it's a ridiculous way to do it and to suggest that we organize our own growth patterns to exploit the people in underdeveloped nations. In that way I think it's insulting to the underdeveloped nations and I think that if we're going to have distribution or redistribution of world wealth, it should be done on a different level than growth in Canada.

GERTLER

Well, I don't quite see how you can put the burden of all that on me. I heartily agree with your observations

about the need for social change in Jamaica but if I'm stupid in my remarks, then Canada has been built by stupid people because a lot of us came in response to population pressures to this country, either we or our fathers or grandfathers and so on. The point that I'm making, which is not a very subtle or complicated one is simply that there is a relationship on the population issue, there is a relationship between domestic population policy and global population policy and that immigration and population growth are but one aspect of our relationship with the rest of the world. I don't think we can dispose of the issue in entirely parochial terms. To say to the world that we should try and do something about population growth and be aware of the limits of growth internationally is one thing. To apply it parochially to a region, or to a province or to a country is quite another.

SINCLAIR

Perhaps I could take this point just one step further, I think it will be the last and ultimate question. Isn't it a fact from what both Alderman Vaughan and Mr. Gertler said that a large part of the problem consists in the fact that the demand in centres like Toronto exceeds the supply, I believe Alderman Vaughan said there is too much emphasis on increasing the supply and not enough on reducing the demand, and this I gathered applies particularly to newcomers to this country who settle in the large cities because that is where they want to be with the other people who came before them. Now what do you do about this situation. How do you reduce the demand short of building government offices in Downsview, which it seems to me would be relatively minor part of the solution?

VAUGHAN

Well, let's get back to the situation of population demand and wealth and various other things. I think that in the example of Jamaica—you know you can take a dozen countries—while the system exists, let people immigrate, be-

cause at least let's try to get some economic equalization. But the root of the problem is to try to equalize on a world-wide basis, not to try to equalize on local-regional-city basis. It just seems to me that many of the economic social problems in Africa or in some parts of Europe and Asia would be better handled by the opportunity of wealth and development within those countries than here, in terms of their independence as well. That seems to be fundamental. I was saying to someone during the coffee break that I think the best lesson we've had in the western world was when the Arabs cut off the oil. Really nice. I think that was probably a very salubrious lesson for all of us about the sorts of pressures that we're putting on countries outside of ourselves in terms of satisfying our appetites.

SINCLAIR

With all due respect, that was not my question. What I wanted to know was how do you persuade the Italian family who comes to Canada that they would be better off in Kingston or in Kapuskasing or in Saskatoon than in Toronto or Montreal?

VAUGHAN

Well I would like to suggest through economic means that they would be better off in Milan. I mean there is a reason why they come. I don't disagree with people immigrating to this country. It seems to me to be a matter of redistribution we're talking about. It's to give economic opportunity through resources within the localities the people come from.

SINCLAIR

Well this is a fascinating discussion, but unfortunately we're out of time. I'd like to thank all our panelists for presenting their views in such an interesting way and in such a concise way. Thank you very much.

We will start our second panel discussion now. We only have two panel-

ists this time, but unfortunately we are so late we cannot allow them more than 10 minutes again, if we are going to have time for a few questions. We're going to start off with Mr. Peter Langer who is Executive Vice President and Director of Markborough Properties Ltd. which is a major real estate development firm. Mr. Langer hails from the same part of the world as I do—more or less—he's Viennese by birth. He's very active—has been active in real estate development for 27 years, he's the past president of the Toronto Real Estate Board, former vice president of the Ontario Association of Real Estate Boards and a Director of the Ontario Housing Corporation since its inception in 1964. He's also a Director of the Ontario Student Housing Corporation and a vice president of the Urban Development Institute of Ontario, which is no mean list of distinctions. Mr. Peter Langer:

LANGER

When I received the invitation to serve on this panel I was asked to discuss whether new communities should be more exclusively the responsibility of the private or the public sector. The title given to this panel goes even further - it talks about impetus and even control.

As you must have gathered from the introduction given by me the panel moderator, I am to some extent sitting on both sides of the fence - I am obviously deeply involved in the creation of new communities by private enterprise, but as a director of the Ontario Housing Corporation I have also to concern myself with the development of new communities by the public sector.

Personally I tend to believe that private enterprise is doing an outstanding job in the creation of new communities, but I also believe that at least some of the impetus - or at least some encouragement in various forms should come from the public sector. And as far as control is concerned I don't think there has ever been a thought in the developer's mind that he should be permitted to proceed without certain

controls being exercised by the public sector. That some of these controls are too restrictive and most unimaginative and others not sufficiently restrictive is quite another matter, which perhaps I might try to discuss a little later.

What I am really saying is that the private sector is best equipped and most capable of executing the creation of new communities, but that it is most desirable - and even essential if a proper governmental overall master plan for development is in existence - that the plans for such new communities conform to the controls established by the public sector, and it is also most desirable that some of the impetus does in fact come from the public sector as well as from the private sector.

It might perhaps be of assistance if I explained my own attitude with regard to joint efforts and co-operation of the private and public sectors in the matter of the creation of new communities. I have always advocated that there be close co-operation and co-ordination between the private and the public sector in the field of development. Just about six years ago, I implored both developers and in particular government officials to co-operate more closely, instead of taking the then fashionable adversary positions.

I think we have come a long way since then, both the Comay Report and the present attitude of the provincial government appear to point in the direction of co-operation and closer co-ordination for the purpose of establishing new communities.

Obviously it is easiest for me to use our new community, Meadowvale, for the purpose of illustrating how private enterprise can and does perform in creating new communities. I understand that you have received a background paper dealing with "The problems involved in the development of a new town", and address which I gave to the society of Real Estate Appraisers in December 1971. This background paper contains a fairly detailed description of Meadowvale and its history of development.

I will therefore not dwell on these details now, but I would briefly like to refer to our original Meadowvale promotional literature published in 1970. The first paragraph of the preamble to our Meadowvale information book reads as follows:

"Meadowvale information is a dynamic new design for urban living . . . a dramatic plan for a total community . . . a pace setter for balanced, harmonious development in the 1970's and beyond.

It is part of the largest, most comprehensively planned and closely related group of communities ever to be undertaken in North America.

Meadowvale is intended for people of all ages, all occupations and aspirations, and virtually all incomes.

The environment will be complete: housing to accommodate every need, education in the fullest sense, employment in all kinds of industries, recreation to suit every inclination, town centres to serve the commercial and cultural needs, and roads and walkways that knit these elements together.

Basically, Meadowvale is people living, learning, working, playing and growing in a new urban lifestyle in the midst of open space and parks."

I am proud to say that we are fulfilling, and are going to fulfill these promises made in the beginning. Although we never are entirely satisfied with our own efforts - we always strive to do better, we have produced what not only we believe but what we have been told by various unbiased sources, is an excellent new community. The reasons for this are many and varied - sometimes relatively minor decisions may have a major impact on a development. An early decision to establish our project administration, planning, urban design, engineering and landscape offices on site to ensure complete control from the

outset, was perhaps an unusual one, as our head office is within a 30-minute drive from Meadowvale. But the advantages in addition to closer control are manifold — the easier liaison with local governments, with local residents, with the newcomers to Meadowvale has proven to be of great benefit to this development.

Before development had even started we built our Meadowvale information pavilion. Not only does it disseminate information to the prospective meadowvale homeowners, to the prospective industrialist locating in the Meadowvale industrial park, to the local residents and politicians, but it also serves to explain the Meadowvale concept and progress to date. The pavilion has played host to countless student groups from public schools, high schools and universities; to school boards, planning boards, members of local and provincial governments, to politicians and developers from overseas as far as Australia and Japan, but it also serves as a meeting place for local resident church groups and similar associations. It is interesting to note that since its doors opened we have had some 60,000 visitors pass through the pavilion.

Probably the most important tool for the purpose of controlling the development of new communities is our environmental development control. Before explaining this method of control, I want to say a few words about the control and discipline we impose on ourselves when developing a new community. First we prepare a complete detailed inventory of all the natural features of the lands to be developed. This includes a detailed inventory of all trees, bushes, hedgegroves including their conditions: rivers, creeks and drainage depressions. Then we ensure that these natural features are built into the plan and thus the destruction or unnecessary removal of these natural features is avoided and the original landscape features are retained.

In addition, after the usual planning and engineering functions are carried out with respect to land use servicing, the open space system is critically reviewed

in detail with respect to the new landscape features we will create, including trees, shrubs, feature planting areas, sitting areas, playgrounds, fencing, park walkways including their lighting, pedestrian underpasses connecting parkways across arterial roads, baseball and football fields, mounding including toboggan hills and other features. Major recreational facilities such as arenas, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, wading pools and tennis courts are established in the overall community plan. These major facilities as well as public libraries are paid for by us but constructed by the municipality.

As mentioned before the major tool to control the development of new communities is our Environmental Development Control System, or abbreviated E.D.C. This system ties in every building, be it residential, industrial, or commercial, as well as every structure be it a fence, a patio or some mounding, all landscaping, much of which is obligatory, into the overall community plan. We provide very explicit manuals both for residential and for industrial buildings, which outline in great detail our requirements and goals for the orderly and esthetic development of Meadowvale. Stringent covenants are included in all our deeds and registered on title.

We exercise strict control of our E.D.C. and covenants both prior to construction as well as after the sale of the completed product. We have had great arguments with substantial industries — and with homebuilders, but we have stuck to our guns and have now proven to everyone's satisfaction how beneficial these controls have been and how much they have contributed to the excellence of our development.

We have had very few problems with residents who have erected illegal fences, unsightly porches or used gaudy paints, all without the required prior approval by us, when we asked them to rectify these matters.

While we might be accused of creating another level of control in addition to all the government controls we feel that this system has been set up and works

for the benefit of the community, the individual residents, the builders and ourselves. It helps us to bring about as perfect a new community as possible.

I apologize for going into some of these matters in considerable detail, but I am anxious to convey the thought to you that the execution of the new community development is well left in the hands of the private sector.

As I said in the beginning I also am convinced that there must be a considerable input by the public sector. There are a number of obvious reasons for public control of location — the new community must fit in with any overall plan in existence, such as the Central Ontario Region Plan (formerly known as the TCR plan), with transportation facilities, and in general with the desire by the various levels of government where to locate these new communities. It is interesting to note that most of the new communities created in the Toronto area, such as Don Mills, Bramalea, Erin Mills, Mississauga City and Meadowvale fit in reasonably well with provincial and municipal plans, yet in all of them the impetus came from the private sector and not from the public sector.

The public sector involvement could take many more forms. In the United States the public sector can get involved in the direct financing of new communities. The public sector can and does get involved in the provision of some of the major trunk services, such as the South Peel Servicing Scheme, covering certain sanitary sewage and water trunk systems, but yet leaving the developer with the financing of very major storm water disposal systems. New communities do require tremendous front-end financing—and to encourage these developments assistance by government in the form of providing some of the trunk services appears to be a reasonable approach. Regardless of who in fact pays for these services, eventually they are paid for by the end user, either as sewer and water charges over a period of time—or through mortgage payments if paid for by the private sector.

Politically the development of new

communities by the private sector is much preferable than their development by the public sector. The private sector can act as an insulator between the various levels of government—it seems that tensions and difficulties appear whenever one level of government deals with another level of government. In a development by the private sector government is also sheltered from direct political pressures which often are counter-productive. It would be extremely difficult for government to enforce the kind of environmental control I have described, when direct political pressure can be brought upon the people endeavouring to enforce these controls. There is no doubt in my mind that the public sector does not like to enforce these controls.

In the development of new communities the private developer is in fact the only representative and spokesman for the future residents—be it the homeowner, tenant, industrialist, employee or shopkeeper in the new community. Invariably local government represents the residents, who are able to bring political pressure to bear on their representatives. The public developer, regardless of which level of government it represents, would be prone to similar pressures, and is therefore unable to serve the best interests of the future resident.

The incentive to succeed, to do an outstanding job of development, will always rest with the private sector. Bureaucracy simply does not have the incentive, the desire, the inspiration nor the continuity of effort all of which is so essential to the really successful development of new communities. The constantly exercised political pressures exerted upon the public sector, yet at the same time the lack of economic pressure combine to negate even the efforts of those in the public sector who would try to make an honest effort to succeed.

The Bureau of Municipal Research in 1972 issued a civic affairs bulletin "The Toronto Region's Privately Developed New Communities". I assume many of you have read it—I agree with some and

disagree with other of their recommendations. But I do think that some of the comments are relevant to today's discussion and therefore permit me to briefly quote—first from the synopsis:

"The Bureau finds that the type of new community being built by private developers ties in well with regional plans and needs, and recommends that the experience of private developers be taken into consideration in the formulation of provincial new community policy. No major criticisms can be made of area privately developed new communities in the context of goals set by the developers and constraints presented to them. One exception to this generalization may be the original decision to develop a new community in a given location: adjustments to circumstances may be made, but often, not enough attention is given to potential problems. Aside from this, developers have made many advances towards extremely efficient methods of servicing land, in timing land development and building, in overall planning and in local government relations. The province should use the experience and expertise of the private new community developers. Although the experience of other countries and other systems should also be used, the unique experience of the private developer in the Canadian—even in the Ontario—social, political, economic and financial climates should provide a major input into the analysis and structuring of a policy. Methods which worked best in the past, with the smallest number of negative effects, must be part of a future system. Also, as pointed out, the province would be well advised to use the types of densities and housing mixes used in privately developed new communities."

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a real pleasure speaking to you today and I thank you for your kind attention.

SINCLAIR

And thank you Mr. Langer. Our next speaker I suspect is going to present the other side of the coin. He is Professor Shoukry T. Roweis of the Department

of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Toronto. Professor Roweis is a native of Cairo, Egypt. He graduated in architecture and worked for 11 years for the Egyptian government as an urban planner. He subsequently went to the United States where he earned his M.Sc. in urban planning at Purdue University and Ph.D. also in urban planning at M.I.T. He joined the staff of the University of Toronto in September 1973. Professor Roweis:

ROWEIS

I will try to be brief for a variety of reasons. First, we are running short of time; second, I don't want to bore you; third, the case I want to advocate is straight forward; it doesn't take a lot of convoluted argumentation. And fourth, I'm not part of a growing business that needs promotion by advocacy of the private sector.

The title of this panel in "New Communities: Public or Private Impetus and Control" and the question that arises is: impetus to do what? and control of what? Now, I suggest that the key factor here is *urban land*; impetus to develop urban land, and control over the social uses of urban land and the conditions under which land is used. It strikes me as more than accidental that Mr. Langer has omitted any mention of that vital issue. But as my few comments proceed I think it will be clear why that is not quite accidental. What is urban land? What is the value of urban land? What generates the value of urban land? Why do we have such a situation in which urban land escalates in price? Quite clearly, land in the desert, for example, is not worth much. So if we use Ricardo's designation of the "indestructible faculties of the soil" as a criterion, we end up concluding that that must not be it—that is not the key factor in determining the value of *urban land*. So what is it? Most clearly, it's access to urban services, urban in structure and social overhead that determines the value of land. Land also has very unique characteristics in being, if you wish to use a simile, like a seamless gown. Anything that happens

on one part of it influences most of what happens on any other part of it. For these unique characteristics, you find that urban land is indeed very difficult to equate to any other “factor of production” to use economic jargon, in the sense that it cannot be “produced” by private enterprises. There is a variety of reasons why that is impossible, the most clear of which is the need for collective action. If left to their own individual interests, producers would not venture to develop urban land. It’s not profitable. It needs a lot of collective resources and collective action. It involves problems of public goods. Problems of non-exclusion—(exclusion of non-payers). It’s not like T.V.’s—you exclude everybody who does not want to pay the price of the gadget. You can’t do that with urban land. Yes, in some events, you can make toll roads and you charge something on the use of the toll road, but you can’t convert old streets in urban areas into toll roads, otherwise we can’t move anywhere. The same is true of almost all other kinds of services. That creates a problem. It means, in the final analysis, that urban land must be publicly produced.

What happens when, under conditions like our social conditions today, we have a so-called land market in which land is privately owned and decisions about what to do with land, subject to controls by government, are still left in the hands of private owners?

Now to clarify these issues, I’ll have to beg you to bear with me for a little digression. The market price system is alleged to have two fundamental functions, as a system of signals. First it gives signals to producers, so if prices go up that is an indication to the producers of this commodity (whose price has gone up) to produce more; that is a signal that society needs more of the same, so that they expand the size of their production. The second function (of the market price system) is to give signals to consumers to economize on their use of products or factors whose social costs of production are high and to use more freely those whose costs of

production are lower. These are the two alleged functions of the market price system. Now what happens in the case of urban land? With respect to signals to producers, quite obviously the market price system doesn’t work for a very simple reason. The producers of urban land are not themselves the actors who own and transact land. In other words, the price of land goes up, government does not automatically expand its programs to provide infrastructure (and hence the supply of urban land). There is no built-in mechanism by which one follows the other. Land prices can go up as far as you can imagine, yet there would be no direct link between this and expanding programs for the provision of infrastructure. So that first signal of the market price system fails in the case of land. How about the other one? Can we claim that if the prices of land go up people economize in their use of land? No. That doesn’t happen. As a matter of fact, you can cite all kinds of correlations that lead you to believe that the more land prices go up, the more urban growth happens. There is no causality here, just a correlation. Urban areas that are growing the most happen at the same time to have the highest urban land values. Only in stagnant urban areas do you find rather stable, but never declining, urban land values. That second function also collapses. In other words, land is a classical text book example of market failures that has been recognized since Ricardo. This has been elaborated by a variety of people and is not a big secret any longer.

So what happens now, under these conditions, when land is privately owned and the impetus to develop urban land comes from the private sector and the control over land is in the hands of the private sector? In the final analysis, we find a phenomenon of deviation between price of land and the cost of production for society—the cost of production of urban land. A very considerable deviation indeed! If you compare this situation (the situation in urban development, I mean) with the ordinary

industrial sector, like say the manufacture of steel sheets—metal sheets—you begin to find some uniqueness in urban development. In the production of metal sheet, prices cannot deviate considerably from the price of production. Why? Because that would invite new entry by other people who would compete in the market—even under conditions of oligopoly that would happen, though it would take longer. And prices would be driven down again. In the case of urban land, as I have just suggested, that will not happen. Prices can escalate and yet no competitors will enter that market because land is not produced by these private sector competitors. So you find the deviation between price and social cost of production.

As a consequence of this we observe extreme irrationalities in our urban organization that reflect themselves in our day to day headaches in urban areas. Half of the population travels outwards to work, the other half lives outwards and travels inwards to work. Social services that are not profitable in the private sense get relegated to secondary lands if at all, and all kinds of irrationalities happen. You find the fiscal crisis setting in. Revenues do not accrue to the collectivity by which infrastructure can be expanded. The same occurs in our fiscal crises—your expenditures exceed your revenues. You attempt to overhaul real estate tax systems—there is no way you can do that. There is a definite ceiling on taxation. All of these things suggest that if we indeed want to avoid some of the irrationalities that we experience today in our urban areas, there is only one way to go about this, and that is public ownership of urban land which assumes control over the social uses of urban land.

Now this leaves room for the private sector—plenty of room, and that is to do construction work, which is a sector that is similar, by and large, to other industrial sectors in which prices do not deviate considerably from costs of production, which doesn't lead to these social irrationalities and encumbrances that we find today.

SINCLAIR

We are now ten minutes into what was to have been the reception time but I'm sure there are some questions that people would like to ask.

QUESTION:

Madam Chairman and members of the panel. First two observations. I noted that if we had instituted 25 or 30 years ago some rather parochial immigration policies, Mrs. Parker would have been the only panelist on this morning's program. Secondly, I've also noted that some of the immigrants to this country are not necessarily the victims of the rip-off of multi-national corporate giants. My question is to Peter Langer, and I wonder if this is a fair question Peter. Can you draw some comparisons based on your dual involvement in both the public and private sectors between the initiatives taken to bring into the new community of Malvern and the initiatives taken to bring in the new community of Meadowvale and the lessons that are to be learned about the roles that are to be played as a result of these two projects.

LANGER

Well, I'll try Allen. Malvern has been the subject of much criticism and malignement, as far as the efforts of the provincial government is concerned. Personally, I think Malvern has been a fair try by the provincial government to do a reasonably good job of development. The problems in which we find ourselves as far as Malvern is concerned or any development by government authorities, are the ones I mentioned. There seems to be much more tension building between two levels of government than there are tensions between the developer and government. Political pressures are exercised much more—and were exercised much more in the Malvern case—than they were in the Meadowvale development. Personnel is quite a problem. I think to some extent we pride ourselves in that we seem to have very good people working for us at OHC, but, for instance, the man that

has been responsible to some extent for developing Malvern was required by another provincial department and was therefore lost to OHC and all these matters I think make it more difficult for a provincially-sponsored development to proceed than for a privately-sponsored development. I also have some serious doubts in my mind whether in the long run the acquisition of land by land banking by government authority is a better way of doing things. I was very interested in the comment by Prof. Roweis that the market forces do not work and one of the reasons I understood him to give is that the infrastructure is not put into the ground when land prices go up. Well, indirectly—not indirectly—directly, what the private sector has been preaching to the provincial government for a long time is to put more infrastructure in. And rather than using—and the monies must be limited—monies to purchase land if in fact infrastructure would have been put into the land, even according to Professor Roweis, this would have made quite a change in the land market.

So there are a number of reasons why I believe that it is better for private enterprise to execute the development; and as I have told you before, I'm not objecting to the public input. On the contrary. I would be quite happy to see some impetus from the public sector and certainly controls have to be by the public sector in order to provide these developments. But it's all very fine, the theories are wonderful, and the text book may be quite right in theory—but so far the only people who have been producing developments and producing houses have been the private sector, with the exception of Malvern where there has been a small start made by OHC.

ROWEIS

On behalf of theoreticians, we have all to acknowledge the efforts of the private sector—they have been failing us for quite some time. I want to make two points. Whether public ownership of land is forthcoming or not is not

the question because it is forthcoming. The question is whether we want to wait until it is forced on us by social unrest, by disruptive forces, by chaotic conditions, or whether we would like to live up to our claims of being planners for the future. That the private developers have been pushing government to put infrastructure on land is quite clear, as long as the social assets paid for by the collectivity at large is put in the hands of private developers to reap the excess profits available to them because of the idiosyncracies of urban development. According to the dynamics that I quickly went into, it is quite logical for them to urge for more infrastructure because the more infrastructure is put there the more private profits are going to be appropriated. So that's not a mystery! The question is whether land should be under total control of the public sector. It is not a question of debate as to what constitutes super profits. As long as prices deviate from costs of production, and that can be computed quite rigorously, there is super profit, and that is the case in urban development. The question is whether or not we want to recapture that for the benefit of the collectivity at large.

LANGER

I can't help myself and will have to make some comments: First, there is nothing wrong with profits in our order of things. Let's get that established; and if you disagree with me, that's too damn bad! Number 2, with some of the irrationalities which were mentioned, I just entirely disagree. The collectivity of people do not pay for our developments; our developments pay for themselves quite handily including the infrastructure put in by the provincial government. We put industry out there, which is most important to the local government. The local existing tax payers don't pay one more cent in taxes because we are developing. Let's get that quite clear. The revenues are produced by our developers—and not by anybody else—to pay for all the social services which incidentally a lot of them we put

in as well. The expenditures do not exceed the revenues and I just don't agree with those points. As far as I'm concerned our development, and many other developments too, more than carry themselves quite handily.

SINCLAIR

Could I ask at what point you would suggest that the private developer move out of the new community development scheme and if it is at the point where the development ceases and profits cease, why are you stating that point?

LANGER

I do not suggest that the developer move out of new community schemes at all.

SINCLAIR

You are saying, that you would like to stay in private government, manage libraries, infrastructure, what have you, after they have been built, once they cease making profit. You say that you build libraries and what have you in the new community and then hand them over to the local authorities?

LANGER

Correct, yes.

SINCLAIR

Why do you hand them over?

LANGER

Because they insist on it.

SINCLAIR

But since you are putting up such a strong fight for having a hand in the development, why not have an equally strong fight to have a hand in the ongoing control.

LANGER

I would be quite happy to do that, but the government won't let us do it.

SINCLAIR

That's a very handy answer.

LANGER

Well it is a true answer.

QUESTION:

I was interested in the question about the comparison of Malvern and Meadowvale. I think perhaps that it might be legitimate to ask the question of a comparison in the price of lots and the relationship between the cost of lots in Saskatoon or in Red Deer, relative to Meadowvale, and I wonder if Prof. Roweis could tell us something about that.

ROWEIS

Well, I really can't tell you much about this. You probably know much more about Canadian peculiarities in the urban land market than I do at this point. But I can tell you something in general. A study done in 1970 or 1971 on Scarborough found out that, on the average, a 53' wide single house lot costs in terms of servicing about \$5,500. The average price of the lot in the so-called land market is \$12,000. Now I'd expect that in smaller communities this difference would be less, but that's the order of magnitude of deviation of price from cost of production. What we are talking about is not a minus deviation, it's an order of magnitude of more than 100%.

I want to make some very brief comments on Mr. Langer's logic, which sounds to me very interesting. From the observation that tax payers in privately-developed communities are not paying more taxes he jumps to the conclusion that the collectivity does not pay for the infrastructure. That intrigues me. It's quite funny kind of logic, because he omits to mention that one generation of users, I repeat, one generation of users, pay the entire burden of infrastructure which gets passed to them on the price of property they buy or rent. So are they or are they not collectively paying for the super profits made by the corporation?

LANGER

That's a question, not what I said, I said that the other taxpayers don't pay for it.

SINCLAIR

I'd like to thank both our panelists

and apologize to the audience for having to cut off the discussion which obviously has turned out to be so stimulating. Thank you both.

LUNCHEON SPEECH BY MR. S. BRUCE MCLAUGHLIN, PRESIDENT, S. B. MCLAUGHLIN ASSOCIATES LTD., TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

Ladies and Gentlemen: Time is at a premium, so we'll try to get to the subject matter. However, the subject matter is sociologically and economically a very volatile subject, because it always leads to things that are close to the heart of all citizens, such as housing, and the price of housing.

And so I'd like to preface my remarks by stating some of my personal philosophy in the realm of sociology and economics. I believe that this country is wealthy enough and capable enough administratively to be able to provide a guaranteed job opportunity for every citizen. I think I know almost every level of lifestyle and economics that our citizens face and what I'm trying to say is that I have empathy for all of the people and I feel a responsibility and I like to think that the majority of the business people do.

Now getting to the subject, which is new development -- how? and by Whom? My thesis is that there is a role for government, of course. But that also there is a vital role for private enterprise.

Let me deal first with the necessary roles of government, which I do not believe are being fulfilled in an ample way. At the present time, no government federal, provincial, or municipal is doing total planning, and therefore no government is doing adequate planning. At last, in the recent past, they have learned that they must plan in advance rather than merely respond to development proposals.

To properly understand planning I suggest that you must break it down into categories and fit it in into your intellectual pigeon holes in this manner:

There is *IDEAL PLANNING*. Ideal planning, so that you would have a perfect world, starting from scratch.

There is *INTERIM PLANNING*, which is the kind of planning that we have been doing since the last great war, and we are in transition to more advanced planning. I suggest that this more advanced planning is *TOTAL PLANNING*.

Total planning whereby we ascertain the optimum level of population for a country or a province and the maximum level of population for a country or province, and plan in accordance with that prime criteria.

But there is a fourth kind of planning, which we in our planning group and our development group call *PLANNING IN PERPETUITY*.

The reason for this terminology is because no total plan can be immutable. We must stay flexible; we must have the capacity to adapt to the changing technology and changing circumstances.

Now let us deal with *IDEAL PLANNING* and how we would go about doing this. We would take a geographic territory, say Canada, and we would make two hypothetical assumptions. First of all, we would roll back - perhaps to 1867 or 1791 or 1498 or thereabouts - and end up with a piece of virgin territory, this great nation of Canada. That's the first assumption.

Then we would come forward and make a mental leap and we would make the next assumption, which is that we knew the ultimate level of population which must come to live in this nation. Then we would concentrate and use all our experience, our perception, our judgement, in order to create a master plan that would give us the most ideal circumstances in which to accommodate the ultimate population. In doing so we would consider every criteria that our planning, economic, and sociological experts could bring before us. Geography, resources, agricultural lands, water, space. And I think space is one of the most important criteria, and I'm not talking about horizontal space only - I'm talking about vertical space also.

And I'm also talking about space with the passage of time. Transportation facilities. Such new concepts as ecological zoning, human habitation areas separated from the polluting uses. And then we get down to specific land uses.

Now this ideal plan would be a planning tool against which we would measure the quality of all of our practical plans. In other words, as a national development policy, we would first create an ideal plan and then we would find out perhaps that some cities were in the wrong place and certainly some uses such as hydro generating stations were in the wrong place. Steel mills, in the wrong place. With this tool of an ideal plan we would be able to use our better judgement to decide perhaps what should be amortized out of use.

Now, let's look at *INTERIM PLANNING*. As I mentioned, this is what's been going on in this country. We started off looking at five-year periods the way businessmen did just after the war, and the way the Russian society looks at five-year periods. Everyone thought that this was planning. And then we planned on the periphery of our communities and what we are doing was planning sprawl. Now after about a decade we progressed to the level of doing 20-year plans, and now at long last most of us are planning to the year 2000. Throughout all of this period and including today, none of our plans have been on a large enough scale and few of these plans were sufficiently sensitive to human requirements. And few of them were sufficiently sensitive to human requirements. And few of them were sensitive to the limitations of our land resources and our other resources. I suggest that we must, and I think every major planner is suggesting that we must put an end to this kind of interim or inadequate planning.

The third kind of planning is *TOTAL PLANNING*. Now here we take the ideal plan and we relate it to the ultimate requirement, adjusting it so as to save some of that which we cannot afford to dispense with, and adjust it to accommodate present developments-

and there are reasons. For instance, we cannot just throw out the baby with the bath water, as we have been trying to do here in the Province of Ontario, for two reasons. It slows down the whole process and makes everything so expensive that no one can afford it. Secondly, it's not very democratic. We are taking away the vested property rights of people without recourse of any kind, and that simply isn't in accordance with our democratic traditions. Now this plan must be flexible, so that it can be adapted as I stated before, to the future circumstances.

Now permit me to digress a little - this isn't to plug it, but I have written a book, and I want to mention the title: "100 Million Canadians". This has proved to be a very stimulating book in many ways. I have had all kinds of letters and some of them have been very bitter, and some of them complimentary. In this book I say that we in this country should think, as our hypothetical figure, 100 million Canadians. We can then have a master plan that will allow us whenever we reach that level to have a better life-style and to live in a higher degree of harmony than we are today. In the near future I hope to be able to publish a book which will have the title, "40 Million Places to Stand". Give us a place to stand - 40 million of them. In this book I recommended that Ontario should have a total plan whereby this Province will be capable of accommodating those 40 million citizens with harmony and efficiency. Now it doesn't matter when these hypothetical levels are reached.

Now finally we have *PLANNING IN PERPETUITY*. The meaning of this term is that there is no perfect, fixed, hypothetical, total plan. The total plan must have built-in flexibility to allow for the modifications of technology, and sociology, the choice and desire of the people, the unforeseen circumstances that we simply are not perceptive enough to be able to determine so far in advance of the ultimate population level, and so far in advance of the on-

going nation for the next thousand years, and two thousands years, and so on. Again I suggest to you that if only our governments would carry out their responsibilities with respect to total planning we would have a more harmonious and also a more affordable society. In the near future expensive delays and processing development plans would be eliminated and housing, yes housing would become more affordable. But, for the time being we cannot afford to wait for the total plan, the total national plan, or the total provincial plan, or the total regional plan, or the district study. We simply cannot afford to wait. The planning delays of the past are already producing an uneconomic development situation and if time permits, I would like to go into some actual history on that subject at the end of the prepared address.

Now there is a further necessary role for provincial governments, and this is the financing of public services. So what I'm saying is the governments must do the total planning long in advance of demand. The demand is not created by the developers, after all, they don't give birth to the babies and so on, and they don't build anything that they can't sell or lease. So the demand is coming. Wake up! It's coming, governments! And do the total plan long in advance so we don't have any bottle necks. And then after you've done that, let's get the services in the ground long in advance of need. This is where we run into some real practical problems with municipalities. It should be apparent to all that the rapidly developing municipalities operating under present tax distribution do not have the capacity to pay for and install major roads, trunk water and sewerage services, schools and recreational amenities. Therefore, it is imperative that the provincial government take over the responsibility of paying for these services. Until they do so we will continue to face the ironic situation whereby it has become the national policy and the provincial policy to put a large quantity of building sites on to the market and affordable housing units on to the market and the muni-

icipalities on the other hand are frustrating every effort to make housing available and to make affordable housing available.

It seems to me that if the province wishes to be effective in making more affordable housing available, it should make larger grants for the principal municipal roads, it should pay the full costs of the trunk water and sewerage systems, it should pay for the schools, it should pay for the recreational amenities, and then it should turn around and lease these to the growing community on a lease/purchase basis, if you will, over a long term. In this manner they can afford to be financed with the lowest cost provincial funds which are available. Now the development industry is being called upon to finance a great deal of this, and like all businessmen we look for a minimum satisfactory yield, and I can tell you that the cost therefore to the consumer is a great deal higher than it would be if the Province of Ontario would only get on with taking care of their subsidiary corporations, the municipalities.

Unless the provinces equate municipal financial capacity with the responsibilities which have been delegated to these municipalities, then there is little or no likelihood that the rapidly developing municipalities will ever encourage affordable housing.

Now all government agencies and much of the media seem to be blaming the development industry and I want to talk about that annoying subject. They're blaming them for speculation, for holding lands off the market. The last budget said, the development industry is holding lands off the market - therefore, that's the reason for the tax change. Now this is absolute nonsense, and it's time more businessmen dropped their low profile and stood up and said it was. This country is drifting into socialism because the businessmen don't have the time to let the people know what's going on. There's absolute incompetence in government today. There's absolute inefficiency. The working people are being denied a lifestyle

which we can't afford to give them, it's the fault of the government, and we businessmen are taking it in the neck. From direct knowledge I can assure you that the major development companies are putting forth an extraordinary effort to bring more building sites to the market. They have always done so, in my experience. They have always been frustrated by negative planning legislation and restrictive municipal policies. So there are two things that government must be busy about. Doing planning and getting the servicing in. And getting the servicing in means giving the financial capacity to the municipalities so that they can carry their responsibilities.

But there is a third thing. It is vital that the governmental administration and the field of planning and development be streamlined. Recently municipal councils have been acting as though they should not be subject to the rule of law or that they have the right to temporarily suspend the rule of law. Their conduct indicates that they feel that once they have won an election, they have the right to govern by fiat, which is to say conducting municipal affairs in a dictatorial manner. Now such conduct is grossly unfair to citizens, it's contrary to the rule of law; the rule of the law says that men should be governed by written laws and regulations, rather than by men. It endangers the democratic process because when we are governed by men, fear and uncertainty prevail, and worse still, favouritism and yet - even corruption - have more scope. Today developers must literally plead in order to obtain the favour of elected officials before they acquire any economically useful developments rights. Now this kind of uncertainty cannot help but cause developers and capital to think about what they are doing and perhaps move elsewhere. We have clearly announced that we are diversifying geographically elsewhere than in this Province. Surely every property owner, whether it is the widow, or the businessman who has operated on the same site for 40 years, or the developer, is entitled

to know the rules of the game in advance. Now this simply isn't fair to keep changing the rules at periodic intervals. If someone kept changing the rules in a poker game you would pick up your chips and go home.

Another change that must be made in our planning administration is the imposition of time limits, for time indeed is money, and the costs of time wasted are eventually borne by the consumer in the marketplace. As a matter of fact, all the frustrations and all the inconveniences to the development industry ultimately are translated into costs and these costs are transmitted to the consumer.

I have a little story, and I think I should take enough time to relate this.

I maintain that no capitalist ever pays any taxes, and you capitalists out there - if you do, you're not following the system right. No capitalist ever pays any taxes whatsoever. He's interested in his after-tax yield. Isn't that right? He's interested in his after-tax yield and because of the competition in the marketplace for capital, if he's astute he knows how to come out on the right side. If he doesn't he moves into a different industry, because if you can't get 24% pre-tax and 12% after-tax you're a failure as an executive, and it depends on the risk of your industry. But that's a secret we should tell the whole country, so that everybody can get in on the game. When everyone's in on the game, maybe we'll have political stability again. But then the other side of the coin is that no working man ever pays any taxes. He joins a union, he's highly organized, and he doesn't worry about taxes, he's interested in his take-home pay.

Now that's a very important piece of philosophy. Who then pays the taxes? It's the consumer, and the more taxes go up, the more prices go up, and the more inflation goes up. And the more government starts taking instead of 19% of gross national product, 25%, 29%, 33%, 39% and headed to 50% - this is the cause of our inflation and it's just fueling the fires of inflation.

So I'm saying to you that it's time we got some basic sense into what's happening to our entire society, let alone the building and development industry and the building of new communities, and who's going to do it. The development industry is merely asking for regulation in the public interest of this nation without stagnation.

Now that all of our society recognizes that there is a housing problem it has become the national policy to encourage the development of housing. The proposed budget which is just going down the drain because of the election encourages housing by saying \$1,000.00 a year tax-free, we want everybody in the country to own a house. So it's national policy to encourage housing. It has become provincial policy here in Ontario to encourage housing. The Housing Action Program is this government's commitment to produce more housing and more affordable housing. But I would be less than honest unless I gave you my opinion and cautioned you that it would be wrong to get our hopes high. In 1975 the single family house on a 50' lot is going to cost about \$75,000 or more.

Most developers feel that we are now merely being exposed to organized irresponsibility. They're just better organized than they were before. Unconscionable delays on the part of municipalities are going to continue to occur. There can be no doubt that most municipalities are still opposing the production of adequate quantities of affordable housing. Our local paper in Mississauga where I live and work most of the time has an interesting article and the whole article, "Levies could double, says City Councillor", the whole article is just organized irresponsibility, but on this subject the point is this. Let one councillor speak. "It is quite clear that in the last election the people of this city don't want any more rapid growth." Now that's the policy, and they announced it in our Council chambers. And there's poor Mr. Handleman up there. I'm sure he must be frustrated. But that's what's happening. That's where the rubber is

meeting the road at the local level. Under the present circumstances in which the Federal Government in the Provinces are making special effort to encourage housing, we can and must condemn most of our municipal governments for the continued high cost of housing and for changing the very lifestyle of our people. Now what is the Canadian lifestyle? To me the Canadian lifestyle is every Canadian worker some day would have the chance to own his own home on his own little piece of ground. We're losing it. You know what goes on in Europe. They stack them up in Council houses. We're headed in that direction, and that's alarming. Very few people will be able to afford the homes of the future, to own their own home. Now I submit that it's wrong to penalize developers for the inadequate supply of building sites. It's counter-productive to penalize responsible developers. I've tried to tell you what our philosophy is. I represent to you that our philosophy is that we will co-operate with any government to put thousands of units of lower priced housing on the market.

In 1972 we were making written submissions to the Province. We were selling houses at \$30,000 and we said that the prices are going up unless we get more land to the market. And I suppose the other developers were doing the same thing because in my experience these developers are responsible people. The correspondence I could show you at regular intervals to Cabinet Ministers, the municipalities, warning them what's going to happen because any high school economist could see it coming. The planning procedures that they'd implemented were slowing everything down to an absolute stop so far as bringing on an adequate quantity of new tract development and building lots for new houses. And as I say to you, all of these costs caused by this inefficiency must be passed on to consumers. Now they say that the developers are speculating, profiteering and raping the landscape and so on. I must confess with a great deal of humility that if



we are those profiteers something is wrong because in 1969 we came out at \$15.00 a share and I see on the stock market today we're \$17.00 a share. If we're profiteering and doing all that sort of thing, why don't all the wise guys just buy up our stock?

Now I have another side of that viewpoint. I think our stock is grossly misunderstood as to value, but we're talking about economic realities. If we're profiteering it must be there somewhere. Why don't they just buy up all our stock and then maybe our true values would be recognized. So why do we have to be negative and why do I have to have the tone today of an aggressive approach to you. I want to shake you up a little bit and I want to get the message across, but most of us here I think are fairly comfortable. The country is doing well. I could cash in my chips tomorrow as my wife tells me to do and not worry about it. But damn it, we feel it as Canadians, we feel it here. And we're going to persist. It's time that our provincial government recognized that it's the municipalities that are causing the housing shortage. We developers should refer every plan we have under the Planning Act to the Ontario Municipal Board. If the Councils can't do the job, let the government put in an Ontario Municipal Board that will plan it for us and put the stamp of approval on it and register it. Let's get these municipalities out of the way. And I can tell you something about the kinds of people who are sitting on our municipal councils now that would shock you. They have neither the experience, the education, or the inclination to do any development.

But let's get practical again, and let's cool it down again. This government of Ontario should bonus exist of Ontario should bonus the municipalities for facilitating housing and penalize them by cancelling existing grants if they fail to facilitate housing. And so much for the government, let's see what the private enterprise industry can do. If we wish to achieve the best kind of affordable development, then there are also necessary roles for the private

developers. There is no doubt in my mind that primarily it is entrepreneurial creativity which stimulates our government and enriches our development. It has always been that way, and that's the way it will continue. We may go through a downward cycle of government intervention and government incompetence, but they need the creative entrepreneur. Now the progress of development in Ontario is the case in point, and please forgive me for being a little personal relating this to my experience, my Company's experience. But I can only say that because we have gone through this process, other great property companies that have evolved in this country have probably been doing the same thing. In 1960, we announced to the Municipality of Toronto Township, which is now Mississauga, and to the provincial government, that it was our intention to build the inner core of a new city for 1 million to 1½ million persons, and we showed them our demographic studies for the Toronto-Centred Region to the year 1980 on a census tract basis, a type of planning that they had never conceived of yet. At that time the TTC was doing the best planning in Ontario. We suggested incidentally, they should buy up the highway right-of-ways before the price of land went up, and they said they couldn't get it through the Treasury Board. But the result of this was the MTART Study which was done between 1963 and it came out in 1967. The MTART Study. Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study, was generally condemned by the private development industry as being a traffic engineer's approach to planning. The result of this was the Toronto-Centred Region Proposals. We brought in sociologists now, we brought in other skills. In our proposals to government, we had suggested a transportation/communication corridor. We still do. We think the parkways are still all wrong. But that concept I think may have opened the door to someone in government about the idea of a corridor. I think this has become the parkways in a rather distorted fashion.

Early in 1963 we suggested a multiplicity of metropolitan governments, and our map was very similar to the Toronto-Centred Region Proposals maps. We laid out a multiplicity of metropolitan governments, and we believe that this may have stimulated someone to thinking in terms of the regional governments. Believe it or not, the voluntary price restraint that is being suggested today, we were the first and have been acknowledged to be the first to ever mention this term, and it went in one of our submissions to cabinet ministers. So private industry says we'll submit to voluntary price restraint. We said, you use moral suasion with the banks, why not use it with the developers when you have a major problem in the economy? Now I suspect most major development companies are continually providing government with this kind of responsible submission. Yet, most developers are being condemned. And yet it is the large tract developer that has staved off urban sprawl and here in Canada we have a better chance than in most nations to do it right. I'm talking about such projects as Don Mills, Bramalea, Erin Mills, Meadowvale, and yes - Mississauga City.

I suggest to you that a state-oriented bureaucracy would stifle this kind of development. Entrepreneurs have a tendency of moving over when their toes are stepped on hard. They move from negative jurisdictions and capital flees the inefficient jurisdiction. In fact, you may or may not know, I've said it before and I said it in Montreal, in my opinion very large quantities of capital are moving out of the Province of Ontario. You know, Quebec is the new frontier and I would like to go down there long enough to become completely fluent, because that's the only thing that bars me from feeling 100% Québécois, because when I'm down there it's just a great place, and maybe I will get a chance to go down there. But I tell you this, we can bury all our problems with bilingualism if we once accept the fact that Quebec deserves the opportunity that has been lavished upon

Ontario and participate down there, but participate with our fellow Canadians who have lived in Quebec for generations. That's what our policy is down there.

So far as the individual is concerned, I suggest state-operated land banks and development would cause an individual to lose his personal liberty. Independence would suffer. Pretty soon it would be the ivory tower boys telling us what we could do and there would not be as wide a choice of development. Housing would become prohibitively expensive because all they do is bury the costs. What can they save, after all? The profit? They take half of that anyhow. It's a question of when they get it. So that all they could possibly save was a part of the profit. But we know what they would do in this kind of an industry because entrepreneurs, developers are special people. I don't mean to say that oil people are not special people too. But developers and builders are special people and you won't get them in government, the ones that can deliver the goods and solve the problems. Without private enterprise development we will never be able to afford a home. Canadian citizens will never be able to afford a home. Most housing would have to become subsidized. And don't forget that private home ownership is a great basis for good citizenship and political stability. Yes, there is a necessary role for government and there is a necessary role for private enterprise. If government will do their jobs and we can have all the benefits of private development and private ownership without sprawl, without economic distortions in the marketplace. It is important that we get through with the adversary system which is presently governing development affairs and get around to co-operation, which is based upon the government doing total planning and regulating, but not inhibiting the private development industry.

Mr. Chairman, I could quit now, but if you give me five minutes, I would like to give them some real facts of recent history going back to 1946. I think the

question has been asked, "How much new town development should be done by the private sector, and how much by the public sector?", and this question surely arises because of the factor of price. Prices have gone right out of kilter and that's why that question arises.

So let us review a little bit of development history.

In 1946 we were building 1,000 sq. ft. homes to 1,100 sq. ft. on 50' lots and selling them for \$8,000.00 Now it helps to look back in order to look forward, so let's go on with the story. In 1949 the same house was \$10,500, and there are the houses that Edmond Peachy and Saracini and so on were building in the West end, and McLintock in the East end, and so on. That was a standard house. About 1,000 to 1,100 sq. ft.

Let's move up to 1955. The price of housing is now \$20,000. The house has got a little larger, 1,200 to 1,400 sq. ft. In 1972, and this is the breakaway point, we were marketing three-bedroom, two storey houses on 50' lots at \$30,500 as our lowest price. In 1972 our company registered our last plan of subdivision in Mississauga. In 1972 we started warning in writing the municipality and this province that we were headed for a major distortion in the marketplace. In 1972 housing began to be no longer affordable for the working man. Now here's the dramatic lift. 1973. \$45,000! The house had become a little larger again, up from 1,200 - 1,400 sq. ft. to 1,500 to 1,600. And toward the end of 1973 and into 1974 the 1,600 sq. ft. house - \$75,000.

Now we're looking at what has been happening and saying there isn't any hope. In 1975 we're going to be \$30.00 a square foot. I can remember for years, I was programmed with the fact that I could build a house for \$10.00 a square foot and sell it for \$12.00 a square foot, for years. And now -- \$30. a square foot. You may be able to do it for \$26.00 today. I'm talking about the costs that are coming now as our trades are lifting the prices on us again. Tradesmen no longer want to give us fixed

prices. When they do, they come back and say I'm sorry we can't abide by that. And they say it in a nice way by not coming back to the job until we phone them six times. What's the matter? Oh, we just can't come back for that kind of money. You can either take them to court or make an adjustment. So time is money. I hope you realize that the compounding of the required yield for any corporation soon mounts up to a very large factor - 24 % doubles itself in three years compounded. They've been holding up developments for ten years in some cases. Sales tax has been going up, you know -- for 11% and 12% Federal and 7% on the Provincial. Servicing requirements are going up. Last week I offered to pave Number 10 Highway with gold for the Mississauga Council, if they'd only get out of the way and let us produce 10,000 housing units. The levies are going up. Carrying costs of holding land are going up. Inflation is going up and this country is damned unless this government wakes up. The public companies, I've told you, are not profiteering. They are responsible. They can be called upon for voluntary price restraint. They can be subjected to moral suasion. Now I think, I know there's at least one other major developer here. We have a surplus of land available. If they will allow us to open up our land and build we can produce affordable housing.

And let me close on a very astounding remark. Our company alone, this one company alone, can break the speculation fever, can turn back the price of housing dramatically this year if the government will only sit down with us. You know when you're having two companies that are trying to do a deal, you get the two presidents together. If they would take the president of the Province and the President of Mississauga and the President of our Company, and put this one company into a room, we would come out and make an announcement within two days that would drop the price of housing by \$15,000 per unit at least. We never have sold a 50' building lot for higher

than \$17,000 approximately, and today they're begging us to deliver them at \$40,000 - \$45,000 each.

I met the Mayor of Mississauga for the first time in his office and I said, Look - let's you and I get together and stand up and make an announcement that we're going to solve the housing crisis. I said - in addition to that, we'll give you a million dollars for the greatest social amenity that you ever had in Mississauga, and you can have the pleasure of doing it, because it's politically astute to work it that way, Let's break this damn speculation tomorrow. And then, next announcement in the paper - we're raping some valley or other! Even though we're spending \$50,000 extra to save a few trees in it. We've got to get through this adversary system. We've got to get co-operation, we've got to get the presidents of our society locked in a room - and if they do, we'll drop the prices, and we'll build a better city than some of these neophytes have ever conceived or dreamed of.

Afternoon sessions

ANNE GOLDEN

Gentlemen, my name is Anne Golden and I'm a Research Associate of the Bureau. I'd like to introduce our moderator for this afternoon. Mr. Allen Bernholtz will be substituting for Mr. Beinhaker who can't be here. Mr. Bernholtz is an architect by profession who has gone on to specialize in computer simulation. He has done extensive work for the British Columbia Land Commission with regard to the Town of Calonia. He has also done a simulation for the North Pickering project. He is president of Allen Bernholtz and Assoc. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Allen Bernholtz who will then introduce our first panel. Thank you.

BERNHOLTZ

Thank you Anne. I'd like to make a couple of changes in the program. Each of the speakers will be speaking for 10 minutes except for the final speaker. Now the topic for this first panel is: "If Developers Had Their Way. . ." and it gives me pleasure to present the man I just met, Mr. Arthur Armstrong, President and Chief Executive Officer, Bramalea Consolidated Developments Limited of Toronto.

ARMSTRONG

Thank you Mr. Chairman. If I were to live up to my image perhaps what I should say when responding to a title such as this is: "the race is to the quick; well, I want *laissez faire*" and sit down. But obviously that isn't the approach I have to take.

The title "If Developers Had Their Way" is obviously an invitation to cover the whole spectrum of the political structure, provincial-municipal-financial

relationships, the compositions of school boards, planning legislation and so on. However, most of these have been discussed ad nauseam at seminars of this kind in the past. In this speaker's humble opinion many measures advocated by the development industry in the past have in fact been undertaken. Regional government has been implemented in several sectors of this province, school boards have been reorganized and the provincial government has taken, what I think, are very positive steps in the setting up of a housing task force to cut red tape and hasten development processing. I'm going to confine my remarks today to that area of developmental operations which cause today's developer the most concern. If we are to look at new communities and new towns as I feel sure we must, we cannot possibly live with those procedures presently mandatory under the Planning Act of Ontario. Let me go back a little and point out that the developer/build-er or the pure developer is simply the manufacturer of a product, albeit unique. No different from the manufacturer of any other product. However, he is the manufacturer of one of the most vital products in our society—shelter. Unlike his fellow producers the developer runs a great deal more risk in today's environment than any of his contemporaries in the producing business. I submit that a developer who commits what has to be enormous sums of money to comprehensive development schemes is taking business risks. He is taking the risk that he is buying the right land—right from the standpoint of location, topography, soil condition, serviability and developability. He is taking the risk that his estimates of cost of development are

accurate, that his urban design is acceptable, that his costs of building shelter are accurate, that the product he produces in the form of shelter is acceptable to the marketplace, and finally risks any responsible and legitimate developer is prepared to take.

However, under the present planning legislation, he is additionally exposed to enormous risk because of the fact that conditions quite beyond his control may exist or come to exist. Bureaucratic procedures which will greatly lengthen the time of development will increase his carrying costs and therefore the cost of his end product, as can opposition from citizens, municipal staff and politicians on a myriad of occasions in that development process.

I might give you an example of my own company's experience, in attempting to process an official plan amendment for some 1800 acres of land. And I must emphasize that this land was immediately adjacent to urbanization, was part of a conceptual master plan which has been in existence for at least 15 years and that all the facilities—sewage, water, shopping, cultural, recreation, education, were immediately available. The company's submission with respect to this official plan amendment was lodged with the municipality in July 1968. The final document received provincial assent in November of 1973. The first draft plan for that area has passed through all the stages of municipal, public and provincial acceptance but it has not yet been released. The first homes will not be started until fall of this year. Six years, ladies and gentlemen. Would anyone here like to estimate the cost of carrying land over that period, the cost of the administrative back up required to sustain an organization attempting to process such a plan, the escalation in the cost of servicing the land and building the homes? Is it not blatantly obvious why the cost of housing has increased? For this is just one example of what the present planning legislation produces.

If we are to take a completely new look at the development of new com-

munities and new towns, it is time that we took a new look at the procedures for such development. It is mandatory that the enormous risk taken by a developer—be he a private developer, a government developer, or a mixture of both—be restricted to the normal business risks which we must all face. The most important thing is the developer must know the ground rules before he starts. If they are tough ground rules—so be it. But let it be known. It is the unknown obstacle—the hurdle, the objection, the fear, the procedural wrangle that creates the problem and the cost.

I am suggesting, therefore, that the Planning Act be changed to allow for the following procedure in the development of new communities and new towns. For any assembly of land slated for major, comprehensive development, there shall be an official plan. This official plan shall be a legal document, a contract between the municipality and the developer or developers—unchangeable regardless of political change. My new official plan will be a very detailed official plan. It will set down all the guidelines for the development of all the lands for all time. Specifically, it will include the following:

- a density plan specifying population by area and detailing the approximate location of single family, semi-detached, low, middle and high density multiple, commercial, industrial, recreational, together with the location of major arterial roads
- standards and timing for the provision of open space, community facilities, including recreational, cultural and day care and welfare
- commercial facilities
- a statement of the exact amount of dedication required for all municipal purposes
- a statement that there should be no arbitrary land use principles set down and that exact land usage in terms of how dwellings shall be placed on the land will be covered by a draft plan
- a fixed formula for the payment of lot levies or financial considerations where applicable—the only adjust-

- a covenant by the municipality to process phases of the development as requested by the developer from time to time in a procedural process upon which I will comment later
- engineering specifications tied to engineering specification guidelines applicable to the entire province and formulated by the Province from time to time
- a building code tied to regional or provincial buildings as formulated from time to time
- a statement of any industrial/commercial assessment requirement if necessary
- a covenant to allow the developer the use of the provincially-provided water and sewage service together with a time schedule for the installation of those services

I recognize that this would be quite a document. I realize that it would take a great deal of time for the developer and the municipality to agree on its contents. But I can assure you that the time spent will be welcomed by the developer if he can then be guaranteed that its terms and conditions are unalterable and he can proceed to develop the land in response to the market. The procedure, after all, is not unlike the PUD system used extensively in the United States, producing some of the best community developments and some of the best housing in the world. I visualize that subsequent to this agreement, the developer will approach the municipality with a draft plan by phases—phases which will not be pre-detailed but which will be a response to market. I visualize that the procedure is then or will be as follows:

- the draft plan will detail exact land use—setting out any necessary side, rear and/or front yards in the case of single and semi-detached housing, and the exact location of multiple housing blocks, together with, of course, the exact location of commercial, recreational and community facilities, engineering specifications and so on.

- this draft plan will be processed by a committee made up of a politician, a staff member and a planner or architect representing the municipality and the developer with two representatives, together with his architect or planner. There would be a provision that the failure of this committee to approve the draft plan submitted within 30 days of the submission would entitle the developer to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board for the release of his plan, it being clearly understood that the draft plan must conform in every way to the official plan
- co-incident with the processing of the draft plan, the zoning by-laws necessarily would be processed by the same committee

You might note that I have made no provisions for the processing of a draft plan or zoning by-laws through a public hearing. It is my contention that in as much as the people living in the community will have been fully informed, and remember this is a new community, as a result of the detailed nature of the official plan, that there is simply no rationale for further delaying development by processing the draft plan and zoning by-laws through public hearings.

- The site plan design for the multiple blocks would require the approval of a like committee and this committee would be responsible for approving building positions on sites, heights and questions of that nature. The approval of these site plans would be subject to public scrutiny through public hearings and the present machinery of public objection and Ontario Municipal Board arbitration would come into affect.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I fully appreciate that what I have suggested may be regarded by many planners as here-say. However, I contend that if we ought to face up to our responsibilities to shelter our people adequately in the future, this is the kind of approach we must take. Thank you.

BERNHOLTZ

Our next panelist this afternoon is

Michael Cassidy. Mr. Cassidy is the member of the Provincial Legislature for Ottawa Centre—NDP.

CASSIDY

I came prepared to respond to some of the comments made by developers but I'm not sure whether to respond to Mr. Armstrong with his version of what would happen if developers had their way or to respond to Mr. McLaughlin and some of the things he said. I find that the gentlemen are rather at odds with each other in some of the things they are saying. Where they do seem to agree is that in whatever is done developers want to keep the public out and deal only with government.

The one thing I find missing in the very comprehensive presentation by Mr. Armstrong is that after everything is done with the particular kind of agenda that he is putting forward, he doesn't mention what happens in this very closely regulated system to land values and who profits from them. And clearly, this is one of the very serious things and one of the real reasons for the conflicts that are taking place now in land development in Metro Toronto and the growing areas of the province. Because quite simply, developers seem, and I think that this presentation would indicate it too, to want it both ways. They want to limit themselves to what Mr. Armstrong calls normal risks but they still want the chance of profits and super-profits which are to be made and which are being made everyday right now in the land development business.

I want to talk briefly about what I would call the agenda of developers. What it is that they would put first in terms of importance. I'll try and sketch these things very quickly and then try and put up a few alternatives:

I think the first thing they want is control of the land, in as much as they can get it, and not control in other hands.

Secondly, growth. Bruce McLaughlin wept about the value of his shares and he wept about the fact that the investors don't value his shares adequately in the market; but as our luncheon program

pointed out, the Bruce McLaughlin empire has grown from \$25 million in assets to \$300 million today and somebody, somewhere is paying for that growth, I would contend that the people who are paying for it, in the main, are the consumers — that is, the people who buy homes or who rent apartments or who buy goods that are sold through stores that are owned by Bruce McLaughlin. There is a very strong element of growth on the agenda of the development industry.

Third, concentration. Some of you may be aware for example, of the way in which Bob Campeau swallowed up Bill Teron. Power corporation swallowed up Bob Campeau for a while but then found that the menu was indigestible. Then Campeau, as I recall, tried to swallow up Markborough but got beaten in the game by Hudson's Bay. I don't know who's after Bramalea right now. But it is a game of big fish eating little fish eating littler fish. A tremendous concentration of power in very few hands. The kind of power, of course, that gets into the development industry in this way in very few hands is to my view contrary to many of the values of our democratic society. Quite frankly, I was a bit frightened listening to Mr. McLaughlin today because he spoke with a profundity that only great wealth can give; and it worries that he has \$300 million worth of assets to put forward to try and implement the kinds of views that he was presenting; that he has the confidence that he can walk into the office of the Mayor of Mississauga and can seek to buy him with a gift to the municipality of \$1 million dollars. I just don't like that at all.

Well, next on the agenda of the industry are profits. I think some of you are aware of the fact that the profits of large developers, I don't know how Bramalea is doing, are up by 30, by 50, by 100, in some case by several hundred percent in the last couple of years, mainly because of the profits that have been made from land dealing.

Next in a sort of a vengeer, there is a certain amount of social conscience because social conscience is something

which is a bit trendy in the land development industry so long as a profit can be made at the same time. If you are developing a Meadowvale or a Bramalea or an Erin Mills or whatever, and perhaps it's significant that so many of our speakers have come from that area of Northern Mississauga and the center of Peel County. At any rate there is a lot of social conscience out there, there is a lot of development as well. These fellows are producing developments which are basically not bad developments. I am not going to argue about that. But in terms of the needs they meet they just don't fit in where we are at in Metro Toronto now. Bruce McLaughlin is selling houses for \$75,000. Bramalea probably doesn't have anything on the market for less than \$38 or \$40,000. In Mississauga, where I happen to know a couple of figures half of the people now live in apartments and the price of the homes being built is completely out of reach of the people who are tenants in Mississauga. The jobs in the industries of Bramalea, of Brampton and of Mississauga don't pay adequate salaries for the people to actually get a stable home in that area. They can't buy, they can't move in, and therefore the people who are carrying out the jobs that keep that community together and they provide a great deal of its wealth are commuting from Orangeville, from Milton, from Geulph, from Kitchener. God knows where they are coming in from, but blue collar workers cannot afford to live in these ideally planned communities which are being created by the developers. The social conscience therefore is represented in terms of the kind of motherhood planning to which developers are willing to give credence, but not in terms of providing affordable housing, housing at reasonable cost, housing that the vast amount of the population in and around Toronto can afford.

Finally, on the developers agenda is the question of housing itself. You notice that I put that very low down. That is a means to these other ends, including one's reputation in order to put on good developments and so on. Housing is a

means, housing is a by-product and the other aims I would suggest are central. Mr. McLaughlin in particular, maybe Mr. Armstrong a bit less, however, (I was surprised about one or two of the things he said), have made it fairly clear and the Urban Institute have made it clear what the developers want. They want the land supply dried up, they want to shorten the development approvals, they want to let the industry move, they want to reduce sales tax and other costs of inputs, and they stoutly resist to the controls that would be represented by public land ownership.

What they don't say in their agenda is that they don't have any particular concern about the excessive growth of urban areas like Metro Toronto, the over-rapid growth which has been the major contributor to many of the problems that we have; that they show little or no concern about housing for the low and moderate income sector. The limit of their concern has been to encourage the Ontario government to provide a token amount of public housing through the Ontario Housing Corporation. They show little or no public concern about the cost of housing. If the cost is up \$5,000 or \$10,000, that's too bad. If there is a market for \$75,000 homes and the profit is greater there than building \$28,000 town houses, then it's the \$75,000 homes that will go up. One is not aware of developers going into council saying "Look, here's what we want to do in order to house people who can't afford housing right now." The pitch is always, "Here's what we want to do in order to improve our own profit position.

The kind of voluntary restraints that Mr. McLaughlin so magnanimously offered have not been evident in any representations that I have heard from developers. There has not been the concern that there ought to have been about the mix and purpose of the housing that's being built. For example, in the Ottawa area, the Ottawa city council insisted vehemently that 10% of a development by Campeau Corporation be devoted to social housing. Campeau fought up to

the OMB, I think it was, and eventually gained the acquiescence that this 10% of the land for social housing would be in two or three ghettoized portions at the edge of the development rather than mix through the development as it has been proposed by the city. That kind of lack of concern has been endemic in the industry.

Finally, I see my time is running out, developers have done their best, I would suggest, to condition the agenda about housing as it's being discussed by local councils and by the provincial government. It wasn't for nothing that millions of dollars of developers money went to Bill Davis. It isn't for nothing that in the past many municipal politicians have benefited handsomely in their campaign funds from contributions from developers and the consequences are that some of the areas of the agenda for housing that ought to have been pushed in this province and in its rapidly growing urban areas have just been ignored. For example, public land ownership—we are just beginning to discuss it—and that's because we are shocked into feeling that something ought to be done because of the fact that middle class people as well as working class people are having a hell of a time getting affordable housing since two or three years ago. Rent control has been completely unacceptable to the development industry and they have conditioned the agenda for governments to the point where rent control has been a non-starter in Ontario up until very recently when North York and the City of Toronto have begun to make it a subject of active discussion. The expansion of public housing, of co-operative housing, of non-profit housing, and of social housing, once again have been non-starters because of the agenda that I would suggest is conditioned by the development industry. If the industry complains that there has not been a concern about the mix of housing or about available land from the municipal and provincial governments, the industry itself has got to recognize that it has encouraged, aided and abetted many of the people who now

hold and wield political power and who have in co-operation with the industry, created that agenda.

Well I think I can stop there, I can put forward a program in terms of what would happen if the socialists came to power here in the province, but that isn't the title of this particular seminar, so let's leave it at that. Thank you very much.

BERNHOLTZ

I would like to open the floor for discussion, but before I do, Mr. Armstrong has asked if he could be the first discussant.

ARMSTRONG

Mr. Chairman, I am not a political animal, I don't intend to carry on an ideological discussion with an expert, but I have spent quite an amount of time preparing an address to you on a subject which I understood was "If The Developer Had His Way" with respect to the design and development of new communities and new towns. I made it very clear in my address that I was as concerned about the government being the developer as I was private enterprise. I have to say that for someone to get up here and deliver a political hurangue and an "Every Businessman is a Bastard" and every "Successful Businessman is a Crooked Bastard." Lecture, No. 29, N. D.P. Library, is an insult to this audience.

BERNHOLTZ

Are there any questions, or discussion or comments? I must say, today has been kind of a revelation for me. In the old days, before I got into the real world, I was a school teacher for about 8 years and I moderated a panel or two, but I have never seen so many testy people in my life, and maybe it's time that people were testy—

CASSIDY

Can I make a comment now? I deliberately didn't talk specifically about how I would suggest it be done. But can I just say very briefly that in

the development of new communities I believe very strongly that in order to allow, among other things, cooperation between the private sector and government, without this constant concern about super profits being made in land development and in order to permit the development industry to simply incur what Mr. Armstrong called normal business risks, in terms of marketability, keeping your costs under control and that kind of thing, that it seems to me very clearly evident that you've got to have the land of new communities be publicly owned. That means either through the province or through the municipalities depending on whichever is appropriate in the particular situation.

It seems to me that the province more than municipalities is in a position to talk about the needs of future residents, be they tenants or home owners, and that therefore the province has got to lay out for that particular new community a kind of agenda of the kind of housing, the mix of housing, the prices to be paid in rents or in purchase for that particular housing in order to insure a balanced community and in order to insure that people in low and moderate incomes are served, and not only those in the upper income brackets. In addition we must achieve a workable form of land leasing to prevent even home owners from becoming speculators in their own small way as time goes on.

Once all that is done then it seems to me that developers and the government can sit down and can try and shorten lead times for development to get the housing on the ground and do some of the other things that Mr. Armstrong is talking about. But the whole discussion about development and the whole future of development in the province is going to be bedeviled so long as we take socially created values in land and put them into private pocket. That really is the root cause of an awful lot of the problems that are being discussed today.

ANNE GOLDEN

I have a question for Mr. Armstrong, with regard to the program which he

suggested. With regard to the official plan, I realize that you were talking about new communities, but the notion of a very fixed official plan which would then become a binding contract as you described it frightens me a little bit. Perhaps this is because of past experiences in the City where the official plan became fixed and then values changed and perspectives changed throughout the 1960's so that it led to a lot of the confrontation which you mentioned. Now in a new community presumeably you wouldn't have this conflict at the beginning; the official plan might be satisfactory, but the new community would be a growing evolving thing and I wonder what role citizen participation could have, or in your view, should have through the span of time. In other words, the official plan would be done in a fixed period of time as you suggested, but the new town wouldn't just spring fullgrown at one time. I'm sort of worried about the implications of a fixed official plan as binding as you suggest, as detailed as you suggest, over a decade, perhaps, as that town grows.

ARMSTRONG

You are absolutely right, Mrs. Golden, that's the biggest problem of all. But I would say that that solution, the solution I suggested, is emanately better than the problem we have today, where the antagonist adversary system is creating the delays it is. I'm suggesting that this official plan would not be that detailed with respect to the location of streets other than major arterials but would indicate that, for instance, if you bought a house on the peripheral of one phase you would know that single family dwellings were in the main in your vicinity in the next phase. You would know the general location of high-rise and mid-rise and low-rise. You would have an idea where the shopping facilities would be, not specifically, but within 400 feet or so and I think that can be done within the context of the knowledge that we have in forward planning.

GOLDEN

Can I just ask one follow-up question in connection with that? Was the problem that you spelled out, or what you are proposing, is that in relation solely to new towns? Or would you have this official plan have that kind of role to play in the total situation?

ARMSTRONG

I don't believe that that type of official plan would work in presently urbanizing areas at all. But I think it would have to be new communities with a definite geographical delineation or new towns.

GOLDEN

Because then I see a problem, a judicial problem perhaps, arising out of how you define citizen participation possibilities in one area as opposed to the rights of citizens, say in another area. In one case you would permit public hearings at a certain stage; in another area you wouldn't. Again I see problems.

ARMSTRONG

Yes, but this has never been done before, there is no reason why it shouldn't be done in the future.

BERNHOLTZ

Would you identify yourself please?

QUESTION:

I would be delighted to identify myself, I am one of the enemy. My name is Eilert Frerichs and I'm the Chairman of the Confederation of Resident and Ratepayers Association in the City of Toronto. I suppose we are the people who are responsible, to some degree, for the so-called delays that Mr. Armstrong was referring to. I'm thinking of a particular piece of land here in town which is presently proposed to be developed. The proposal was first made, if I remember rightly in 1967, and all that has gone up so far on that parcel of land is a gigantic phallic symbol. Now, one of the reasons why the development has been delayed so long is that the developers simply proposed to put up the kind of housing that many people

in the city perceived to be the wrong kind of housing. The kind of housing that Metro Centre wanted to put up was that geared to the marketplace and they were willing to be as specific in terms of the official plan and agreements and so on with the city as you have outlined. I mean I heard Bud Andrews talking while you were speaking and the one portion of the development that he did not want to specify was the housing component of that development and we said this is ridiculous this is the wrong priority for our city. The thing still hasn't gone up as a result because the developer in this particular case has been unwilling to budge; and my suggestion to you is that nowadays, at any rate as I perceive it, in this city part of the problem that developers have is caused by the fact that they are not putting up the right kind of housing.

ARMSTRONG

By whose standards?

QUESTION:

By the communities standards. If there is need to house low-income people for instance and you are only willing to put up houses that cost 30, 40, 50 thousand dollars then it's plainly the wrong kind of housing and we have to sit down and try and convince the industry to build the kind of housing that is in fact needed. I would suggest that at the present time the need is precisely for housing for people in the low and middle income groups, and that's not what we are getting from you — and that's one of the reasons we are battling you.

ARMSTRONG

I think that you'll find that in the development of new communities and new towns, and I'd like to stick to that if I may because I have to say to you that whilst I do not have intimate knowledge of Metro Center, though I know Bud Andrews very well, and I don't want to get into that discussion for that reason. If we stick to new towns and the new communities I think you'll find as government participation becomes more and more important, and, I will

have to admit that that will be the case, the amounts of money that will be required for the front end loading of the infrastructure in the new towns particularly are far beyond the resources of private enterprise. I think we have to face into this, this is going to be a partnership and this is why Bruce McLaughlin was talking about getting rid of the adversary approach because it can no longer work. I think you will find a very proper and necessary injection of low-cost housing for all levels of our population within those new communities and I don't think there will be any problem in that regard. I think it will be dictated by circumstance.

QUESTION:

As long as the profits are right for you.

ARMSTRONG

But that isn't the point because if the official plan is detailed enough it could for instance set down the criteria for percentages of different types of housing. We could live with that without specifying minutely what kind of housing it is. It could for instance, I would suggest, set aside certain amounts of housing for public rental housing, for public home plan housing; there has to be that mixture of housing in any new community. We recognize that. Heretofore, however, the delays we have been facing have caused us a cost of land which prohibits doing just that.

BERNHOLTZ

Are there further questions or discussions?

CASSIDY

Just to comment again, I think that what Mr. Armstrong says is probably well taken but there is a chicken and egg kind of situation. Developers appear in the public eye on the basis of evidence the people see to be wanting to build 40 or 50 or 80 thousand dollar homes. Developers do not appear, in the public eye, interested in setting aside a lot of land for home plan, or for

public rental housing and that kind of thing. In fact it's an anathema or appears to be an anathema to developers. Now Mr. Armstrong says otherwise; I welcome that kind of comment.

ARMSTRONG

Alright, I'll say this and it's available for proof at any time for anyone who would like to go out to Bramalea. Bramalea was the first developer in this province to set aside land for home plan. It was Bramalea that designed the original home plan financing. Bramalea was the first condominium developer, had it's first condominium open and available for sale the day after legislation was passed, September the 29th, 1968, was it? Bramalea was the first developer of zero lot line. Every innovation to bring down the cost of housing has been done by the private development industry. All the innovations have come from the development industry. Our problem, Mr. Cassidy is the cost of our land. The risk we take in carrying it precludes us from setting aside lands at a price that can enable us to reach the \$13,500 salary earner. We're not happy about that and we are prepared to cooperate with government in every way but we simply can't get the cost of our land down until the procedures are straightened out, until the servicing is in the ground and we can produce lots in quantity.

CASSIDY

Well, okay, tax or no tax, and we've got a tax bill on the legislature today, the place where unholy profits are made in the development business are in land and if the development industry were to come to government and say, "Look! you fellows provide the land and we're going to start supporting public involvement in the provision of land rather than resisting it, and we want to make a normal commercial profit in the building in innovative kinds of housing," then it would seem to me you will get greater credibility and more support and some

shortening of these development delays which are bedeviling you.

ARMSTRONG

I have heard this expression "super profits", "excess profits", "Obscene profits", "untoward profits" today until I'm sick and tired of it! Bramalea has been in existence for 15 years. If someone would take a look at the earnings of Bramalea, and I'm obviously not selling the stock now and I hope there are no investment dealers around, if you look at the earnings of Bramalea over 15 years, look at the tough years when we were struggling for our existence, when we were damn nearly bankrupt. If you look at those earnings over 15 years the return on equity, the return on investment is not as good as the return on Canada Savings Bonds. Now don't look at the good years, look at the tough ones as well, because that's what the industry is all about.

CASSIDY

I will look at your figures. Bruce McLaughlin's figures are before us today and they show, what is it, 12 fold increase in assets from a very high figure over six years. Now yours may show the same thing for that period of time, I'm not sure, but that suggests to me that the control and concentration within the industry has become very intense in recent years. Now possibly back in the early 1960's, when the market was soft, things were different.

ARMSTRONG

Nothing to do with it all. The fact is that Bramalea was assembled at least 8 years before maturity and land could only be assembled at the prices at which we assembled land because there was no market. I'm talking about urban maturity, and the land has to be held, it has to be carried, it has to be planned and there are costs involved. Government could not do it any cheaper; in fact I guarantee you it would cost government more, but you people in the audience would never see the figures.

BERNHOLTZ

Final comment please.

QUESTION:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to mention here that I deplore the kind of political slamming backwards and forwards this is going on. It is unfortunate that our industry is the one industry that I know of that has to work closely with 3 or 4 levels of government. Nobody in the shoe industry, for instance, has to go to government and say we would like to have this type of shoe or that type of shoe. When we are talking about profits and rip-off, I paid this morning \$14.00 for a pair of baby shoes for a two year old and I would like to know who in politics is going to stand up and make a big song and dance about it.

Now it seems to me that the profits that the land developers are making are because they are getting bigger. They all started out as small builders and now the politics require them to be big (I'm sorry I'm trembling but I'm just so angry); the profits that are required to withstand the sort of thing Mr. Armstrong was talking about—that is a 6 to 7 to 8 year wait for some political rangling with various elected officials who come and go and who don't understand the problem and who could care less except to get elected again—seems to me to be the root of the problem.

Now I think if Mr. Armstrong would support me here there is in various municipalities a minimum lot and a minimum house size and I would like to know what Mr. Cassidy is doing about the decreasing family; we are all told to watch our population and so on, so we are going to have less and less children. What size house is the government requiring developers to build to accommodate decreasing family? I would just like to reiterate that I deplore the political aspects that have crept into this discussion.

CASSIDY

It's a valid point. What I said before is that the provincial government can better express the needs of people who

are not adequately housed now than can a municipal government which tends to speak for people who are already comfortably settled and that the province therefore should be telling Mississauga and Durham and other municipalities in the Toronto region, "Look, over the next three years, this is the agenda in terms of the kind of housing we expect you to provide, and leave it to that municipality to find the ways to provide that housing at affordable cost. It may be by reducing lot sizes; it may be by reducing the minimum square footage; there may be other techniques by which that is done. Clearly the province has got to accompany that kind of pretty tough over all framework planning by insuring municipalities have the financial wherewithall and don't suffer now, because a lot of their planning is planning for assessment and clearly has become increasingly unworkable.

BERNHOLTZ

Thank you. I hope both Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Cassidy would be good enough to come back after Dr. Hanson's discussion and join us up here on the panel so that we may continue this.

Again, our second panel of speakers will be limited to 10 minutes instead of their allocated 15 minutes. I have met neither of the panelists beforehand. In a way that is kind of an interesting thing, especially because I have found that the fame of our guests has preceded them and anything I said would just be extraneous. So I would like to call first the Assistant Deputy Minister of Housing for Ontario, Mr. W. Wronski, to talk about Pickering, a new community with "prospects and problems".

WRONSKI

I am very happy to have this opportunity of sharing the platform today with Mayor Cosgrove in a discussion about one of the Province's most ambitious programs, the North Pickering Project. Mayor Cosgrove and I have discussed North Pickering privately on many occasions and I must say that I am well

aware of the extent of his criticism regarding the Pickering concept.

The Provincial decision to develop North Pickering is based upon the Toronto-Centred Region Plan, about which I have written in the position paper which was passed out to you here today. I don't think that I need to get into too much detail about the TCR Plan but I do want to reiterate the provincial goals as they relate to Zone 1, the lake-shore urbanized area which is the framework in which North Pickering is being developed.

In the TCR Plan, the lakeshore urbanized area is designated as a highly structured set of two-tiered cities, looking to Hamilton and Oshawa as the regional terminal cities at either end of the zone. These centres would be differentiated by role, size and growth, but tightly integrated through social and economic flows and communications linkages, and separated by a series of open spaces known as the Parkway Belt.

One of the major thrusts of the concept is the encouragement of growth east of Metropolitan Toronto, focusing on the regional centre of Oshawa. The shift of growth to this area would serve several objectives, including the balancing of urbanization to the east and west of Metro, deconcentrating some of the growth from Metro Toronto, strengthening the Oshawa sub-regional economic base, and enhancing the diversity of urban choice for residential and employment opportunities.

The TCR Plan proposed the development of four new second-tier communities east of Metro. The Federal Government's decision to proceed with development of an airport in North Pickering prompted the Provincial Government to combine the development of Brock and Cedarwood, two of these new communities, into what is now known as North Pickering.

There has been a great deal of negative comment about the location of North Pickering, that it is too close to Metro and that it would merely be an appendage of Metropolitan Toronto. In my view there are many advantages

to the North Pickering location. North Pickering can combine many of the aspects of the original free-standing British new towns and, at the same time, avoid some of the problems of the original British programs. North Pickering will be built in conjunction with an existing urban area, but much nearer to the city than was the original British practice, thus giving the new population the diversified cultural and recreational wealth which only a large city like Toronto can afford - an obvious short-coming of the first British New Towns serving the London overspill.

Land acquisition for a near-in town is, of course, more costly than in the case of rural free standing or growth-centred towns, but the proximity of ready-made facilities and amenities would make possible an extensive delay in providing these for the new town. Thus, there could be a net saving of considerable proportions during the most costly period.

An existing urban area would be extended, which is the principle being questioned; but the extension would be an orderly one, not in any sense sprawl, and the additional Toronto population growth would, in effect, be distributed and would not contribute to the urban crisis. It is not the number of people that make the crisis, but their digestibility into a system. An important consideration is that most of the anticipated growth of Metro into the next several decades would be internally generated, and this internal growth could be directed more easily into an adjacent area than into a far removed area. In short, while idealists tend to recommend the rural or semi-rural based new town, it is possible as a means of digesting masses of people.

North Pickering will require a strong economic base to provide job opportunities for its residents as well as the provision of retail and other services for their convenience. A balanced property tax base will flow from facilities to support employment and services. Opportunity for new industries is almost unlimited. It is close to major Canad-

ian and U.S. markets, but most important is its proximity to Metro Toronto. Metro's ability to generate economic activity over a widespread area presents a potential that could be of outstanding benefit to North Pickering. Thus, the continuing growth of secondary and distribution industries as typified in Metro should represent an economic opportunity for North Pickering.

The proposed new Toronto Airport would have an important influence on the economy of North Pickering. The economic activity adjacent to other airports certainly suggests the nature and the magnitude of the potential.

North Pickering can learn from the experience of new towns the world over. Since War World II, new towns have enjoyed a resurgence in popularity. Of course, their *raison d'être* have differed with location and particular Government policies. The USSR has built an astonishing number of new towns, over 800 of them since the revolution. Many were factory towns built in conjunction with industrial and military installations. Soviet policy was directed to development of its Eastern States, while decentralizing the West.

Western European States have also been active in new town development, hoping to use them as a means of dispersing population from larger urban areas and providing housing and other urban amenities to their increasing population.

American experience with new communities during the last fifty years has been rather limited. Only in the last decade have new towns grown in popularity, most of them being developed by private enterprise. They tend to be dormitory communities built near larger Metropolitan areas.

Canada's experience in new town development has been, like the Soviet factory towns, mainly in the area of resource based new towns, such as Kittimat and Elliot Lake, or the extensions or appendages to the existing urban areas, like Don Mills, Erin Mills, Meadowvale and Kanata. North Pickering is the first Government venture into

the development of something which, we hope, will be neither.

North Pickering has much to gain from the British experience of the past 30 years. Originally, Britain built new towns with complete Government control and monies, with a limited input from the private sector.

The new Mack III towns, such as Milton Keynes, is indicative that the British are moving away from deterministic planning towards a recognition of a vital and creative role that private enterprise can play in the development of Government sponsored new towns.

A major purpose of the British new town program was to relieve the pressures on London. The new towns have succeeded in doing this. Specifically, the purpose was to find livable quarters and jobs to which low-income people could be moved. In this the British succeeded. Contrast this with urban redevelopment, particularly in the United States, where the emphasis is on moving people out of an existing area rather than moving people into a desirable area. Here in North Pickering we have an opportunity to develop new and better ways to organize existing urban institutions, and to improve urban management and practices - and we don't have to follow tradition. The new town is a means to an end. It's not the cure-all. It holds great promise if thoughtfully planned. It seems reasonable to suppose that North Pickering, planned in close co-operation with Metro Toronto, can help to relieve the pressure from the Metropolitan area.

The purpose and objective of North Pickering must be primarily the creation of a rewarding place in which to live, a place where new patterns for urban living can be designed. And if this should require new economic, social and political approaches, now is our chance to design them.

Mr. Chairman, I have not given you any basic facts and figures about North Pickering but these I have included in my position paper which I hope most of you in the audience already have in your possession. Thank you.

BERNHOLTZ

Our next panelist is Mayor Paul Cosgrove of the Borough of Scarborough.

COSGROVE

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Charles Darwin had a method of operating as a lawyer, if you can believe what he wrote. And he said that he first made his mind up on a problem and then he went and found the law to substantiate his position. That is in fact the way I approach you this afternoon.

My initial reaction to the North Pickering project, in view of the fact that it took from Scarborough 3,000 acres, was that it was too close to Scarborough. I couldn't reconcile it with the Toronto Centered Regional Plan, notwithstanding Mr. Wronski's statement that it does correspond with the plan. When the plan said that the project was to be beyond easy commuting range of Metropolitan Toronto and the object of it was to prevent a swell of growth near or close to the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto, I couldn't reconcile those with the plan. I can't reconcile them with the plan that originally spoke of a population of 50,000 or so people in Cedarwood with the amended proposal for 200,000 people. So my initial reaction is that there is something wrong with it. It doesn't, in my observation, do what it is supposed to do. As a matter of fact it runs diametrically contrary to what it was designed to do.

So what I put before you today, and I think it was just distributed a few moments ago, is a position paper. It's headed "New Community-Pickering" and as you go through the paper you will see that I have evaluated the Pickering proposal both in light of the new town concept as described by Mr. Wronski and the past experiences of new towns in Europe and the U.S. I can say to you that I have text, paragraph and before you statements that support my view that the proposal for North Pickering doesn't coincide either with the Toronto-Center Regional Plan nor does it coincide with the theory of the

new town concept. Let me take you to the conclusions on page 5:

“Although the Toronto—Center Region Plan concept (now the Central Ontario Planning Region) geared to develop a well-structured urban growth for the lakeshore belt from Hamilton to Bowmanville and to stimulate the eastern corridor to a higher growth rate is comendable, yet its first application to direct the future growth in the region by proposing the Pickering Development, (New town and new airport) in proximity to Metro Toronto is ill considered.”

And I made a note as Mr. Wronski spoke that this is really the first proposal by the government, major proposal to proceed with the implementation of the Plan and this is how I see it. As a local politician I see the project as spot rezoning. It was the first attempt to implement the plan. I think it failed in that it was diametrically opposed to the fundamental principles of the plan and so I say it's spot rezoning. I say that the government is a developer. I say that the reasons that the government proposes this scheme is for the sake of the economies, for the sake of accessibility to the center to Metropolitan Toronto, to serve the growth of Metropolitan Toronto. Those are reasons that you look at when you look at spot rezoning. As developers always tell you, it is economy when they bought the land that motivates them to ask for 60 units to the acre instead of 30 units to the acre. That's good economy but is it good planning? My view is that it isn't good planning, it's an extension of Metropolitan Toronto.

My view is that Metropolitan Toronto as it is now is large enough and we are contributing to this growth pattern rather than approaching the experience of the new towns in other jurisdictions. This is in effect an extension of Metropolitan Toronto and undesirable. I have said it many times—I'm not optimistic that I say I will really be listened to—I perceive that Mr. Wronski's influence and the provincial government probably will win out in the end.

So I have a second part to my paper and the second part is: Can I offer any comments as a local politician on the proposal for the new town, notwithstanding what I have said up to this point? I can, I think, from my brief experience and exposure to municipal politics. It is that the new town should be self-sufficient to a greater degree. In other words, the planners instead of looking at accessibility to Metropolitan Toronto, instead of looking at Metropolitan Toronto as an industrial base to support the town, should as much as possible look to the new town as being self-sufficient. It should have its industries, it should have its job opportunities, it should have everything that Mr. Wronski talks about being desirable in giving a full experience to people.

That's what happened in the municipal elections in Metropolitan Toronto. I perceive that people said we want our communities to be strong and healthy; that's what the people in the City of Toronto said in the last election; that's what the people in the Borough said and I think that's true across Ontario and I think it's true across Canada. It's a people thing happening right now and I think it tells the planners something. It has told me something so, although I would say: “don't proceed with the North Pickering project; don't proceed with the airport because you are making a mistake; instead develop around Oshawa, build industries by setting up a huge plant to turn out light rapid transit vehicles instead of building an airport and make your growth centre somewhere further towards the east.” Nonetheless, I suppose it can work. Everything works more or less, well or not well. But as it goes along, Metropolitan Toronto can offer not only the hard support that Mr. Wronski refers to, but municipal experience and the experience of the elections to, direct the planners in what they are doing in North Pickering. Thank you very much.

BERNHOLTZ

Now I'd like to open the floor for discussion, questions, comments.

QUESTION:

I would like to ask Mr. Wronski why industry would locate in Durham region which is North Pickering, when other municipalities with a far better industry urban assessment ratio are available now and have lots of industrial land nearer the demographic centre of Ontario. Why would an industry want to go east? Oshawa so far hasn't been very successful. Now I've got three questions so would you like to do them one at a time?

WRONSKI

Well there are several reasons why industry will go east. First of all we do, I wouldn't say rely, but we do appreciate the advent of the international airport. That in itself is a catalyst for quite a sizeable industrial and commercial activity. In itself it is an attraction. We know the development in Mississauga around the airport, we know how it grew up. Secondly, and let's not forget that this is after all a little piece of land like 25,000 acres which happens to be owned by provincial government, the Province has the possibility, has the means by which to encourage industrial development if not necessarily direct. I don't think, we are at the stage of direction yet, but certainly at the stage of providing inducement to industry to locate where the government feels it is necessary. There are many programs already in existence and those which will be designed to convince industry that this may be a good location. One of them obviously is, as you very well realize, the price of land which can be controlled by the government while the government is in possession of that land.

QUESTION:

So it is very probable that there will be development along the Scarborough airport North Pickering corridor, I suppose then.

WRONSKI

Well we hope so, yes.

QUESTION:

Well then the next question is, why would industry? Will not government subsidizing industrial land in North Pickering discourage development and industrial development in Oshawa?

WRONSKI

Well I think this is a question of phasing and timing and it is a question of the efficiency of the program. The government thrust is to the east. If the government is going to discourage anything or compete with anything, it is not going to be Oshawa but it is going to be Oakville and Mississauga. If we have got to argue names, as you know the TCR and the COLUC policy is to encourage growth to the east and if any competition can be assumed between locations for industrial development, it will be between east and the west. I'm quite confident that we can stimulate the growth of Oshawa as we do right now by creation of industrial parks and the diversification of the economic base of Oshawa, which, by the way, is not a miserable as you may assume. It is a pretty substantial one except that it might appear to be a one factory town. We are doing this at the same time as we will open up Pickering. So I think these 2 programs can go at the same time because, don't forget, when in 1954 Metropolitan Toronto was opened up, the action went on 4 fronts at the same time—the Humber, both of the Dons and the Highland Creek. The areas were not just developed one by one but at the same time and they developed quite rationally and quite logically.

QUESTION:

Did not the original TCR concept envisage the phasing of development that put the anchor purposely first at Oshawa to encourage development at Oshawa and then in the later years, the 90's and late 80's, backfill towards Toronto?

WRONSKI

No, I think we are reading far too much into the TCR. There was no such

statement; as a matter of fact, one of the great beefs I had when I was still a municipal planner was that far too little was said in TCR as far as phasing of development and as far as industry and employment opportunities were concerned. No, there was no such thing.....

QUESTION:

What did the dates on the little maps show, the different time phases....?

WRONSKI

Oh, I presume you are referring to Cedarwood and Brock which were earmarked to be developed in the second phase of TCR development. Well, I refer to in my statement that the advent of the North Pickering Airport has changed the timing as well as the location of these communities. That is a very important factor.

QUESTION:

My last question, I don't want to have to have debate, but how can Durham region become a community and have a community of interests when its population will be centered in North and South Pickering rather than somewhere near the geographic center of the region? and when the commuter service and when the new railway runs out to Pickering from Toronto?

WRONSKI

Alright, let me ask you a question. What is a community identity in a region? In a neighbourhood, in cities and neighbourhoods, fine. Once we are dealing with regions, we are dealing with systems we are not dealing with community identities. The community identity as far as I'm concerned is between Oshawa and Hamilton and centered in Toronto and that's the name of the game, the Toronto-Centered Region. Each of the small communities whether it's Columbus, whether it's Whitby, whether it's Oshawa, whether it's North Pickering, we all have the identity, but there will be no identity for regional Durham as there is none for Metropolitan Toronto or Regional York.

QUESTION:

Isn't there a conflict with our plans for regional government that said they would be urban-centered regions and we will have an Oshawa-centered region when everybody is living over in Pickering?

WRONSKI

Well now look please do read the Toronto-Centered Region Plan. Oshawa is planned to the population of 400,000 people. Obviously for certain functions Oshawa will be a centre but nobody will ever in the same sense say that Oshawa will replace Toronto as a centre for the Toronto Centred Region. I say this is the name of the game, it's a Toronto-Centred Region.

QUESTION:

I have a question for Mr. Wronski. This morning somebody from TEIGA was saying that the projected growth for Metropolitan Toronto is 5.7 million inhabitants, or something like that. North Pickering is going to have 200,000 people and Oshawa is going to have 400,000 people. The whole province of Ontario, at the moment has, how many people in it, 8 million altogether. Are we going to have living in a ring around Metropolitan Toronto within a easy commuting distance of the Toronto Dominion Centre? Where do all these people come from and what is the effect of the kinds of figures that the province of Ontario is projecting for the easy commuting distance from the Toronto Dominion Center on the rest of the province let alone the rest of the country?

WRONSKI

Well who am I to deny the knowledge of the planners, regional planners from TEIGA but let me try my simple interpretation of the regional plan. I am quite sure that nobody from TEIGA would even dream to tell you that Toronto, that is the Metropolitan Toronto as I understand it, will have a population of 5 million people. The so-called maturity, the mature plan for the Toronto-

Centred Region which goes beyond even our youngest member of the audience's expectation, because it reaches the time of the year 2050 plus, deals with the kind of population projection for the area between Hamilton and beyond to Bowmanville of about 7 million people all together. This is not very unrealistic if you listened to Bruce McLaughlin today who says Canada will have 100 million people and a place to stand for 14 million in Ontario alone. You have to realize that this golden horseshoe is probably the most significant centre not just for Ontario but the whole of Canada, and will be for a very very long time. Therefore I don't think it is unreasonable for us to assume that the long range plan should at least bear in mind that this is the kind of magnitudes of numbers we are talking about. The question of commuting distances, the question of commuting itself is a debatable one, I think that the plan in its final analysis will not necessarily rely on commuting. It will give opportunities for commuting because of the transportation corridors and the facility for people's movement and good's movement by provision of rapid transit and private individual transportation, but it certainly will not create dormitory communities where people live and have to move to work. The opportunities will be there to live and work in the same community or alternatively, they may choose to work at Toronto Dominion Centre. But there will be a comparatively few people working at Toronto Dominion Centre. Even now, less than 1/3 of the total labour force in this general region works in Toronto's downtown. Let's not kid ourselves, most of the people work in Rexdale, in Scarborough and North York, now. So, now the situation isn't so tragic and certainly would be less tragic once rational planning takes command.

QUESTION:

You haven't answered my third question, about the country and the rest of the province. I'm frightened quite frankly at the kind of projection you know

that the golden horseshoe is going to be it for ever and ever at least in our lifetimes, and Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and you know the prairies and all the rest of it. It seems to me that the policy of the government is a very historical one obviously and doesn't seem to be changing, or it doesn't seem to be changing. The 'Feds' have to get into the act at that point and I'm concerned that maybe we need to give some thought to the rest of the country as well.

WRONSKI

You mean, we in Ontario, should give thought to the rest of the country? Well, yes we are trying very hard, we are paying half the bill anyway as it is! I don't know really what to answer, could you wait a couple of years when I am promoted to the Federal Government?

Well, joking apart, the fact is that there are certain points in the Canadian economic structure which just can't be denied and I think Metropolitan Toronto the Toronto Centered Region is one of them. The growth points will grow. I think that is proven, even Mr. Marchand realized that with his regional economic assistance programs. They decided there is no point trying to create something in the middle of Labrador because there is no reason for it. It is much better to stimulate something for which there is a need and which has a reason for existence; as the Toronto Centered Region has a reason for existence (whatever reason they may be—) I think our impact on the rest of Canada will persist and will be quite considerable. So we will go, in spite of the no-growth philosophy of Paul Cosgrove.

QUESTION:

I would like to address my question to Mr. Wronski. I'd just like to pick up on one point you mentioned which was the British new town experiences as shown to be a successful example of how new towns can be developed. In my personal experience, as confirmed by other people, I have found that the

new towns in Britain haven't achieved the kinds of success that you are implying. They haven't succeeded in alleviating the problems of over-population in large urban centers like London and Glasgow. They haven't been able to overcome a lot of the blues called the settling-in period in the new towns themselves. They have tied people down and restricted movement into new towns by restricting job entry allied with housing accommodation. So my question really centres on the new community in North Pickering, and I would like to know not so much the opinions that you might have about the adverse affects on Metro Toronto, but of the adverse affects of Metro Toronto on North Pickering—in the community there itself—how that community will be able to shape part of its lifestyle without Metro Toronto dictating it.

WRONSKI

Alright, I think we have got a problem of communication. What I said, I think, was that new towns of Britain, specifically the Mark I towns, the original 18 towns around London, have achieved their purpose. That is, decentralization of London's population and the accommodation of London overspill. They are in my opinion however a dismal failure because, you cannot take a guy from Poplar or Stepney and put him in Crowley New Town with beautiful trees and grass, without giving him the kind of amenities he has been used to in London. This basically was the theory of self sufficiency because Crowley is about 65 miles away from London and 65 miles in Britain in about two days trip for anybody who has ever travelled in that country. Therefore what I was contrasting to North Pickering is that we are not basically creating a new town. We have got other programs for expanding towns outside the commuting distance within the Toronto-Centred Region Plan or the Design for Development which Mayor Cosgrove was referring to and unfortunately I think everything is concentrating on North

Pickering.

North Pickering is a new community, a new community which in my opinion will rely very heavily on the facilities and the infrastructure of Metropolitan Toronto. The kind of things that we cannot even think of building in a new town or the kind of dimensions we are talking about. We cannot build a new university, we cannot build O'Keefe Centres, we cannot build opera houses which we can build in Metropolitan Toronto, and we hope that North Pickering people will be coming to use these facilities in Metro Toronto. The failure of providing these kinds of facilities in the British new towns, the 18 original Mark I new towns, led the British to consider a completely different concept, that is those like Milton-Kenes which I referred to—you know, a town of 350,000 people which is 7 times as large practically as the original ones, where they hope to be able to provide the kind of facilities people may require.

And this will not be just a very homogenous population of London which will go into it. I also forward to you a proposition that the population of North Pickering will be basically a Toronto population. The population for which we will not have any more space in about 10 years time, that is your children, my children's children, because we are full up to the brim and we will have to get them out somehow because obviously they will not want to live in our basement or our spare rooms and whathave you. And this is the safety valve which Metropolitan Toronto should have because it will be basically the same population.

I think I lost your other question by now, but if I just may put one sentence which is basically in answer to Mayor Cosgrove's statement; the non-commuting new towns which the province has in mind—I am quite sure you are all aware of the other growth points of the design of Development in the Toronto-Centered Region are the Port Hopes, Cobourgs, Peterboroughs, the Kitchener-Waterloos, the Barries and Midlands which will be expanded and built into

very substantial communities which can live by themselves without relying on Metropolitan Toronto for either employment or cultural amenities. If, Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen wants to repeat his last question I will try to answer it but I've lost it somewhere.

QUESTION:

Basically it was centered on the fact that if a new community is going to be built in North Pickering will the people in the local area be able to actually participate in the creation of that community, recognizing that in Britain where new towns are created so much domination is placed on the location and the way they are constructed in relation to the European common market in building in Southern England? My feeling is that building a new community so close to Metro Toronto will not allow the local community and the people that will inhabit that area of North Pickering to actually determine a lot of the major decisions regarding the environment in which they will live.

WRONSKI

Well, I can't give you any promises, obviously, I can only tell you how I feel about it. I feel quite confident that the kind of social climate within which we operate will force even the most reluctant government to have the citizens' participation in the major decision making process. Even in the circumstances which now prevail in North Pickering when we only have about 350 families left in the hamlets, while the rest are already displaced, even now there is a tremendous effort getting these people to participate and plan together with us the future of the new community. That is 350 people already invited to decide about the future of maybe 100,000 or 150,000 people, and I think that is a fair, a very fair proposal in anybody's books. We cannot invite the 150,000 we don't know them. However we will invite people who we feel will contribute to any ideas about a new community, those who have experience of the Erin Mills, the Don Mills, the Kanatas, the industry themselves, the

sociologists, the academics, heaven help us, to give us their comments and to help us in planning this new community.

COSGROVE

Mr. Chairman, my paper must have been so clear it left no questions to be asked. Mr. Wronski referred to Mayor Cosgrove and "no-growth" and I wanted to say that he was confusing me with some other man. Scarborough has a population of approximately 400,000 people. In the last ten years its population has increased by at least 50%. In the next 25 years it is planned, under its official plan designed in 1957, to double its population. I agree with the official plan. I intend to see that the official plan is implemented as far as possible under the structures it was designed. What I am afraid of is that there will be pressures from other areas other than the borough that would result in things such as happened in the Toronto-Centered Region plan where Cedarwood originally designated at 50,000 people now is 200,000 people, part of that taking up part of Scarborough.

BERNHOLTZ

I would like to thank our two panelists, Mr. Wronski and Mayor Cosgrove. Our next speaker is Dr. Royce Hanson, Chairman of the Maryland-National Capital Parks and planning Commission. He is an acknowledged expert in the field of new towns both because of his publications on the subject and his extensive practical experience. Dr. Royce Hanson:

HANSON

As was indicated I have the responsibility at the present time for chairing, as a full time occupation, a planning board which is working in the suburbs of Washington D.C. and we have also been instrumental in the planning of a new town. I have been involved over the past 10 years or so with various aspects of the new town movement in the U.S. I am most interested in the discussion today. I suppose I have attended 20 or 30 conferences over the past few years

and I have never been to one where I have enjoyed myself more. The discussion between the developers and those who are not developers always intrigues me and it is very pleasant not to be sitting in the seat of judgment when those arguments are being cast about.

First of all I think it is important to say that new towns are not a panacea for the urban problems of any country, at least as far as I have been able to determine. New towns in my judgment are a better way of going at the planning of growth than the traditional methods which we have used; and what I am suggesting in my own jurisdiction, wherever I have an opportunity to be influential in the U.S., we approached the new towns phenomenon not as a problem of doctrine but as a very pragmatic approach to dealing with some extremely difficult matters in the country. I therefore like to think of a new town strategy which says that new towns involve a social movement and a way of looking at growth as distinguished from a strategy of new towns which takes the new town as some very clear thing and plunks it down at various geographic locations in a region and says, "now these are going to be new towns and they will all have green belts and they will have 5 village centres and each village will have five neighbourhoods and a particular hierarchy will emerge. I don't think that is altogether a workable policy.

I think that in the U.S. it is not a workable policy to try to establish a whole series of free standing new towns because we lack a national growth policy and, I think it's fair to say really in all the states, we lack a state growth policy which will give us the opportunity to direct industry to a particular location. Without the opportunity to really direct the economic base to particular barren areas like the middle of Nebraska or South Dakota or somewhere, we are not very likely to encourage an awful lot of people to go there to live. It isn't the most desirable place for an urban settlement to take place particularly if you like to drink water.

Much of the discussion today that I have had the opportunity to listen to has been cast in terms of private versus public and I think that is a bit of a misnomer. I think that it has to be private and public because the new town, as both a social movement and as an approach to urban development, requires a much heavier commitment by the public sector as well as by the private sector than the forms of urbanization that we have experienced before.

Let me deal a little bit first with the role of government because I tend to be political and partial to a strong governmental role, but I hope I have some understanding of the private role and the private problem involved. First of all I think for a new town strategy to succeed there has to be a reasonably clear public policy on the subject. Now by public policy I don't mean declarations by chiefs of government or by elected councils that are made in the form of speeches. I mean a line of decisions that makes it possible for people to reasonably predict what will happen if they do or don't do certain things. If there is a government statement that a new town should be located in a particular area but there is no means of helping bring that about I would argue there was no governmental policy for a new town. If on the other hand, the land is either assembled or it is zoned properly, if the infrastructure is available or can be expected to be available then I would suggest there may be a policy for the development or urbanization of that particular area.

The policy also I think has to recognize that the new town is a means of both channelling and staging growth. Now one of the big dilemmas of urban planning insofar as I have been able to see is that there has always been a great gap between the picture drawn of the state of the area and the question of how in the world can you get there from here. One of the things that's necessary when you go into new town development is to answer that question, because you have to make a whole series of incremental decisions from the point

of deciding that you want a new town, to talking about the size of the new town, to talking about the population mix that you need to plan for, to talking about the kind of housing that will be used, to realizing as Heiking Von Hertson has said that housing is only about 25% of what people need when they move into a community. That once they are housed they have got to get to work, they need some place to play, they need cultural and recreational activities available to them and consequently you have to figure out what these relationships are going to be and how you are going to pull it off, because whether you are doing it publicly or privately or with a mixture of public or private funds, the amount of capital riding out in front of these decisions is quite immense, and if you are going to get your return either in profit or in social goods you have to do a much more meticulous job of planning than you do at any other time.

This means that the government has to take much more of an entrepreneurial role in its own right than is normally the case. I was appalled when I first came into the agency I now head to hear one of the key staff members say that our major job is regulation. Indeed, 2/3 of our budget was regulating development and 1/3 of our budget was planning the future. That is the reverse of the approach that government should take in my judgment. At least 2/3's of our resources in planning ought to be devoted to planning the future and about 1/3 to regulating activities that are on-going on a day to day basis. The government has got to take a much more positive approach to these matters.

In planning I think we have to recognize we are in a different kind of ball game with new towns than we have been with conventional kinds of development. Most of our zoning ordinances and our land regulatory ordinances and even our master plans are predicated on a private market dominated by the quick buck artist as a developer who gets in and out in 5 years, changes the

corporate name and moves to another subdivision. Now that doesn't happen with a new town development. There is probably a 15 to 20 to 25 year build-out period involved and consequently some of the things I have said to you this afternoon are very pertinent and government officials need to listen to them very carefully. That is, given the kind of commitment that is being made by private sector in the development of the new town pursuant to public policy—and I make that important distinction, pursuant to public policy—the public has an obligation also to make a similar kind of commitment that makes it possible for the two of them together to carry off the enterprise.

Staging is very important. Staging of private development so that land can be ready for development when it is necessary to be ready. These are the kind of mundane things sometimes that public planners don't think about but they are important so that the cash flow of the developer can be maintained. One of the most serious problems that people living in new communities face is a situation where the developer verges on the brink of bankruptcy; if he is unable, because of the long lead time involved in bringing a plan to fruition, if he cannot continue to develop at a reasonable pace and gets into financial difficulty, then he is in the position of having to sell off parts of his land to people who may not share the same view of the future that he does and who will try to develop it at much less than what are regarded as new town standards.

Similarly we have to do a much better job of programming our public facilities to reach new towns so that development can occur when it should occur and so that the amenities and services that people need for a good style of urban living are available as they enter the town rather than coming along sometime later. I'm sure you have got those problems solved in Canada but these are problems we are still wrestling with south of you.

The zoning problem is a very serious one. When you begin to plan a new town and you develop a master plan for a new town that is based on history. One of the dilemmas of all planning is that you make decisions about the future based on experience and of course you haven't experienced the future and therefore you can't always perceive it very accurately. When we started planning German Town the first time in 1968 we thought there was going to be a strong market for a lot of high rise apartment buildings. It turns out there isn't that market today that we thought there would be. We consequently found it necessary to change some of the basic kinds of land uses that would be made. There is a need I think for a strong participation by government and particularly in the design process. Now this means that the government must have the confidence to enter directly and creatively into the process of urban design and the review of site plans and there must be a constant monitoring of the pace of development and of the pace of public activity and a willingness to say that we made a mistake and we are going to have to make some changes in this process.

Now to that I think you might add some things that are optional goodies and ideas that I think we need to look at a little bit more closely. One is the question of land assembly. I've heard a lot of people here today talk about the price of land. Indeed, in all urbanized areas land prices are increasing rather dramatically and I think public assembly of land or even public participation in the assembly of land for development is probably one of the things that we are going to have to very very seriously consider not in just the distant future but, in some cases, the near future. Otherwise we are left in the development of a new town's policy of having new towns developed where it is undesirable for environmental and other reasons to locate new towns in the first instance. And one of the problems of the American new town program has been that it has relied exclusively on private initiative for the assembly of tracts of land

and therefore the location of new towns comes very often as a surprise to state and local planning officials who didn't realize that somebody was out there with a suitcase full of money buying land in order to get a couple of thousand to 10,000 to 15,000 acres of it together for new town development. The private problem arises, I think, in new town development, not only because of the long-term nature of the investment incurred (bankers are not notorious for wanting their money to be out for ten years without a single black line showing on the cash flow chart for the first 10 years), but also because new towns are a social process. New community building is a social process as well as a physical development process, so I think community building is a much different kind of thing than home building. Quite frankly, I think that many of my friends in the development industry have not fully perceived the difference. Now some have.

I think the public sector also needs to recognize that some of the most creative thinking being done is being done by private entrepreneurs in the community building business. Some of the most regressive thinking also occurs in the building business and I think many builders would recognize that also but the same is true of the public sector. Many times those of us in the public sector lump all the developers together and say, you know, "a bad lot". It is not true any more than it is true that all ratepayers or all citizens are a good lot and there has to be some understanding on both sides of this new dimension in community development. It's represented by new town development.

I think it is very much in the public interest for government agencies to be directly involved in the planning for the social responsibility of the new communities. Now where the federal government gets into this in the U.S. is through guaranteeing the loan which the private developer contracts for with his own financial institutions. What this amounts to is, it allows him to build at about 2% on the average less interest

rate that he ordinarily would get at prevailing market rates. Now that 2% gives the federal government enough leverage to demand an affirmative action program for socially mixed and economically mixed housing....income housing constructed by the private market. The construction costs and money costs today are not going to permit it even if the land were free. So, consequently I think there is going to have to be a lot of direct public participation in the construction of housing or at least in the purchase of housing, some of it constructed publicly, some of it constructed privately, particularly for low-income families. There is however, in this new towns process some opportunity to get better prices for housing because of the trade-off that is possible in the private development process between residential, commercial and industrial land, so that the high-priced land can in part subsidize the private business. Government can take its profit in social goods rather than in money and that is a perfectly acceptable activity, it seems to me.

New towns then, if they become a part of public policy are a preferred form of urban growth and therefore they require preferential treatment, not this treating every subdivision like every other subdivision. So I would conclude then simply by repeating what I said earlier that the problem is not one of private versus public, but the one of carefully thinking out some public policies that make it possible for public and private to work together to channel growth that is going to occur, to manage growth that is desirable, to place it where it can be handled best to the greatest advantage to both the natural and the built environment; policies by which a much higher degree of social responsibility can be obtained through the development process and where we can have a better distributive effect throughout our urban economy resulting from urban growth. That we ought to use a "new town strategy" rather than a doctrinaire approach to the problem and a strategy of new towns. Thank you.

BERNHOLTZ

Thank you Dr. Hanson. The floor is now open for comments, discussions and remarks.

QUESTION:

I would like to ask the last speaker if he has any views on citizen participation in the planning of the communities. One view that we hear quite regularly is that if these local inhabitants had been invited to assist in the planning of the community when Columbus first arrived, nothing would have every happened. I was wondering if you have had any experience with this problem.

HANSON

Yes, I've had both experience in the days when I used to be regarded as a scholar before I became a public official and lost all my objectivity. I wrote a couple of books on the subject. One is a study which is called, *New Towns, Laboratories for Democracy* and the other is a short pamphlet called *Managing Services for New Towns*.

I believe that there needs to be public participation in the planning process. I have very high regard for professional planners—some of my best friends are planners—but I think that all of us in planning and related professions have an awful lot to learn about laymen. I think in the early stages of planning a new town it is important not only to have a professional interdisciplinary team assembled which looks at the social, religious, cultural, transportation, economic and other aspects of human life in urban settlements and tells the developer, public or private, what he ought to plan for physically and socially, but it is an awfully good idea to have some advisors who are in a sense trustees for the future residents; they should be able to react as ordinary human beings and not as sociologists or planners to the kinds of problems that are presented. I think one of the most creative things is to have housewives and others involved in the planning of the city. It may be useful to have some turnover in the citizen advisory group because if you stay with a certain group of citizens they become

professionalized in a period of time and they begin then to react not as trustees for the ordinary resident but they begin to exercise professional judgment in the area.

Now one of the other things that we've tried to do in German Town, which is unique among the new towns, is that it is not under single ownership. We have 83 different land owners in German Town; This is to suggest there be a German Town Council established and I've advocated this from time to time. We also suggested this in a study we did in Detroit on a paired new town in the inner city and in the suburbs to create an advisory council for the development corporation from the beginning. Initially it would have to be set up with trustees as members. The pattern is old, going back to Radford and as the community becomes populated with real people rather than statistics, allow them to elect members to the board of trustees or board of advisors to the corporation so that at some point the residents of the community become the dominant voice in the advisory process.

Similarly, I'm inclined to think that either a municipal or a quasi-municipal corporation very often needs to be established as the new town advances. You have the advantage in the Toronto region or at least within Metro of having a pattern of federation which seems to me to be a very desirable one, but the problem we have in the U.S. is if you create a municipality then there is nobody to look over its shoulder. A home rule municipality in some states is quite capable of ignoring everybody and that's not a good idea if your new town is performing a larger social purpose. There is always a dilemma and a friction between the desire to complete the plan which the developer or the attitudes of the residents who sort of have "got theirs" when they first moved in. And there needs to be a continuing process, I think, of allowing the residents to advise and making sure that their views are honoured in the process of development. I think the experience

that we have had in new towns like Columbia and Reston, for example two with which I am most familiar, indicates that citizen participation can actually be very helpful to the developer. In many cases it can assist the developer in obtaining the necessary government positions that he needs to complete the plan, because the citizens who move to new towns are immensely patriotic about their new town environment and are insistent that the new town be fulfilled rather than stopped at some point along the way.

QUESTION:

You said some very useful things, I think, about the planning and building process for new towns, particularly your emphasis on community building and its special requirements. I'd like to raise a couple of points that relate to problems here in Canada and I would very much appreciate your observation.

HANSON

Since I am leaving town this evening I will feel safe.

QUESTION:

The problem of front end capital costs—I think you said that the American legislation deals with this by providing direct guarantees to the developer. The Canadian legislation, I'm speaking of the legislation at the National level, deals with this by providing funds through the provinces by agreements with the provinces. This is done so that new communities can be fostered as a means of carrying out the development strategies of provinces, at least that is the operating assumption. I would like to have your observation on these alternative ways of dealing with front end capital costs. Another point concerns the role of the public agency as entrepreneur—you mention this particularly in relation to land assembly coordination and the staging of facilities and that kind of thing. Do you think that the municipality, whether local or regional, can serve as this public agency or must we think in terms of a special

agency like a development corporation?

HANSON

Those are both awfully good questions. I wouldn't look at the difference between the Canadian and the U.S. approach necessarily as alternatives. In some cases it would be a good idea if they were complimentary. The debt guarantee system used under title 7 of the 1970 Housing Act in the U.S. has the advantage of permitting the private developer to carry his costs a lot better. Then there may be some other ways of doing things. A direct subsidy could conceivably do the same thing; however the interests rate as it is compounded becomes a really terrific problem. The title 7 also has in it a lot of things that the administration has never asked for. It allows them to give direct grants to developers; it also allows them some additional federal grants on top of the normal level of the federal grant for the community services; it also permits direct grants to local government to finance capital costs in the early years of developments.

I think one of the things—I am not familiar with Canadian law—but one of the things that your comment suggests to me that does sound very desirable is that in allowing the province, or in our case the state, to control the direction of that money, it is far more likely that the siting of new towns will be responsive to somebody who is making growth policy. In our country the federal government isn't, and it was supposed to prepare a report two years ago on growth policy; it turned in a report that said "my that's a difficult problem and we are sorry you asked". Some of the states are beginning to worry creatively about this. To deal with your second question, I guess the only answer I could really give you is it depends on the circumstances as a very pragmatic matter as to which agency should be in control of the public aspects. In general I have felt that our experience in most states in the area municipal American government is so god-awfully fragmented that it is extremely difficult to get

an answer from anybody in any reasonable period of time to do things and time is very important in new town development. Consequently what I have often recommended, as in the case of Fort Lincoln, Washington and in Detroit and I proposed it in my own county but I can't get it through the state legislature, is the creation of what I call the "Development District" which is simply a special public corporation which is for the period of development of the new town, lent the powers of all of the other governments that have to provide services to the community. Thus there is sort of a one-stop-shop for subsidies and for the provision of infrastructure. You have to be careful how you set up the governing body of it and the role of the public. The reason the idea doesn't get adopted is that local public officials are reluctant to lend anybody anything for sometimes a good reason. I think that if you have a strong municipality and the new town as within the municipality and has a system which is coordinating the various functions of government I see no reason why it can't do it. I think your provinces and our states are sufficiently similar in the composition of your ministry and our departments there probably is some greater need for something like a development corporation if you are operating at a state level and are outside the jurisdiction of a major municipality.

The other one thing I would mention is that in many cases new towns are located in local jurisdictions that, I think it's fair to say are not overwhelming competent in the management of complex problems. They are perfectly capable of collecting taxes and jailing miscreants and sweeping the streets but they have maybe a one man planning department if any and have 2 or 3 people in the public works department to mainly patch pot holes and turn on the water, so part of the answer depends on how competent the government is in managing complex things.

QUESTION:

I'm a regional councillor in the Regional Municipality of Niagara. We are in a different position than you are in the Toronto-Centred Region but we are trying to redirect growth away from the valuable and unique fruit lands and into areas which are less suitable for agriculture. But the thing that I am a little bit wary of is that there is only so much money available for example for the establishment of new communities and when there is an over emphasis on this aspect of urban expenditures then something else must suffer. My concern as a politician is that if too much of our available money resources are spent on new communities and urban expansion then, of necessity, less must be spent on maintenance of existing equilibrium. From what I can see, this new community development is similar to the flight from the suburbs which we have seen in the 50's and 60's and it could be a further factor in creating a social problem in the older areas of the city. It could be a factor in separating the rich intellectuals from the poor ignorant and in effect we could be creating or could be encouraging the further existence of ghettos. While we may not see them in the Niagara area we see them in Chicago and in Detroit. I think that we should not for every new acre that we develop, create another acre of neglect. I think there should be a good balance especially in the area of spending money between the two. I do see clouds on the urban horizon when I look into the future and it is a real concern to me as a politician.

HANSON

Your comment is a fairly good description of some of the existing patterns of urbanization. A new town strategy should be aimed and consciously aimed at making it possible for the people who are not fully sharing the values of an urban civilization to share in them, which they do not through the normal process of suburbanization. We addressed this problem in Detroit in a study called "Regional New Towns," which suggest-

ed that one strategy that might be used is to pair the redevelopment of the inner city with the development of new towns so that the people in the inner city could share in the economic values that are generated by the urban development process. Harvey Perloff also addressed this in his work on new towns in town which again ties the new town strategy to the redevelopment of areas of older cities. This again is why I say not to approach it in a doctrinaire way but in a pragmatic way and indeed establish first of all the social goals that you are attempting to achieve and then devise means by which the economic wealth that is generated by urbanization and by urban development can be distributed more equitably. By and large new towns can be condemned because they are not utopia; but I am reasonably confident in what I have seen of new towns that they are a better approach and a more equitable approach and a more socially responsible approach to urbanization than most of the other ways that are capable of realization and that we're using instead of new towns. So I guess that's why I'm a new towns advocate.

Conclusion

The conference program was divided into five sessions, together with a luncheon address. As explained in the Introduction, the Bureau staff selected the topic, "The Development of New Communities in Ontario", because of the evident lack of consensus on virtually all of the basic issues related to new town planning—why they should be built, who should build them, where and in what form. In organizing the seminar, it was decided to focus on the first two issues primarily: the general purpose of new towns and how a new towns strategy can best be implemented.

The first panel provided an opportunity for representatives from all governmental levels to present their ideas about the general challenge of controlling and redirecting growth. In three of the four sessions which followed attention was directed to the issue of public vs. private enterprise in new town development, while in the fourth, two contrasting views of the proposed new community of Pickering were presented.

Our first general observation upon reviewing the proceedings of the conference was that no definitive set of conclusions on the very complex subject of new communities could be drawn. For one thing, it quickly became apparent that each of the participants' approach was deeply rooted in his or her fundamental assumptions about our present political and economic system. While several speakers, for example, expressed concern about the high cost of urban land, explanations and solutions to the problem varied according

to the individual's ideological perspective.

Similarly, on the key issues surrounding the public role, opinions tended to reflect the bureaucratic or political commitment of the particular official. Not surprisingly, the Urban Affairs representative spoke about new towns in terms of global and national growth patterns and stressed the need for a national policy as essential for success; the provincial representatives favoured new town development according to the dictates of Design for Development and the Toronto-Centred Region Plan which lies at its heart; local politicians were naturally concerned about controlling growth and protecting the quality of life within their municipalities.

As a result we felt that the conference served more to expose assumptions underlying the different approaches to new town development than to answer the questions themselves.

Yet, while the discussion offered no final answers, it did help to clarify our concerns about the direction in which our province is moving.

These concerns relate mostly to the overall question of the rationale for Ontario's new community planning. We recognize that our conference was largely geared to more specific questions of implementation. Yet we began to wonder, as we reread the transcripts, whether new town development is being pursued by the Province because it has become the fashionable thing to do, rather than because it will serve as a significant element in the control of urban sprawl around Metro Toronto.

While everyone appeared to be in favour of the goal of decentralizing urban growth in Southern Ontario, the conference participants concentrated on one of the possible strategies: namely, the establishment of new towns within the provincial planning scheme known as the Toronto-Centred Region Plan. The avowed purpose of the Toronto-Centred Region concept, unveiled in May, 1970, is to avoid the continuing sprawl of Metro Toronto by a rational redirection of industrial and population growth.¹ In spite of this idealistic objective two key facts are becoming increasingly clear about the TCRP: first, beyond a tentative beginning towards the creation of the Parkway Belt—which is supposed to divide the intensely developed zone 1 (now called the Central Ontario Lakeshore Urban Complex—COLUC) from the peripheral zone 3, intended to receive the decentralized population and industry—little appears to have been done to implement the TCR;² secondly, there is no convincing evidence that this provincial strategy would, in fact, check uncontrolled growth around Toronto even if it were implemented. The delay in adopting the TCR concept had led both to developments which violate the original proposal and to speculation that the TCRP will never come into effect.³

It is therefore unfortunate that even as doubts about the value and status of the TCR concept continue to grow, it must of necessity be taken for granted as the planning context for Ontario's new communities. As others have pointed out, this remains one of the chief dangers of the TCR idea—that while it is not being translated from rhetoric to reality, it ultimately dominates all planning problems. Consequently, one of the effects of the conference for us was that it highlighted many basic questions about how the province is planning to cope with growth in Ontario and how meaningful a new towns policy can, be given the TCR concept and its present status. Admittedly, the concerns of the locally elected participants, including Mayor Parker of

Barrie, Mayor Cosgrove of Scarborough and Alderman Vaughan of Toronto, struck a sympathetic chord with many at the conference.

The debate over Pickering underlined these concerns. Clearly at variance with the original TCR concept, the province's new community proposal in North Pickering has led sceptics to conclude that Queen's Park is employing a very elastic definition of the TCR and then using that definition to justify its plans.

With regard to what became the central question at the conference—private vs public control—the Bureau has drawn two very simple conclusions: first, that the problem is very complex and second, that there is a need for a shared responsibility. In order to ensure that the interests of the public are represented and that the long-range financial security of the project is protected, a strong governmental role is deemed essential. A positive role by private developers will contribute both the necessary private capital and the enterprise and expertise which the profit-motivated private sector is assumed to possess. The precise mixture of public and private sector participation that would be most ideal is not easily determined. The appropriate division of responsibilities must reflect many considerations, such as the public interest involved, the size of the capital investment and the risk inherent in the project, and the comparative efficiency of private developers vs government in building communities quickly, economically and in response to consumer needs. To make the issue more confusing, arguments have been presented in the literature on both sides and no definitive research exists to prove the relative merits of private vs public control. The fact that the developers, political officials and academics at our conference all seemed to agree that joint participation is necessary suggests that if goals could be agreed upon, questions of implementation and techniques could be resolved.

Most basic of all to the problem of public vs private development of new

communities is the question of land control and ownership. On this fundamental question participants at the conference remained in disagreement and possibilities for reaching a compromise were not explored. In Ontario, where the notions of private property rights and private sector initiative in development are so deeply ingrained, it might be useful to examine such concepts as the "transfer of development rights" which perhaps could provide a compromise between the evident need for governmental land-use regulation and private landowner rights.⁴

We remain impressed with evidence that new towns have worked best where they have been part of a central urban policy combined with aggressive local initiative. Sweden offers, perhaps, the most relevant example.⁵ With a population of eight million, roughly equivalent to the population of this province, Sweden must also come to grips with massive population growth around a few major urban centres. To do so, Sweden has adopted a comprehensive growth control strategy incorporating the new towns idea. On the national level growth centres are designated with a population target of 30,000 people (sufficient, it is argued, to support "major services") and a system of incentives and disincentives are utilized to promote them. Many of the new communities in Sweden are located within the orbit of the City of Stockholm and were developed by the city itself. Armed with strong local planning powers, Stockholm followed an aggressive policy of acquiring fringe area public lands since the beginning of the century and consequently accumulated a large municipal land reserve. It should be noted that initiative for new town development in Sweden has not been confined to public hands and some private development is occurring. While the record of achievement in Sweden on the national level is still unknown—for it will take years for the program to come into effect—the Swedish case seems most applicable to our own and we would be interested in further studies of its significance for Ontario.

Can we make any positive recommendations on the basis of what was learned at the conference? We would suggest that one thing that became very clear from the dialogue is the importance of closer cooperation between the public and private sectors as the basis of developing new towns. In order to facilitate this cooperation an effort should begin immediately to coordinate planning policies and goals. The structure for such coordination exists now. For example, the Tri-Level Conference and the Provincial—Municipal Liaison Committee—both inter-governmental coordinating bodies—could invite representatives from the development industry to serve on a special advisory committee or "task force" to develop, within a specified time, a list of guidelines for new community planning. These guidelines would take into account both the conditions deemed essential by developers and the government's restrictions. Some "neutral" representatives could be included to help avoid polarization which would prevent meaningful decisions being reached. One idea that they might consider is the development of a process and a model for the evaluation of new town experiments as a vital component of new community development. Another possibility might be the establishment of a formal mechanism whereby all levels of government and developers can communicate and coordinate plans and activities—to replace the existing ad hoc approach. As a prerequisite, the Province would have to identify and adhere to its own plans which would serve as the framework for joint new community enterprises. And, finally, we would argue that no lasting solution to the problem of how urban growth should occur in Ontario is possible without a national policy and strategy on urban settlement.

1. The TCR takes in an 8,600 square mile area in a 90 mile arc around Toronto stretching from Hamilton/Brantford in the west to beyond Port Hope/Cobourg in the east. In brief, the TCRP designated three zones: an area of intense urban growth (zone 1); an area to be preserved for agriculture, recreation and open space (zone 2); a peripheral area of selective urban-economic development (zone 3).
2. For an excellent critique of the TCRP see, *The Tail of the Elephant: A Guide to Regional Planning and Development in Southern Ontario* (Toronto: Pollution Probe, May, 1974).
3. See Patrick Howe, "Plan to Control Toronto's Sprawl is Slowly Dying", *Globe and Mail* (August 21, 1974), p. 7
4. While the merits of the transfer of development rights concept are not agreed upon, this device is currently receiving considerable attention and praise as a vehicle for more public control over land-use without placing unfair burdens on the property owner. See two articles, one by Jared Shlaes and the other by John Costonis in *Planning*, V.40 (July, 1974).
5. *Financing new Communities: Government and Private Experience in Europe and the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1973); Shirley S. Passon, "Land Reserves and Teamwork Planning in Stockholm", *J.A.I.P.* (May, 1970).



BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

Founded in 1914 as a non-profit research agency staffed by well qualified personnel, the Bureau of Municipal Research maintains continuous study of the problems facing municipalities and their residents.

Long an advocate of responsive and responsible government, the Bureau has gained wide recognition for the high calibre of its quarterly *Civic Affairs*, its monthly *BMR Comment*, its information and advisory services, and the participation of its staff in the public discussion of issues.

The Bureau is an independent agency supported by a broad cross-section of business and professional firms, organizations, governments, and individuals.

your inquiries are invited:

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
Suite 406, 4 RICHMOND ST. E., Toronto, Ontario M5C 1M6
Telephone 363-9265
