1

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR CHERNOH M. SESAY

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE The Role of Private Land Developers in the Decision-Making Process in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton:
A Test of Lerimer's Hypothesis - That Private Land Developers
(Run City Hall.)

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ Carleton Univ. Ottawa, Ontario

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE Ph.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Prof. Henry B. MAYO

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

The author reserves other publication rights; and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE March 28, 1978 SIGNED/SIGNÉ Chernoh Sesay

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENTE FIXE 90 Dept. of Political Science,
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban use ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE LAND DEVELOPERS IN THE
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF OTTAWA-CARLETON: A TEST OF LORIMER'S HYPOTHESIS -
THAT PRIVATE LAND DEVELOPERS RUN CITY HALL

by

CHERNOH M. SESAY

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research,
Carleton University,
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Political Science,
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

March 1978

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE LAND DEVELOPERS IN THE
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF OTTAWA-CARLETON: A TEST OF LORIMER'S HYPOTHESIS
- THAT PRIVATE LAND DEVELOPERS RUN CITY HALL

Submitted by Chernoh M. Sesay, M.A., in partial fulfillment
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

HB Mays

.....
Thesis Supervisor

G. Rose

for
Chairman, Department of
Political Science

Carleton University

March, 1978

ABSTRACT

Since the pioneer works of Floyd Hunter, Robert Dahl and others, the study of community decision-making is still heavily involved in the controversy relating to the methods of locating the most influential groups and individuals in the local decision-making process. In Canada, the controversy was highlighted by the emergence of private land development as a critical issue in urban areas. The effects of private land development activities on urban neighbourhoods brought about bitter reaction from citizen's groups and reform movements in municipal councils who singled out the private land development industry as having the most influence on city hall. This claim is the basis of James Lorimer's hypothesis that private land developers run city hall.

In this thesis, Lorimer's hypothesis is tested in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton by means of the decision-making approach and two statistical techniques. In the decision-making approach, a major case study in Planning and Development (the Regional Official Plan), and a minor case study in Social Services (the Low Income Supplement Experiment) are examined in efforts to determine which groups and individuals were most influential in their development and adoption by Regional Council. The two statistical techniques, crosstabulations and correlation analysis, test Lorimer's hypothesized relationship between councillors' occupations and their voting records using voting data from the 1974-76 Council on Planning and Development and Social Services. A new variable, area of residence, was introduced to see if it had any effect on councillors' voting patterns.

The conclusion is that decision-making in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton is by the rational approach and is characterized by the combined effects and influence of provincial, federal, incremental, community and occupational factors. The hypothesis is therefore, not found valid in relation to Ottawa-Carleton.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must first of all express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Henry B. Mayo and to Professors V. Seymour Wilson and G. Bruce Doern for all their encouragement and the valuable help they gave me. The three of them constituted the kind of advisory board that students often pray to have. I am also indebted to all the federal, provincial and local municipal officials and leaders of local organizations who helped me with my research. Special thanks are due to Professor Ken Hart of the Department of Political Science at Carleton University, and to my student colleague, Ken Gibbons, for their help with the methodology and the statistical analysis in chapter 9. Finally, my acknowledgements would be incomplete if I did not mention the personal debt I owe to my family, especially my wife, Aleta, whose inspiration has been most valuable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
<u>PART ONE</u>	17
<u>Chapter 1:</u> A. THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	18
B. REVIEW OF THEORETICAL LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT	23
- The Positional Approach	24
- The Reputational Approach	26
- The Decision-Making Approach	30
<u>Chapter 2:</u> GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OTTAWA- CARLETON REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY	42
- Political Structure	42
- Administrative Organization	48
- Regional Levies	51
- Economy and Labour Force	55
- Housing	56
- Public Housing	61
<u>Chapter 3:</u> THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RMOC	67
- Water Supply	67
- Sewage Treatment	68
- Public Transit	69
- Road System	71
- Traffic Engineering and Street Lighting	73
- Health and Social Services	73
- Planning	75

	Page
Chapter 4: THE ROLE OF THE "SENIOR" GOVERNMENTS IN THE REGION	80
A - The Provincial Impact	80
- Department of Housing	81
- Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)	82
B - Federal Impact	88
- The National Capital Commission (NCC) ..	88
- The Department of Public Works	97
- Central Mortgage and Housing Corpora-	
tion (CMHC)	104
- Other	105
PART TWO	110
THE MAJOR CASE STUDY: THE RMOC OFFICIAL PLAN	110
Chapter 5: GOALS AND PLANNING ISSUES	112
- Social Well-Being	113
- Communities	114
- Regional Form	116
- Housing	119
- Transportation	120
- Economic Base	122
- Utilities and Services	123
- Recreation	124
- Day Care	125
- Urban Design	125
- Urban Core	126
- Implementation	126
Chapter 6: GROWTH CONCEPTS AND INITIAL PROPOSALS	130
A. GROWTH CONCEPTS	130
- Regional Planning Questionnaire	130
- Alternative Regional Development	
Concepts	137
B. THE INITIAL PROPOSALS	152
Chapter 7: THE DRAFT AND FINAL OFFICIAL PLANS	164
A. THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN	164
B. FINAL OFFICIAL PLAN AND COUNCIL ADOPTION	179
- Population	180
- Employment	182
- Satellite Cities	182
- Housing	186
- Shopping Centres	186

	Page
- Transportation	187
- Land Conservation	191
- Rural Policies	191
<u>PART THREE</u>	195
<u>Chapter 8:</u> THE MINOR CASE STUDY - THE LOW INCOME SUPPLEMENT EXPERIMENT	196
<u>Chapter 9:</u> THE PRIVATE PROPERTY INDUSTRY AND REGIONAL COUNCILLORS: CROSSTABULATIONS AND CORRELATION ANALYSIS	221
<u>PART FOUR</u>	250
<u>Chapter 10:</u> CONCLUSION	251
BIBLIOGRAPHY	278
<u>Appendix A:</u> PRELIMINARY (LISE) PROPOSAL BY THE PROJECT COMMITTEE	287
<u>Appendix B:</u> OFFICIAL LISE PROPOSAL BY RMOC	292
<u>Appendix C:</u> LISE CONTRACT BETWEEN RMOC AND PROVINCE	298
<u>Appendix D:</u> ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF OTTAWA-CARLETON (SPC)	301

INTRODUCTION

How are important political decisions made in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton? What groups or individuals have the greatest influence on important decisions? Does the influence on decisions by groups or individuals remain constant or vary from one issue-area to another? These questions are the main concern of this thesis in efforts to analytically explore the hypothesis, made by James Lorimer that land developers run city hall.¹ In testing this hypothesis in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, my aim has been to try and discover which groups or individuals have the most influence in the making of important decisions, and specifically, to try and discover whether private land developers are the most influential group in the decision-making process in the regional municipality.

Lorimer's analysis looks into all sectors of the private urban property industry which he defines as "encompassing all the businesses and professions involved in supplying accommodation in cities." Accommodation includes housing and all other kinds of urban shelter - office space, shops, factories, etc."² However, land development and construction is the sector of the private property industry which concerned Lorimer most and which eventually led to his hypothesis. To him, this sector "is the leading edge of the property

industry - and in many ways the cutting edge."³ He continues explaining his emphasis on this sector as follows:

... countless examples from every Canadian city testify to the power of the interests involved in land development and construction, to their ability to get their way with politicians, and to the immense profits that are regularly made in the business. Usually attention gets focussed on the developers involved in these projects. In recent years people have learned from hard experience about the political power of developers, and of the ruthless tactics they regularly use in going about their business.⁴

Lorimer's hypothesis is based on two assumptions.

The first is that a good number of municipal politicians (councillors) are in occupations and businesses that are directly related to the private property industry. He assumes therefore, that such officials serve as agents protecting and furthering the interests of the private property industry at municipal hall. According to Lorimer, this group is often the core of the majority in many important municipal decisions. The second assumption is based on the very nature of municipal functions. According to him, because municipal government is primarily concerned with the regulation and servicing of real property, the private property industry has a big stake in the maintenance of a decision-making structure that reflects its interests. This means having at municipal hall people the industry can easily influence. These two assumptions help provide a working interpretation of the

hypothesis. For purposes of this study, the hypothesis is interpreted as follows: that private land developers dominate the decision-making process at city hall in the sense that they comprise the group with the most influence in the making of important decisions in all issue-areas in the community.

This study easily falls within the general context of community power studies - an area which has always been surrounded by the controversy over the method of finding or locating decision-makers. However, this study is looking specifically into the distribution and patterns of influence in the decision-making process.

For purposes of this study, influence is taken as a variant of the wider concept of power. According to Robert Dahl, "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do."⁵ This definition sees power as a relation, especially among people. Another useful definition of power is by Carl J. Friedrich who sees power as "that relation among men which manifests itself in the behavior of following."⁶ In Friedrich's view, "following means typically that A, B and C do what L wants, i.e., when the behavior of a certain group of men conforms to the wishes of one or several of them, the relation between them shall be called the power of L over A, B, C."⁷ The concept of power includes the whole of a continuum while influence is a special case of the exercise of power.

• According to Friedrich, influence "usually exists when the behavior of B is molded by and conforms to the behavior of A, but without the issuance of a command."⁸ He continues to explain that influence is "largely power not expressed as command."⁹ One can conclude therefore, that while power is characterized by command and the threat of sanctions, influence is characterized by persuasion, suggestion, anticipation, or even insinuation. Influence then could be used to shape the conduct of municipal officials by groups or individuals in the community who do not have legally or formally sanctioned power to command and supervise. Such influence by groups or individuals could be quite effective despite the fact that they lack legal or formal capacity to compel compliance to their wishes. In this study, therefore, the word "influence" will be used on the basis of the following premise: when municipal officials make decisions that conform to the wishes or desires of groups or individuals by means of persuasion, suggestion or anticipation, the groups or individuals involved will be said to have influence over the municipal officials (decision-makers).

Friedrich's reference to influence as a "hidden" kind of power implies that a great amount of influence exists in great secrecy, and this makes it difficult to distinguish between direct and indirect influence in the decision-making process. To avoid this difficulty, this study will concentrate on

examining the general distribution of influence so that we may be able to determine which groups or individuals have more influence than others in the selected issue-areas. It may also help to determine whether these groups or individuals participate in a wide range of issues, or whether each issue-area is the preserve of a different set of individuals or groups. Individuals or groups found to be influential in the decision-making process are designated in this study as leaders or influentials.

The preceding discussion helps to explain why this is, in fact, a study of the decision-making structures and processes in the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Municipality.

Decision-making structure in this sense will be taken as "the patterned distribution of influence in a social system."¹⁰

An analysis of the decision-making structures and processes in the area may enable us to tell whether regional municipal officials have developed some form of a decision-making pattern that favours private land developers or other groups over the years. If there has been any kind of pattern at all, we may discover that regional municipal officials do conform to established policy to protect the privileges and influence of special interests (probably private land developers). This decision-making pattern may be a set of policies for handling a variety of recurrent problems, or it may represent an accumulation of precedents that tend to guide and to restrict the

decisions of subsequent administrations. In efforts to discover this kind of pattern and to properly investigate the validity of the hypothesis, this study looks into the decision-making activities of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Municipality.

My decision to focus on the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Municipality is based on these reasons: First, I want to add a new dimension to studies relating to this subject, especially community power studies, by applying some of their existing theories of decision-making to regional government which has emerged to take away many important functions from cities across Canada.

With the exception of public housing, the RMOC has assumed most of the responsibilities for housing and land development in the area - responsibilities which directly involve the interests of private land developers. Regional Council approves applications for land subdivisions and condominium conversions, and the Land Divisions Committee of the Regional Planning Department approves applications for land severances. The Official Plan of the Region contains specific policies concerning the number and types of housing to be constructed in every section of the regional municipality. All local Official Plans are subject to the requirements of the Regional Official Plan and the approval of Regional Council. The transfer of these responsibilities (on which Lorimer's hypothesis is based) from the local city halls to the Region means that the Region has appropriately become the unit for testing

27

Lorimer's hypothesis, because a lot of the lobbying on behalf of land development interests is now directed at Regional Council instead of the local municipalities.

Secondly, concentrating on the Ottawa-Carleton Region alone enables me to do much more detailed research which will undoubtedly add to the quality of the study, and thirdly, being a resident of the study area has enabled me to establish valuable contacts for conducting interviews and obtaining necessary documents, especially during my research assignment with the Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into this introduction and four parts. Part One consists of chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4. In chapter 1, the theoretical significance and practical importance of the study is explained, and some of the more important theoretical literature relating to the subject under study is reviewed. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 constitute an analysis of background material to the study, focusing on three areas: the general characteristics of the Regional Municipality; the functions and responsibilities of the Region, and the role of the "senior" governments in the area.

Part Two (chapters 5, 6, and 7) features an investigation and analysis of the first case study - the RMOC Official Plan - utilizing the decision-making approach. The three

chapters will be on Goals and Planning Issues; Growth Concepts and Initial Proposals, and the Draft and Final Plans and Council Adoption. The analysis will critically evaluate the input of the various actors in the development and implementation of the Regional Official Plan.

Part Three consists of two chapters. Chapter 8 features an analysis of the second case study - the Low Income Supplement Experiment (LISE) of the Regional Social Services Department. This again, involves the decision-making approach. In chapter 9, contingency table (crosstabulation) analysis and correlation analysis (Pearson correlation coefficient) are employed to test the relationship between Regional Councillors' occupations and business interests and their voting patterns, as well as between their areas of residence and voting patterns on the issue-areas of Development and Planning, and Social Services in Council.

Part Four consists of the concluding chapter (10). In it, an integrated analysis of the findings and conclusions of all the previous chapters is made with a view to upholding, modifying or rejecting Lorimer's hypothesis. This analysis is related as much as possible, to the questions posed earlier at the beginning of this introduction. This will be

followed by the appendices and the bibliography.

Methodology

The empirical task of the study has been to try and discover which individuals or groups have the most influence in the making of important decisions in the regional municipality. Two research techniques have been utilized in efforts to determine the configuration of influence in the decision-making process in the Region.

The first technique, the decision-making approach, involves exploring and tracing in more detail, the actions of federal, provincial and municipal officials and community groups and individuals in regard to decision-making and policy formation within the context of specific issues. To accomplish this, two council decisions, one from the issue-area of Development and Planning and one from Social Services, were selected as case studies on the basis of their actual or potential cost, the number of participating groups and individuals, and the approximate number of people affected by the outcome of each decision. The decision which rates highest on at least two of these criteria was selected from each issue-area.

The two issue-areas from which the decisions were selected were chosen on the basis of their potential to cut across a wide variety of interests and participants. They are also among the more important functions of the regional

municipality. I have focused on the 1974-76 council of the regional municipality because most of the groups and individuals of that period who actively participated in the formulation of the two decisions I have taken as case studies are readily available to provide me with valuable research information. Most of the regional councillors and administrative staff of that period are still in office. The various community groups too, are still active.

The decision to adopt the Regional Official Plan on October 9, 1974, was selected from the issue-area of Development and Planning for detailed study. The Plan, which represents years of intensive study and consultation on the future of the Region was compiled at a cost of 1.8 million dollars. Some 200 community groups and individuals, both governmental and non-governmental, submitted briefs and actively participated in the formulation of the Plan. The whole Region is affected by the policies of the Plan, the most important of which deals with urban development and its relation to housing, employment and transportation, conservation of natural resources and protection of the environment, and the provision of municipal services.

From the issue-area of Social Services, I selected the council decision approving the participation of the Region in a special project of supplementation of low-wage earners by cash payments. The programme called the Low In-

come Supplement Experiment (LISE), received council approval on July 9, 1975, and was put in operation on October 1, 1975 at a cost of \$200,000 for the first year. LISE came into being after a long process of negotiation and consultation involving federal, provincial and regional officials as well as local community groups and individuals.¹¹ It affects all ~~qualified residents of the Region.~~ Information relating to the selection of the two decisions above was obtained from Regional Council minutes and documents, and from interviews ~~with Regional Councillors and administrative personnel,~~ federal and provincial officials, and leaders of community groups:

The aim in utilizing the decision-making approach is to analyse the decision-making process in the regional municipality by examining the number and activities of actors involved in each of the two decisions, and the degree to which these actors may overlap from one decision to the other. Council members and senior administrative officials, especially department heads, were interviewed to determine which other groups and individuals were involved in the making of each decision and the extent to which they were involved. The federal, provincial and regional officials and other participating groups and individuals were then interviewed on the basis of the following procedure:

- (a) Who initiated action on the issue?
- (b) Who supported this action?
- (c) Who opposed this action?
- (d) What was the nature of the bargaining process?

Who negotiated with whom?

- (e) What was the decision?

Whose views prevailed?

Thus from these five stages it may be possible to determine for each decision which participants had initiated alternatives that were finally adopted, had helped to defeat alternatives initiated by others, or had proposed alternatives that were turned down. In addition to interviews, additional information and data were obtained from official records, documents, and newspapers. Most of the interviews were recorded.

The advantage of the decision-making approach is that it focuses on what people do, not on formal office or reputation. Studying participation in decisions helps to discover which actors participated more actively in making decisions. It may be argued that it is logically invalid to generalize, prove or disprove the hypothesis on the basis of only two decisions treated as case studies, but it is practically impossible to deal with all regional council decisions within time and financial limitations. Analysing the two decisions in much more detail undoubtedly enhances the kind of quality

expected of a study like this. As I mentioned earlier, the two issue-areas from which they were selected have the most potential to cut across a wide variety of interests and participants, and from which a logical inference could be made about groups or individuals with the most influence on decisions of Regional Council. It may be objected that the approach is static in the sense that the two decisions selected each deal with a single point in time. This objection is countered by the fact that the two decisions are an ideal reflection of the growing functions of the regional municipality.

The second technique involves two forms of statistical measures of association to test data relating to Lorimer's hypothesized relationship between the occupations and business interests of municipal councillors and their voting patterns in Council. They are contingency table (cross-tabulation) analysis and correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient (r).¹² Computations involving the two methods are made by use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) system of computer programming. In addition to the variables of Occupations and Voting on Development and Social Services, a new independent variable (area of residence) was introduced and utilized in both methods to see if it could explain Councillors' voting attitudes in the two issue-areas.¹³ Furthermore, all unani-

mous yea votes in both issue-areas were eliminated to see if the computations of the two methods on the remaining votes would indicate any differences in the degrees and direction of relationships from those obtained for all the issues. There were 27 (out of 148) such issues in Development, and 22 (out of 117) in social services.¹⁴

The occupations and business interests of all 31 members of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Council for the two-year period 1974-76 were obtained and used in this approach. Occupations and business interests classified as related to the private property industry include those of real estate agents and lawyers, insurance agents, architects, small contractors, building supply company people and engineers. The occupational information was obtained from official records and documents in the office of the regional clerk at regional headquarters in Ottawa.

Next, the votes of all regional council members in the same two-year period, 1974-76, were compiled on all final decisions taken in council in the two issue-areas of Development and Planning, and Social Services. A final decision is one which is the culmination of one or more related sub-decisions on the same subject, or a terminal decision on any subject which results in council action or inaction. The voting records were obtained from council minutes of the period in the regional clerk's office. There were a total

of 148 such decisions taken in the area of Development and Planning, and 117 in Social Services.

If, as Lorimer said, private land developers run municipal halls, the extent and scope of their influence on the selected issues, revealed by the results of the two research techniques, will serve to uphold or disprove the hypothesis.

Introduction Footnotes

1. This hypothesis is the basis of James Lorimer's book, A Citizen's Guide to City Politics, Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1972. See page 4.
2. Ibid., p.12.
3. Ibid., p.38.
4. Ibid., p.38.
5. Dahl, Robert A., "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 11 (July, 1957), p.203.
6. Friedrich, Carl J., Man and His Government, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963, p.161.
7. Ibid., p.161.
8. Ibid., p.200.
9. Ibid., p.200.
10. Clark, Terry N., "The Concept of Power," in Terry N. Clark (ed.). Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis, San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968, p.47.
11. Other reasons for selecting LISE as a case study in social services, other than the criteria of cost, anticipating and affected groups, are fully explained in the beginning of chapter 8.
12. The two methods are explained in detail in chapter 9 in which they are both utilized.
13. The use of this new variable is also explained fully in chapter 9.
14. This step is also explained in chapter 9.

PART ONE

This part consists of what is essentially background material to the study. In addition to explaining the theoretical significance of the study and reviewing some of the more important literature related to it, an examination is made of such regional characteristics as political structure and administrative organization, economy, population and labour force, and housing. The functions and responsibilities of the RMOC are outlined in order to explain the purpose for which the Regional Municipality was created, and the kinds of functions it has been delegated by the Province at the expense of the local (member) municipalities. Lastly, the role of the provincial and federal governments in the Region is analysed in efforts to determine the nature and extent of their involvement in the RMOC decision-making process. Part One is therefore, organized as follows:

- CHAPTER 1: A. THE THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
B. REVIEW OF THEORETICAL LITERATURE
- CHAPTER 2: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RMOC
- CHAPTER 3: FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RMOC
- CHAPTER 4: THE ROLE OF "SENIOR" GOVERNMENTS IN THE
REGION

CHAPTER 1

A. THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Since this study involves a study of decision-making at the local level, it undoubtedly derives its theoretical significance from the liberal conception of democracy, which sees local self-government and the democratic system as being mutually interdependent. The small jurisdiction of local government, in liberal writing, is considered the basic unit of grass-roots democracy. This relationship could, perhaps, be adequately explained in the light of the values which have been considered inherent in local government. In the introductory essay of his book, Area and Power, Arthur Maass defines these values as being, Liberty, in the sense that it is a division of powers on an area basis which mitigates the power of the sovereign; equality, in the political sense that it provides broad opportunities for citizens to participate in public policy, and welfare, in the sense that it provides agents that are apt for meeting the needs of society. John Stuart Mill asserts in his book Representative Government, that "it is but a small proportion of the public business of a country which can be well done or safely attempted, by central authorities."

Recent writers on the subject have come up with other values which differ from those of Maass only in terminology. For instance, L. J. Sharpe and J. Stefan Dupre have added participation and efficiency which more or less replace Maass' equality and welfare respectively. Others have emphasized accountability in the sense that local government, based as it is on local knowledge and information, is more sensitive to local opinion and needs, thereby adopting policies that would meet the requirements and characteristics of their local community. The appointment of the Herbert Commission and the Redcliffe-Maud Commission in Great Britain in the sixties to investigate various aspects of local government illustrates continued British concern over the relationship between local government and the democratic process. The terms of reference of both commissions illustrate the view by British authorities that the local government system has its democratic base in its ability to effectively provide services to the satisfaction of the consumer. While the Herbert Commission was instructed to consider whether any changes in the metropolitan area of London "would better secure effective and convenient local government,"¹ the Redcliffe-Maud Commission was told to take into account, "the need to sustain a viable system of local democracy"² considering such elements as accountability and control, responsiveness, and redress of grievance. This general concern

with the effectiveness of local government as a generalist agent close to the point of consumption of the services, and the ability of citizens to participate equally in decisions that affect them has led to local government reforms in many parts of the world including Canada. There are of course, other scholars such as Hugh Whalen, Robert A. Dahl and Georges Langrod who contend that participation in the political life of a democracy is not significantly limited by the size of the citizen body or its territory.

Attempts to establish a cause and effect relationship between local government and democracy lead us to some of the important questions which scholars like Floyd Hunter, Robert Dahl and others developed in their studies of community power and decision-making. If local government provides the citizens their best chance to participate in the making of decisions that affect them, how is this chance limited by the inequalities in the capacities of different citizens to influence the making of those decisions? In other words, if local government is taken as a very important variable of democratic viability, with the assumption that it offers every citizen an equal opportunity to influence governmental policy, how is this "local democracy" affected by the unequal distribution of the resources of influence in the community? What are some of the more important resources for influencing political decisions in the community? Is it safe to assume

that local politicians generally respond to the interests of the few citizens who control such important resources as wealth, knowledge and social status? The search for answers to these questions ultimately reveals the theoretical foundations of my study and its implications beyond the area under study.

The practical importance of this study could also be traced to the extensive involvement of the federal and provincial governments in the study area. First, the statutory authority of the provincial governments over local governments in Canada means that most of the functional and structural characteristics of the area are subject to legislative provisions from Queen's Park in Toronto. For instance, official municipal plans are under the jurisdictions of the Minister of Housing and the OMB. The province is also one of the chief sources of revenue for the municipalities by means of payments in lieu of taxes, subsidies, and grants. Through the Ontario Housing Corporation, the province has become a major landlord in the area.

The federal involvement is mainly through the National Capital Commission which Parliament has given the mandate to promote the development of the National Capital Region "in accordance with its national significance."³ The Commission was therefore, given the responsibility to prepare plans for and to coordinate the uses to be made of the exten-

sive federal land holdings in the Region. The NCC is also one of several federal agencies who carry out development in accordance with approved uses. The strong role of the NCC in the area has caused some controversy in recent years. For instance, in recent briefs to the Joint Senate-Commons committee studying the future of the national capital, both the Outaouais Regional Community and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton urged a curtailment of NCC planning power through amendments to the National Capital Act, recommending that the NCC totally withdraw from municipal planning in the region. While local politicians have accused the Commission of being insensitive to the needs of the local municipalities, others have suggested replacing it with a federal ministry directly responsible to Parliament for its decisions.

The next federal involvement is through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) which is the federal administrative agency responsible for housing. As a crown corporation, it has authority to do business with provinces, municipalities, financial institutions, builders, private borrowers, and tenants in an attempt to carry out federal policy enacted under the National Housing Act (NHA). CMHC is also an important landlord in the area, operating a good number of low-income units at Hawthorne Heights in the east end of the city of Ottawa. Finally, there is the federal Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, created in 1971, which

according to David M. Cameron, was "the product of a lengthy historical process of rapid urbanization, on the one hand, and a growing federal participation in meeting demands for public services, particularly housing, generated by that process on the other."⁴ Analysing the effects of the roles and activities of the federal and provincial governments on the decision-making process in the Region may bring about quite a different dimension to the outcome of this study.

B. REVIEW OF THEORETICAL LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT

The study of community decision-making has developed in three stages over the years: After the power elitist stage inspired by Hunter and Mills, and the pluralist stage influenced by Robert Dahl, the current trend is towards a comparative state. As was noted earlier, the field has been heavily involved in the controversy relating to the method of locating the real decision-makers, or the method of measuring the configurations of influence in a local community. My intention here therefore, is to review the more important literature in the context of the three methodological techniques that have been used in various ways to identify community decision-makers: the positional, reputational, and decision-making approaches.

The Positional Approach

This technique assumes that individuals occupying key roles in the major social, economic and political institutions of the community are indeed the community leaders in decision-making. The implied assumption here equates control over important community resources in the economic, political and social spheres to leadership. The difficulties with this approach are, first, some of the so-called "positional" leaders may choose not to utilize their potential influence; secondly, there is a problem of deciding what roles in a community control the important community resources, and thirdly, more problems may be encountered when comparative studies of a number of communities differing in size and economic base are made. These procedural problems especially the second and third, are evident in attempts to define the "economic dominants" of several communities in these major studies: In their article, "The Determination of Local Power Elites," Robert Schulze and Leonard Blumberg include the following roles in their category of economic dominants:

- (a) Heads of all industries employing seventy-five or more workers.
- (b) Heads of all banks with total assets in excess of \$1,000,000.
- (c) Persons who were members of the boards of directors of two or more of these industries and/or banks,

thus serving as "interlocking" directors of the dominant economic units.⁵

In the second case, under the heading "Shadow and Substance: The Social and Economic Notables," Robert Dahl determined the "economic notables" in New Haven using the following criteria:

- (a) The President or Chairman of the board of a corporation with property in New Haven assessed in any of the five years 1953-1957 at a value placing it among the fifty highest assessments in the city.
- (b) Any individual or group of individuals with property in the city assessed in the years 1953-1957 at a value of \$250,000 or more.
- (c) President or Chairman of the board of any bank or public utility in the city.
- (d) Any individual who was a director of three or more of the following: a firm with assessed valuation of \$250,000 or more, a manufacturing firm with fifty employees or more, a retailing firm with twenty-five employees or more, a bank.
- (e) All directors of New Haven Banks.⁶

When M. K. Jennings restudied Atlanta, he used a third set of criteria:

- (a) The top executive of a local firm or branch office of 700 or more employees, or

- (b) Members of the boards of directors of three or more locally centred firms, or
- (c) The top executives of the five leading financial (banking) units in the area.⁷

In addition to the variety of results which the sets of criteria above may yield, there is also the significant problem of whether the top leadership roles in various social, economic, and political institutions are actually involved in decision-making in the community.

The Reputational Approach

This method is based on the assumption that those having a "reputation" for power are indeed the powerful. Power and influence are measured by attribution in the eyes of knowledgeable individuals rather than by any more direct method of their determination. The method has numerous variations for selecting reputational leaders, but it consists essentially of asking informants to name and rank the leaders in their community. This "elitist" approach, first made popular by Floyd Hunter in his analysis of the power structure in Atlanta,⁸ asserts that in many communities a social and economic elite will usually be found actually running things. What are the main advantages of this approach? Terry N. Clark lists them as follows:

- (a) the cost and effort involved in applying the technique to the study of a community are markedly less than those of the decision method, the pluralists' methodological choice;
- (b) it isolates the power aspect of a community and allows the researcher to analyze this aspect without becoming involved in often rich but frequently irrelevant details of local community life; and
- (c) the method is highly reproducible. Its operations are sufficiently simply and clearly defined to allow numerous researchers to investigate several different communities with a relatively high degree of assurance that the operations for measuring the dispersal of community influence can be closely duplicated in other communities, and thereby reduce the coefficient of human error.⁹

Political Scientists became the foremost critics of the reputational approach and made it a subject of controversy and heated debate. The first and one of the most quoted criticisms came from Herbert Kaufman and Victor Jones in their article "The Mystery of Power" which reviews Hunter's book. However, the more sustained criticism came from the so-called "Yale pluralists" whose bone of contention was with the underlying philosophical assumptions of the approach rather than the research procedure itself. The group was led by Robert

Dahl, Raymond E. Wolfinger and Nelson W. Polsby who in a series of articles and books, presented strong arguments against the "elitist" models of power as well as the reputational technique.¹⁰ M. H. Danzér, in his article "Community Power Structure: Problems and Continuities," and A. M. Rose, in his book The Power Structure: Political Process in American Society, summarize the more important criticisms of the reputational technique as follows:

- (a) the technique measures opinions about power, not power itself;
- (b) it receives erroneous assessments by informants as a result of erroneous perceptions of the power structure or misunderstandings of questions intended to reveal those with power;
- (c) the method is diffuse and fails to acknowledge "issue specialization" and instability of power;
- (d) it assumes that there is a power structure, but does not demonstrate it. Thus, the questions predispose the answers by asking, who run things? rather than, does anybody run things?
- (e) it is insensitive to the role of both formal political power and political parties in the study of community decision-making;
- (f) it confuses status with power, e.g., labour leaders who have power but low status are less likely to be

nominated; and

- (g) it is insensitive to the feedback mechanisms in community influence systems, with the result that power is portrayed as a one-way process.

The approach has been the most widely used technique in the study of community leadership. Its adherents have either used it directly or in combination with another approach. They have disavowed the "elitist" bias often made against Hunter by arguing that the technique is valid, although it does not always identify a single, cohesive leadership group in communities. For instance, in their article, "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," William V. D'Antonio and Eugene C. Erickson demonstrated empirically, both by comparing the results of the reputational technique with those of the decision-making approach and by doing a longitudinal study, that there is a set of community leaders perceived to be generally influential although not active in many community issues. William A. Garrison, in his article, "Reputation and Resources in Community Politics," also attempted to show the utility and meaning of the technique. He argues that reputation for power is not only an indicator of resources, but a resource itself. Among others who have tried to make refinements on the approach include Charles M. Bonjean who developed a technique of locating visi-

ble, symbolic, and concealed leaders in his article "Community Leadership: A Case Study and Conceptual Refinement," and Terry N. Clark who studied decision-making comparatively in 51 American Communities.¹¹

The Decision-Making Approach

This is also known as the "Event Analysis" or "Issue" approach, spearheaded mainly by the "Yale Pluralists" of Dahl, Polsby and Wolfinger as a reaction to the reputational approach. It involves tracing the actions of leaders in regard to decision-making and policy formation within the context of specific issues. One of the first and most prominent studies on this approach are Dahl's Who Governs? In his study, Dahl not only developed a theory of pluralism, but tried to show how New Haven moved historically from a system of cumulative inequalities, or oligarchy, with concentration of resources, rewards, and power, to one of noncumulative and dispersed inequalities, or pluralism, with dispersion of resources, rewards, and power. In demonstrating his thesis, Dahl examined decisions in three issue areas - urban redevelopment between 1950 and 1959 (which included 8 different decisions); the public schools during the same period (which included 8 different decisions), and nine nominations for Mayor during the period 1941-1957. He concluded that decision-making was highly specialized in New Haven, with the social and

economic notables having little part to play in these decisions. Methodologically, Dahl used participation in decisions as his criterion for leadership, implicitly assuming that active participation in decision-making is leadership and that all such active involvements are equal.

The decision-making approach has been primarily used by Political Scientists either singly or in combination with other approaches. In Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, Robert Presthus studied five comparable decisions in two communities: a school bond, new industry, a hospital, flood control, and a municipal building. Other investigations which have utilized this approach include Raymond E. Wolfinger, The Politics of Progress, A. Wildavsky, Leadership in a Small Town; R. C. Martin, et al., Decisions in Syracuse; Linton C. Freeman, et al., "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A comparison of some Alternative Approaches," American Sociological Review, 28 (October 1963), 791-798; and Nelson Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory. The main advantage of this approach is that it leads to the possibility of identifying overt power rather than potential power, as well as providing a more realistic viewpoint of power relations as processes rather than as fixed structures.

Three types of criticisms have been made against the decision-making approach. The first involves Dahl's operationalizations of the technique in the New Haven study,

and was highlighted by H. D. Price in his review of Who Governs? (Yale Law Journal, 71, July 1962). Dahl based many of his conclusions on the fact that few of the social and economic notables in the community had participated in the issue areas he selected. Price points out that the three issue areas applied only to the political boundaries of New Haven, and not to the larger metropolitan area, thereby, leaving out a sizeable part of the middle class who do not live in New Haven proper and who have very little at stake in these issues. Price also questions the typicality of New Haven.

The second type of criticisms has been made by P. Bachrach and M. S. Baratz in their articles, "Two Faces of Power," and "Decisions and Nondecisions".¹² They point out that the sampling of only the issues that are actually raised in a community precludes obtaining information about the dynamics involved when issues are suppressed; i.e., issues raised in a community may be limited to "safe" ones through the manipulation of community values, myths, and institutional procedures. They therefore, doubt whether the issues raised exhaust the phenomenon of power.

The third criticism points out differences in the philosophies of the major researchers on community power-political scientists and sociologists - and was advanced by T. J. Anton in his article "Power, Pluralism, and Local Poli-

tics."¹³ He pointed out that political scientists are more likely to conceive of social reality in terms of an actor-individual, while sociologists are more prone to study roles in social systems.

Canadian Literature

Studies relating to community power and decision-making have been predominantly American, but there were some done in Canada which are highly relevant to my study. Among them are Harold Kaplan's Urban Political Systems. In his study, Kaplan used functional analysis to try and discover the nature and patterns of political leadership and decision-making in the Metropolitan government of Toronto. His major finding perhaps, was that Metro Toronto differs from both the elitist and broker leadership systems in the sense that its appointed officials (administrators) and the Metro chairman dominated the initiation and making of public policy. He stated it this way: "If one were to comprise a list of 'community influentials' in the Toronto area, defining an influential as someone who plays a major role in public policy-making, that list almost certainly would be dominated by governmental bureaucrats."¹⁴ This situation, he found, is the result of the weak involvement of private interest groups in issues going before Metro Council, as well as the weaker involvement of local municipal officials in Metro

Council business. He found the Toronto Press - the three dailies, their editorials, columnists and City Hall reporters - to be the only significant source of private influence over proceedings of Metro Council.

Another significant study was done by Nevill O. Matthews in his 1967 Ph.D thesis for the University of Alberta entitled "Decision-Making in Two Alberta School Boards," part of which was published in his article "Small Town Power and Politics."¹⁵ Matthews utilized the reputational approach to identify individuals reputed to have the greatest power and influence in Bridgetown, Alberta, and the issue-analysis approach to identify the most influential individuals on the school site issue in the same community. A comparison of the two lists of influentials obtained by the two approaches revealed a good deal of overlap and high consensus regarding the top influentials. He concluded therefore, that there was a general power structure in the community that was associated with issues that affected the whole community, while there were also specialized overlapping structures that dealt with specific issues in limited areas.

In the sixties and early seventies, private land development emerged as a critical issue in many urban areas in Canada, and it continues to be one of the main sources of conflict between citizens' groups and local officials. In many of the large urban areas, the consequences of land develop-

ment activities have brought private developers to the forefront in the battle between citizens' groups and city halls. Citizens' groups maintain that the best way to oppose private developers is to neutralize their influence or control of city officials who are responsible for such things as zoning, housing inspection, and giving official approval for demolition and final plan. This in effect, is a struggle in the decision-making process. The other writings that relate to my study therefore, are by the so-called left-liberal politicians and academics who have taken up the citizens' cause. Most of them originated in Toronto. They include Stephen Clarkson, City Lib; Graham Fraser, Fighting Back; Allan Powell, The City - Attacking Modern Myths; James Lorimer, A Citizen's Guide to City Politics; Boyce Richardson, The Future of Canadian Cities; John Sewell, Up Against City Hall; David Lewis Stein, The Rape of Toronto; and Graham Barker, et al., Highrise and Super-profits.

While all of the authors above, in one way or another, deal with the subject of "citizens vs city hall" and the urgent need to reform city governments, Sewell and Lorimer particularly single out the private land development industry as having by far the most powerful influence at city hall. Sewell's analysis is based on his experience as an Alderman in Toronto and could be safely regarded as a case study only of that City. Lorimer too, had been involved with neighbourhood

groups in Toronto, but his study includes Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, and his analysis is based on what he considers the standard functions of city government anywhere else in Canada. Since this study is an attempt to investigate his hypothesis, I think it is proper to explain the assumptions underlying his study a bit further.

In A Citizen's Guide to City Politics, Lorimer attempts to establish and examine the connections between the private property industry and city hall. According to him, almost everything city hall does is related to the private property industry, and he therefore, sees city government as performing mostly two functions: servicing and regulating property. Servicing urban property involves "providing the necessary services and facilities that are required in order for a piece of land to be used for urban purposes." The list of services starts with roads, sidewalks, sewers, water, utilities. It includes maintaining these facilities and providing garbage collection, fire protection, traffic control, public transportation, and public health measures."¹⁶ Regulating urban property "involves controlling every aspect of the way every piece of land can be used: what sort of building can be erected, how big it can be, how it must be constructed, and how its occupants may use it."¹⁷ This regulatory function involves city planning, the system of zoning bylaws and other bylaws regulating construction of new buildings, minimum standards and fire standards of existing buildings.

Since these two functions create the value of urban land, private developers therefore, according to Lorimer, make sure that people representing their interest (land development) are at city hall, in the form of councillors and bureaucrats in order to dominate the decision-making process. He maintains also that the provincial and federal governments, the independent civic agencies, and the news media often act favourably to the private property industry.

In addition to citing numerous newspaper commentaries on the influence of the private property industry at city halls in Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, Lorimer used two other approaches. He made an analysis of the occupations and business interests of council members in the three cities in order to determine which of the city politicians were in occupations that were related to the private property industry. In Vancouver, 1971-72, he found that 7 of the 11 council members were in private property industry occupations; out of 51 members in Winnipeg's 1972-74 city council, 24 were in property industry. Occupations relating to the private property industry included those of real estate agents, insurance agents, lawyers, public utility employees, general contractors, and many others. Secondly, he studied and analysed the voting records of all council members in each municipality in the same time period on issues classified under four headings: development and planning, transportation,

relations with the private property industry, and, other. In each of the three cities, he found that there was a bloc of aldermen who generally voted together, who were the controlling majority at city hall, and who voted in favour of proposals the industry supported and against proposals the industry opposed. These findings led to his hypothesis that private developers run city hall, the validity of which will be investigated in this study.

Harvey Goldberg, a former Carleton University Student, attempted to test Lorimer's hypothesis in the city of Ottawa using the two methods discussed above. In an article entitled "The Property Industry at City Hall: The Case of the City of Ottawa,"¹⁸ he concluded that in the period 1970-72, the government of the City of Ottawa was dominated by the private property industry. Mr. Goldberg's study probably achieved its purpose as a class research essay, but it fell far short of revealing the actual decision-making pattern in a city with perhaps, the most federal presence in the country. While he touched briefly on the provincial and federal presence in the area, he made no attempt to investigate their inputs and those of other groups into decisions at Ottawa City Hall.

The other recent attempt to explore the nature and operations of the private development industry and its links with the various levels of government in Canada was made by

Graham Barker, Jennifer Penny and Wally Seccombe in their book Highrise and Superprofits. The authors see some form of contradiction between the worsening housing crisis and the rising profits of private developers. They maintain that restrictive land policies have an inflationary effect on the price of land. In other words, the restriction of land use to the advantage of local neighbourhoods often leads to rising land prices to the disadvantage of the working class as a whole. Caught in the middle of this contradiction are the reform councils across Canada. The authors explain their predicament this way: "Elected on the promise to protect the quality of residential neighbourhoods, they are powerless to solve the sheer quantitative problems of housing scarcity in the midst of inflating land prices."¹⁹ In pleading for socialist alternatives, these Marxist-oriented authors argue that the struggles against the private development industry and in particular, the housing problem, must be understood within the context of the general social crisis of the capitalist system. Their point of view is as follows:

What has become clear in the results of reform councils and single-issue citizen "achievements" is that the urban crisis is not one of ill-will by elected officials, or payoffs, or bad planning, but is a structural problem, rooted in nothing less than the total economic organization of the country - and in the long run, it is nothing less than the total re-organization of that economy, that can change things for the better.²⁰

Chapter 1 Footnotes

1. Redcliffe-Maud, Lord, and Bruce Wood, English Local Government Reformed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974, p.19.
2. Ibid., p.19.
3. Tomorrow's Capital, Ottawa: National Capital Commission, 1974, p.1.
4. Cameron, David, M., "Urban Policy" in G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson, (eds.), Issues in Canadian Public Policy, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974, p.228.
5. Schulze, Robert O., and Leonard U. Blumberg, "The Determination of Local Power Elites," The American Journal of Sociology, 63 (Nov. 1957), pp.290-296.
6. Dahl, Robert A., Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961, pp.67 and 68.
7. Jennings, M. K., Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta, New York: Free Press, 1964, p.25.
8. Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure: A study of Decision-Makers, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
9. Clark, Terry N., "Methods for Measuring Power and Decision-Making Structures," in Terry N. Clark (editors), Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis, pp.76 and 77.
10. Their main points of criticism culminated in the publication of the following: Robert Dahl, who Governs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961); Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), and Raymond E. Wolfinger, The Politics of Progress (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974).
11. See the methodology and findings of the research in Terry N. Clark, "Community Structure, Decision-making Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," in Fred M. Wirt (ed.), Future Directions in Community Power Research: A Colloquium,

Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Governmental Studies, 1971.

12. See P. Bachrach and M. S. Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," American Political Science Review, 56 (December, 1962), 947-952; and "Decisions and Nondecisions," American Political Science Review, 57 (September, 1963), 632-642.
13. T. J. Anton, "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (March, 1963), 425-457.
14. Harold Kaplan, "The Policy-Making Process in Metro Toronto," in Lionel D. Feldman and Michael D. Goldrick, Politics and Government of Urban Canada: Selected Readings, Toronto: Methuen, 1972, p.221.
15. Neville O. Mathews, "Small Town Power and Politics," in Feldman and Goldrick, Politics and Government of Urban Canada, pp.112-130.
16. Lorimer, A Citizen's Guide to City Politics, p.4.
17. Ibid., p.6.
18. Harvey Goldberg, "The Property Industry at City Hall: The Case of the City of Ottawa," in Donald C. Rowat, (ed.), Urban Politics in Ottawa-Carleton: Research Essays. Carleton University, Dept. of Political Science, Nov. 1974.
19. Barker, Graham, J. Penney and W. Seccombe, Highrise and Superprofits, Kitchener, Ontario: Dumong Press Graphix, 1973, p.157.
20. Ibid., p.157.

CHAPTER 2

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OTTAWA- CARLETON REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC) was incorporated in 1968 under authority of Bill 112¹ of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, and began its operations on January 1, 1969. Not counting Metropolitan Toronto, Ottawa-Carleton was the first regional government established under a broad local government reorganization programme undertaken by the Province, for the purpose of equipping local government with the political, structural and financial capacity to deal effectively with the growing problems of urbanization.

Political Structure

The Regional government is the upper tier of a two-tier system of local government in an area located at the confluence of the Rideau River and the Ottawa River. The Region is given certain functions while the lower tier units (area municipalities) retain certain residual responsibilities.² The RMOC is composed of eleven municipalities (reduced in 1974 from the original sixteen) including the cities of Ottawa and Vanier, the village of Rockcliffe Park, and the townships of Cumberland, Gloucester, Goulbourn, March, Nepean,

Osgoode, Rideau and West Carleton. The population of the Region is approximately 506,592³ in an area of 681,280 acres, centred upon the City of Ottawa, the national capital of Canada.

The RMOC is administered in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Regional Act by a Regional Council which is composed of the Chairman and thirty representatives from the local municipalities. The council includes the mayor or reeve of each of the eleven area municipalities, plus the four controllers and eleven aldermen from the city of Ottawa, a councillor selected by the Vanier Council, the deputy reeve of Gloucester township, and the deputy reeve and the councillor receiving the largest number of votes in the previous general election from Nepean township. The number of seats held by each area municipality on the Regional Council was established by the Regional Act and was designed to achieve a balanced representation between the City of Ottawa and the rest of the Region.

The Chairman, who serves as head of the council and Chief Executive Officer of the Region, is elected by Regional Council for a two-year term, with the option of re-election to subsequent terms. If a local representative on Regional Council is elected Chairman, he is considered to have resigned as a member of the area municipal council, and his seat therefore, is declared vacant. The Chairman may vote at Re-

RMOC with NCR and GREENBELT

Regional Council Members, 1974-76⁴

<u>Member</u>	<u>Local Municipality Represented</u>
1. Denis M. Coqlican (Chairman)	
2. Bedard, Georges A.	Ottawa
3. Bourns, Brian V.	Ottawa
4. Boyce, Sandy	Ottawa
5. Clark, Ronald H.	Rockcliffe Park
6. Dewar, Mrs. Marion	Ottawa
7. Franklin, Benjamin	Nepean
8. Grandmaitre, Bernard	Vanier
9. Greenberg, Lawrence	Ottawa
10. Guzzo, Garry J.	Ottawa
11. Hasenack, Rolf	Ottawa
12. Haydon, Andrew S.	Nepean
13. Hill, Mrs. Betty	Goulbourn
14. Kay, Donald C.	Ottawa
15. Kehoe, Mrs. Margaret M.	Ottawa
16. Kennedy, Trip	Ottawa
17. Law, William A. H.	Ottawa
18. Lockhart, Don	Ottawa
19. MacQuarrie, Robert W.	Gloucester
20. Mitchell, Robert C.	Nepean
21. Mlacak, John G.	March
22. Munro, Donald B.	West Carleton

<u>Member</u>	<u>Local Municipality Represented</u>
23. Nicol, Mrs. Patricia	Ottawa
24. Owens, Mitchell G.	Gloucester
25. Quinn, C. Joseph	Ottawa
26. Reid, Donald B.	Ottawa
27. Robert, R. A.	Ottawa
28. Rocque, Henri	Cumberland
29. St. George, Paul	Vanier
30. Taylor, Dr. W. Arnold	Osgoode
31. Tupper, Dr. W. M.	Rideau

Table 2-1

Population and Representation for RMOC and Area Municipalities, 1974-76

Municipality	1975 Population	Total Local Reps.	Population per Local Rep.	No. of RMOC Reps.	% of RMOC Reps.	Area in Acres
RMOC	506,592	-	-	31	-	681,280
Ottawa, C.	302,124	16	18,883	16	51.6	27,219.2
Vanier, C.	20,146	8	2,518	2	6.5	723.2
Rockcliffe Park, Vl.	2,229	5	445	1	3.2	428.8
Cumberland, twp.	11,458	5	2,292	1	3.2	78,009.6
Gloucester, twp.	53,322	5	10,664	2	6.5	72,614.4
Goulbourn, twp.	12,489	9	1,387	1	3.2	69,145.6
March, twp.	6,910	5	1,382	1	3.2	28,972.8
Nepean, twp.	74,000	7	10,571	3	9.7	55,219.2
Osgoode, twp.	8,272	5	1,654	1	3.2	93,856.0
Rideau, twp.	7,860	7	1,122	1	3.2	101,024.0
West Carleton, twp.	7,782	7	1,111	1	3.2	154,067.2

Source: Population and acreage figures obtained from Ontario Municipal Directory, 1976.

Note: The percentages do not necessarily add to 100% due to rounding.

gional Council only if there is a tie.

Table 2-1 presents a summary of the political structure of RMOC. The City of Ottawa has the highest population per local representative, with 18,883 residents for one representative. In the other extreme is the Village of Rockcliffe Park which has the lowest, with one representative per 433 residents. The table also shows the total number of representatives from each area municipality that sits on Regional Council, as well as the percentage of the total for Regional Council that this number represents. We can see that the City of Ottawa and the townships of Gloucester and Nepean which are highly populated and which together constitute about 85% of the total regional population are under-represented on Regional Council, while the other area municipalities have a greater percentage of the representation than their population alone would warrant. However, the over-represented municipalities have only one representative on Regional Council with the exception of the City of Vanier which has two.

Administrative Organization

All matters of business of the Regional Council are considered by an Executive Committee of nine members, including the Regional Chairman, who sits as a voting member. Not more than half of its members may come from the council of

the City of Ottawa. The committee is the equivalent of a board of control, having the same range of powers and duties. Executive Committee recommendations have priority at Council meetings, and Council can approve measures requiring the expenditure of funds without prior approval of the Executive Committee only if two-thirds of the councillors present vote in favour of such measures. The Executive Committee therefore, acts as the co-ordinating body, providing a policy framework and exercising overall control within the agreed policy of Council.

The 1974-76 Executive Committee

<u>Member</u>	<u>Area Municipality</u>	<u>Position in Area Municipality</u>
D. M. Coolican	(Chairman)	-
M. Dewar	Ottawa	Controller, Deputy Mayor
B. Grandmaitre	Vanier	Mayor
L. Greenberg	Ottawa	Mayor
A. S. Haydon	Nepean	Reeve
D. Lockhart	Ottawa	Alderman
R. W. MacQuarrie	Gloucester	Reeve
C. J. Quinn	Ottawa	Alderman
Dr. W. A. Taylor	Gsgoode	Reeve

The Regional Council also has four important committees which are closely associated with the major administrative departments. They are the Planning Committee, with wide-ranging responsibilities with respect to regional planning, the Transportation Committee, the Social Services Committee, and the Homes for the Aged Committee of Management. The major administrative departments include Planning, Works, Transportation, Social Services, Finance, Homes for the Aged, Legal and Emergency Measures. Until early 1976, the City of Ottawa provided the Region with full personnel services with the Commissioner of Personnel for the City of Ottawa also serving in the same capacity for the Region. The termination of that agreement has enabled the Region to establish its own separate personnel department. Department heads are appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of, the Regional Council.

The 1974-76 Department Heads

<u>Department</u>	<u>Head</u>	<u>Title of Office</u>
Emergency Measures	F. F. Holcombe	Co-ordinator
Finance	James K. Perkins	Commissioner
Homes for the Aged	Miss V. Allan	Administrator
Legal	J. D. Cameron	Regional Solicitor
Personnel	R. J. Wilson	Commissioner
Planning	John Wright	Commissioner
Social Services	S. R. Godfrey	Commissioner
Transportation	Michael Sheflin	Commissioner
Works	Frank E. Ayers	Commissioner

We see from the organizational chart (p.52) therefore, that the organs which are mainly involved in the process of decision-making in the RMOC are the administrative departments, the standing council committees, the Executive Committee, and Regional Council. The process usually begins in the departments where all matters are carefully studied before recommendations are made to the standing committees. If accepted by the committees, they are passed on to Executive Committee for consideration, and finally, to Regional Council for approval. Matters before Council are usually in the form of Executive Committee reports. At any stage in this procedure, if the recommendations are not accepted, they can be referred back to Committee or back to staff for more information or modification. Some recommendations, however, do not have to follow this process. For instance, a recommendation to expropriate land in order to build a new road can go directly from the department to the Executive Committee and then to Council, as long as the approval to construct the road had already been given by Council.

Regional Levies

RMOC makes levies (deemed under the Regional Act to be taxes) proportionately upon the area municipalities on the basis of assessments, equalized to affect, among other factors, the impact of Federal, Provincial and municipal proper-

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
ORGANIZATION

ELECTORS OF THE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

1 2 1 1 3 1 16 1 1 2 1

R-E-G-I-O-N-A-L C-O-U-N-C-I-L

(REGIONAL PLANNING BOARD)

CHAIRMAN (CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE REGIONAL CORPORATION)
30 MEMBERS (FROM MUNICIPAL COUNCILS)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN (CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
OF THE REGIONAL CORPORATION)
PLUS
8 MEMBERS FROM REGIONAL COUNCIL

(NOTE 1)

S-T-A-N-D-I-N-G

C-O

PLANNING
COMMITTEE

REGIONAL LAND
DIVISION
COMMITTEE

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE

SOCIAL SERVICES
COMMITTEE

PERSONNEL
DEPARTMENT

EMERGENCY
MEASURES
ORGANIZATION

FINANCE
DEPARTMENT

HOUSES FOR
THE AGED

LEGAL
DEPARTMENT

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

1 of 1

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

ORGANIZATION

ELECTORS OF THE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

TWP OF MARCH TWP OF NEPEAN TWP OF OSSEBOOE CITY OF OTTAWA TWP OF RIDEAU VILLAGE OF ROCKCLIFFE CITY OF VANIER TWP OF WEST CARLETON COUNCILS

1 2 1 1 3 1 16 1 1 2 1
R-E-G-I-O-N-A-L C-O-U-N-C-I-L
(REGIONAL PLANNING BOARD)
CHAIRMAN (CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE REGIONAL CORPORATION)
30 MEMBERS (FROM MUNICIPAL COUNCILS)

REGIONAL CLERK

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN (CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE REGIONAL CORPORATION)
PLUS
8 MEMBERS FROM REGIONAL COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE
SECRETARY

MANAGEMENT SERVICES
OFFICER

CHIEF INTERNAL
AUDITOR

T-R-A-N-S-P-O-R-T-A-T-I-O-N

C-O-M-M-I-T-T-E-E-S

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE

SOCIAL SERVICES
COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE FOR THE
AGED
COMMITTEE
OF MANAGEMENT

NOTE 1
THE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP OF CERTAIN
COMMITTEES TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AND/OR COUNCIL IS NOT SHOWN; SUCH
RELATIONSHIPS ARE INCLUDED IN THE
APPROPRIATE TERMS OF REFERENCE.

COMMITTEE FOR THE
AGED

LEGAL
DEPARTMENT

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT

SOCIAL SERVICES
DEPARTMENT

WORKS
DEPARTMENT

ties which are tax exempt. The assessments are established by Provincial authorities according to the provisions of The Assessment Act of Ontario. Levies related to sewage works and transit are assessed only upon those portions of those area municipalities in which such services are rendered by the Region.

The amount of gross general levy payable by each area municipality to the Region is calculated by applying the percentage of total equalized assessment of the Region which is established for each area municipality to the total gross general levy to be raised by the Region. The table below sets forth the 1974 equalized assessment and apportionment relating to each area municipality within the Region, the resulting 1975 gross general levy and municipal grants from the Province which are deducted to determine net general Regional Levy.

The Province makes conditional and unconditional grants to the Region in support of current and capital expenditures. Conditional grants are based on or related to certain types of current or capital expenditures and are used to defray those expenditures. Unconditional grants are based on population, density and other factors and are used for any municipal purpose. For instance, the RMOC receives from the Province an unconditional general municipal grant as well as grants in aid of welfare, road and sewer construction and

Table 2-2

General Regional Levy Apportionment for 1975

Area Municipality	Equalized Assessment 1974	Assessment and Gross Levy as a % of Total	1975 Gross General Levy	Less: Municipal Grants	1975 Net General Levy
Ottawa	\$4,223,091,626	68.472	\$19,061,988	\$5,024,010	\$14,037,978
Nepean	763,534,435	12.380	3,446,480	1,429,640	2,016,840
Gloucester	457,097,841	7.411	2,063,156	1,018,269	1,044,887
Vanier	183,266,175	2.971	827,100	361,369	465,731
Curberland	85,130,781	1.380	384,180	158,872	225,308
Goulbourn	99,607,775	1.615	449,601	150,850	298,751
Osgoode	71,951,231	1.167	324,882	113,736	211,146
Rideau	79,557,248	1.290	359,124	105,210	253,914
West Carleton	81,303,190	1.318	366,919	107,842	259,077
March	75,834,640	1.230	342,421	91,518	250,903
Rockcliffe Park	47,250,926	.766	213,247	36,822	176,425
Total	\$6,167,625,868	100.000	\$27,839,098	\$8,598,138	\$19,240,960

Source: Annual audited financial statements of the area municipalities for 1974 and 1975.

other current and capital expenditures. In addition, substantial Provincial grants are received in support of current and capital expenditures for transit purposes.

On a cost-shared basis with the Province, the Federal Government provides indirect assistance to the RMOC through Provincial grants for welfare, new sewage treatment facilities costs and certain road construction costs as well as providing assistance through low-cost subsidized loans for sewers, and other purposes.

Economy

The economy of the RMOC is strongly influenced by the presence of the Federal Government which in 1976 accounted for over 37% of total employment in the City of Ottawa, provided 76% of the white collar jobs, and employed about 94,000 people in the National Capital Region.⁵ The "white collar" group includes senior civil servants, lawyers, economists, clerical workers, scientists and specialists in various fields.

The RMOC has a significant number of private science-oriented manufacturing companies which utilize direct and indirect assistance from both government and privately-owned laboratories and from the Region's two universities. A Federal Government agency, the National Research Council, provides basic research and other scientific services for secondary industry.

Among the manufacturing industries in the RMOC are pulp and paper, foods and beverages, printing and publishing and electrical goods. Government demand is particularly important to the printing and publishing industry, while the electrical goods industry finds advantages in the scientific facilities centred in the Region. The table below provides a summary of selected economic indicators for the Region from 1969-1974.

Housing

Housing conditions in Ottawa-Carleton improved significantly between 1961 and 1971, but despite the record levels of housing construction in the early 1970's, the supply for both purchase and rental accommodations in the Region has been shrinking. These 1961-75 trends could possibly be explained within the context of four factors: the growth in housing demand, increase in housing supply, change in housing conditions, and affordability.

The increase in the regional population to a little over 500,000 in 1975 (an increase of two-fifths over 1961) brought about a sharp increase in the number of households to a 1975 total of 162,900.⁶

This rapid household growth was brought about by the rise of young adult age groups, the increase in non-family persons (persons such as the elderly who would rather maintain

Table 2-3

Selected Economic Indicators ⁽¹⁾

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
RMOC Population for Assessment (000's)	440	448	446	468	478	490
Consumer Price Indices (1961 = 100) (1)	123.1	127.4	130.7	136.0	146.3	161.9
Cheques cashed at major clearing centres (000,000's) (2)	\$14,706	\$15,386	\$18,309	\$20,365	\$23,108	N.A.
Industrial Employ- ment Index (1961 = 100) (3)	137.7	140.7	143.1	146.9	157.5	168.6
Average Annual Un- employment rates (3)	2.5%	3.5%	5.9%	5.2%	3.3%	3.6%
Federal Government Staff Strength (3)	N.A.	57,591	65,928	70,293	76,885	N.A.
Payroll (000's) (3)	N.A.	\$497,664	\$593,523	\$713,278	\$835,595	N.A.

Sources and Notes:

- (1) Compiled from Regional sources and from CMHC and
Statistics Canada
- (2) City of Ottawa only
- (3) Cities of Ottawa and Hull

Table 2-4

Comparative Labour Force Statistics for Region,
Ontario and Canada, (1971) ⁽¹⁾

		<u>RMOC</u>	<u>Ontario</u>	<u>Canada</u>
Participation Rate ⁽²⁾	Total	63.7%	62.0%	58.0%
	Male	81.1%	80.2%	76.3%
	Female	47.4%	44.2%	39.9%
Unemployment Rate:	Average	5.9%	7.1%	7.8%
Average Employment Income:	Male	\$8,267	\$7,213	\$6,574
	Female	\$3,948	\$3,328	\$3,199

(1) This table is derived from information contained in
Ottawa-Carleton In Review, Ottawa-Carleton Review
 Commission, August, 1975, pp.21-25.

(2) The labour force participation rate indicates the number
 of people over the age of 15 who either were employed
 or seeking employment in the week preceding the census,
 expressed as a percentage of the total population
 aged 15 and over.

Table 2-5

Comparative Labour Force Distribution by
Occupational Group for Region, Ontario and Canada, 1971

	RMOC	Ontario	Canada
Primary and Secondary occupations (agriculture, manufacturing and processing, construction and transportation)	14.2%	30.7%	32.2%
Managerial and Administrative positions in natural sciences, engineering, mathematics and social sciences	17.7%	8.8%	7.9%
Clerical occupations	25.0%	17.6%	15.9%
Sales related occupations	8.2%	9.6%	9.5%
Service occupations	12.7%	10.6%	11.2%
Medicine and health related occupations	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%
Teaching professions	4.7%	3.8%	4.0%
Occupations relating to Arts, literature and recreation	1.6%	1.0%	0.9%
Religion related occupations	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%

Source: Ottawa-Carleton In Review, Ottawa-Carleton Review
Commission, August, 1975, pp.21-25.

their own homes), the rapid growth of the Federal Government in the area, and improved housing affordability. These circumstances brought about a disproportionate increase in the number of small, and in many cases, one-person households made up mostly of people between the ages of 16 and 25, or 65 and over.

Following the record years of housing production in Ottawa-Carleton in the early 1970's construction dropped very sharply in 1974. In Ottawa, for instance, dwelling starts declined from a record high of 11,951 in 1973 to 7,327 in 1974 and to 4,122 in 1975. Dwelling completions dropped from 27,832 in 1973 to 27,726 in 1974 and to 25,377 in 1975.⁷ Between 1961 and 1971, detached dwellings declined from 51% to 47% of the stock in Ottawa-Carleton, while attached units rose from 14% to nearly 17% and apartments rose from 35% to 36%.⁸ Mobile homes represented less than half of 1% of the stock in 1971.⁹ However, since 1971, two-thirds of the housing completions in the Region have been apartments.

Increased construction activity between the early 1960's and early 1970's brought about significant improvements in housing conditions. While the average number of persons per dwelling declined from 3.8 in 1961 to an estimated 3.0 in 1974, the average number of rooms per dwelling showed a slight increase. This resulted in a sharp decrease in the proportion of overcrowded dwellings from 11.5% of the stock in 1961

to an estimated 2.1% in 1974.¹⁰ There was also a decrease of households with 2 or more families from 3.5% of the total in 1961 to 1.5% in 1971, and households with lodgers declined from 12% to 8%.¹¹ However these improved conditions have somewhat been offset by the inconvenience of apartment living for many of the families with children who cannot afford ground-oriented accommodation and who can only afford apartments.

The Ottawa-Hull area recorded the highest average family income and the second highest household income in Canada in 1971. Furthermore, the average ratio of shelter-cost-to-income was lower for Ottawa-Hull than for many other major Canadian metropolitan areas during the 1969-71 period. These two factors have, since 1971, helped to improve housing affordability though frequently at a slowing rate, for the majority of wage-earners in Ottawa-Hull. At the same time, affordability for a growing minority in the area has deteriorated because house prices have been rising substantially faster than some incomes.

Public Housing

Publicly-assisted housing, including rent-to-income units, limited dividend and HOME dwellings, amount to only one unit for every twelve units of private housing in the Region. About 80% of all public housing in the Region is owned by the

Table 2-6

Housing Characteristics, 1961 and 1971

Municipality	Dwellings	Type by %				Occupancy by %	
		Single Detached	Single Attached	Mobile Homes	Owner Occupied	Tenant Occupied	
RMOC	1971 137,230	46.9	16.6	36.0	0.5	49.7	50.3
Ottawa	1961 70,114	45.4	16.9	37.8	n.a.	48.9	51.1
	1971 92,805	38.7	17.5	43.9	0.01	41.9	58.1
	% change 32.4	-14.8	3.6	16.1	-	-14.3	13.7
Vanier	1961 6,555	21.1	8.5	70.3	n.a.	29.1	70.9
	1971 7,022	18.2	5.8	75.7	0.3	27.8	72.2
	% change 7.1	-13.7	-31.8	7.7	-	-4.5	13.7
Rockcliffe Park	1961 549	91.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	87.2	12.8
	1971 575	94.8	1.7	4.3	0.0	87.8	12.2
	% change 4.7	4.1	-	-	-	0.7	-4.7
Camberland (1)	1971 2,300	85.9	4.3	4.1	5.7	86.0	13.7
Gloucester	1961 3,903	85.9	6.8	9.8	n.a.	72.5	27.5
	1971 8,665	70.9	21.2	7.2	0.8	72.8	27.3
	% change 122.0	-15.0	211.8	-26.5	-	0.4	-0.7
Goulbourn (1)	1971 2,480	92.5	2.2	2.4	3.0	88.7	10.7
March (1)	1971 1,460	71.9	21.6	6.5	0.3	73.3	27.1

continued

Table 2-6

Housing Characteristics, 1961 and 1971 continued

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Type by %</u>			<u>Occupancy by %</u>	
		Single Detached	Single Attached	Mobile Homes	Owner Occupied	Tenant Occupied
Nepean	1961	4,776	n.a.	n.a.	88.3	11.7
	1971	16,885	21.9	14.1	65.8	34.2
	% change	235.5	-35.7	-	-25.5	192.3
Osgoode (1)	1971	2,000	4.0	2.0	82.8	17.0
Rideau (2)	1971	1,360	3.3	4.0	83.1	16.5
West Carleton (1)	1971	1,675	3.6	2.4	85.4	14.3

Source: Ottawa-Carleton In Review, Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission,

August, 1975, p.27.

(1) 1961 data are not available.

(2) Includes only the former Marlborough and North Gower townships;
1961 data are not available.

Ontario Housing Corporation (OHC), 98.8% of which is located in the City of Ottawa and administered by the Ottawa Housing Authority (OHA). The OHC regional office directly administers units that are located elsewhere in the Region. The OHC-OHA programme provides rent-to-income accommodation to low-income families and senior citizens. The City of Ottawa Housing Company Limited (COHC), which is owned wholly by the City owns the remaining 20% of the public housing stock in the Region.

Table 2-7

Public Housing Units, Built and Under
Construction in the Regional Municipality
of Ottawa-Carleton, January, 1975

Municipality	Managed by OHC-OHA		Managed by COHC		Total
	Senior citizens	Families	Senior citizens	Families	
Ottawa, C.	4,618	3,382	723	818	9,541
Vanier, C.	51	15	-	-	66
Nepean, twp.	54	-	-	-	54
March, twp.	40	-	-	-	40
RMOC Total	4,763	3,397	723	818	9,701

Source: Appendix to Final Report, Housing in Ottawa-Carleton,
RMOC, February, 1976, p.37.

In addition to the above, OHC-OHA administers a rent supplement scheme whereby units in private rental accommodation are contracted for by OHC-OHA and then rented out to low-income families and individuals. 658 units were included in this scheme as of July 1975.

Chapter 2 Footnotes

1. Became The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act, R.S.O. 1970, Chapter 407.
2. These will be explained in much more detail in Chapter 4 where I will deal with the functions and responsibilities of the Region.
3. Obtained from the Municipal Directory 1976, Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario, pp.12 and 13.
4. This list was obtained from the Regional Clerk's Office.
5. This information is contained in a study in 1976 by Woods, Gordon and Co., and reported in the Ottawa Citizen of January 27, 1977, p.9.
6. See Appendix to Final Report on Housing In Ottawa-Carleton, RMOC, February, 1976, p.1.
7. Figures on dwelling starts and completions for 1973, 1974 and 1975 obtained from Canadian Housing Statistics 1975, Ottawa, CMHC, March 1976, pp.6 and 7.
8. Appendix to Final Report on Housing in Ottawa-Carleton, p.2.
9. Ibid., p.2.
10. Appendix to Final Report on Housing in Ottawa-Carleton, p.3.
11. Ibid., p.10.

CHAPTER 3

THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RMOC

Under the RMOC Act, the Region is responsible for matters that are of general common concern to the eleven area municipalities. The assets and liabilities related to the functions assumed by the Region were vested in the Region on January 1, 1969, and all debt service costs in respect thereof were then assumed by the Region. Major Regional responsibilities include the following:

Water Supply

The Region is responsible for water supply, purification and distribution but not for making local connections. Regional Council is prohibited by statute from delegating this responsibility to a public utilities commission. Water requirements are obtained primarily from the Ottawa River through the Britannia and Lemieux Island purification plants. At December 31, 1974, the Region's water system included 951 miles of mains, 7 reservoirs and 9 supplementary well systems serving a population of approximately 442,000 primarily in the urban areas of the Region.

Water revenues, including special fire protection charges, are collected directly by the Region. In 1976, such revenues amounted to \$10.9 million or 10.5% of total Regional

revenue, and related expenditures were \$15.1 million or 29.9% of the gross current expenditures of the Region. It has become Regional policy to carry forward any deficit or surplus resulting from water system operations to future years' operations in order to provide stabilized rates over a three-year period. The most recent rate increase became effective in July 1975. The water supply system is administered by Regional Works Department.

Sewage Treatment

The responsibility for sewage collection within the Region is split between the regional municipality and the area municipalities. While the area municipalities are responsible only for the sewers connecting individual properties, the regional municipality is responsible for collecting sewage from the area municipalities, and for its treatment and disposal. However, the RMOC must approve the standards set for local systems and also handles the inspection of all sewers in the Region. The Regional Sewer System was created in 1972 to consolidate the then existing separate sewer systems. At the moment, 8 of the 11 area municipalities are served fully or in part by the Regional Sewer System. The three area municipalities not included - Osgoode, Rideau and West Carleton - are mostly rural, but are intended to be included in the Regional Sewer System under a long range expansion plan.

The Regional Sewer System includes 81.2 miles of trunk mains, as well as three major plants designed to provide primary and secondary treatment. These plants are located along the Ottawa River. The Region plans approximately \$15.2 million in capital expenditures for the Regional Sewer System over the next five years, approximately \$5 million of which is expected to be recovered through Provincial and Federal assistance. In addition to subsidization of capital expenditures by the senior levels of government, capital and current operating costs are financed by a separate levy upon property in those portions of the area municipalities which are included in the Regional Sewer System. The table below summarizes the distribution of the Regional Sewer Levy in 1975. The RMOC Sewage System is administered by the Pollution Control division of the Regional Works Department.

Public Transit

The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission, commonly called OC Transpo, provides a bus system within the urbanized areas of the Region. Through amendments to the RMOC Act, the Transit Commission was established as a statutory body in 1972 to take over the assets and system of the Ottawa Transportation Commission. As a result, public transit became the responsibility of the Regional Municipality. The

Table 3-1

Distributions of the Regional Sewer Levy, 1975

(\$ thousands)

<u>Area Municipality</u>	<u>Regional Sewer Levy</u>
Ottawa	\$3,830
Vanier	135
Rockcliffe Park	43
Cumberland	32
Gloucester	270
Goulbourn	24
March	60
Nepean	621
Osgoode	-
Rideau	-
West Carleton	-
	<hr/>
	\$5,014.
	<hr/>

Source: Figures and information above obtained from the
1974 and 1975 Annual Reports of the Regional
Works Department.

Commission is composed of five members appointed by the Regional Council from among its members, including the Regional chairman who acts as its chairman. The members are from the municipalities chiefly served by OC Transpo. The 1974-76 mem-

bers were:

D. M. Coolican (Chairman)
B. Grandmaitre (City of Vanier Mayor)
L. Greenberg (City of Ottawa Mayor)
A.S. Haydon (Twp. of Nepean Reeve)
R. W. MacQuarrie (Twp. of Gloucester Reeve)

Through a policy of support for public transportation, the Province provides 75% of capital cost and 50% of operational deficits for public transportation service systems. The balance of such deficit is recovered through a levy apportioned against those area municipalities, or portions thereof, comprising the defined Regional Transit Area. In 1976, the transit deficit subsidy from the province was \$6.2 million which constituted 5.9% of the total Regional revenue. The transit levy in the same year amounted to \$7.5 million, 7.2% of total Regional revenue. However, the 1976 current expenditures on Public Transit (\$14.5 million deficit and \$200,000 reserve) amounted to \$14.7 million or 14.2% of the gross current expenditures.¹

Regional Road System

The RMOC and the area municipalities are primarily responsible for roadways in the Region. Initially established by bylaw of the Regional Council and approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the regional road system has as its nu-

cleus 330 miles of the former County of Carleton road network. In addition, certain other main arterial roads in the City of Ottawa and other area municipalities have been designated as regional roads. The total mileage under Regional administration is 600 miles. Area municipalities maintain responsibility for local residential streets and collector roads. Certain highways such as the Queensway and Highway 417 are provincial, while the Ottawa River Parkway and the Queen Elizabeth Driveway are federally owned and maintained by the NCC. Any Regional Council changes to the regional road system would require the approval of the Ontario Minister of Transportation and Communications.

The RMOC Act requires the Regional Council to adopt a plan of road construction and maintenance. More than 50% of approved road construction and maintenance costs are normally subsidized by the Province. In addition, if a plan for constructing and maintaining a road has been submitted to and approved by the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Region becomes eligible for provincial subsidies of up to 80% to cover the given expenditures. Expenditures on roads and traffic usually constitute a substantial portion of total expenditures of the Region. In 1976, that portion was \$14.8 million or 14.2% of gross regional expenditures. The regional road system is administered by the newly-created Department of Transportation.

Traffic Engineering and Street Lighting

Following an amendment to the RMOC Act in 1970, the Region assumed control of the preparation and coordination of traffic engineering services within the Region. This involves the regulation of all traffic control devices for regional roads and all traffic lights for roads under the jurisdiction of the area municipalities. In addition, the Region is responsible for installing street lighting along regional roads while the area municipalities are responsible for doing the same on their roads. This traffic engineering and street lighting function is also under the Transportation Department.

Health and Social Services

Under Provincial health and welfare legislation, the Regional Municipality is responsible for the administration of a broad range of social and family services including homes for the aged, general assistance, day care centres, home care for the elderly and infirm, financial support for public health services and some support of public hospitals by way of operating and capital grants. The Region may pass bylaws granting aid for the construction, acquisition or maintenance of hospital facilities and may issue debentures for that purpose.

The Social Services Commissioner, as head of the Regional Social Services Department, is a "Municipal Administrator" appointed by Regional Council with the approval of the Minister of Social and Family Services of Ontario for the purposes of the General Welfare Assistance Act, the Homemakers and Nurses Services Act, the Day Nurseries Act, and other related Provincial legislation.

The social services programmes administered by RMOC are financed by cost-sharing arrangements involving the federal and provincial governments as well as the Region and area municipalities. For some programmes, the RMOC assumes 20% of the cost, with the province funding 30% and federal government under the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) paying the remaining 50%. For certain other programmes, the RMOC pays 50% of the cost while the federal government contributes the other 50%. In both cases however, the federal government contribution is channelled to the RMOC through the provincial government. The Low Income Supplement Experiment which I have selected as one of the two case studies falls under the second category of financing. Of the \$200,000 budgeted for its first year of operation, the RMOC contributed 50% while the province covered the other 50% with federal funds through the CAP programme.

A separate Regional department, Homes for the Aged, takes care of Island Park Lodge/Bradford House and Carleton

Lodge which are socially oriented institutions established and maintained for the care of residents who are over 60 years of age and who can no longer care for themselves or live in an ordinarily functioning family home. Lodge services are extended to other parts of the Region in the form of Day Care, Meals-on-Wheels, Private Home Care and Vacation Care.

Homes for the Aged operate under the terms and conditions of the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act and by the bylaws policies and procedures established by Regional Council.

There is also the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Area Health Unit established in 1969 under provisions of the RMOC Act, amalgamating the former boards of health for Ottawa, Vanier and Carleton County. The Health Unit is responsible to the Regional Board of Health which consists of nine members including six Regional Council members and three persons appointed by the provincial government. The Board is responsible for the Unit's budget. However, final approval for the amount of total expenditure as well as the Region's share of the costs must come from Regional Council. The Medical Officer of Health who directs the operations of the Unit, is nominated by the Board of Health and appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Planning

One of the major reasons for the creation of the

Region was to permit the planning for and development of the area in a coordinated and economic manner. Under the RMOC Act, the Region is designated as a "planning area" within the provisions of the Planning Act of Ontario and given the responsibility of drawing up an "Official Plan" for the Region. Such a plan has been drawn and given final approval by Regional Council on October 9, 1974. One of the two case studies in this study involves the decision to adopt the Regional Official Plan.

The planning boards of the area municipalities are maintained as subsidiary boards, and their plans are coordinated with the Regional Plan. The Region is responsible for long range planning and has assumed from the Province responsibility for subdivision approvals and other delegated duties.

The table below gives a comparison of gross expenditures for each Regional function for 1975 and 1976.

Table 3-2

Gross Expenditures for RMOC, 1975 and 1976

	1975 Actual \$	1976 Budget \$	Increase from prior year
Other:			
Protective Services	187,967	187,488	
Environment:			
Current	234,727	247,527	
Contribution to Capital	40,000	-	
Cultural Services	100,000	100,000	
	<u>562,694</u>	<u>535,015</u>	
Environmental Development:			
Current	1,758,024	2,106,925	19.85
Contribution to Capital	577,900	187,750	
	<u>2,335,924</u>	<u>2,294,675</u>	
Sewer System:			
Current	2,901,161	3,806,611	31.21
Financial charges	2,464,755	3,765,039	
	<u>5,365,816</u>	<u>7,571,650</u>	
General Government:			
Current	4,437,551	4,729,043	6.57
Provision for Unforeseen	566,808	3,724,075	
	<u>5,004,359</u>	<u>8,453,118</u>	
Debt Charges (General Fund Only)	4,961,598	9,287,947	87.20

continued

Table 3-2 continued

	1975 Actual \$	1976 Budget \$	Increase from prior year %
Roads and Traffic:			
Current	11,555,930	12,733,832	10.19
Contribution to Capital	2,355,900	2,084,680	
	<u>13,911,830</u>	<u>14,818,512</u>	
Water Supply:			
Current	7,427,216	7,684,399	3.46
Financial Charges	3,632,411	7,427,501	
	<u>11,059,627</u>	<u>15,111,900</u>	
Public Transit:			
1976 Reserve	-	200,000	
1976 Estimated Deficit	-	14,543,000	15.54
1975 Actual Deficit	12,587,191	-	49.11
1974 Actual Deficit	8,441,432	-	
1973 Underlevy and others	315,246	-	
	<u>21,343,869</u>	<u>14,743,000</u>	
Health and Social Services	27,213,482	31,154,849	14.48
TOTAL	<u>91,704,451</u>	<u>104,220,666</u>	

Source: RMC, 1976 Current Budget.

Chapter 3 Footnotes

1. The 1976 figures on the provincial subsidy, transit levy and current expenditures were obtained from the RMO, 1976 Current Budget.

CHAPTER 4

THE ROLE OF THE "SENIOR" GOVERNMENTS IN THE REGION

In this chapter, an attempt is made to analyse the roles and activities of the federal and provincial governments in the Region in relation to any influence they may have on the planning policies and decisions of the Regional Municipality. In the last chapter, the financial contributions of both the federal and provincial governments to the various functions of the Regional Municipality were briefly discussed. The implications of such contributions will be further analysed later in this study. In this chapter therefore, the emphasis will be on the public ownership and management of land and property as they relate to planning matters in the Region, as well as the main control mechanisms of the Province over the Region.

The Provincial Impact

In Canada, provinces derive their control of municipal institutions from Section 92 of the British North American Act. Municipalities are not given separate powers by the BNA Act. They derive their authority by assignment or delegation of specific powers from the Legislature of the

respective provincial government. What this means is that municipalities in Canada are nothing but offsprings of the provincial governments. Their power to raise money (business and property taxes), to plan, to develop, to provide health and social services and to legislate (bylaws) is delegated by provincial statute. Though many of the departments and agencies of the provincial government of Ontario play a vital role in the operation of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the activities of two are especially important for purposes of this discussion.

A. Ministry of Housing:

The power and decisions of this department, affect many aspects of the RMOC. The most significant function of this Ministry in relation to this study is the approval of official municipal plans. The Minister of Housing recently approved the Official Plan of the RMOC and referred certain aspects of it to the OMB. This approval power has to be considered a crucial provincial control mechanism in view of the fact that one of the principal reasons for establishing the RMOC is so that the area could be planned for and developed in an economic and coordinated manner. Through a programme of decentralization in the last two years, the Minister of Housing has delegated some of his planning authority to the Regional Council with respect to the approval of area municipalities' official plans and their amendment, the approval

of plans for subdivisions, and commenting to the OMB, on the restricted area bylaws of area municipalities.

The province, through the Ontario Housing Corporation and the Ottawa Housing Authority, has become one of the biggest landlords in the Region. As of January 1975, OHC-OHA maintained a total of 8,160 rental units for senior citizens and low income families in the area, most of them located in the City of Ottawa. In this capacity, provincial housing authorities are obviously interested in local policies and decisions affecting real estate property in the area. In addition, the province and the federal government are joint owners of the Carlsbad Springs land assembly. The development of this potential growth area has been one of the hottest issues involving the RMOC and the federal government, and I will deal with it in more detail in chapters on the Regional Plan in Part Two.

B. Ontario Municipal Board (OMB):

The OMB is an administrative tribunal established under provisions of the Ontario Municipal Board Act, and was first established in 1932 as the successor to the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board. It is composed of approximately 26 full-time members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. In addition to its powers under its enabling Act, the Board has considerable jurisdiction under many other provincial statutes, particularly the Planning Act, The Assess-

ment Act, The Municipal Act, The Secondary Schools and Boards Act, and The Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

As one of the principal agencies supervising the financial activities of Ontario municipalities, the OMB is specifically charged with the supervision of all municipal debt in Ontario. In this respect, the RMOC is required to submit a five-year capital forecast annually to the Board which examines it in light of the total debt burden of the Region including direct debt of the Region, the area municipalities and the public and secondary schools. The Board grants approval of debenture authorities only when it is satisfied that no undue burden will be placed on the Region's taxpayers and debt won't threaten default.

Under The Planning Act, the Board has jurisdiction in official plan references and zoning bylaw approvals. The OMB has no originating jurisdiction in Official Plan matters; its jurisdiction arises upon a referral. The Planning Act gives the Minister of Housing discretion to refer any part of the plan to the Board. This in fact, is what the Minister has done with certain parts of the RMOC Official Plan, which led to the application of the Regional Municipality to the OMB for approval of those parts of the Plan. On the other hand, a person or municipality may request the Minister to refer any part of the Plan to the Board prior to its

approval, and the Minister is obliged to do so unless the request is not made in good faith or is frivolous or is made only for the purpose of delay.

Another instance in which an Official Plan may be referred to the Board is when any person requests the council to make an amendment to the Official Plan. Where council either refuses to propose the amendment or fails to propose the amendment within thirty days from the receipt of the request, such a person may then request the Minister to refer the proposal to the Board. In such a case, the Minister has discretion to refer the matter or refuse the request.

Unlike the provisions for references of official plans and plans of subdivisions, no zoning bylaw comes into force without the approval of the Board.

What are the main factors often considered by the OMB on official plan references and zoning bylaw hearings?

Marie Corbett, a sitting member of the OMB, helps answer this question in an article in the Osgoode Hall Law Journal.¹

According to Miss. Corbett, the Board considers many factors in its determination of sound planning policies, and these could be broadly classified as matters involving consideration of feasibility, impact, and public interest.

The feasibility factors involve determining whether the land is suitable for the requested purpose, taking into consideration such matters as topography, servicing, including

sanitary and storm sewers, water and drainage, parking requirements, the effect of and generation of traffic access and the availability of schools and community amenities. Thus, the author notes that in consideration of these factors, the Board usually refuses approval of zoning applications in areas where existing services are at a saturation point, and when there is no guarantee that the proposed use will not overburden the available services. On the other hand, the Board may grant its approval regardless of legitimate objections in cases where a need for a particular use is clearly established.

Next, the Board determines what impact, if any, the proposed use will have on existing and future uses, and this involves consideration of the adjoining uses, the degree of integration or intrusion and its effect, the character of the neighbourhood, density, height, shadowing effect, the effect on land values and assessment, the creation of non-conforming uses, and environmental impact.² Proposed uses which are usually not approved in view of these factors are those involving the complete alteration in the character of the neighbourhood; for instance, the development of high-rise apartments in predominantly residential areas, or the intrusion of an urban-style development in a predominantly rural area. In making decisions with these factors in mind, the Board also often follows what Miss. Corbett calls the

"balancing of interests", which means the interests of the individual may have to give way to those of the neighbourhood, or the interests of the neighbourhood to those of the municipality as a whole.

Finally, there are the all-important factors involving the public interest. These include "reasons for the municipal decision, the amount of prior consideration, policy statements in the Official Plan and other planning documents, future planning, need, available jobs, prematurity, reasonableness, the degree of public participation, government policy, and whether reasonable land use would be sterilized."³

It is primarily because of OMB decisions on official plan matters and zoning bylaws on the basis of the factors above that citizens' groups have often referred to the Board as the losing citizen's second chance.⁴ The OMB is said to have a lot of faith in the wisdom of those, including professional planners, who make council decisions, and as such, citizens' groups across the province generally believe that in issues which pit citizens' groups against developers or municipalities, the OMB decides in favour of the latter most of the time.

In an article entitled "The OMB: Citizens as Losers", in The City Book, Bruce McKenna made an analysis of all the cases heard by the Board in 1973.⁵ Of the 135 which

he selected and analysed as issues which pitted citizens' groups against developers or city councils or both, he found that the overall success rate of citizens' groups was 40%. When he broke the cases down by their importance, he found that on those he classified as being of minor importance (23 in 1973), citizens won 16, or 69%. And in the 29 cases of major municipality-wide importance, citizens won only 6, a success rate of 21%. On the other hand, he found that the overall success rate of municipalities in the 106 cases where they took a firm stand one way or another was 73%; their success rate increasing as follows: 60% on minor issues, 68% on local issues, and 91% on major issues. McKenna concluded therefore, that the OMB is a tool of provincial policy helping to implement the pro-development, pro-developer, pro-centralization policies of the Ontario government.

The RMOC Official Plan, as we shall see in more detail in later chapters, incorporates the decisional factors outlined by Miss. Corbett to a very large extent, and as such, objectors to aspects of it face an up-hill battle in efforts to have any of them put aside by the Board. The most important thing in the Region's favour going into the OMB hearings is provincial government commitment to most of the major provisions of the Plan as it has already been approved by the Minister of Housing. In a letter to the Regional Chairman, Mr. D. M. Coolican, on June 4, 1976, concerning the

A large, bold, black number '2' is centered on a white background. The number is thick and has a slightly irregular, hand-drawn appearance. It is oriented vertically, with the top of the number at the top of the page and the bottom at the bottom. The number is composed of two main parts: a curved top section and a straight vertical section. The top section is a thick, curved line that starts at the top left and curves down to the right. The straight section is a thick vertical line that starts at the bottom of the curved section and extends down to the bottom of the page. The number is centered horizontally and vertically.

RMOC Official Plan, the Minister of Housing, John Rhodes, stated as follows:

Before accounting this Ministry's specific concerns and suggested modifications, I wish to assure you that my staff and I are impressed with the high quality of the Plan, and encouraged by the Planning process undertaken by the Regional Municipality. As you will note, most of the points raised are intended only to clarify statements in the Plan, not to suggest changes in policy.⁶

It should be noted however, that the OMB is only the second to the final stage of the appeal process. OMB decisions can be appealed to the Ontario Cabinet which has very rarely altered any Board decision in recent years.

The Federal Impact

The involvement of the federal government in the Region is enormous and complex and would probably require a separate study by itself to review it adequately. This discussion will therefore, centre around the main federal departments and agencies which dominate the federal role in the Region, while emphasizing the physical impact of such federal activities as planning, building, land ownership, parks and recreation, roads, payments in lieu of taxes, and a few others.

A. The National Capital Commission (NCC):

The NCC is the crown agency which, under the National Capital Act (1958), Parliament gave the federal mandate "to

prepare plans for and assist in the development, conservation and improvement of the National Capital Region in order that the nature and character of the seat of the Government of Canada may be in accordance with its national significance."⁷ Accordingly, the Commission administers the National Capital Region which has an area of 1,800 square miles - 1,050 square miles of Eastern Ontario and 750 square miles of western Quebec, in somewhat of a square around the cities of Ottawa and Hull. Most of the RMOC is contained within the National Capital Region, especially the cities of Ottawa and Vanier, the Townships of Nepean and Gloucester and the village of Rockcliffe Park, which are completely enclosed in it, as well as portions of the remaining area municipalities and some areas outside the RMOC.

In order to meet its objectives, the NCC is empowered to "acquire, manage and develop property; construct, maintain and operate roads, bridges, parks and other works; undertake joint projects with municipalities; construct and operate concessions; make grants; maintain historic places; review for approval, site and exterior plans for federal buildings planned for National Capital Region, and conduct research for the planning of the National Capital Region."⁸ In view of these duties, I will direct my analysis to the two NCC functional areas of Planning and Development, and Land which are particularly relevant to this study.

(1) Planning & Development: In this area, the NCC is guided by "Tomorrow's Capital", a proposed development concept for the National Capital Region which was released by the NCC in December 1974. The concept incorporates such goals as a better balance of economic and cultural development, managed growth, a revitalized core area and the preservation of open space and agricultural land. On the Ontario side, there is a very pressing need to resolve the basic differences that currently exist between the policies contained in the RMOC Official Plan and those of the "Tomorrow's Capital" concept. These planning differences relate to different priorities, primarily for the development of new urban communities beyond the Greenbelt - South East City versus South Nepean/South Gloucester⁹ - and for the location of employment centres in relation to the future rapid transit network.

Despite the NCC claim that its planning and development activities in the Capital Region have been carried out in close collaboration with other planning jurisdictions, local government officials in the area have always accused the Commission of not recognizing their planning authority, and of not behaving in accordance with local objectives or policies. In a submission to the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Capital Region, RMOC Chairman, Denis Coolican, called for an amendment to the National Capital Act in order to limit the powers of the NCC.¹⁰ According to

him, the Commission should not have any responsibility for urban planning, a role which he considers to rest with the Region and area municipalities. Any planning on the part of the NCC, he added, should relate solely to Federal Government lands and to ensure that federal planning policies are compatible and in accord with Regional and local policies.

In reply to Mr. Coolican and other critics of NCC planning policies in the Capital Region, the NCC chairman at the time, Edgar Gallant, made a statement to the same Joint Parliamentary Committee. In it, he said:

Clearly, the federal government has a legitimate and recognized planning role in the National Capital Region which allows it to express national interest and aspirations. Although provincial and municipal authorities have exclusive responsibility for local concerns in their respective jurisdictions with the Region, their responsibilities cannot be construed as representing the national interest - nor can they be substituted for the national concerns and aspirations.¹¹

Four big projects which are highly essential to the Commission's development of the Capital as a core area and which will have a great impact on the future of the Region are the development of Lebreton Flats, Rideau Centre, Wellington Street West, and the Woodroffe Demonstration Project at Baseline and Woodroffe.

Early in 1975, the federal Cabinet approved an NCC proposal to develop Lebreton Flats - 200 acres of land less than one mile from Parliament Hill and close to the Ottawa

River - for residential purposes. The NCC is working with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the planning and development of the site. While the project will focus on residential uses, a wide range of supporting facilities will be included in the development. Furthermore, some non-residential uses may be necessary to provide a broad mixture of activities but the main objective is to provide an inner-city community for a cross-section of residents. Despite consultations with municipal and provincial officials and community groups, there was serious disagreement between the City of Ottawa and NCC/CMHC officials over housing density for the proposed community.

The dispute centred on a recent plan¹² which called for the construction of 4,000 housing units on the Lebreton site, and since only 70 of the entire 200 acres would be utilized for housing, the result would be 55 units per acre. City of Ottawa planners thought that was too high. They would prefer to see the project reduced to 2,000 units, or 40 units per acre. The 55 units per acre in the recent federal plan contrasts with an average density of 30 to 40 units per acre in existing inner city neighbourhoods. Although NCC/CMHC could theoretically ignore city objections and go ahead, both sides were able to work out a compromise, and so the dispute was resolved.

Another issue of potential controversy in the Lebreton Flats proposals involves the priority given to the needs of the automobile in the plan. Some members of the City of Ottawa Housing Advisory Committee wanted to know why it was suddenly necessary to have two new arterial routes running through the site. The federal plan calls for the extension of Preston Street to link up with the Chaudiere Bridge. It also calls for the creation of a new east-west one-way arterial pair by extending Albert and Slater Streets through the Flats. Federal authorities maintain that provisions for these routes were made to meet the transportation requirements of Regional Council. The issue is still under negotiation.

In May 1974, the Federal Cabinet approved an NCC concept plan for the development of the so-called Rideau Centre, which is an ambitious scheme to revitalize that part of the Core Area lying east of the Rideau Canal between the Mackenzie King Bridge, Waller Street and the Byward Market. The principal features of the Rideau Centre plan include an enclosed pedestrian galleria on Rideau Street between Waller and Sussex; a regional bus transit station below Freiman Street to provide direct access to Rideau Centre from all parts of the Capital Region; construction of a 200,000 square foot department store south of Besserer Street with supplementary stores in a subsidiary galleria on Freiman Street offering

direct connections to the Byward Market; construction of a 650 room Canadian Pacific Hotel on a site overlooking the Rideau Canal adjacent to the Mackenzie King Bridge; construction of a large terrace on the east bank of the Canal; and conservation of the Byward Market/Sussex Drive area.

The Rideau Centre development plans have encountered stiff opposition from community groups in the area, the City of Ottawa and the RMOC which have all accused the NCC of adopting a high-handed approach on the issue and of failing to adequately consult local municipal officials. Opposition to the Centre ranges from residents of Centre Town, Lower Town and Sandy Hill who prefer comparatively modest redevelopment for fear that the federal scheme would kill small businesses in the area, to the Lebreton Flats citizens committee which maintains that closing Rideau Street and building a climate-controlled mall from Sussex Drive to Waller Street would overload Wellington Street and make driving downtown a nightmare. City of Ottawa planners have suggested turning Rideau Street into a bus mall, with widened sidewalks protected from rain and wind by glass canopies. As of now, there doesn't seem to be an easy solution to these differences.

Arising from the expressed desire of the federal government to strengthen the Capital Core, the NCC has jointly initiated a study with the Department of Public Works to develop plans for the land on the north side of Wellington

Street between the West Block of Parliament and the Portage Bridge. Prospective plans call for the construction of the National Gallery, a new Federal Court Building, an extension to the existing Archives/National Library Building, and additional office accommodation for the Justice Department. The aim is to combine these features with impending improvements to Victoria and Chaudière Islands to create a so-called "Cultural Mall" which could easily become a top tourist attraction in the area.

Lastly, the federal government, through the NCC and CMHC, was embroiled in a controversy with the RMOC concerning the development of the federally-owned 411 acres of land situated on the south-west corner of Merivale Road and Woodroffe Avenue. Planning activity on this proposed housing project virtually came to a standstill because of the dispute between the NCC and the RMOC over extension of the Western Parkway to the site and the possible location of office buildings on it. However, the dispute was recently settled and the development of the site is expected to begin sometime soon.

(2) Land: The extensive land holdings of the NCC grew out of land acquisition programmes which were greatly expanded at the time the Greenbelt was expropriated. The tables below show the various NCC land holdings and uses within the RMOC to illustrate how the Commission is carrying out its responsibi-

lity "to prepare plans for and to coordinate the uses to be made of the extensive federal land holdings in the Capital Region."¹³

Table 4-1

NCC Property Holdings in RMOC

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>% of Municipal Area</u>	<u>As % of NCC total</u>
Cumberland	390	0.5	0.3
Gloucester	25,255	34.6	21.3
Goulbourn	-	-	-
March	49	0.2	-
Nepean	16,669	30.0	14.1
Osgoode	-	-	-
Ottawa	4,966	18.2	4.2
Rideau	180	0.2	0.2
Rockcliffe	29	6.8	-
Vanier	20	2.8	-
West Carleton	-	-	-
RMOC Area TOTAL	47,558		40.1

Source: NCC, Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee,
1975, p.139.

Table 4-2

NCC Grants in Lieu of Taxes to RMOC Municipalities,
1970-74

	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970
Ottawa	867,292.96	856,913.68	884,367.91	871,437.26	780,848.78
Gloucester	299,975.77	272,163.71	256,539.12	236,297.36	229,913.24
Nepean	159,966.72	154,166.42	172,190.44	140,711.76	124,705.79

Source: NCC, Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee,
 1975, p.144.

B. The Department of Public Works (DPW):

Public Works Department is the realty organization of the federal government. Its service role is best described in a statement in an official departmental booklet as follows:

In carrying out their programme responsibilities some 86 departments and agencies come to us for their real property requirements: their land; general office and other general purpose accommodation; special purpose buildings such as penitentiaries or laboratories; improvements such as roads, bridges, docks, wharves - indeed, any and all improvements of a physical nature to raw land, and subsequent additions or alterations to these. 14

The Public Works Department prides itself on being the largest landowner and leaseholder in the country. National-

TABLE 4-5

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION
COMMISSION DE LA CAPITALE NATIONALE

PUBLIC PARKS BY OWNERSHIP, AREA, COST AND DATE OF ACQUISITION
PARCS PUBLICS PAR DROIT DE PROPRIÉTÉ, SUPERFICIE, COUT ET DATE D'ACQUISITION

NAME / NOM	AREA/ACRES SUPERFICIE/ACRES	COST COUT	DATE ACQUIRED DATE D'ACQUISITION	MAINTAINED BY ENTRETENU PAR	OWNED BY PROPRIÉTAIRE
MAJOR HILL/NEPEAN POINT Transferred from N.M. the Queen to P.O.C./Transféré de Sa Majesté la Reine à D.P.C.	10.68		1950	M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
VINCENT MASSEY & ROG'S BACK	100.00	193,000.00	1947	M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
POOMET'S BAY	55.00	194,700.00	1947 & 1952	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa	M.C.C./C.C.M.
CENTRAL/CENTRAL Transferred from Dept. of Mines to P.O.C./Transféré du Ministère des Mines à D.P.C.	14.50		1949	M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
HAMPTON	40.00	40,000.00	1931	M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
ROCKLIFFE*	(91.80)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa
STRATHCONA	137.63			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
COMMISSIONER	116.71			M.C.C./C.C.M.	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa
GARDEN OF THE PROVINCES/ JARDIN DES PROVINCES	4.60			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
	1.00			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
	(1.20)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	D.P.M./M.T.P.
BROMSON	(1.41)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa
STANLEY AVE.	7.62			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
BROWN'S INLET	3.05			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
	(.60)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa
KINGSVIEW PARK	10.25			M.C.C./C.C.M.	M.C.C./C.C.M.
VANIER	9.23			City of Vanier Ville de Vanier	M.C.C./C.C.M.
CONFEDERATION	8.43			M.C.C./C.C.M.	D.P.M./M.T.P.
ROSE STREET King Edward - Cathcart	(2.60)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	City of Ottawa/ Ville d'Ottawa
DON'S LAKE	(25.01)			M.C.C./C.C.M.	Ministry of Transp. Ministère des Transports
TOTAL M.C.C./C.C.M.	401.99				
TOTAL OTHERS/AUTRES	(139.31)				

*The Rockcliffe Parkway containing 3.6 miles is included in M.C.C. ownership of 137.63 acres shown above.
Le promenade de Rockcliffe comprend 3.6 milles et est incluse dans les 137.63 acres de terrains tenus par la C.C.M.

Source: N.C.C. Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, 1974, p.150.

Table 4-3

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION / COMMISSION DE LA CAPITAL NATIONALE

LAND ACQUISITION COST BY YEAR - 1957-58 to 1974-75
COUT ANNUEL D'ACQUISITION DES TERRAINS DE 1957-1958 A 1974-1975FINANCED OUT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL FUND AND LOANS
FINANCE A MEME LA CAISSE DE LA CAPITAL NATIONALE ET PAR EMPRUNTS

YEAR ANNEE	ACQUIRED ACQUISITIONS	SOLD OR TRANSFERRED VENTES OU TRANSFERTS	CUMULATIVE ACQUIRED ACQUISITIONS	CUMULATIVE SOLD OR TRANSFERRED VENTES OU TRANS- FERTS CUMULATIFS	CUMULATIVE NET COST COUT NET CUMULATIF
1957-58	\$ 2,294,973	\$ -	\$ 2,294,973	\$ -	\$ 2,294,973
1958-59	5,043,522	282,779	7,338,495	282,779	7,055,716
1959-60	11,087,224	145,355	18,425,719	428,134	17,997,585
1960-61	7,629,375	193,292	26,055,094	621,426	25,433,668
1961-62	9,973,506	4,235,351	36,028,600	4,856,777	31,171,823
1962-63	10,571,454	493,130	46,600,054	5,349,907	41,250,147
1963-64	14,026,185	296,428	60,626,239	5,646,335	54,979,904
1964-65	11,279,300	4,860,554	71,905,539	10,506,889	61,398,650
1965-66	11,856,363	4,050,874	83,761,902	14,557,763	69,204,139
1966-67	7,684,944	3,223,525	91,446,846	17,781,288	73,665,558
1967-68	5,242,075	598,503	96,688,921	18,379,791	78,309,130
1968-69	3,466,017	7,720,827	100,154,938	26,100,618	74,054,320
1969-70	4,934,810	679,867	105,089,748	26,780,485	78,309,263
1970-71	3,608,413	1,025,677	108,698,161	27,806,162	80,891,999
1971-72	27,284,062	685,726	135,982,223	28,491,888	107,490,335
1972-73	9,010,375	3,306,817	144,992,598	31,798,705	113,193,893
1973-74	5,756,477	3,211,382	150,749,075	35,010,087	115,738,988
1974-75	16,317,571	342,770	167,066,646	35,352,857	131,713,789

Source: N.C.C. Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, 1975, p.148.

Table 4-6

NCC Parkway Acquisition by Area, Cost and Date in RMOC

Parkways	Total Area (Acres)	Acres Acquired Prior to 1959	Cost	Dates Balance Acquired and Cost		Total Cost
Western	687.21	478.51	\$ 588,371.64	1966/75 -	\$ 480,159.47	\$ 1,068,531.11
Eastern	1,158.35	885.23	2,021,818.95	1960/64 -	179,002.75	2,200,821.70
Rideau River	654.37	448.67	2,602,829.85	1965/75 -	635,432.26	3,238,262.11
Ottawa River East 270.46 West 317.15	587.61	204.95	2,870,164.29	1965/69 -	1,658,389.39	4,528,553.68
Airport	143.83	NIL	NIL	1970 -	15,483.75	15,483.75
Island Park	27.11	27.11	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
TOTAL	3,258.48	2,044.47	8,083,184.73		2,968,467.62	11,051,652.35

Source: NCC, Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, 1975, p.152.

Table 4-7

NCC Land Holdings Listed by Major Land Use (in acres) and Municipality (RMOC)

	Ottawa	Vanier	Rockcliffe	Gloucester	Nepean	Cumberland	Rideau	March	Total
Parkways	2,384.41	10.86		407.24	320.87				3,123.38
Public Parks	392.76	9.23							401.99
Proposed Residential Development	147.95								147.95
Open Spaces				22,178.52	16,276.65	390.00			38,845.17
Heritage	38.47								38.47
Industrial	831.54								831.54
Mixed Use	1,166.81		29.06	2,668.91	71.88		180.22	49.40	4,166.28
Federal Government Accommodation									3.11
TOTAL	4,965.05	20.09	29.06	25,254.67	16,669.40	390.00	180.22	49.40	47,557.89

Source: NCC, Report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, 1975, p.153.

ly, it now owns about 6,000 building units, with an estimated value of \$20 billion.¹⁵ In 1975, the federal government spent more than \$20 million¹⁶ to lease privately-owned space across Canada. In the 1975-76 fiscal year, accommodation programme costs constituted 80% of all Public Works funding at \$496 million,¹⁷ with one-half dedicated to the construction and acquisition of Crown-owned buildings and the other half for leasing and maintenance. The analysis here will centre around the two areas of DPW operations which are of interest to this study - government leasing and the construction and acquisition of buildings in the Ottawa-Hull area.

The federal government, through DPW, now owns about 250 buildings of various shapes and sizes in the Ottawa-Hull area containing 11,300,000 square feet of office accommodation, and the current 300 leases with the private sector add another 9,700,000 square feet of office area.¹⁸ This brings the total of office space under federal control in Ottawa-Hull to 21,000,000 square feet as of December 1976. This figure is set to increase tremendously over the next few years because of the large federal projects currently under construction in the area. For instance, the controversial Terrasses de la Chaudière project in Hull, being built by Campeau Corporation under a lease-purchase agreement, will have 1.5 million square feet of office space, while the 13 storey building on Sparks Street will add another 950,000

square feet of office accommodation.¹⁹

Other Crown-owned buildings currently under construction which will add substantially to the amount of office space in the area include Phase 3, Place du Portage, with 900,000 square feet of space; Phase 4, Place du Portage, with 740,000 square feet of accommodation; and the Census Building, Tunney's Pasture in Ottawa, slated to provide 650,000 square feet of office space for Statistics Canada.²⁰ It is expected that the amount of office space will keep rising especially if such ambitious projects as Rideau Centre go through. The central question then, in the minds of local municipal officials is whether the federal government will be able to utilize the available office space in view of its commitment to a decentralization programme that could move a substantial number of public servants to other parts of the country and to Hull. Repudiating what they call "ghost town scare tactics", federal authorities maintain that if a problem of surplus federal office space does in fact materialize in Ottawa-Hull, necessary adjustments can be made in the government's decentralization programme.

C. The CMHC:

The next federal involvement in the RMOC is through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) which is the federal administrative agency responsible for housing. As a

Crown Corporation, it has authority to do business with provinces, municipalities, financial institutions, builders, private borrowers, and tenants in an attempt to carry out federal policy enacted under the National Housing Act. CMHC therefore, ensures mortgage loans, makes direct loans for home-ownership and rental housing, carries out land assembly, subsidizes public housing, and makes loans and grants for urban renewal, sewage treatment projects, and urban research. It is through these activities that CMHC exercises a lot of influence on the shape and direction of the Region's growth, especially its power to give or withhold insured mortgage loans which could be a very potent force in supporting or weakening housing policies in the area. For instance, in 1975 under NHA provisions, CMHC financed the construction starts of 996 single detached units; 601 semi-detached and duplex units; 1,297 row units, and 1,228 apartment and other units.²¹

In addition to its partnership with the NCC in the planning and development of major federal projects in the Region, already discussed, CMHC is a partner with the NCC and with the Ontario Housing Corporation in the assembly of land in Carlsbad Springs.

D. Other:

There is also the 1,100 acre Central Experimental Farm

in Ottawa under the firm jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. City of Ottawa officials have always complained that while the Farm provides no tax revenue, it has added substantially to the costs of providing such services as water, sewer, roads and public transportation to the rapidly growing areas beyond it. While recognizing that this urban land would be very valuable if used for housing or related purposes, Douglas Fullerton, in his report on the National Capital Region suggested that the judgment of whether the present use of this land is good for the Capital area or not should essentially be an urban planning decision.²²

There are a few other federal land owners in the Region. The Department of National Defence owns a total of 5,550 acres²³ in the Rockcliffe and Uplands air bases and in various military installations such as armouries and proving grounds. The Ministry of Transport owns 6,100 acres²⁴ mainly at the Ottawa International Airport. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development administers the Rideau Canal and owns the land along it.

The preceding discussion indicates that both the provincial and federal governments are actively involved in planning matters in the RMOC. The Province's involvement is through its constitutional authority over the Regional Municipality by means of which it affects regional policies and functions in various ways. The federal government, on the

other hand, is involved through the activities of some of its departments and agencies in the Region, especially the NCC. The degree to which provincial and federal involvement affects the decision-making process in the RMOC will be further examined in the analysis of the two case studies in Parts B and C of this study.

Chapter 4 Footnotes

1. Corbett, Marie, "The Ontario Municipal Board: Planning and Zoning Cases", Osgoode Hall Law Journal, Vol. 14, No. 1, June 1976, p.93.
2. Ibid., p.103.
3. Ibid., pp.105 and 106.
4. This accusation is also based on the fact that private developers, unlike citizens' groups, can afford to hire lots of highly qualified lawyers to represent them at OMB hearings. This is evident at the current OMB hearings into the RMOC Official Plan. While the various citizens' groups could only afford to hire Tom McDougall and his law partners with the limited grants they received from the City of Ottawa, the private land development firms were able to come up with a string of some of the best law firms in the Province to represent them at the hearings. The argument is that this imbalance in representation before the OMB favours the private developers.
5. McKenna, Bruce, "The OMB: Citizens as Losers", in James Lorimer and Evelyn Ross, (eds.), The City Book, Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, Publisher, 1976, pp.197-203.
6. R. M.O.C., Proposed Ministerial Modifications to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Official Plan, June 25, 1976, p.23.
7. N.C.C., Tomorrow's Capital, Ottawa, 1974, p.7.
8. N.C.C., Annual Report 1974-1975, p.2.
9. I will deal with the controversy surrounding these two potential growth areas in more detail when I discuss the objections to the RMOC Official Plan in Part Two.
10. Coolican, Denis M., Submission to the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of The House of Commons on the National Capital Region, March 2, 1976.
11. Gallant, Edgar, Statement by NCC Chairman to Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Capital Region, May 27, 1976, p.7.

12. This plan is in the form of a CMHC progress report to the City of Ottawa Housing Advisory Committee, and the Ottawa Planning Board, January 31, 1977.
13. Tomorrow's Capital, 1974, p.1.
14. Public Works Canada, November, 1972, p.1.
15. Best, Patrick, "Too Much Office Space?" The Ottawa Citizen, November 20, 1976, p.69. Mr. Best's article was based on a report by the Planning and Coordination Division of the Department of Public Works in late 1976.
16. Ibid., p.69.
17. Public Works, Canada, 1975-76 Annual Report, 1976, p.13.
18. The Ottawa Citizen, Nov. 20, 1976, p.69.
19. Ibid., p.69.
20. The Ottawa Citizen, Nov. 20, 1976, p.69.
21. CMHC, Canadian Housing Statistics 1975, pp.16 and 17.
22. Fullerton, Douglas H., The Capital of Canada: How Should It be Governed?, Ottawa, 1974, p.15.
23. Fullerton, Douglas H., The Capital of Canada: How Should It be Governed?, Ottawa, 1974, p.15.
24. Ibid., p.15.

PART TWO

INTRODUCTION

The three chapters in this part will feature an exclusive analysis of the major case study on the RMOC Official Plan. The decision-making approach is utilized throughout this part in tracing the actions of regional officials, local groups and individuals including federal and provincial government agencies, in regard to the development and adoption of the Regional Official Plan. The aim is to try and determine which groups or individuals had the most influence on policies contained in the Official Plan.

As already mentioned in chapter 3, one of the primary reasons for the creation of the RMOC was to bring about the planning for and development of the area in a coordinated and economic manner. Under Section 68 of the RMOC Act, the Regional Municipality was designated as a "planning area" and given the responsibility for drawing up an "official plan" for the Region by December 31, 1972. Accordingly, the Act empowered Regional Council to act as the planning board for the Region. On January 8, 1969, the process of developing the Official Plan began after Regional Council appointed both a Planning Commissioner and a Planning Committee.

The RMOC Act required Regional Council to obtain the participation and cooperation of the inhabitants of the

Region in preparing the Plan, and to consult with any local board having jurisdiction within the Planning Area. In early 1974 therefore, Regional Council set up a massive public participation programme on the development of the Plan. The aim was to give residents in the area broad opportunities to become involved in decisions relating to the future development of their localities. The programme involved a large number of public meetings conducted by both the Planning Committee and Planning Department Staff, thousands of copies of distributed documents, and hundreds of briefs and submissions. This analysis will centre around the activities of the Planning Committee, the Planning Department, Regional Council and the various points of views presented at the meetings and contained in the briefs, as well as those views expressed in my interviews with various people in the Region. Since the development of the Plan went through certain stages, the analysis in this part is broken down into corresponding chapters and topics as follows:

CHAPTER 5: GOALS AND PLANNING ISSUES

CHAPTER 6: GROWTH CONCEPTS AND INITIAL PROPOSALS

CHAPTER 7: THE DRAFT AND OFFICIAL PLANS

CHAPTER 5

GOALS AND PLANNING ISSUES

In December 1970, the Regional Planning Department published a "Progress Report" and made copies of it available to the public to assist them in preparing their submissions to the Planning Committee. The Report was nothing more than a review of the Municipality and its development at that time. It contained data findings about the land, people and development of the Region which were considered important in planning its future. In March 1971, letters were sent to area municipal councils and planning boards, and known community associations to announce the five public hearings which were held with planning staff and planning committee members from April 27-30, 1971. Groups and individuals were specifically invited to submit briefs and to speak at the hearings. As a result, a total of 36 individuals and groups submitted written briefs and presented them orally at the hearings. The Planning Committee essentially received the submissions and did not attempt to make any responses at the time although committee members often asked questions of the spokesmen. The aim was to hear what residents in the area considered the goals and planning issues of the Region. The rest of this chapter will feature a review and analysis of the submissions¹

under the sub-headings social well-being, communities, regional form, housing, transportation, economic base, utilities and services, recreation, day care, urban design, urban core, and implementation.

Social Well-Being

Almost all the briefs were based on a concern that the social well-being of the people of the Regional Municipality be the basic concern of the Plan. Most expressed the view that the achievement of social goals should be the principal objective of the Plan, and that such goals be considered the context within which the technical problems are approached. The Social Planning Council of Ottawa and District felt the integration of social and physical planning could be facilitated through greater integration of itself and the planning committee, in view of the fact that the Social Planning Council has expertise in social planning and had done extensive research on the social needs of the Ottawa area.

The Parkwood Hills Community Association felt that psychologists and sociologists should be called upon to help in the planning process in order to create a living environment that is stimulating to children. The Beacon Hill North Community Association suggested that the Regional Government assist local municipalities in establishing social services and programmes. They also suggested that the Region coordi-

nate representation to the Province on legislation relating to social services.

Communities

Several briefs indicated that goals concerning the social well-being of the residents of the Region could be implemented through the structuring of neighbourhoods, and through the provision of adequate community facilities. Several others put forth the suggestion that communities should be structured to make community facilities easily accessible and more efficient. The Glebe Community Association suggested that such facilities should include information centres, day care centres, youth services, services for senior citizens and ethnic groups. Efficiency, accessibility and community cohesiveness could be enhanced by locating these services in community centres flexible enough in organization to serve various groups at various times of the day. Several briefs proposed that land for facilities be bought in advance of the development of communities.

A good number of communities felt that they wanted the existing character of their areas preserved. These included the Glebe, Ottawa East, Centre Town, Sandy Hill, Kanata, Manotick, Kempark, Pineglenn, Grenfell Glen, Merivale Gardens, Parkwood Hills, Vanier and Rockcliffe Park. Kanata, for instance, felt that the desirable elements in its community in-

cluded extra open space, a strong community association, low density building, a common architectural style, and a village centre with services and recreational facilities. Manotick cited community tranquility and proximity to the river as elements which far outweigh such disadvantages as high hydro rates, slow-delivery service, and long travelling times. The older, downtown communities felt the desirable elements of their communities to be quite the opposite of some of these.

The older communities, particularly the Glebe, Sandy Hill, and Ottawa East, felt that plans should be made for their particular areas. Ottawa East felt that the goals of each particular community should form the basis of such a plan. These older communities felt that special attention was needed for their areas because of the great pressures being exerted on them which were resulting in the erosion of their character. The greatest erosive influence came from traffic entering the central core of the city, giving rise to expressways, road widenings, and parking lots. They therefore, proposed locating major roads on the boundaries of communities, de-emphasizing the car, and instituting public transportation. Another erosive influence is the large scale multiple family developments imposed in the midst of older communities. The Ottawa East Community Association suggested that attempts should be made to integrate such deve-

lopments into the communities. They also proposed that large scale office, commercial and industrial uses be excluded from residential communities.

Regional Form

Since the plan has to deal with the structure of the Region, such subjects as centralization and decentralization, location of major residential areas, and transportation systems become increasingly important. The main concerns expressed about the urban form related to the implications it would have for people's lifestyles. Professor V. Lambert of the Centre for Regional Studies at the University of Ottawa proposed that the Region be developed into a hierarchy of neighbourhoods (4,500-6,000 inhabitants), and zones (4-6 neighbourhoods) with appropriate facilities and services. March proposed neighbourhood units of 40 - 100 units.

Several briefs, including those of Beacon Hill North, March Township, the Kanata-Beaverbrook Community Association, and the Goulbourn Area Planning Board suggested that the Region encourage the decentralization of employment, residential areas and services. This would alleviate traffic problems as people could live close to their place of work. March Township and the Parkwood Hills Community Association proposed the development of village communities in rural areas, and areas of small forms for urban workers. Cliff Holdings

Limited felt that decentralization of employment would maximize social and economic options. The Parkwood Hills brief specifically proposed that existing villages be developed as self-sufficient towns, as spin-offs, from improved highway and transit systems. This would keep land values down and increase the availability of single family housing. The University of Ottawa proposed the decentralization of employment into cells around the Greenbelt in conjunction with rapid transit. The cells should be self-contained so that community is a matter of choice.

Others, however, suggested that the Region should opt for the centralization of places of employment, and higher density residential development. Among those supporting this view were former City of Ottawa Alderman Michael Cassidy, now MPP for Ottawa Centre, and the Sandy Hill Community Association. Mr. Cassidy suggested that low density development was too costly, in that services for it were expensive, and traffic from it was eroding the core of Ottawa. Centralization would allow the invitation of rapid transit in the Region, which would decrease the demand for road widenings and parking lots which have been eroding the older communities in the centre of Ottawa. It would also decrease noise and air pollution, and increase efficiency of travel within the Region. Mr. Cassidy suggested that a policy of decentralization of employment and residential development would not solve

traffic problems as people would not necessarily live adjacent to their employment, particularly in Ottawa where people frequently transfer between government departments.

Several groups, particularly the Ottawa Chapter of the Town Planning Institute of Canada, felt that sprawling development should be eliminated, and that development should be concentrated in planned communities of a size sufficient to support adequate services. Many, including the Ottawa Field Naturalists, stressed the need to protect the physical environment. They continued that urban development on good farmland or land of high quality for conservation and recreation should also be avoided.

Specifically, March Township felt the southerly growth area should not be given priority for development, but rather the westerly growth area should be allowed to grow to 70,000 people. The Parkwood Hills Community Association felt that the growth areas should be those which could be provided with services from the City of Ottawa, noting however, that their location should not be based entirely on this consideration. Mr. Cassidy suggested that the planning committee consider public land ownership as a means of controlling development, particularly in the area outside the Greenbelt. March Township also proposed the establishment of a land bank to ensure reasonably priced land.

Housing

There were various opinions expressed at the hearings on the kinds of housing that should be encouraged in the Region. Mr. Cassidy proposed that the plan contain a statement of principle that housing be accessible to all income groups. While the Beacon Hill North Community Association suggested that a range of housing types be in every community, Mr. Cassidy noted that such a plan could best be implemented through the public ownership of land.

Mr. R. O. Pickard, representing Costain Estates Limited, suggested that the existing trend away from single family housing had arisen, not because of a lack of demand for this form of housing, but rather because of a lack of supply of land for single family housing, making prices prohibitively expensive. For that reason, Mr. Pickard noted a need to approve single family developments outside the Greenbelt such as the Costain proposal for the Orleans area, before land became too expensive.

The Centretown Community Association noted the need for family housing in Centretown, and they agreed with Parkwood Hills that multi-unit complexes suitable for family living be developed. March Township proposed that substandard housing be upgraded, and the Ottawa chapter of the Town Planning Institute of Canada proposed that the Regional Municipality set housing standards for the Region having in mind that

standards for rural areas may be somewhat different from those for urban areas. On the whole, the briefs generally expressed the need for a variety of housing types accessible to the people of the Region according to their needs.

Transportation

Again, relating to social goals, one of the most strongly and frequently made points was that transportation routes should not cut through established communities, thus dividing them, destroying them, causing noise and air pollution, destroying internal circulation patterns, cutting off access and using up recreational land. These views were put forward especially by the older communities of downtown Ottawa and by Mr. J. Steinhardt of the Ottawa Research Foundation. The Committee for the Survival of Residential Areas proposed that if major roads must be built in the urban area, they should avoid residential communities, and should be of a parkway character. March Township proposed the inclusion of sound and pollution abatement structures as part of expressways.

Many briefs proposed that public transportation be emphasized in the Region. Rapid transit in many forms was proposed for high density areas. Although the initial dollar cost would be great, the long-term social costs would be lower than continuing to encourage the car. Combinations of express buses and dial-a-bus systems were proposed for

suburban areas by Messrs. Cassidy and Steinhardt and by associations representing Beacon Hill North, Kanata and Gloucester North. Messrs. Cassidy and Steinhardt also suggested the use of express buses on their own rights-of-way as an interim measure leading to a rapid transit facility.

The general feeling was that if emphasis were placed on public transportation, transportation would be more efficient, less disruptive, and would provide alternatives for such areas as suburban communities which have been relying heavily on the private automobile. It was proposed that incentives, such as monthly passes, discounts for new riders on a monthly basis, advertising and good service be offered. Manotick noted however, that people liked the motor car and were willing to put up with a great deal to use it.

The Centre Town Community Association proposed that privileged parking for government employees be phased out as rapid transit is instituted. The Gloucester Planning Board suggested that the transportation aspect of the plan relate to transportation corridors rather than specific roads or transit proposals. The Goulbourn Planning Board indicated a need for a tourist recreation route along the Ottawa River by-passing Ottawa.

Specific points were raised concerning highways 416 and 417. The Parkwood Hills Community Association and Mr. R. W. Higgs suggested that highways 416 and 417 be joined to

form an east-west arterial through the industrial area south of Walkley Road. According to Mr. Higgs, this would encourage southward linear development, and would minimize environmental disturbances. The centre Town Community Association proposed a similar east-west road south of the city for inter-city traffic.

Economic Base

Several briefs noted the need for the diversification of the economic base of the Region. It was suggested that an incentive programme be established in this regard. Tourism, research and development industries were mentioned most frequently as the types of industries to be encouraged. Light industry was also suggested, particularly near residential areas. It was also proposed that agriculture be developed to a point to make the Region self-sufficient in food. Industry should be encouraged around highways, railways and the airport. Canadian National Railways proposed industrial zones for the Greenbelt where it is cut by highways 416 and 417.

March Township proposed that the Regional Municipality buy land, making it available to industries at reasonable prices. They stressed that was particularly important in the townships, as areas immediately adjacent to the Region are eligible for federal grants for industry. They further noted

a need for more good serviced industrial land. Cumberland Township proposed that an industrial park be located between Orleans and Cumberland.

Utilities and Services

The City of Ottawa proposed that provisions for utilities in the plan be related to population thresholds rather than time. Kanata noted a need to provide services as economically as possible. Manotick noted that the provision of utilities exerts pressure for growth, and should be tied in with coordinated development policies. March noted a need to extend all services at the same time, while Cumberland asked that water services be extended to their area and that individual or cooperative water services be allowed where central services are impractical.

March proposed the establishment of service corridors through the Greenbelt to be paid for by the National Capital Commission. They and the Ottawa Field Naturalists Club proposed the establishment of waste control areas or the institution of a system of recycling waste to make waste disposal more efficient. Cumberland suggested that police, hydro, fire stations and telephone calls be on a Regional basis. March Township noted the need for major shopping facilities in the west end and stressed the need for regional direction regarding that type of service. The Parkwood Hills Community

Association pointed to the need for a hospital in the west end.

Recreation

There was a general feeling that the Region assure the recreational needs of all age groups of the population.

Many briefs proposed that natural areas of high quality in the Region be designated as open space to avoid losing them to other kinds of development. Suggestions on specific areas advanced by the Ottawa Field Naturalists Club and others, included the Carp Ridge, the Mer Bleue, the Rideau River and trails in the west of the city. The Sandy Hill and the Parkwood Hills Community Associations suggested that parks be developed on lands unsuitable for urban development. The University of Ottawa suggested using the Greenbelt for recreation.

The Beacon Hill North and Parkwood Hills Community Associations pointed that the five percent land formula provided by sub-dividers for recreation was discriminatory in that it provided more land for recreation for those with larger lots who, in most cases, were more well-to-do, had greater mobility, and therefore, had less need for local recreation space. Provision for recreational land, they suggested, should relate to population density and need. In this regard, the Glebe expressed the need for more open and recreational space in its community.

Several groups and the Ottawa Chapter of the Town Planning Institute of Canada saw the regional role in recreation as setting a framework and constructing facilities which would not be duplicated within the Region. Such facilities could include camp grounds, zoos, aquariums, libraries, golf courses, conservation parks, and using the river system for swimming and boating. Rothwell Heights and March Township felt that recreation was, for the most part, a local concern, and that the Region should provide consultant services to local municipalities for recreational planning.

Day Care

Noting that private arrangements for child care were often unsatisfactory, several groups, especially the Beacon Hill North Community Association, pointed to the need for a full day care programme funded by the Region. Centres should be located close to homes or work. They also noted the need for changes in provincial policies so that there would be adequate provincial aid for capital expenses and transportation to enable the Regional Municipality to own and subsidize day care facilities. They suggested that the Region make representations to the Province on this matter.

Urban Design

A number of briefs, including those from Rockcliffe Park, Sandy Hill, Centretown and Manotick proposed that the

plan attempt to enhance the national capital character of the area, the capital defined as including Hull. The Parkwood Hills Community Association proposed that the architecture of future buildings within three miles of Parliament be controlled. The Centretown Community Association proposed that heritage sites and points of historical and geological interest be preserved.

Urban Core

Several briefs expressed a desire that the downtown core be an active, viable place. The Centretown Community Association proposed multi-function buildings which would be in use 24 hours a day, plus a new parking policy to prevent off-site parking. The University of Ottawa proposed an increase in residential population in the core.

Implementation

A good number of briefs stressed the need for the Planning Department to coordinate its proposals with Hull and the Outaouais Regional Municipality, with local governments in the Region, and with all other public agencies involved in the planning process. The problems arising from the division of jurisdiction in the Region were noted by both developers and citizens groups. The University of Ottawa proposed a tri-partite committee of Ottawa-Carleton, Outaouais, and the National Capital Commission as a partial solution to the

problem.

Several aspects of a Regional role were proposed in some briefs. Consistent with the Act creating the RMOC, it was suggested that the Region, in its plan, establish a framework within which local planning could occur. In this regard, the City of Ottawa proposed that the Region define the role and financial commitments expected of local municipalities.

Some briefs including those of Costain Estates, Cliff Holdings and March Township proposed that the 'framework' defined by the Region in the plan be a policy framework and a flexible framework rather than a rigid development plan. Mr. Haizis, on behalf of J. L. Richards and Associates, proposed the use of development plans rather than rigid zoning bylaws. The Gloucester Planning Board suggested that the plan maximize the opportunity for private enterprise to function. The Kanata-Beaverbrook Community Association proposed that the planners not be hampered by the limitations of their jurisdiction in formulating the plan, but rather study all areas relating to the quality of life in order to protect and enhance it.

A few briefs proposed changes to the structure of the powers of the Regional Municipality. Cumberland suggested that people on local commissions be elected. J. M. Monahan & Associates proposed that the Regional Municipality have final

approval of all subdivisions. Mr. J. Steinhardt suggested that the Region be restructured to have representation by population. Manotick noted a need for local administrative units to unify communities, especially in the event of large scale growth. Goulbourn Township expressed concern about the lack of benefits to rural areas from Regional Government relative to the benefits obtained by urban areas.

The various points of view contained in the submissions and discussed at those preliminary meetings, as reviewed in this chapter, left no doubt that residents in the Region were greatly concerned about planning problems facing the area, and were therefore, very eager to be part of the process of developing a plan which would affect their lives for years to come. Having discussed what the public considered the relevant goals and planning issues of the Region, we will see in the next two chapters which of these goals and issues subsequently found their way into the final draft of the Plan, and which groups and individuals won or lost on specific issues in the final Council decision to adopt the Plan.

Chapter 5 Footnotes

1. These submissions were reported in Transcripts of Hearings and Briefs, Vols. 1 and 2, RMOC, Planning Department, April 1971.

CHAPTER 6

GROWTH CONCEPTS AND INITIAL PROPOSALS

A. GROWTH CONCEPTS

This section deals essentially with what one might call the second phase in the process of developing the Regional Official Plan. Two aspects of the process which will be specifically analysed here are the responses to the planning questionnaire of March 25, 1972, and the alternative Regional development concepts formulated by the planning staff at about the same time.

The Regional Planning Questionnaire

On March 25, 1972, the Planning Department, on behalf of the Planning Committee, inserted an eight-page newspaper supplement with questionnaire in all local newspapers in the Region. The questionnaire was designed to allow respondents a structure within which to reply, and was based on goals identified during the special meetings of April 1971 which were discussed in the previous chapter. The goals were classified under the broad categories of Natural Environment, Urban Development, Social Well-Being, Transportation, Utilities Economic Base, Finance, and Implementation.¹ According to Planning staff members, this form of response of various groups

across the Region was solicited in order to see how widespread support was for these goals. This analysis is based on the 2,100 completed questionnaires received back by Planning staff. The respondents were geographically distributed as follows:²

<u>Area</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>No. of Households, 1971</u>
Crystal Beach-Bayshore	62	2,902
Nepean West	129	4,787
Nepean East	153	7,369
Queensway Terrace-Carlington	189	13,187
Westborough	182	14,430
Preston Street - Centretown	93	18,611
Glebe - Ottawa South	171	11,203
Alta Vista South - Elmvale	429	15,972
Lower Town - Sandy Hill	121	11,934
Rockcliffe Park	19	624
Vanier	43	7,041
Overbrook - Rockcliffe Airport	77	7,335
Cyrville - Beacon Hill	104	2,859
Blackburn - Orleans - Queenswood	79	1,600 (est.)
Kanata - Glencairn	76	1,747
Rural Villages and Townships	132	13,447

Some very interesting observations emerged from the questionnaire responses on pp.132 and 133. Through all three sections of the questionnaire, protecting the environment and improving the transportation system, particularly by emphasis on public transit, emerged as the dominant concerns. For example, in looking at goals to guide regional development, the highest rating was given to developing and enhancing the natural environment (73%). In reviewing elements of the regional plan, again roughly the same proportion of respon-

The Choice is Yours

Not often these days is every resident of a large municipality asked to help decide its future. It presents a tremendous challenge and a great opportunity. You are being asked to help plan the whole of the Ottawa-Carleton Region, 1100 square miles -- and to influence decisions that will determine the life style of residents of the Region for decades to come.

The Planning Committee needs your

help right now if sound, satisfactory answers are to be found to the many problems that change and growth will bring.

The choice is yours: you can sit back passively and let changes in whatever form they may take just happen. Or you can seize this opportunity to put ahead your ideas on how the Region should grow and develop in the years ahead.

The questionnaire below has been prepared to make it easy for you to make your opinions known. By thoughtfully completing it after you have read through this supplement you will be providing helpful information to the Planning Committee in their work of drawing up the first possible plan for the future of the Ottawa-Carleton Region. Note: If another member of your family wishes to reply, make up a separate sheet showing the question numbers and the respective responses and mail it in with your questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF INITIAL RESPONSES

QUESTIONNAIRE

Area: Total Region
Households (1971): 133,889
Responses Tabulated: 2,103

SECTION A

These are goals identified during the special meetings last year and described on page 5 of this supplement.

Opposite each goal are these numbers. Please indicate the degree of importance you attach to each goal by circling one of the following numbers.

- 1 for highly important
- 2 for medium importance
- 3 for low importance

Read the list over carefully, marking in first several goals you feel are of high (1) importance. Next indicate several goals you feel are of low (3) importance. The remaining goals can then be marked (2) for medium importance.

Blank spaces at the end of the list are left for you to fill in a description of any other goals you feel should be included.

Goals to Guide Regional Development

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Natural environment to develop and enhance the natural environment by providing for changing needs in such a way as to protect plant and animal life, water courses and valuable soils, etc.	73	20	7	2.6

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Urban development to develop and enhance the quality of the urban environment by providing for changing needs in rational ways with a minimum disturbance of the ecology through landscaping, pollution control, etc.	62	29	9	2.5

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Social Well-Being to create a safe, healthy and stimulating environment in which residents can pursue their daily activities in their best physical and abilities. This means providing such things as adequate housing, employment and facilities.	69	25	6	2.6

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Transportation to develop a safe, convenient and efficient transportation both public and private which provides maximum accessibility to all residents with a minimum disturbance in the natural, residential and business environments.	71	24	5	2.6

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Utilities to provide efficient and up-to-date utility systems, adequate to meet population and technical needs. These would include water, storm and sanitary sewer, hydro, gas, telephone and telecommunications systems.	49	39	12	2.3

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Economic Base to develop the economic potential of the Region in its fullest. This would include rational, expansion and diversification of the local economies.	25	38	37	1.8

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Finance to develop the Region in such ways that the maximum social benefits are achieved at the minimum real cost. This would mean that the benefits of all development would have to be considered in the light of the ability of the Region to pay for them in short to guarantee the best possible use of tax dollars.	57	30	13	2.6

	IMPORTANCE			
	High	Medium	Low	Av.*
Implementation to develop a coordinated Regional plan to implement the achievement of identified goals. This plan would be capable of continual evaluation and be sufficiently flexible to accommodate up-dating without compromising other identified goals. It would have to be compatible with the local plans of the larger member communities.	54	32	14	2.4

Additional Goals and Comments

Some 939 additional statements of goals and comments were contributed by respondents tabulated thus far. Among the most frequently mentioned were:

one tier government (85), improve and foster public transit (84), expand recreational development (70), against regional government (55), foster the quality of life (54), reduce taxes and costs of government (42), create a single capital region (36), reduce pollution (35), preserve historic and park areas (31), control growth (31), improve local government services (29), foster rapid transit (27), improve the maintenance of existing transportation routes (24), preserve the natural environment (20). (These figures are numbers, not percentages).

Other subjects addressed included housing, population density, zoning, reducing downtown traffic, industry, alternative development concepts, welfare and education.

*Average value given e.g. 3.0 if all rated a goal High or 1.0 if all rated it low.

*Numbers in margin are for processing purposes only.

Area: Total Region

You No Don't Know Any

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Av. ²⁵		Yes	No	Don't Know	Av. ²⁵
20. Do you want a better level of service in a public transit system if it means higher taxes and redevelopment of existing older communities and modernizing existing suburban housing on land now vacant?	59	34	7	2.2	36	61	34	5	2.2
						34	58	8	1.7
21. Do you want to encourage the use of the private car for transportation if it means cutting through established communities to new freeways and wider arterial roads?	11	86	3	1.2	26	42	49	9	1.9
22. Do you want development of population and employment in satellite towns if it means using more rural land and more open space?	40	52	8	1.8	28	88	10	2	2.7
					26	54	38	8	2.1
					26	44	47	9	1.9

*Average value given e.g. 3.0 if all replied Yes, 2.0 if all said Don't Know and 1.0 if all replied No.

Section C is a tricky one to complete but it is a fascinating one. If you feel it is more of a job than you want to tackle right now, fill in the rest of the questionnaire and mail it in without completing Section C.

What kind of surroundings do you want to live in during the next 5, 10 or 15 years? Do you prefer a Region with a highly developed central core or are you more in favour of greater local development with the emphasis away from the central core? Probably you favour some mix of the two

The chart below gives you an indication of the effects of various mixes of plan elements between the two extremes of high concentration and low concentration.

First, look over the chart and in the shaded circles at the bottom indicate the importance in view of the various elements involved in the Regional Plan (Place 1) under several goals which are of high importance to you, then at (3) under several which you rate as of little importance. Finally put at (2) under those of medium importance to you.

Now examine the triangles which show how increasing one factor, for instance the proportion of single family homes, affects many other features. A high proportion of single family homes decreases the emphasis on public transportation and limits the concentration of development in the downtown area.

Now, examine each plan element in turn and identify the level of development you think is proper for it. Place a (1) in the square to indicate your preference e.g. If you feel there should be a high emphasis on public transit, you would place a (1) in the high (H) square.

The object of this chart is to show the planners how much of each element should be included in the basic mix of population, land use, employment and transportation, etc.

Note - all figures are percentages of persons responding to this section.

SECTION D
(No.: 2,044)

To enable the Planning Committee to better understand the respondents in this questionnaire please complete this section by circling the appropriate numbers.

46	I am male	78	female	22
49	I am single	26.3	married	74
50	I have children living with me			
	Yes	55	No	45
51	I am up to 18 years old			11
	between 19 and 29			19
	between 30 and 54			53
	over 55 years old			17

52 I live within the area numbered (in the ac-
53 companying map of the urban area) in
Township

Name _____
Street Address _____
Community or _____
Area _____

CUT ON DOTTED LINE

CUT ON DOTTED LINE

PUT ON BUTTER LINE

dents rated preservation of the natural environment as of highest priority (72%).

In replying to more specific questions relating to the natural environment, the large majority (88%) said they would use public transportation to enhance the environment and reduce pollution. However, opinion was more evenly divided on choices between protecting the environment and restricting the location of population growth. Similarly, in assessing goals for the region, transportation was rated of almost equal importance to the natural environment (71%). As an element of the regional plan, public transit was given an identically high score (72%) as the environment. From the replies to several specific questions on transportation, a majority (59%) favoured a better level of service in public transportation even at the expense of redevelopment of existing communities and if it implied higher densities for new residential development.

More than half the respondents to section B (59%) indicated they wanted a better level of service in a public transit system if it meant higher density redevelopment of existing older communities and medium density attached housing on vacant land at the time. Just 11% wanted to encourage the use of the private car for transportation if it meant cutting through established communities by new freeways and/or widened arterial roads. 40% favoured the decentralization

of population and employment to satellite towns if it meant using more rural land and conservation areas. A small majority (52%) was against such decentralization under the given conditions.

In examining the three conditions under which people might live in medium density attached housing (garden homes and town houses), a better public transportation service was favoured by 61% of those replying. 51% would live in such housing if it meant reducing the use of land for urban purposes, and only 34% would do so if it brought about less privacy around the house.

An examination of age groupings suggested that a better transportation system was more attractive to the young adult (19-29) category, while the decreased privacy around the house was more of a factor to respondents over 30. The younger respondents (up to 18) favoured the economic use of the land more than any other age group. Women and single persons appeared to be more concerned with the efficient use of land than men and married respondents. Married persons appeared to value privacy more than singles. Respondents without children indicated they were more concerned with the efficient use of land, more desirous of improved public transportation and less concerned about privacy. The same split occurred again concerning encouraging population growth in rural areas if it meant changing the character of existing

villages and countryside to make them more urban. Those who appeared to be more in favour of preserving the existing rural character were more likely to be male, married, living with children and older. Respondents from some rural townships indicated strong favour for retaining the character of existing villages and the countryside.

While most respondents (88%) declared they were willing to use public transportation instead of their car to enhance the natural environment and prevent pollution, barely half (54%) were willing to restrict population growth in rural areas to achieve that objective. Opinion was almost evenly split (44% to 47%) as to whether it was worthwhile to concentrate population inside the greenbelt to foster the environment and control pollution.

In rating the various elements of the plan, the respondents to Section C indicated consistent support for a more, rather than less, concentrated form of future development in the Region. However, residents of new suburbs appeared less willing to accept some of the aspects of concentrated development than those in older and inner city communities. Generally, respondents to this section indicated they wanted to see the greatest emphasis placed on a high level of development of public transit and to the preservation of the natural environment. Population density was rated slightly higher than single family homes, the number of nearby social facili-

ties, and preserving established communities. These were followed by the degree of downtown development, downtown employment and opportunities for social coherence.

Respondents clearly placed the first four goals (Natural Environment, Urban Development, Social Well-Being and Transportation) above the remainder in importance. Utilities, Finance and Implementation were rated, in the middle, while Economic Base received the lowest rating. It remained to be seen what impact these findings would have on the formulation of the Regional Plan. We shall see in the next section of this discussion below how the Regional Planning Staff integrated these findings into their own development concepts.

Alternative Regional Development Concepts

When the task of preparing the Regional Plan started Regional authorities noted that the first step in establishing development policies for the Region was to identify possible forms of development, and to assess their ability to satisfy the Region's physical, economic and social needs, and finally to select the most appropriate pattern for future regional development. The Regional planning staff therefore, identified the following five basic development concepts which they considered applicable to the scale of development anticipated for the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Municipality.³

1. Core - A concentrated city form with a highly active, high density central area.

"CORE"

"SATELLITE"

"CORRIDOR"

BASIC DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

FIGURE 6-1

Source: RMOC, Report on Alternative Regional Development Concepts, February 1972, p.

IV

"SATELLITE"

"LINEAR"

II

III

"DISPERSED"

BASIC DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

FIGURE 6-1

Source: RMOC, Report on Alternative Regional Development Concepts, February 1972; p.4.

V

2. Satellite - A multi-centred urban area in which the central city is linked to neighbouring communities, each with their own distinct sub-centre.
3. Linear - A longitudinal development with a dominant transportation spine.
4. Corridor - A core city with outstretched development fingers, each one along a major transportation facility.
5. Dispersed - A spread of undifferentiated growth with neither distinct centres nor change in urban form.

Each of the development concepts above was converted into a number of more specific development alternatives which related to the major physical features of the Region, these being the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers, the greenbelt and the major urbanized area within the greenbelt. A limited number of alternatives for each concept was selected on the basis of their relationships to the general characteristics and development trends in the Region, and so that the selected alternatives represented as wide a range of development alternatives as could be considered realistic.

Using the two principles above resulted in the identification of eight regional development alternatives from four basic concepts (See Figure 6-2). No alternative was derived from the concept of linear development because of its close relationship to the alternative based on the "corridor" concept with two opposing development fingers. In addition, it was thought that existing development in the central area

"CORE"

"SATELLITE"

"CORRIDOR"

I

III

IV

II

V

VI

DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

FIGURE 6-2

"ELLITE"

III

"CORRIDOR"

IV

"DISPERSED"

VII

V

VIII

VI

Source: FMOC, Report on Alternative
Regional Development Concept
February 1972, p.5.

was of such magnitude that a linear city would be difficult to achieve. Two alternatives were developed for the "core" concept, the one with all development entirely within the greenbelt and the other with development spilling over the outer edge of the greenbelt to form an annular type development. Only one alternative was developed for the "satellite" concept which adopted the three growth areas already identified by earlier studies of the area. Three alternatives were derived from the "corridor" concept, each one favouring a particular mode of commuter travel. Lastly, two alternatives were identified for the "dispersed" concept with the essential difference being the degree of dispersal. The eight development alternatives derived from the four concepts are as follows:

Alternative I - "Core" Concept - This alternative is the most explicit statement of this concept. It creates one large metropolis with ninety percent of the region's population resident within the greenbelt at a density seventy percent greater than that found in Metro Toronto in 1972. Most non-industrial and non-local employment is located in the central area with only small employment centres scattered elsewhere through the Region. The development densities in relation to this alternative require most housing to be medium and high density in character and the implementation of an extensive public transit system to cater for many different types of trips.

Alternative II - "Core" Concept - This alternative accommodates only seventy-five percent of the target population within the greenbelt with the majority of the remainder located immediately adjacent to the outer limit of the greenbelt. Residential densities are significantly lower than those in Alternative I but the distribution of employment and the dependence on transit would be similar. However, the reduction in density and the enlargement of travel distances reduce the latter's viability and require a greater provision for automobile travel.

Alternative III - "Satellite" Concept - This alternative establishes relatively large satellite towns immediately outside the outer limits of the greenbelt. It accepts present development policies within the greenbelt, thereby accommodating approximately sixty-five percent of the target population. It calls for greater decentralization of employment to create one major centre in each satellite town. The densities within these towns are relatively low with the automobile as the primary mode of travel except for commuting into the central area where a greater use of public transit is possible.

Alternative IV - "Corridor" Concept - This alternative creates linear development corridors, each one served by a high-speed transit system to the central area. Because of the higher

densities needed to serve a transit system, approximately seventy-five percent of the target population is accommodated within the greenbelt and about twenty percent in the fingers in predominantly medium and high density development. Employment is concentrated primarily within the central area. Thereby facilitating the use of transit for the trip to work.

Alternative V - "Corridor" Concept - In this alternative, a freeway is the transportation spine of a series of development corridors, each containing four or five communities with about 20,000 population each. Residential densities throughout this alternative are generally low with only sixty-five percent of the target population accommodated within the greenbelt. Most employment is located within the greenbelt but with no particular emphasis on developing the central area. This pattern of development, with its extensive utilization of highway facilities for commuter travel cannot support a rapid transit system and, therefore, requires the development of an extensive urban freeway system.

Alternative VI - "Corridor" Concept - This alternative utilizes existing rail lines as the transportation spine for each development corridor. In principle and life style, it is very similar to Alternative V except for the reduced demand for urban freeways and the need for a high speed transit

link between the central area and the mode interchange points on the commuter rail facilities.

Alternative VII - "Dispersed" Concept - This alternative decentralizes new residential communities and associated employment and services throughout the region with approximately 65% of the target population located within the greenbelt. These communities assume an expansion of most existing settlements and generally have low densities. This type of dispersal necessitates almost complete dependence upon the automobile for all trips, thereby requiring the continued development of urban freeways within the greenbelt. In addition, the majority of this development outside the greenbelt must use wells and septic tanks for its services.

Alternative VIII - "Dispersed" Concept - This alternative represents a "trends" plan and is based on existing and anticipated development proposals outside the greenbelt. Many aspects of this alternative are similar to Alternative VII except that the development is far less structured and community services more difficult to provide.

The eight alternatives above were evaluated to identify those which had the greatest potential for maximizing fulfillment of regional development and objectives. The relative degree of fulfillment by each alternative of the goals and sub-goals identified for the Region was assessed by means of two

basic procedures - ranking and rating.⁷ In the former, alternatives were ranked in order of their performance against each sub-goal, whereas in the latter points were awarded according to their level of fulfilment of each sub-goal.⁸

All the approved regional planning goals and sub-goals were subdivided into the six fields of physical environment, social well-being, services, economic base, finance and implementation, and were used as the base for evaluating the eight development alternatives. Consequently, three basic approaches were utilized for selecting the alternatives with the greatest potential.

The first approach involved applying a reverse order ranking procedure to each sub-goal. Thus, the alternative which ranked first with respect to that sub-goal received 8 points and the alternative ranking last received 1 point as shown in Table 6-1 below.

Table 6-1

Alternatives	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Rank Order	1st	5th	6th	7th	3rd	4th	2nd	8th
Score	8	4	3	2	6	5	7	1

Points scored for each sub-goal were then summed for each goal so that the overall fulfilment of each alternative could be compared directly, as in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 below.

In the second approach, a series of individual judgements were incorporated as to the level of sub-goal achievement of each alternative and also as to the relative importance of each sub-goal. The individual results were meaned when the latter stage was reached so as to provide the overall result in this method of evaluation. Each alternative was scored out of 10 points for each sub-goal and the sub-goal weights established on a proportionate basis. Thus, according to Planning Staff calculations, if

n = number of sub-goals for a particular goal,

X_{ij} = score for alternative i with respect to sub-goal j ,
and

Y_j = weight of sub-goal j

then the relative performance of alternative i was obtained by this formula:¹²

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij} \cdot Y_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j}$$

The computed and meaned ratings for each alternative summa-

TABLE 6-2¹⁰

SCORES FOR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
USING RANK ORDER ONLY

	Alternatives							
Sub-Goals	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
1	8	3	4	2	5	6	7	1
2	8	7	7	7	7	7	2	1
3	8	7	5	6	4	4	2	1
4	2	5	6	7	5	8	3	1
5	3	4	7	6	5	8	3	3
6	8	6	5	7	4	3	2	1
TOTAL	37	32	34	35	30	36	19	8
Average Score	6.2	5.3	5.7	5.8	5.0	6.0	3.2	1.3

TABLE 6-3¹¹

SCORES USING RANK ORDER ONLY

Goal	Alternatives							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Physical Environment	6.2	5.3	5.7	5.8	5.0	6.0	3.2	1.3
Social Well-Being	3.0	4.0	5.7	5.6	5.0	5.7	4.4	2.7
Services	4.4	4.5	7.0	5.1	5.2	4.9	3.3	2.6
Economic Base	3.5	5.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	3.0	3.5	2.0
Finance	4.5	4.5	6.0	6.0	4.5	6.0	3.0	2.0
Implementation	2.0	5.5	10.5	8.0	8.5	4.5	9.5	6.0
TOTAL	23.6	28.8	42.4	37.5	34.2	30.1	26.9	16.6
Alternative Ranking	7th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	6th	8th

zed by each goal are shown in Table 6-4.

A further refinement was added in the third approach by weighting each goal and adjusting the overall scores for each alternative accordingly. According to Planning Staff, these were established individually and then aggregated into a single overall rating so as to reflect the different views on goal priorities, as shown in Table 6-5.

Table 6-4¹³

Scores Using Individual Rating and Sub-Goal
Weighting

Goal	Alternative							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Physical Environment	6.2	5.2	5.4	5.6	4.9	5.5	3.7	2.3
Social Well-Being	3.6	4.8	7.0	7.0	5.7	6.5	5.2	3.3
Services	5.8	5.4	7.9	6.5	5.6	5.3	3.4	2.7
Economic Base	4.5	6.2	8.4	8.2	7.6	4.2	4.1	2.4
Finance	6.0	6.0	6.3	6.8	4.8	6.3	3.6	2.6
Implementation	2.1	4.3	7.9	5.2	5.8	3.9	6.9	5.6
TOTAL	28.0	31.9	42.9	39.3	34.4	31.7	26.9	18.9
Alternative Ranking	6th	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	5th	7th	8th

The surprisingly low variance indicated a considerable degree of consistency in goal priorities. When these weights were applied to the scores in Table 6-4, Table 6-6 below was

Table 6-5¹⁴Goal Priorities

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Variance</u>
Physical Environment	0.81	0.13
Social Well-Being	1.00	0.00
Services	0.81	0.19
Economic Base	0.49	0.13
Finance	0.59	0.29
Implementation	0.68	0.04

Table 6-6¹⁵

Scores Using Individual Rating, Sub-Goal
and Goal Rating

Goal	Weight	Alternatives							
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Physical Environment	0.81	5.0	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.5	3.0	1.9
Social Well-Being	1.00	3.6	4.8	7.0	7.0	5.7	6.5	5.2	3.3
Services	0.81	4.7	4.4	6.4	5.3	4.5	4.3	2.8	2.2
Economic Base	0.49	2.2	3.0	4.1	4.0	3.7	2.1	2.0	1.2
Finance	0.59	3.5	3.5	3.7	4.0	2.8	3.7	2.1	1.5
Implementation	0.68	1.4	2.9	5.4	3.5	3.9	2.6	4.7	3.8
TOTAL		20.4	22.8	31.0	28.3	24.6	23.7	19.8	13.9
RANK		6th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	7th	8th

generated. When the results of the three approaches were com-

pared, the ensuing results showed a high degree of statistical consistency, as shown in Tables 6-7 and 6-8 below.

Tables 6-7 and 6-8 show alternatives III, IV and V to be the first, second and third respectively, with alternatives VI and II vying for fourth and fifth positions. While alternatives I and VII vie for sixth and seventh positions,

Table 6-7¹⁶

Comparison of Ranking by Each Method

Method	Alternative							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
1	7th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	6th	8th
2	6th	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	5th	7th	8th
3.	6th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	7th	8th

Table 6-8¹⁷

Comparison of Scores by Each Method

Method	Alternative							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
1	23.6	28.8	42.4	37.5	34.2	30.1	26.9	16.6
2	28.0	31.9	42.9	39.3	34.4	31.7	26.9	18.9
3	20.4	22.8	31.0	28.3	24.6	23.7	19.8	13.9

alternative VIII was consistently last. On the basis of the results of the evaluation techniques above, the planning staff therefore, recommended that alternatives III and IV based on the "satellite" and "corridor" concepts respectively, be considered as the set of alternatives with the greatest potential, with alternatives V, VI and II as a reserve set to be used in the event that the selected alternatives were unable to fulfil the desired regional planning goals. Planning staff maintained that the consistent emergence of the "satellite" and "corridor" concepts as the best options was a result of the compromises developed between the advantages and disadvantages of the two extremes of high concentration and maximum dispersed. They noted too that although these two alternatives proposed considerable growth beyond the greenbelt, which would adversely affect the agricultural and forest land conservation areas and other aspects of the natural environment, the controlled nature of this development into towns or corridors minimizes this effect. In the next section, we shall see how the results of the questionnaire and the selection of these two concepts affected the initial proposals for the Official Plan.

B. THE INITIAL PROPOSALS

In September 1972, Regional Council released a document entitled "Official Plan: Initial Proposals." In it, the basic principles on which the planning committee proposed to base the plan were set out. According to regional authorities, these guiding principles were based on public responses and staff evaluation of growth concepts discussed in the previous chapters. The discussion in this section will draw on ideas of earlier studies on the Region to see how much influence they had in setting these general planning principles.

In selecting the satellite and corridor forms of development for inside and outside the greenbelt, it has become evident that the results of a number of studies had significant impact on regional authorities. In the first instance, the planning report for the National Capital and area prepared for the federal government in the early fifties by Jacques Gréber¹⁸ proposed an urban core, defined by a Greenbelt, beyond which were satellite communities developed from existing villages and connected to the urban core by radial highways.

Secondly, there was the preliminary study in the late fifties relating to the preparation of the Official Plan for the Ottawa Planning Area by the City of Ottawa Planning

staff.¹⁹ This study determined that by the turn of the century, the population of the Region would reach 1,000,000 persons. Of these, 600,000 would live within the Greenbelt, while 400,000 would live beyond the Greenbelt in existing settlements and in new towns. It was concluded that developments beyond the Greenbelt would occur along the major approach roads into the National Capital - Highways 15 and 17 to the west, Highway 16 to the south and Highway 17 to the east. This conclusion was supported by the report, Economic Prospects - National Capital Region, prepared in 1963 for the NCC by Larry Smith and Company.

Both studies relating to the Ottawa Official Plan and Economic Prospects projected three areas of growth beyond the Greenbelt - to the west, south and east. On the basis of this projection, the Statistical Review, prepared in 1964 by the NCC setting out statistically the existing and expected distribution of population and employment within the urban area of the National Capital Region, confirmed that beyond the Greenbelt, communities will occur at centres along three traffic routes leading out of the urban core with each being separated from the other by wedges of sparsely developed land. According to the study, the routes will be high speed arteries, with or without the addition of rapid transit facilities, and will provide connections from the satellite communities to the Regional centre.

I will now proceed to discuss the nature of the initial proposals of the RMOC Official Plan to see if any of them were derived directly or indirectly from conclusions of the various studies above.

In the initial proposals, it was anticipated that the population of the Region would reach 1,000,000 during the next 25 to 40 years, 650,000 of which was expected to be located within the Greenbelt. Redevelopment of existing housing areas at higher residential densities was expected to contribute to population growth in the inner urban areas. However, planning staff insisted that redevelopment should not be allowed to produce densities which would make it difficult or expensive to provide adequate community facilities. With regards to job location, the main options appeared to be centralization - locating more jobs in the downtown area of Ottawa, or decentralization - locating more jobs outside the Greenbelt. If very substantial employment was planned for in Ottawa's central area, serious transportation problems might be created. Since the federal government is a major employer in the Region, it was recognized that a common regional - municipal - federal approach to the problem of job locations was desirable.

Outside the Greenbelt, in accordance with the satellite and corridor development concepts, consideration was given to growth areas in the West, South-West, South Nepean/

South Gloucester, South-East, and East - (See Figure 6-3). Based on preliminary studies,²⁰ the Planning Committee recommended that relatively large urban communities be developed to the west and east of the Greenbelt (see Figure 6-4), although their ultimate size and shape were to be determined later. At the same time, the committee recognized the existence of possibilities for urban development in the other growth areas under consideration. However, it was thought necessary to defer any commitments to development in those other areas until the full implications of their urbanization, such as transportation requirements, impact on the Rideau River, the effects of airport noise and the costs of supplying water, could be determined.

Of the two recommended growth areas, the Easterly (Orleans/Queenswood), was considered to be more economical for the provision of water and sewer systems. In addition, apart from some leda clay deposits, the soils in this area were found more suitable for urbanization than those in the other potential growth areas in the Region.²¹ However, analysis of the transportation requirements in the corridor between downtown Ottawa and the Easterly growth area indicated that the cost of providing adequate road and transit services would be great, particularly if a very large growth area was contemplated.²²

GROWTH AREAS STUDIED

ZONES DE CROISSANCE SOUS ÉTUDE

FIGURE 6-3

GREENBELT

CEINTURE DE VÉGÉTATION

Source: RMOC, Official Plan - Initial Proposals, July, 1972.

scale 1 : 400,000 échelle

MAP
7
CARTE

OFFICIAL PLAN INITIAL PROPOSALS

PLAN OFFICIEL PROPOSITIONS INITIALES

FIGURE 6-4

Recommended Growth Areas

Source: RMC, Official Plan -
Initial Proposals, July, 1972

The studies indicated that the Westerly growth area (Kanata/Glencairn) could be serviced with water as cheaply as the Easterly area, but it was found more expensive to be provided with sewers. Physically, the land in this growth area was found to be varied, thereby creating opportunities for interesting housing areas but at the same time presenting difficulties for the installation of services because of bedrock occurring at or near the surface. The transportation analysis indicated that adequate road and transit facilities could be provided for a growth area larger than the Easterly area.

With regard to transportation, it was concluded that a public transit service on exclusive rights-of-way would be required to serve both the future population inside the Greenbelt and within the potential urban growth areas. It was suggested too, that some relief of the existing Queensway was required, and that a road connection between Highways 416 and 417 south of the Queensway was under investigation. Regional authorities stressed that the location of any transportation facilities would be guided by the recognition of established communities.

In the area of water and sewer services, the proposals restated the basic conclusions of the MacLaren-Richards report (January 1970)²³ on the provision of water supply and sewage disposal facilities as adopted in principle by Regional Coun-

cil. A major recommendation of the MacLaren-Richards report was to phase out Watts Creek and Bilberry Creek Pollution Control Centres, and to expand Green Creek Pollution Control Centre to serve all the Region's population residing within the urban area. A fundamental requirement for this was the construction of a major trunk-sewer system within the Greenbelt, but south of the bulk of the existing urbanized area, and known as the South Ottawa and Lynwood collectors. The reasoning behind the acceptance of this recommendation was that it would provide great flexibility, since urban growth areas could be created at any point outside the Greenbelt by building collectors through the Greenbelt to service them.

The sanitary sewer system within the Greenbelt which was recommended in the report was meant to provide sufficient service to the possible population range of between 620,000 and 750,000.

To serve the population inside the Greenbelt with water supply, the system recommended in the MacLaren-Richards report required the construction of two reservoirs at Glencairn in the Westerly Growth Area and at Orleans in the Eastern Growth Area, outside the Greenbelt. Like the sewers, the water works system recommended in the report could provide adequate service for populations of 620,000 to 750,000 within the Greenbelt.

Something important to note about the MacLaren-

Richards report is that it assumed a growth pattern of 600,000 people living within the Greenbelt, and three satellite communities of 144,000, 104,000 and 46,000 people to the west, south and east of the Greenbelt, respectively. This assumption seemed to have been based on the conclusions of the Greber report, the Economic Prospects, and the Statistical Review.

It was recognized that some lands in the Region are unsuitable for urban development because they consist of organic soils or leda clay deposits, or because they are subject to flooding or the effects of airport noise. It was suggested that such lands be kept free of development which is incompatible with these conditions.

Since additional population was to be expected in the rural areas of the Region, it was assumed that some of the future rural residents would wish to live on large lots with individual septic tanks and wells. The suggestion was that this type of rural residential development should be located in areas with attractive physical features and soils suitable for septic tanks, and where productive farm lands and potential conservation or recreation areas would not be adversely affected. Furthermore, it was suggested that since there is more than enough remaining land available for urban development, the Region's supply of good farmland should be retained for agricultural and complementary rural uses.

Although the provision of recreation facilities is primarily a local municipal responsibility, it was proposed that policies for the development of potential recreational or conservation areas be worked out in co-operation with other agencies concerned with parks, recreation and open space, such as the NCC and the Rideau and Mississippi River Valley Conservation Authorities.

The discussion in this chapter has demonstrated that the initial proposals of the Official Plan were heavily influenced by the conclusions and recommendations of earlier studies, notably, the Greber Report, studies leading to the City of Ottawa Official Plan, The Economic Prospects, the Statistical Review, and The MacLaren-Richards Report. It may appear therefore, that the various submissions discussed in chapter 5 have not been integrated into the initial proposals for the Plan. We shall see in the next chapter if this trend continues on to the Draft and Official Plans.

Chapter 6 Footnotes

1. See Questionnaire on pp.132 and 133. The summary of responses was prepared on the original questionnaire form for ease of reference by planning staff, but the complete copy of the computer output tables is available for reference in the Planning Department Office in the RMOC headquarters at 222 Queen Street.
2. These figures were obtained from the individual questionnaires for each of the areas listed on the left.
3. These are contained and fully explained in Official Plan - Summary of Technical Reports, RMOC, Planning Department, February, 1972, pp.67-71.
4. Ibid., pp.67-69.
5. Based on analysis of the 8 alternatives in Ibid., pp.67 and 68.
6. Ibid., pp.67-69.
7. For complete list of approved goals and sub-goals, see Ibid., pp.69 and 70.
8. Planning Staff's assessment of each alternative's performance against each sub-goal is recorded in Appendix 3 of Report on Alternative Regional Development Concepts, RMOC, Planning Department, February, 1972.
9. Ibid., p.9.
10. Ibid., p.9.
11. Ibid., p.10.
12. Ibid., p.10.
13. Ibid., p.10.
14. Ibid., p.11.
15. Ibid., p.11.
16. Ibid., p.12.
17. Ibid., p.12.

18. Gréber, Jacques, Plan for the National Capital - General Report, Ottawa: National Capital Planning Service, 1950.
19. This study was under the direction of Professor Gordon Stephenson, Professor John Bland and Mr. Jean Issalys, and was carried out in 1958.
20. These were presented and analysed in Official Plan - Initial Proposals, RMOC, Planning Department, July, 1972.
21. The suitability of regional land for urbanization is discussed in Official Plan - Initial Proposals, pp.18-20.
22. See analysis of transportation requirements in Ibid., pp.21-31.
23. The firms of James F. MacLaren Ltd., and J. L. Richards and Associates Ltd. were contracted by Regional Council to conduct an engineering study and prepare a report on the development of regional waterworks and waste water control. The report, submitted to Regional Council in January, 1970, is entitled, Report and Technical Discussion on Master Plan of Water Works and Waste Water Control for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

CHAPTER 7

THE DRAFT AND FINAL OFFICIAL PLANS

A. THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

In August 1973, the Planning Committee released the Official Plan in Draft form with the hope that any matters of concern to the public would be identified and possibly resolved prior to Council adoption. While the Draft Plan was put together by Planning staff, it was reviewed and finalized by the Planning Committee in 8 meetings lasting a total of 23 hours. Although the document was basically consistent with the general statements in the initial proposals, it contained much more detailed recommendations. Two areas in which proposals were clearly spelled out and which became the centre of much of the controversy surrounding the Draft Plan were transportation and the scale and structure of growth. This section will therefore, focus on these two areas in efforts to explain how competing community groups reacted and endeavoured to sway the final outcome of the Plan their own way. The main actors whose input is examined in this regard are the federal/provincial governments (NCC, CMHC and OHA), the area municipalities, the citizens' associations, and the major private land developers in the area.

In accordance with the transportation recommendations contained in the Initial Proposals, the Draft Plan strongly urged an immediate start at improving public transportation, with emphasis on a rapid transit facility on its own right of way. Five rapid transit corridors from the centre area were proposed: to the north shore of the Ottawa River, to the east, west, southwest and southeast. The proposed rapid transit system, fed by other means of public transit, was expected to draw an increasing number of work trips to and from the core area, assuming also that the service could attract a substantial number of non-work trip patrons, thereby reducing the need for road and parking facilities.

No new urban freeways were proposed in the Draft Plan since the principal aim of the new transportation policy is to discourage auto traffic in the core area. To alleviate the problem of traffic congestion in Ottawa which had been made worse by the flow of traffic from the Quebec side of the river to the core area, two new bridges across the Ottawa River were proposed - one in the west at Deschenes Rapids, and the other at Kettle Island, north of Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Rockcliffe. In order to reduce the east-west through traffic in the core area, it was proposed to construct the Western Parkway as an inner ring road from Woodroffe Avenue to Blair Road, following the right-of-way reserved for that purpose by the NCC.

An outer ring road beyond the greenbelt that would divert external traffic and serve as a direct connection between the proposed growth areas to the west, south and east of the greenbelt was also proposed. Furthermore, two new bridges over the Rideau River were proposed, one in the Western Parkway corridor and the other along a road to connect the Merivale industrial area with the Hunt Club Road.

The Draft Plan was based on a projected regional population growth to about one million by the turn of the century. At that rate, job requirements were expected to nearly double to 450,000, while requiring additional 220,000 housing units along with commercial, shopping, social and cultural services to meet the needs of the expanded population. Dispersed employment and improved public transportation therefore, became the key objectives governing policies to accommodate and guide future growth. Accordingly, the Draft Plan called for regional growth with the following characteristics:

First, it was proposed that growth inside the greenbelt should continue but be limited to a population of about 630,000. To achieve the planned population pattern a number of District Centres would have to be established to serve as focal points for decentralized employment. District Centres were planned as communities in which activity revolved around major office sites, retail and commercial facilities, and high density residential units. A number of such centres were

identified in the Draft Plan for development inside and outside the greenbelt, the establishment of which would reduce the relative percentage of total regional employment in the core area from the existing 35% to a projected 24%.¹

Secondly, it was proposed that a number of new communities with their own employment base would be developed outside the greenbelt as stated in the following direct quotation from the Draft Plan text:

- (1) Council designates as the first stage of urban development in the planning area all land within the outer limit of the greenbelt, an urban community with a population in the neighbourhood of 100,000 persons west of the greenbelt (Kanata-Glencairn), an urban community with a population in the neighbourhood of 35,000 persons east of the greenbelt (Orleans-Queenswood), and an urban community up to the limit of existing services southwest of the greenbelt (Barrhaven).
- (2) Council proposes an urban community in the neighbourhood of 100,000 persons southeast of the greenbelt as the second stage of urban development in the planning area. It is intended that only lands held by the Federal-Provincial partnership will be developed for urban purposes in this area.
- (3) Council proposes an urban community in the neighbourhood of 100,000 persons southwest of the greenbelt (Barrhaven expansion) as the third stage of urban development in the planning area.
- (4) Council proposes that consideration may be given to the expansion of the urban community east of the greenbelt to an ultimate size of 50,000 after completion of the first stage of development, as and when transportation facilities become available.
- (5) Council proposes to designate specific land areas for second and third stages of urban development in the planning area by amendment to this plan when detailed urban land uses, transportation and other servicing systems have been determined.

- (6) Council proposes that major employment centres be created in suburban areas within the greenbelt and in the urban communities outside the greenbelt.
- (7) Council intends that areas proposed for development will be developed sequentially. That is, the first stage areas will be provided with services and developed before second stage areas and second stage areas will be provided with services and developed before third stage areas.²

The staging policy for urban development outlined above was derived from an analysis of the recommended growth areas on the basis of three variables - environment, development implications, and development status (see Table 7-1). Thus, it can be seen on Table 7-1 that the west and south-east growth areas received the highest final ratings, followed by the south-west and east growth areas. South-Nepean and South-Gloucester received the lowest final ratings. One would expect therefore, that on the basis of this rating system, the South-East area would be included in the first stage of urban development instead of in the second stage as recommended in the staging policy. However, it would seem that both planning staff and planning committee acted wisely in omitting indefinitely South-Nepean and South-Gloucester from development considerations in view of their very low final ratings.

The Draft Plan offered community groups and individuals an opportunity to see how far their ideas and suggestions had been taken into consideration. It also marked the begin-

Table 7-1

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS OF NEW COMMUNITIES

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	WEST	SOUTH WEST	SOUTH NEPEAN	SOUTH GLOUC- ESTER	SOUTH EAST	EAST
FIELD 1 ENVIRONMENT							
(a) Agriculture	H	A	C	C	C	A	C
(b) Mineral Reserve	L	B	C	C	A	A	C
(c) Water Quality	H	A	C	C	C	B	A
(d) Landscape At- traction	M	A	B	A	B	B	A
(e) River Corridor	H	A	A	C	C	A	B
(f) Community Dis- ruption	H	A	B	B	C	A	A
FIELD WEIGHT AND SCORE	H	A	B	C	C	A	B
FIELD 2 DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS							
(a) Water Supply	L	A	C	A	B	C	A
(b) Sewer Services	L	A	A	C	C	B	A
(c) Soil Capability	M	A	A	A	A	C	B
(d) Transportation	H	A	B	B	C	B	C
FIELD WEIGHT AND SCORE	M	A	B	B	B	B	B
FIELD 3 DEVELOPMENT STATUS							
(a) Existing Development	H	A	B	C	C	C	A
(b) Approved Official Plans	M	A	C	C	C	C	C
(c) Proposed Official Plans	L	C	A	C	A	C	A
(d) Capital Works Forecast	M	A	C	C	C	C	A
(e) Public Land Assembly	H	C	C	C	C	A	C
(f) Private Land Assembly	L	A	A	A	A	C	A
FIELD WEIGHT AND SCORE	L	B	C	C	C	C	B
FINAL RATING		A	B	C	C	A	B
H - High A - High Score M - Medium B - Medium Score L - Low C - Low Score							

ning of the actual bargaining process in terms of determining which participants had initiated alternatives that were adopted in the final draft plan, or had proposed alternatives that were turned down. It is worthwhile at this stage therefore, to examine the nature of the reactions and input of the main participants (mentioned earlier in this chapter) in their efforts to influence the final outcome of the Plan.

In December 1973, the Ontario Housing Corporation, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the National Capital Commission, acting as co-owners of the huge land assembly in Carlsbad Springs (South-East growth area), submitted a brief to Regional Council in response to policies proposed in the Draft Official Plan, especially the policies which related to the future development of the South-East growth area. In particular, in response to staging growth policies in the Draft Plan which put the development of Carlsbad Springs in the second stage of development, the brief maintained that the early development of a sufficiently large new community in the South-East was essential if the objectives of the Official Plan were to be achieved.

The three agencies (OHC, CMHC and NCC) viewed the development of a new community in the South-East as "an immediate and effective response to the challenge of accommodating a rapidly increasing population, preventing urban sprawl, providing housing of good quality at reasonable prices, and cre-

ating an aesthetically and socially satisfying environment."³
According to the brief, the major factors determining the choice of the site were:

1. The South-East growth area is particularly well located to counteract the long-standing westerly development trend within the National Capital Region which accentuates dispersion from the core of Ottawa-Hull and causes unbalanced assessment for the local municipalities.
2. The relatively low cost of land and the lack of development in South-East Gloucester provided the opportunity for public land banking to aid in stabilizing land and housing prices in the Region.
3. Availability of major transportation facilities, such as Highway 417, and the excellent prospects for a future rapid transit connection to the centre of Ottawa using the abandoned railway right-of-way and the Alta Vista corridor.⁴

In conclusion, the three agencies requested Regional Council to consider "the development of the South-East Community to a population in the region of 100,000 to achieve the objectives of the Draft Official Plan, and create a new community which is socially desirable, economically viable, and physically attractive."⁵ Furthermore, they requested that as part of its capital works program, the Regional Municipality "make provision for the extension of trunk services to the South-East area within the next five years in order to, (a) aid in stabilizing the cost of land and housing in the Region by supplying serviced land in large quantities at competitive prices, and (b) help provide housing for a wide range

of income groups at reasonable prices at the earliest possible date."⁶ The brief made it quite clear that the existing tri-partite cost-sharing arrangement for trunk services between the Region, the Province and the NCC might be extended to cover the financing of major services to the South-East area.

The most significant response to the Draft Plan by private land developers came in January 1974 when a prominent consulting firm, Project Planning Associates Limited, prepared and presented on behalf of Campeau Corporation, Jockvale Realty, Shenkman Corporation and Urbandale Realty Corporation, a brief entitled "Brief for a South Growth Area", to Regional Council. The South Growth Area, generally called the South Urban Community, refers to the South Nepean/South Gloucester Growth Area which was given very low priority for future development in the Draft Plan. The four development companies together own approximately 4,000 acres⁷ in the area, and were obviously afraid that the low rating and priority given to it by both planning staff and planning committee might jeopardize their chances of ever making profit on their land. They therefore, retained Project Planning Associates Limited to examine the Draft Plan as it related to the designation of the growth area and prepare a brief accordingly.

The brief contained very detailed studies of the proposed South Growth Area, especially in regard to those aspects

thought, by some other community groups, to create problems for development in the area. The studies included an analysis of the transportation and traffic figures and patterns for the Region as a whole; a soils and agricultural land-use survey for the South Growth Area; the Region's program for piped services, especially as it concerns the South Growth Area, and a detailed examination of such factors as airport noise and the impact of urbanization upon the Rideau and Jock rivers in the area. In view of the results of their studies, the consulting firm, on behalf of its developer clients, urged that "South Growth Areas on each side of the Rideau River in Nepean and Gloucester Townships would be appropriate and should be designated as new growth areas in the Official Plan for the Ottawa-Carleton Region".⁸

Earlier, in July 1972, the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Ottawa which is an affiliate of the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada (HUDAC), submitted a brief to planning staff commending them for adopting the satellite concept to guide development in the Region. Among other things, the Association urged that trunk services be provided to large and diverse areas in order to ensure an adequate competitive market for housing, and for the Region to use its good offices to encourage the dispersal of government employment centres throughout the Region.

Early in 1974, the Home Builders Association of Metro.

Ottawa in conjunction with HUDAC presented a more detailed brief to Regional Council in response to the Draft Plan. Like the four private land development companies discussed earlier in this chapter, these two associations retained the services of two experts - M. J. Bacon of the Proctor and Redfern Group of Consulting Engineers and Planners, and Ms. Marion Seymour of M. M. Dillon Limited, - in efforts to strengthen their presentation. In anticipation of the OHC, CMHC, and NCC presentation which urged that top priority be given to the publicly-held land at Carlsbad Springs for development, the two developer umbrella organizations argued that land banking alone does not ensure a proper supply of housing. The public interest, they said, would be served better if the governments concentrated their efforts and money in enlarging the effective supply of land by providing the required services and the necessary community facilities. They stressed there was no evidence that governments could provide housing at a lower total cost than private developers. They maintained therefore, that if sufficient serviced land was made available the industry could provide housing, within a healthy competitive environment, more efficiently than the government.

While supporting the decentralization of employment, the two associations strenuously objected to the provision in the Draft Plan that major urban centres should have eventual populations of 100,000. They claimed there was no justifi-

cation nor evidence to support the selection of 100,000 as a reasonable size. They obviously favoured a higher figure which would bring them higher returns since their members owned most of the land in the proposed urban centres. Furthermore, they claimed that the Draft Plan attempted to impose arbitrary finite limits on types of housing as well as not providing sufficient lands to permit the variety and choice called for in the stage I development goals. They also considered the development proposed in the villages as being too restrictive.

Knowing that most of their opposition might come from citizens' groups in the community, the developers alerted both the Planning Committee and Regional Council to "difficulties encountered when citizen participation leads to 'down-zoning', after a plan has been approved."⁹ According to their rationale, "the developer establishes prices, based on the approved plan, but if he cannot have confidence in the approved plan, then this could be reflected in the price structure, to the detriment of the public we are trying to serve."¹⁰

On the other side of the case, the Federation of Citizens' Association of Ottawa-Carleton, an umbrella organization representing over a hundred citizens' associations in the Region, responded to the Draft Plan in terms somewhat contrary to those of the developer organizations above. Their con-

cerns were basically in the areas of the scale and structure of growth, and transportation. First of all, the Association seriously questioned some aspects of the satellite growth concept on the grounds that it was doubtful whether the size and proximity of the proposed growth areas could attract the desired employment and avoid the creation of mere dormitory suburbs. It therefore, called for further exploration of other growth alternatives.

The Association took exception to the Draft view that continued rapid growth is inevitable and beyond control, thereby allowing for growth to a population of 1,000,000 over the next quarter century. It argued that the public might not be prepared to accept the inevitability of such uncontrolled growth, especially as it would have enormous effects on the quality of life in the National Capital Region. A possible approach it suggested for carefully phasing population growth and containing it within tolerable limits would be the decentralization of growth outside the Ottawa-Carleton Region entirely with transportation systems like the Go Commuter trains providing the needed links.

Although the Draft Plan made provision for the development and implementation of a comprehensive public transit system, the Association doubted the strength of the commitment in view of the vagueness of its proposals regarding location and timing, compared to the highly specific and detailed road

proposals. The Association therefore, urged as follows:

We believe that top priority must now be given to the establishment of a firm timetable for transportation development, beginning with immediate expansion and improvement of existing public transportation services, and the earliest possible implementation of rapid transit. New roadway proposals must be justified in relation to such a phased transportation development scheme.¹¹

The member municipalities responded to the Draft Plan in ways in which it affected them individually. Such was to be expected since their official plans or planning policies would eventually be required to conform to the adopted Official Regional Plan. However, on the major issues of Growth and Transportation, substantial differences emerged between the City of Ottawa and the rest of the other municipalities.

While objecting to the satellite concept of growth, the City of Ottawa strongly questioned the Region's population forecast and distribution as well as the employment forecast and distribution. It maintained that the Region's population forecast of 600,000 people within the Greenbelt was not realistic, and that the development and continuing redevelopment of the City of Ottawa within existing development policies of the City indicated that a population of between 480,000 to 560,000 by the turn of the century was possible. With regard to employment distribution, City officials rejected Regional recommendations which

would limit central area employment to 110,000 people. The City view was summarized in this statement:

It is our view that a concept where a major central retail and employment centre is established, supported immediately by high density residential development and supplemented by a series of high density residential and minor employment and retail centres along transit corridors, with a balanced distribution of population in each direction along these corridors, would be a more realistic form of development to be considered regardless of the aspirations of individual municipalities within the Region.

Such land use system consisting of a series of nodes of development linked by a transit system and supplemented by a grid of roads and supplementary transit radiating from the nodes would, in our view, be a better solution to the area's urbanization problems than the form suggested in the Draft Plan.¹²

The suburban and rural municipalities on the other hand, especially Nepean, Gloucester, Cumberland, Goulbourn, West Carleton, Rideau, March and Osgoode, generally supported the satellite concept. The rural municipalities pleaded with Regional authorities to make sure that a number of villages and estate areas in their townships are developed, urging too that the Draft Plan's goal to preserve and protect good quality agricultural land be maintained. They all supported and called for a definite policy on the decentralization of employment out of the central area into the satellite communities in order to make them not only viable and self-supporting, but also to ease the transportation problem. In

particular, Nepean and Gloucester opposed the designation of Carlsbad Springs as a second stage satellite development, and called for its replacement with a satellite community in the South (South Urban Community) as stage II. In this matter, as well as that of the satellite concept, Nepean, Gloucester and the rest of the smaller municipalities found themselves in agreement with the private land developers.

Thus, we have seen how the main actors responded to the Draft Plan and the kind of actions which each advocated for inclusion in the final draft. In the next section, we shall see which actors, if any, prevailed over the others in terms of having their suggestions materialize into final Regional policies.

B. FINAL OFFICIAL PLAN AND COUNCIL ADOPTION

In February 1974, the planning staff revised the Draft Plan, incorporating the public input received in response to the Draft Plan and presented it to the planning committee the following April. Between April and June, the planning committee held a total of nine meetings to consider the revised Draft Plan which it subsequently amended and tabled before Regional Council on July 3 of the same year. Regional Council, acting as Planning Board, met 21 times on the Official Plan and finally adopted it on October 9, 1974.

It is important to note again that the final draft of the Plan was developed after one of the earliest and most remarkable experiments in citizen involvement in local decision-making ever attempted in the area, a process which resulted in the formulation and presentation of alternatives by the various community groups and individuals, as we saw in earlier chapters, for consideration by Regional Council in the final development of the Official Regional Plan. In this context, council action could therefore, be taken as the ultimate process of choosing those alternatives which it considered most appropriate in fulfilling the development goals of the Region.

In this section, the main provisions and issues of the final draft as officially adopted by Regional Council will be discussed and analysed in efforts to determine which participants or actors initiated alternatives that were finally adopted, had helped to defeat alternatives initiated by others, or had proposed alternatives that were ultimately turned down by Regional Council.

Population: The Official Plan calls for the provision of housing, roads and services for a population of 1 million in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. According to the Plan, that population could be achieved as early as 1998 or as late as 2015, but somewhere in that period the Region's population is expected to double.

A number of factors, such as birth rate, housing costs and the pace of economic development, can influence the growth rate of a city. In Ottawa, which is essentially a company town, the biggest single factor is the federal government. How fast the government expands the public service and how extensively it intends to decentralize its operations especially across the Ottawa River to Hull, are probably more important to the future of Ottawa than any other factors.

Since the Official Plan was completed and adopted in October 1974, there have been some significant changes in federal government policy. Growth of the public service has been reduced to about one per cent annually while decentralization and relocation programmes have been stepped up. For instance, in addition to such departments as Veterans Affairs which are slated for relocation to other parts of the country, the government recently announced further plans to move 15,000 Ottawa public servants across the river to Hull during the next three years.

Mainly because of these federal government policies, population projections by the Ontario Government and the NCC, among others, have been as much as 200,000 lower than Regional projections. This was what prompted objections from citizens' groups and the City of Ottawa, as we saw in the previous chapter, who argued that some features of the Plan to accommodate growth to a population of 1 million won't be

needed. Both the City of Ottawa and the Federation of Citizens' Associations lost out on this issue.

Employment: By the time a population of one million is achieved in Ottawa-Carleton, the Official Plan expects the number of jobs in the Region to increase to 450,000 from just under 200,000 in 1971. About 110,000 of those jobs would be in Ottawa's central area, with the rest distributed among suburban districts and the three proposed satellite cities outside the Greenbelt. In particular, the Plan places heavy emphasis on job creation in the new urban communities outside the Greenbelt. The rationale is that the people who live in those new cities will work in their communities, thus removing commuter pressure on arterial roads and proposed transit lines leading into the city core.

The City of Ottawa is the most notable objector to the employment distribution pattern put forward in the Plan. In its brief to Regional Council in response to the Draft Plan, the City stated it would like about 145,000 jobs in the core area in order to preserve its economic viability, but again it lost out to the suburban and rural municipalities which had called for the kind of employment distribution contained in the Official Plan.

Satellite Cities: The Official Plan calls for three new urban communities outside the Greenbelt as follows: a city of

3

100,000 around the existing communities of Kanata and Glencairn, west of Ottawa; another new city of the same size, called the south urban community, along the Rideau River in Nepean and Gloucester townships; and a smaller city of 35,000 to 50,000 around the existing town of Orleans. In addition, the Plan retains the federal-provincial landbank site near Carlsbad Springs (south-east growth area) for long-range development after the Region has reached a population of 1 million.

This aspect of the Official Plan involves the most notable political change when Regional Council decided to give priority to development of the 4,000-acre developer-owned land in the proposed south urban community over Carlsbad Springs (south-east growth area). We may recall that in the Draft Plan, planning staff proposed an urban community of about 100,000 persons south-east of the Greenbelt (Carlsbad Springs) as the second stage of urban development in the Region after the development of Orleans-Queenswood, Kanata-Glencairn, and limited growth at Barrhaven, in the first stage. According to a number of planning criteria, such as impact on agricultural land, danger of pollution, preservation of conservation areas and transportation, the south growth area (south urban community) received the lowest rating (C) of all the other proposed growth areas. The south-east growth area received the maximum total rating of A and was therefore, recommended ahead

of the south growth area by planning staff.

Another important factor considered by the planning staff was that Carlsbad Springs is publicly owned and that it would be very important to develop this relatively low-priced land quickly as a means of providing a pricing mechanism for housing in the entire Region. Its development was considered a way of keeping the general price of housing down in the area.

However, an intensive developer lobby, as evidenced by the joint brief and representations of the four land development companies - Jockvale, Shenkman, Campeau, Urbandale - which own most of the land in the south growth area, brought about a late change of mind by Regional Council in their favour. Developer representation highlighted concerns about soil suitability to support buildings in the south-east growth area.

Regional Council's choice of the south growth area over the south-east in defiance of planning staff recommendations marked the most outright confrontation between private land developers and other community groups, in the course of preparing the Official Plan, in which the developers clearly came on top. The controversy surrounding the two satellite city sites has prompted accusations that Regional Council put the interests of private landowners in the south growth area ahead of those of residents in the Region.

The losers in this battle seem to be the City of Ottawa, the Federation of Citizens' Associations, the NCC/OHA, and some rural municipalities. Ottawa politicians are particularly worried about a possible heavy flow of traffic through established city neighbourhoods, and the danger of worsening pollution of the Rideau River.

The federal government, through the NCC and CMHC, has also made its opinions forcefully known. As co-owner with the Province of Ontario of 9,000 acres of land at Carlsbad Springs, federal authorities have developed their own Plan which provides for the development of their site rather than the privately-owned south growth area. They have made it known in the past that they would not co-operate with the development of the south growth area by refusing to locate federal offices there. Furthermore, they have hinted that they may not allow trunk sewers or new roads servicing the southern satellite city to cross federally-owned Greenbelt land.

A couple of rural municipalities, Rideau and Osgoode Townships, have been very concerned about the location of a 100,000 - population satellite city near their borders. To residents of these two townships, especially those in North Gower, Manotick and Osgoode, development of the south growth area would bring closer the kind of environment they had hoped to escape when they bought their homes. They were con-

cerned too that good farmland would be wasted and quiet village life destroyed by a major city nearby.

Housing: According to the Official Plan, more than 220,000 new dwelling units will be needed to accommodate 1 million people in the Region. Fifty-five per cent of these new units must be ground-oriented, i.e., they must be either single-family homes, doubles, townhouses or row-housing. The Plan also attempts to cope with the problem of keeping housing costs down. It suggests Regional Council make an attempt to ensure that significant amounts of assisted and subsidized housing are built. Policies in the Plan relating to housing have been protested by both the private land developers and the various municipalities, complaining that they are arbitrary and restrictive. However, no one came out a loser or winner in this issue.

Shopping Centres: The Plan calls for two new shopping centres the size of Bayshore to be built to serve the regional market. One of the giant new complexes is designated for location at the corner of Blair and Ogilvie roads, the other in an area still to be designated along south of Bank Street. With regard to the first site, the City of Ottawa and merchants of the St. Laurent shopping centre oppose the construction of a major new commercial centre so close to an existing shopping centre in the Region.

The second site was not designated in the Official Plan, but in a recent vote, Regional Council selected a Campeau Corporation site in Ottawa opposite South Keys over a competing site on the other side of Bank Street just across the municipal boundary in Gloucester Township.

Transportation: Development patterns outlined in the Plan hinge on transportation policies which minimize disruption by road construction, assuming too that road improvements cannot be provided beyond a certain point without severely damaging residential neighbourhoods, particularly those in the core area. As a consequence, the Plan gives preference to travel in the urban area by public transit, including a rapid transit system operating in five corridors and/or commuter service which will provide levels of service in keeping with transportation needs throughout the entire community. The five corridors are north into Quebec and west, east, south-west and south-east in Ontario (see Figures 9-1 and 9-2). The public transit proposal is about the only aspect of the Official Plan which has been unanimously endorsed by all groups.

However, the Plan makes provision for a region-wide network of arterial roads, some existing, some to be upgraded and some entirely new. One of the most controversial of the new routes is one which would enter the city along a route roughly parallel to Merivale Road, then follow an alignment

PROPOSED RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDORS **CORRIDORS PROPOSÉS POUR LE TRANSPORT RAPIDE**

FIGURE 7-2

Source: MOC, Official Plan,
October 1974.

**POSSIBLE RAPID
TRANSIT ROUTES**

**TRAJETS POSSIBLES,
TRANSPORT RAPIDE**

FIGURE 7-3

SOURCE: RMC, Official Plan,
October 1974.

**POSSIBLE TRANSIT ROUTE
POSSIBLE STATION
TRANSIT CORRIDOR
MINIMUM**

**TRANSIT CORRIDOR
EXPANDED**

**TRAJETS POSSIBLES, TRANSPORT
STATION POSSIBLE
CORRIDOR
MINIMUM**

**CORRIDOR
EXPANSION**

along Tweedsmuir Avenue to Scott Street. In view of 1976 regional planning and transportation studies which showed that the new road won't be needed after all, Regional Council has instead, accepted the position that the route could be used for a future rapid transit line. However, community groups affected are attempting to make sure that the corridor is removed from the Plan to avoid its eventual use for some other transportation purpose.

Another transportation route which has been the subject of bitter debate since the adoption of the Official Plan in 1974 is the proposed arterial running through the Britannia area to link up with a new bridge over the Ottawa River at Deschenes. Britannia residents who bitterly oppose the arterial road say it would disrupt a fragile wildlife area known as Britannia Woods, and also lower the quality of life for their area. A bid to remove the arterial from the Official Plan by a group of Ottawa councillors failed by a single vote in Regional Council in 1974, but City of Ottawa opposition to the route has been so solid that very little has been heard about the new road in the last few years. Nevertheless, it remains in the Official Plan, and all Britannia residents can do is keep their fingers crossed.

The Official Plan also designates a number of core area streets as major routes. In their objections, City of Ottawa officials maintain that the designation of the streets

would lead to increased traffic flow which would seriously disrupt existing residential areas such as Sandy Hill, Centre Town and Lower Town. Among the roads which the City is concerned about are St. Patrick, Lyon, Metcalfe, Gloucester, MacLaren and Somerset streets, Prince of Wales Drive and Parkdale and Preston Avenues.

Conservation Lands: The Official Plan sets out areas which are to be protected from development and preserved for conservation and recreation purposes. Among them are 44 square miles excluding the Greenbelt which are designated as nature study and wildlife areas, a further 77 square miles called recreation and forest management areas, and the Rideau and Ottawa River corridors. Most of the objections to these policies come from private land developers, other private landowners and a few municipalities who are unhappy that the designated areas are being frozen from development.

Rural Policies: The Official Plan allows for a doubling of the rural population of the Region to 100,000 by the time the regional population reaches 1 million. However, it severely restricts where and when that expansion in rural population can occur. To ensure that private land developers and short-sighted rural councillors don't turn the Region's countryside into an ill-planned suburban sprawl, the Official Plan lays down strict quotas governing the amount of development which

can occur in each rural township.

Growth in the Region's villages and hamlets is limited to 28 of the 40 small communities which presently dot the countryside. The 28 villages will be collectively permitted to grow by about 25,000 residents during the quarter century period covered by the Official Plan. The rest of the rural growth will be parcelled out in carefully-controlled doses in the form of country lot development, at densities of not less than one lot for every two acres.

Almost all the rural municipalities object to some aspects of the Plan's restrictive rural development policies, and their objections have been supported by the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada, the umbrella organization which acts as the mouthpiece for private land developers across the country.

The Minister of Housing has approved some parts of the Official Plan, but most of the controversial aspects discussed above are now before the Ontario Municipal Board which started hearings on the Plan in mid February, 1977. What is evident is that no one group or individual clearly came on top in terms of overall success in pushing all their alternatives through the final stage. It is true that the private land developers succeeded in getting Regional Council to change its mind and designate the South Growth Area for stage 1 development, but they also have expressed their dissatisfaction

with policies relating to housing, land conservation and rural development.

While the adoption of the Official Plan is undoubtedly the biggest and most important decision Regional Council has ever made, it reflects what governmental decision-making is all about - choosing between alternative courses of action. The discussion in this part clearly demonstrates how the Regional authorities, especially the planning staff, endeavoured to follow the standards of the rational model of decision-making in the sense that they identified the problem, clarified the regional development goals and ranked them as to their importance, listed all possible means and policies for achieving each of the goals, assessed all the costs, benefits, advantages and disadvantages that seemed to follow from each of the alternative policies, and finally, selected the package of goals and associated policies that would bring the greatest relative benefits and the least relative disadvantages.¹³

The rationale and consequences of adhering to such an approach will be analysed in the concluding chapter (chapter 10) in relation to how it affected the capacity of community groups and individuals to influence Regional authorities in the formation of the Official Plan.

Chapter 8 Footnotes

1. Draft Official Plan for Ottawa-Carleton, Part 4, RMOC, Planning Department, July 1973, pp.1-5.
2. Ibid., p.7.
3. Briefs Presented to the Planning Committee in Response to "Draft Regional Official Plan," Volume 6, R.M.O.C., Planning Department, February 1974, pp.702 and 703.
4. Ibid., p.703.
5. Ibid., p.713.
6. Ibid., pp.713 and 714.
7. Ibid., Volume 12, p.1374.
8. Ibid., p.1374.
9. Ibid., Volume 10, p.1138.
10. Ibid., p.1138.
11. Ibid., Volume I, p.45.
12. Ibid., Volume 17, p.1924.
13. As outlined in Charles E. Lindblom, The Policy-Making Process, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968, p.13.

PART THREE

This part consists of two chapters (8 and 9). In chapter 8, the minor case study, the Low Income Supplement Experiment (L.I.S.E.) in the department of Social Services, is examined. Chapter 9 deals exclusively with two methods of statistical analysis in an attempt to examine the relationship between councillors' occupations and business backgrounds and their voting patterns in the 1974-76 Regional Council.

CHAPTER 8

THE LOW INCOME SUPPLEMENT EXPERIMENT (LISE)

In this chapter, the second case study, the Low Income Supplement Experiment (LISE) of the regional Department of Social Services is examined by means of the decision-making approach. As in the previous case study which dealt with the development and adoption of the Official Plan, the aim here is to try and determine the extent to which community groups and individuals interacted and contributed to the development and implementation of the programme, and specifically, to examine what role, if any, private land developers play in decisions relating to social services in the regional municipality.

This case (LISE) is considered as being minor compared to that of the Official Plan which is probably the biggest and most important decision the Region has made since its creation. It was thought necessary to examine a second case from another issue-area (Social Services) to counter any queries which may challenge the findings of the first case as biased and inconclusive since it is from an issue-area (Development and Planning) that is obviously of great interest to private land developers. Since it is only temporary and experimental, LISE may not be considered a typical social service programme.

However, I selected it for a number of reasons.

In the first place, most of the current programmes administered under the General Welfare Assistance Act, the Homemakers and Nurses Services Act, the Day Nurseries Act and other related provincial legislation have been in existence long before the RMOC was created, and it would be most difficult to relate their development to the decision-making processes of the RMOC since my analysis is only at the level of the regional municipality created in 1968. In addition, the origin, structure and administration of these other programmes are bound by very strict statutory requirements involving very complex federal-provincial-municipal relationships which could by themselves, be the subject of a whole thesis. Although LISE is considered an aspect of the general welfare system under the GWA Act, its short history makes it possible to trace the inputs of the various actors involved in its conception, development and implementation.

Secondly, LISE is considered a possible beginning for one of the most contentious concepts in Canadian social policy-the guaranteed annual income - and as such, it has the potential to draw widespread input from the community, especially Ottawa-Carleton which has one of the highest average annual incomes in the country. Unlike the Official Plan which was developed and adopted in compliance with provincial statutory requirements, LISE derived its origin from the

efforts and desires of groups and individuals in the community. This characteristic, in addition to that of being an experiment for guaranteed annual income, makes LISE an ideal case for identifying influential groups and individuals in social service decisions in the regional municipality. The following discussion will therefore focus on the input of the main actors, the federal and provincial governments, the RMOC and the various community groups and individuals, in the development of the programme. Before that, a word about the administration and funding of social services in the Region is in order.

Although social services in the Region involve a very complex network of programmes, cost-sharing schemes and various social agencies, their administration is almost wholly the responsibility of the RMOC under the guidance of both federal and provincial regulations. According to his terms of reference, the Regional Social Services Commissioner is "a municipal administrator appointed by the Regional Corporation with the approval of the Minister of Community and Social Services of Ontario for the General Welfare Assistance Act, the Homemakers and Nurses Services Act, the Day Nurseries Act, and other related provincial legislation."¹ The only exceptions are the few programmes which the Province administers directly itself through its regional offices in the area; expenditures on such items as pensions, family allowances and

unemployment benefits which are federally administered, and other services provided by the various voluntary social agencies in the Region.

Funds for the social services administered by the Region come from all three levels of government. As I already explained in chapter III, for some programmes, the RMOC assumes 20% of the cost, with the province funding 30% and the federal government under the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) paying the remaining 50%. For other programmes, the RMOC absorbs 50% of the cost while the federal government pays the other 50%. In both cases, the federal government channels its contribution to the Region through the Province. LISE falls under the second category of financing whereby the RMOC contributed 50% of the \$200,000 budgeted for its first operational year while the Province, through CAP, covered the other 50%.

How did LISE find its way into Ottawa-Carleton? It did so in response to demands and pressure for such a programme by various groups and individuals in the community, especially social agencies. In 1969, the Neighbourhood Improvement Committee, under the leadership of Father Bert Serre, started organizing efforts for a region-wide conference on social problems in the area. The idea generated widespread interest in the community, especially among social agencies and welfare recipients, and the conference, called Action '70

was held at the High School of Commerce on January 17, 1970. It was organized into workshops on various social issues.

According to Bill Zimmerman,² Executive Director of the Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton who participated in the conference, there was a great deal of concern at the welfare and poverty workshop about how to help those people who are on very low or borderline earned income and who can possibly get more benefits by going on welfare, to stay in the work force. There was a consensus on the need for some form of welfare supplementation so that people in such circumstances could remain in the work force, but Ontario had no such scheme. Income supplementation emerged as the most prominent issue in the whole conference, and consequently, participants decided to organize a follow-up conference that would deal solely with the issue of welfare, and income supplementation in particular.

The follow-up conference, called Action '70 Action, held at LaSalle Academy on March 7, 1970, was co-sponsored by the Secretary of State Department, the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship Department (each of which gave \$500 grants), the Neighbourhood Improvement Committee, the Lower Town East Goodwill Centre, and the Social Planning Council. Action '70 Action was designed to give the participating low-income and welfare recipients, plus pensioners and family allowance recipients, a chance to get to the root of their poverty prob-

lems in a positive fashion. . Accordingly, the conference aimed at "helping people help themselves, by analysing their problems with others like them and discussing them with persons responsible for designing and implementing welfare and manpower legislation."³

The planning committee of Action '70 Action succeeded in getting the then federal and provincial welfare ministers, John Munro and John Yaremko respectively, to attend the conference. Also in attendance was former Carleton-East MPP ~~Bert Lawrence who had just been appointed Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs for Ontario.~~ If for nothing else, the presence of the three Ministers and their advisers assured participants that they would sit face to face with and receive answers to their questions directly from the people responsible for solving their problems in the two levels of government. According to conference reports,⁴ most of the questioning by the poor, local politicians, social workers and local welfare administrators zeroed in on Mr. Yaremko who was the representative of the government constitutionally responsible for writing and administering local welfare laws.

During our interview, Mr. Zimmerman recalled that throughout the conference and especially during the discussion with the Ministers, there was a recurring theme that if there was only a way of supplementing the income of low wage-

earners, many people on welfare would go back to work. According to the existing system, it was all or nothing: you could not obtain any welfare money if you were working even if the salary you made was not enough to feed your family. In accordance with the consensus on the need for wage supplementation, Lorry Greenberg, an Ottawa Controller at the time and now Ottawa's Mayor and Regional Council member, urged the Ontario Government to start implementing programmes that would allow employable persons who cannot provide sufficiently for their families to get off the welfare rolls and back to work. He therefore, proposed a pilot project for Ottawa-Carleton that would allow the provincial government to test such supplementation schemes as the negative income tax or other wage supplement programmes that would, at the same time, improve welfare support in the Region. Mr. Greenberg explained his proposal as follows: "We've got to allow the persons who have the capacity to work to get jobs and to retain their dignity, and yet provide them with whatever additional money is required to support their families adequately."⁵

In support of Mr. Greenberg's proposal, Desmond Bender, former City of Ottawa Alderman and Chairman of the Regional Social Services Committee, suggested to Mr. Yaremko that the provincial government bring in legislation to implement the federal laws relating to supplementary income under the Canada Assistance Act.⁶ Stuart Godfrey, RMOC Social Ser-

vices Commissioner called for an expansion of the definition of a person in need through an income supplementation programme that would let people work and yet have sufficient income to meet the needs of their families. He argued that "There is a vast army of people perilously close to need who stay off public assistance only by depriving themselves and their children of necessities."⁷

While Mr. Yaremko did not promise any immediate action, he stated that he wanted more time for his department to complete studies on supplementation programmes in Wisconsin, New Jersey and Alberta, so that he would know the consequences of earned income supplementation. However, he promised to take the pilot project idea with him back to the cabinet, and also asked the conference organizers to send him a concrete proposal for the project. Bert Lawrence, on the other hand, committed himself to arguing for the pilot project in cabinet.

In response to the seemingly favourable attitude showed by the two provincial ministers, the conference unanimously endorsed a motion for an income supplementation project in the Region, and consequently, appointed a project committee to develop concrete proposals for the project as well as maintain constant liaison with local, provincial and federal officials. The project committee itself was a total community group consisting of representatives of three neighbourhood organizations, social workers, teachers, other pro-

professionals involved in social work, and most important, welfare recipients themselves. It was under the leadership of the Social Planning Council (SPC) which played a very crucial role in coordinating the various efforts, most of which centred on the constant correspondence and contacts between its Executive Director, Bill Zimmerman, and the various groups and governmental authorities involved.

On March 21, 1970, the project committee completed the proposal for the pilot project⁸ and sent it to the Minister (Mr. Yaremko) in Toronto. It received widespread community support as indicated by comments of the following organizations and individuals who wrote in support of it.⁹

Andrew Fleck Child Centre: "We are confident that the Action '70 ACTION Project Committee is broadly representative and soundly based in the community".

Anglican Diocese of Ottawa (from the Bishop of Ottawa): "I hope that their faith will be reinforced by your acceptance of the idea to carry out a pilot project".

Archdiocese of Ottawa: ".... good government is constantly seeking ways to improve standards of service to its people".

Canadian Mental Health Association, Ottawa Branch: "Undoubtedly the more adequate economic and social functioning of such families would lead to their improved mental health".

Carleton University, School of Social Work: ".... it will contribute to your efforts to find more effective means of implementing a constructive public policy in the social welfare field".

Le Carrefour: "This project is a source of hope for many who hate their present welfare recipient situation".

Senator C. W. Carter: "In my opinion your proposal has great value".

Catholic Family Service: "We are aware of the time and thought this local committee has invested".

Catholic Women's League of Canada: "... I wish to assure you (the Hon. John Yaremko) of our wholehearted support".

Children's Aid Society: "undoubtedly the financial problems these families are experiencing relate to their difficulties in providing good care for their children".

Christ Risen Lutheran Church: "This project seems to have considerable merit".

Family Service Centre: "We strongly support the recommendation".

John Howard Society: "The Ottawa Committee has demonstrated by the two Forums, that they are interested in and capable of taking steps to help themselves".

Neighbourhood Improvement Committee: "The citizens in our area of the Dalhousie Ward fully believe in and support this project".

Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, Eastern Branch: "... heartily support an early decision to bring this project to reality in the Ottawa area."

Ottawa Board of Education: "We endorse the project, believing it to be sound in its objectives, to be distinctively Canadian, to be imaginative and to be likely to produce information which will dispel many of the myths about poor people".

Ottawa Council of Churches: "The Ottawa Council approved the recommendation of the Action '70 ACTION Committee."

Ottawa Council of Women: "For your further information, please note that the Ottawa Council of Women comprises 74 organizations with 25,000 men and women".

Ottawa Handicapped Association: "We know that it is not a perfect scheme, but it does represent the most constructive and imaginative proposal put forward to date".

Ottawa Tenants' Council of Public Housing: "Plans such as this show that the low income people are willing to help themselves".

Senator Herbert O. Sparrow: "The outline of your suggested plan and those who would participate seems reasonable and I am happy to add my voice of support".

St. David and St. Martin Presbyterian Church: "May we ask for your (the Hon. John Yaremko's) co-operation in doing everything you can to advance the implementation of this project".

United Appeal of Ottawa-Carleton: "We endorse the principle of the desirability of a thorough study".

University Women's Club of Ottawa, Public Affairs Study Group: "As concerned citizens, who are neither poor nor working professionally with the poor, we urge that you take steps to implement the pilot project of income supplement without delay".

Vanier Institute of the Family: "The proposed project is interesting and vital towards the many solutions in assisting the families in the low-income group".

Visiting Homemakers Association: "The experience gained by this committee with wide community representation could be most helpful."

"Z" Committee: "It is our earnest hope that you will give these proposals the attention they merit".

Asked what the reaction of other groups, such as private land developers was to the proposal, Mr. Zimmerman explained as follows:

I don't believe any of them did anything to jeopardize the proposal because they knew we were not out to overthrow the system, nor did we intend to make anyone bankrupt. They knew our cause was justified and that we had a lot of community support, and above all, what we were calling for posed no threat to their own activities in the area. They knew we didn't have a class warfare mentality by which we would want to hurt them. Our aim had been to bring some kind of social justice to residents in the area, which means some people would have to give up a little while others gain a little. We are definitely not out to redress all of the wrongs of this community on anyone in particular. We

don't attach any radical rhetoric to our proposals, and this made it a lot easier for potential opponents to understand and support our proposal for LISE.¹⁰

Community support for the proposal was enhanced by the extensive publicity it received from the two major newspapers in the area, the Journal and the Citizen, both of which openly supported it in their editorials of February 5, 1971 and February 16, 1971 respectively. In addition, all area MPP's and MP's came out with statements in support of the proposal. Previously, on December 8, 1970, the Regional Social Services Committee formally endorsed the proposal and assured the project committee that it would seek the support of Regional Council as a whole in pressuring the Province to get the project started. It was indeed a major development since Regional Council was the body that would eventually be charged with the responsibility of administering the project. In fact, in April 1971, three RMOC officials, former Social Services Committee Chairman, Desmond Bender, Regional Council Chairman Denis Coolican, and Social Services Commissioner Stuart Godfrey, flew to Toronto to discuss Ottawa-Carleton welfare problems with the new Family and Social Services Minister, Tom Wells, and to seek his support for the project. Although Mr. Wells reiterated the need to study the social effects of income supplementation before any final decision could be made, he felt however, that a community as prepared as Ottawa-Carleton should be chosen if income supplementation

plans were finally approved.

Another important development was the announcement by federal Health and Welfare Minister, John Munro, on CBC's "Now Just Listen" that his department would share costs for the pilot project with the Ontario Government.¹¹ This federal move placed the onus for the realization of the project squarely on the province, for it meant that provincial authorities could no longer cite cost-sharing difficulties with Ottawa as part of any reason for delaying the decision on the issue.

For almost 2½ years, from early 1970 to mid 1972, provincial authorities fought off all the pressures for an immediate decision on the issue, maintaining always that the matter was still under review within the government. Because of the strong community support for the pilot project, regional authorities reacted to provincial inaction by proposing to adopt a one-year income supplement experiment on their own. The Regional Social Services Committee approved the plan in October, 1971, and it was formally endorsed by the Regional Executive Committee early in February, 1972. Terms of the proposed regional plan were as follows:¹² the group to be supplemented must be restricted to 25; the group would comprise single employables, men or women, or male employable heads of families receiving public assistance; supplementation would not be continued for any case beyond one

year; there would be a control group of 25 employables not receiving supplementation but to whom general welfare assistance would be paid as long as they remained eligible. However, further RMOC action on the proposed plan was deferred indefinitely in favour of continued efforts to get the provincial government involved.

The first major breakthrough for the pilot project came on May 30, 1972, when ~~Ree~~ Brunelle, the new Minister of Community and Social Services for Ontario, announced an outline for a three-year experimental programme in income supplements for Ontario's working poor. In a speech to Ontario's Standing Committee on Social Development,¹³ he stated that his department's 1972-73 estimates included a \$500,000 allocation to begin planning the programme which he described as "a research project."

Mr. Brunelle stressed that plans for the project were still at a very early stage and that he felt one year should be spent organizing the experiment. According to him, "payments and observations would be made over the succeeding three years and a final year would be needed to evaluate findings and prepare a report."¹⁴ He also stressed that people receiving income supplement payments would be observed closely to determine how they react socially and as employees. He described this as one of the projects' prime objectives and explained as follows: "The objectives we have in mind are

testing the responses people would make to a form of guaranteed minimum income. Would they work less, the same, or more? We are also interested in observing some of the social effects."¹⁵

The Minister told the committee he favoured the working poor as the object of the experiment, and added "we do not foresee a time when a negative income tax scheme would replace present income security programmes or other forms of social security."¹⁶ He described the experiment as involving between 800 and 1,000 families which would be selected "in a random manner so generalizations can be drawn about the population they represent. Finding eligible people in the sites chosen will also require careful attention to sampling technique."¹⁷

While mentioning no sites for the experiment, he said he favoured two to four locations, reasonably representative of Ontario as a whole and with good employment opportunities.

Mr. Brunelle estimated the total cost of the project to be in the neighbourhood of \$5 million - with an annual budget of \$1.5 million for payments and research, the remainder to cover overhead. He acknowledged what was known all along that the federal government was prepared to finance its share of an income supplement experiment, and that discussions with federal officials would begin within the next few weeks so that payments under the programme could begin by May, 1973.

Despite Mr. Brunelle's announcement of Ontario's deci-

sion to take part in the project, the Province came very close to cancelling the proposed plan two years later. Early in January, 1974, Thomas Eberlee, Deputy Minister of Community and Social Services commented that it was doubtful if the government would learn much from a programme where people knew they were receiving the supplement as part of an experiment. Mr. Eberlee explained the Ministry's fear as follows: "Our own feeling in the Ministry is that it won't produce very much in the form of definite results and the money can be put to better use elsewhere."¹⁸ These comments drew bitter reaction not only from Ottawa-Carleton but also from Toronto where the Globe and Mail sharply criticized the government in an editorial on January 14, 1974.

Mr. Eberlee's comments were probably meant to test existing feelings on the matter, to see if they were still as strong as before, for on January 18, 1974, Mr. Brunelle made a press announcement designating Metro Toronto as one of the municipalities for the income supplementation project. The announcement brought quick reaction from Ottawa-Carleton. Regional Chairman, Denis Coolican, wrote immediately to the Minister commenting favourably on his press announcement, and expressing the hope that the Minister would find it possible to include Ottawa-Carleton in the scheme. In his reply, about a month later, the Minister indicated that although the Cabinet had earlier decided not to proceed with an outright

income supplementation experiment, it had recently approved changes in the General Welfare Assistance (GWA) Act which would permit municipalities to make cash payments to employed low income families. The Act required interested municipalities to develop appropriate proposals and submit them for provincial approval before implementing the new provision.

The Regional Social Services Commissioner, with the help of the project committee, prepared a comprehensive proposal¹⁹ for RMOC participation in the programme, and Regional Council unanimously approved it on July 9, 1975, as well as the Region's 50% (\$100,000) share of the first year costs. The following September, the Ministry of Community and Social Services gave formal approval, and authorized the implementation of the programme effective October 1, 1975 for a one-year experimental period. The authorization was however, subject to the signing of a contract²⁰ between the Province and the Region to make sure that the Region comply fully with the requirements of the regulations. The contract was signed by both parties in December 1975 and had retroactive effect. Thus, Ottawa-Carleton became one of three municipalities chosen by the Province to conduct the experiment, Metro Toronto and Peterborough being the other two.

Facts relating to the development and implementation of LISE, as discussed above, indicate clearly that the decision by both Regional Council and the Province to adopt the pro-

gramme in Ottawa-Carleton was heavily influenced by community groups and individuals who did not only initiate action on the issue and enlisted widespread support for it, but also participated in the negotiations with provincial authorities. The decision by Regional Council to endorse and become actively involved in the idea was no doubt based on the atmosphere of support and sympathy created for it in the community by its proponents. Mr. Zimmerman explained it this way: "The issue was made easier for Regional Council because possible red-neck opposition to the proposal was greatly diminished by the consensus reached at the various conferences and meetings which indicated a large amount of community support for the proposal."²¹ The same could be said about the Province which might have acted in response to pressures from the local community.

Community input into social services decisions by Regional Council is channelled mainly through the Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton (SPC) - an independent umbrella organization of about 80 community groups.²² Its activities in relation to the development and implementation of LISE are an excellent example of the leading role it plays in affecting Regional Council decisions on social services. Its effectiveness in this regard is acknowledged by both regional and provincial authorities. In my interview with Councillor Rolf Hasenack, Chairman of the Regional Social Services Committee for 1974-76, on November 16, 1976, he explained the role

of SPC as follows:

The Social Planning Council, an independent body financed in part by the Region, advises the Social Services Committee on the annual distribution of funds among the various social agencies and other community groups in the Region. All applications for regional grants go through their Grants Review Committee which reviews them and makes recommendations to us. We also try to get their input into any decisions affecting social programmes in the Region.

Councillor Hasenack's remarks were echoed by the provincial official responsible for overseeing LISE and some other local social programmes, Dominic Alfieri, Director, Municipal Welfare Consulting Branch, Ministry of Community and Social Services. In my interview with him on October 27, 1977, he observed as follows:

The Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton is highly involved in many of the social service programmes we are involved in in the Region. A good example is the study they were requested to do concerning the Visiting Homemakers Association. A recent proposal for a Work Activity Project in the Region was referred to them by the Regional Social Services Committee for their input. A good number of social service programmes in the Region go through the same process. The organization was also very instrumental in coordinating the various efforts which eventually led to the introduction of LISE in the Region.

Among its many achievements in the Region, the SPC has been either partly or wholly responsible for the establishment of such community programmes as Christmas Exchange, Community Information Centre, Home Care Programme, Youth Services

Bureau, the Rehabilitation Institute, the Central Volunteer Bureau and Transportation for the Handicapped. In the area of citizen participation in the local decision-making process, it was a Social Planning Council proposal to Regional Council that resulted in the establishment of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Regional Department of Social Services in April, 1971. The official acceptance and use of such a body which is made up and speaks on behalf of welfare recipients and other low-income persons is not very common among Canadian municipalities. The CAC is represented by three of its members at regular meetings of the Regional Social Services Committee and enjoys a healthy relationship with both the elected council members and the bureaucrats in the Social Services Department, especially with the Commissioner, Mr. Godfrey.

In recent years, the CAC has assisted Regional Council in introducing such essential public assistance measures as guaranteed "special assistance" (optional) service to its welfare recipients; "special assistance" services to marginal income families; Christmas supplements to its own and provincial welfare recipients, and dental services to children from marginal income families. In our interview, Mr. Zimmerman explained the role of CAC this way: "The CAC can put any item it wants on the agenda of the Social Services Committee which it uses as its forum. It has initiated a lot of proposals.

that cost the Region money, but Council has agreed with most of them because they realized they were well-founded proposals."

The preceding discussion leads one to conclude that the SPC and its affiliates are the most influential actors in regional decisions relating to social services. Their influential role could be attributed to the fact that there still remain lots of local options for municipalities in the area of social services despite provincial controls. As discussed above, LISE and other programmes which were initiated by SPC and other groups and adopted by Regional Council, illustrate the kind of options available to municipalities like Ottawa-Carleton. From the beginning, LISE proponents realized that under the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP), supplementary payments and benefits could be made available to welfare recipients and low income earners whereby the federal government pays 50% of the supplementation costs to any province which makes use of this aspect of CAP. These proponents successfully pressured both the Region and the Province to exercise this option in Ottawa-Carleton.

The effects of provincial control over social services, manifested in "the power of the purse" should not however, be underestimated. The refusal of the Province to participate (contribute) in any given social programme or the tightening of the ceiling on provincial spending on social services could

drastically affect the realization or success of any local social programme. For instance, if the Region had gone ahead and exercised the option to implement its own supplementation plan, the project would have been conducted with only 50 families instead of the originally-planned 200 with provincial participation, or it would never have gotten off the ground at all. In other words, provincial contribution can make the difference between life and death for many local programmes. A tight provincial ceiling on welfare spending usually means a reduction in welfare services rendered at the local level.

However, it must be noted that the statutory and fiscal control exercised by the Province is heavy but by no means total. In our interview this fact was echoed by Mr. Alfieri by the following remarks:

What usually happens is that the Province sets the parameters for any programmes which may require provincial funding. We set the parameters for cost-sharing. Otherwise, what type of services a municipality implements, other than perhaps, the mandatory ones under the general welfare system, is entirely up to each municipality.

The next question in this discussion is, what role did private land developers play in the development and implementation of LISE and other social programmes in the Region? Very little, if any at all. All obtainable evidence, as discussed above, suggests that the main actors in social ser-

vice matters and decisions among residents in the community are the SPC and its affiliated social agencies, social workers and administrators, and the people affected directly by social services - welfare recipients and low-income groups. This conclusion is backed by the following remarks by Pierre Benoit, former Ottawa Mayor and Regional Councillor, and now a Vice-President for Campeau Corporation, in an interview with him on November 15, 1976:

We are really not very active in social services as such. Our main concern lies in the provision of office, commercial and residential accommodation. That is why we are interested in decisions on planning and land development. I guess you would have to enquire from the various social agencies in the area about regional decisions on social issues.

The discussion in this chapter has shown that although LISE is not your typical social service programme, circumstances which led to the decision to implement it have provided a very useful yardstick for determining the influence of the various community actors on social service decisions in the Region.

Chapter 8 Footnotes

1. RMOC, Policy and Administrative Instructions, p.58.
2. Information by Mr. Zimmerman is from my interview with him on November 4, 1977.
3. Action '70 Action, Information Booklet, Ottawa, March 7, 1970, p.4.
4. Action '70 Action Report, Ottawa, March 7, 1970.
5. The Ottawa Journal, March 9, 1970, p.3.
6. The Ottawa Citizen, March 9, 1970, p.2.
7. Ibid., p.2.
8. See Appendix A.
9. The various comments have been summarized from letters sent in by the organizations and individuals which are contained in Social Planning Council files. It is only a partial list of the many groups and individuals who wrote in support of the proposal.
10. From our interview of November 4, 1977.
11. According to the September 22, 1971 report from the Action '70 Action project committee.
12. Contained in a press release to the Ottawa Citizen, February 8, 1972, p.5.
13. Statement of the Honorable Rene Brunelle, Minister of Community and Social Services on Possible Income Supplement Experiment, Queen's Park, Toronto, May 30, 1972.
14. Ibid., p.2.
15. Ibid., p.2.
16. Ibid., p.1.
17. Ibid., p.3.
18. The Globe and Mail, Toronto, January 10, 1974, p.15.

19. See Appendix B. This proposal is more comprehensive and incorporates most of the provisions of the earlier proposal prepared by the project committee.
20. See Appendix C for details of the contract.
21. From our November 4, 1977 interview.
22. See Appendix D for organization and functions of SPC.

CHAPTER 9

THE PRIVATE PROPERTY INDUSTRY AND REGIONAL POLITICIANS

In this chapter, two forms of statistical measures of association are employed in efforts to test Lorimer's hypothesized relationship between the occupations and business interests of municipal councillors and their voting patterns in council. The data relating to the two values (occupations and votes) includes all final votes taken during the 1974-76 council by all members (excluding the chairman who didn't vote) in the two issue-areas of Planning and development, and Social Services, as well as the occupations and business interests of all councillors. Two techniques are utilized in this analysis - contingency table (crosstabulation) analysis and correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient. It should be noted that due to the small size of the sample in this study, the findings are limited and should only be considered exploratory in the sense that there is nothing definite about them.

Let us see, first of all, how many of the 31 regional councillors have occupations or business interests that are related to the private property industry. Using Lorimer's criteria, the 1974-76 regional councillors are grouped into the following categories in Table 11-1.

Table 9-1

1974-76 Regional Councillors and their Occupations andBusiness Interests¹

Dennis Coolican	- Chemical engineer
Lorry Greenberg	- Land development & construction
Garry Guzzo	- Lawyer
Andrew Hayden	- Chemical engineer
Don Lockhart	- Canadian Lumbermen's Association (Executive Director)
Robert MacQuarrie	- Lawyer
John Mlacak	- Electrical engineer
Patricia Nicol	- Housewife (developer wife)

Other Business Occupations

Ronald Clark	- Businessman (Clark's Diary)
Bernard Grandmaitre	- Businessman (retail store)
Donald Reid	- Businessman (furniture store)
Paul St-George	- Businessman (flower shop)
Sandy Boyce	- Media relations consultant
Donald Munro	- Farmer

Other Professional Occupations

Georges Bedard	- Environmentalist
Brian Bourns	- Journalist
Marion Dewar	- Public Health Nurse
Benjamin Franklin	- Educator (School teacher)
Trip Kennedy	- Educator (School teacher)
William Law	- Educator (School for mentally retarded)
Henri Rocque	- Educator (University professor)
W. Arnold Taylor	- Veterinarian (Doctor)
W. M. Tupper	- Educator (University professor)

Public Service Occupations

R. A. Robert	- Mailman
Joseph Quinn	- Federal public servant (retired)
Mitchell Owens	- RCMP officer (retired)
Robert Mitchell	- Federal public servant (technical officer)

Other Occupations

Rolf Hasenack	- Catholic Priest
Betty Hill	- Housewife
Donald Kay	- Trade Unionist (PSAC)
Margaret Kehoe	- Housewife

The distribution in Table 9-1 above shows that in the 1974-76 council, councillors with property industry occupations constituted only 8, (26%) of the total number of councillors, compared to 6 (19.4%) for other business occupations, 9 (29%) for other professionals, 4 (12.9%) for public service occupations, and 4 (12.9%) for other occupations. Compared to Lorimer's findings in Toronto, Vancouver and Winnipeg, the number of councillors with private property industry occupations in the RMOC in the period 1974-76 was far less than those of the three cities as shown in Table 9-2 below.

Table 9-2

Private Property Industry Politicians in Four
Canadian Municipalities

	<u>Total No. of</u> <u>Politicians</u>	<u>No. in pro-</u> <u>perty industry</u>	<u>% in property</u> <u>industry</u>
Toronto (1970-72)	23	12	52%
Vancouver (1971-72)	11	7	64%
Winnipeg (1972-74)	51	24	47%
RMOC (1974-76)	31	8	26%

Thus, Lorimer's contention that private property industry people usually constitute a third to a half of the total number of councillors in most municipal governments across Canada did not hold in the RMOC where they made up only a quarter of the total body in 1974-76.

As already mentioned, the two methods for investigating

the relationship between the occupations and votes of the 1974-76 regional councillors are based on the occupational information outlined in Table 9-1, and on the voting records in Tables 9-3 and 9-4 below.

Table 9-3

Voting Records in Planning & Development²RMOC, 1974-76

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Total Votes</u>	<u>Yeas</u>	<u>Nays</u>	<u>% Nays</u>
G. Bedard	148	138	4	2.8
B. Bourns	148	134	14	9.5
S. Boyce	148	124	2	1.6
R. Clarke	148	112	3	2.6
M. Dewar	148	113	8	6.6
B. Franklin	148	112	3	2.6
B. Grandmaitre	148	108	5	4.4
L. Greenberg	148	100	3	2.9
G. Guzzo	148	88	1	1.1
R. Hasenack	148	130	8	5.8
A. Haydon	148	121	9	6.9
B. Hill	148	101	2	1.9
D. Kay	148	120	1	0.8
M. Kehoe	148	132	8	5.7
T. Kennedy	148	116	17	12.8
W. Law	148	143	1	0.7
D. Lockhart	148	110	2	1.8
R. MacQuarrie	148	103	3	2.8
R. Mitchell	148	132	3	2.3
J. Mlacak	148	128	3	2.3
D. Munro	148	142	6	4.1
P. Nicol	148	128	3	2.3
M. Owens	148	126	3	2.3
J. Quinn	148	117	2	1.7
D. Reid	148	124	2	1.6
R. Robert	148	122	1	0.8
H. Rooque	148	82	2	2.4
P. St-George	110	102	3	3.2
W. Taylor	148	133	4	2.9
W. Tupper	148	135	7	4.9

Table 9-4Voting records in Social ServicesRMOC, 1974-76

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Total Votes</u>	<u>Yeas</u>	<u>Nays</u>	<u>% Nays</u>
G. Bedard	117	109	0	0.0
B. Bourns	117	116	1	0.9
S. Boyce	117	104	1	1.0
R. Clark	117	80	2	2.4
M. Dewar	117	103	2	1.9
B. Franklin	117	99	2	2.0
B. Grandmaitre	117	110	2	1.8
L. Greenberg	117	98	0	0.0
G. Guzzo	117	95	1	1.00
R. Hasenack	117	106	1	0.9
A. Haydon	117	96	14	12.7
B. Hill	117	89	3	3.3
D. Kay	117	88	1	1.1
M. Kehoe	117	107	3	2.7
T. Kennedy	117	97	5	4.9
W. Law	117	111	1	0.9
D. Lockhart	117	89	4	4.3
R. MacQuarrie	117	92	6	6.1
R. Mitchell	117	106	1	0.9
J. Mlacak	117	106	1	0.9
D. Munro	117	115	2	1.7
P. Nicol	117	112	1	0.9
M. Owens	117	83	2	2.4
J. Quinn	117	97	1	1.0
D. Reid	117	89	0	0.0
R. Robert	117	85	3	3.4
H. Rocque	117	46	0	0.0
P. St. George	66	63	1	1.6
W. Taylor	117	85	3	3.4
W. Tupper	117	110	4	3.5

In both Tables 9-3 and 9-4, the Regional Chairman, Denis Coolican, has been left out because he didn't cast any votes in all the issues considered for the entire two-year period. He only votes to break a tie. It should be noted too that in both tables, the difference between the total votes and the sum of yeas and nays in each case represents the absences and abstentions which are not considered relevant for purposes of this analysis.

Computations involving the two techniques used here for measuring the relationship between the two values (occupations and votes) are made by use of the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) System of computer programming.⁴ The first technique involves contingency table analysis or crosstabulation which is "a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables, characterized by the display of the distribution of cases by their position on two or more variables."⁵ The distribution of cases in this analysis are summarized by two measures of association - Lambda and Gamma - which essentially "describe the degree to which the values of one variable predict or vary with those of another."⁶

Lambda is a measure of association between two qualitative variables.⁷ It is used for crosstabulations based on nominal-level variables such as the five occupational categories of property industry, business, professional, public

service, and others. According to Nie and colleagues, "asymmetric lambda measures the percentage of improvement in our ability to predict the value of the dependent variable once we know the value of the independent variable."⁸

Lambda is always positive and may range from 0 to 1.0. A value of 0 indicates that no reduction in error is achieved by shifting from one prediction rule to another, which means that knowing the independent variable does not help us in any way in predicting the dependent variable following the prediction rules of Lambda. A value of 1.0 is an indication that knowing the independent variable allows the prediction of the dependent variable without any error whatsoever, which is to say that error is reduced by 100 percent in shifting from one prediction rule to another. Computed values of Lambda between the two extremes of 0 and 1.0 represent precisely the degree to which error is reduced in shifting from one prediction rule to the other. Thus, if

$\sum \max.f_{jk}$ represents the sum of the maximum values of the cell frequencies in each column, and $\max.f.k$ represents the maximum value of the new totals,

then asymmetric lambda is given by:

$$\frac{\sum \max.f_{jk} - \max.f.k}{N - \max.f.k}$$

Gamma, on the other hand, measures the predictability of order on one variable from order on another.⁹ It is used for crosstabulations involving ordinal (ordered) variables such as the residential categories of city, suburb, and rural used in this analyses which are measures of the degree of urbanization. The numerical value of gamma represents the degree of association. It may vary from -1.0 to +1.0. A gamma of -1.0 indicates that, for untied pairs, the order on one variable is always the reverse of the order on the other variable. When gamma is +1.0, order is the same on both variables for all untied pairs. A gamma of zero indicates that among all untied pairs there are exactly as many pairs with reversed orders on the two variables as there are pairs with the same order. Values between 0 and 1.0 show the degree to which guessing errors may be reduced by using knowledge of order on a second variable. Gamma is computed as follows:

$$\frac{P - Q}{P + Q}$$

Where P is the number of concordant (tied) pairs, and Q the number of discordant (untied) pairs.

According to the above formula "gamma takes on a positive value if the concordant pairs predominate, a negative value if the discordant pairs predominate, and a zero value if they are

equal."¹⁰ The gamma calculated for the two-way crosstabulation tables below is zero-order gamma which simply measures the relationship between the two variables without controlling for any other variables.

On the basis of the frequency distributions of the percentages of nay votes for both development and social services for the 30 councillors, the following medians were derived: 2.61% for development and 1.57% for social services. In the crosstabulation tables, row no. 1 indicates all nay voting percentages from 0 to 2.61, while row no. 2 indicates all those from 2.62 upwards. In social services, row no. 1 indicates all those from 0 to 1.57, while row no. 2 indicates all those from 1.58 upwards. Accordingly, row 1 in each case contains the number and percentage of councillors classified as pro-development or pro-social services, while row 2 contains the opposite. The medians of 2.61% for development and 1.57% for social services are low but significant considering the fact that only about 10% of the total votes in each category are nay votes. The large majority of the votes are unanimous yea votes.

For purposes of this study, pro-development councillors are classified as conservative and anti-development councillors are classified as liberal. In Social Services, the conservatives are considered anti-social services, and the liberals are considered pro-social services. Table 9-5 below summa-

rizes the crosstabulation results for Development and Occupations.

Table 9-5

Development and Occupations

Occupations	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
Property Industry	4 57.14	3 42.86	7
Other Business	3 50.00	3 50.00	6
Professional	3 33.33	6 66.67	9
Public Service	4 100.00	0 .00	4
Others	2 50.00	2 50.00	4
Total	16 53.33	14 46.67	30

Table 9-5 shows that 4 out of the 7 voting councilors (excluding the Regional Chairman) or 57.1% are pro-development with 3 or 42.9% anti-development. According to the individual voting records in Table 9-3, the pro-development group consists of Guzzo, Lockhart, Mlacak and Nicol. This is to be expected. Mr. Guzzo is known to have strong faith in the goodwill of private land developers and is in fact, appearing at the OMB hearings on behalf of a number of

land development interests. While legally representing two firms at the hearings - Waycan Investments, a large Toronto holding company, and K. D. Dolan Ltd., a small local firm - he has also been retained to advise the prestigious legal firm of Gowling and Henderson, which is appearing on behalf of six private land developers including three of the principal landowners in the proposed south growth area - Campeau, Jockvale and Urbandale. Mr. Lockhart strongly supported the south growth area and opposed any moratorium on condominium conversion as well as the activities of the Federation of Citizens Associations. Mlacak was also a strong supporter of the south growth area. Although opposed to the south growth area, Mrs. Nicol was generally known as a sympathizer of land development concerns and was designated RMOC representative to HUDAC. She is not only the wife of a major building contractor (R. J. Nicol Construction Ltd.) but also sister-in-law of the proprietor of one of the growing land development companies in the area - Tartan Development Corporation.

The anti-development trio of Greenberg, Haydon and MacQuarrie among councillors with property industry occupations presents a dilemma. While many people may expect Greenberg to be strong pro-development because of past connections as co-owner of one of the major land development companies in the area (Minto Construction Co.), observers¹¹ at

RMOC meetings have generally placed him among the liberal elements in Regional Council in development matters. While he successfully pushed for a programme of neighbourhood studies to update the City's overall zoning bylaw AZ-64, he seemingly supported the causes of various minority groups as well as citizen involvement in community planning. Haydon, on the other hand, supports the south growth area and steadfastly opposed such things as rent control and any degree of citizen participation in planning. MacQuarrie, a lawyer who deals with real estate matters, was regarded as having little sympathy for tenants in the condominium conversion issue, while strongly supporting the south growth area.

There is an even split among the 6 councillors with other business occupations. 3 (50%) were pro-development and the other 3 (50%) anti-development. Those in the pro-development category include Ottawa's Reid and Boyce, and Rockcliffe Park's Clark. The two representatives from the City of Vanier, Grandmaitre and St-George, and West-Carleton's Munro, make up the anti-development group.

Among the professionals, only 3 (33.3%) out of the 9 showed any pro-development tendencies, compared to 6 (66.7%) in the anti-development group. The three in the first group are Nepean's Franklin, Ottawa's Law and Cumberland's Rocque. Of the 6 councillors in the anti-development group, three - Bourns, Dewar and Kennedy - constitute the mainstay of the

liberal elements in regional council and consistently led the campaign for controlled development. The fourth, Bedard, is considered a borderline case in his support of development matters. The remaining two, Taylor and Tupper, are doubtful cases in this category.

Councillors with public service occupations exhibited the most solidarity in relation to their support for development issues. All 4 of them (100%) were pro-development. Those listed in the other category (column 5) are evenly divided at 2 (50%) a piece. The two pro-development councillors in the group - Hill and Kay - voted according to their usual conservative stand on development issues in council. The other two, Hasenack and Kehoe, displayed tendencies expected of them as members of the liberal group in council.

Asymmetric lambda for computations in Table 9-5 is .21, which is an indication that 21% fewer errors in predicting the dependent variable (development) have been made by using our knowledge of the independent variable (occupations) than by predicting on the basis of the marginal modal attribute. This 21% explanation is derived mostly from the professional group which is more anti-development than the other groups. The .21 Lambda is below the generally accepted level of .25 in social science research and indicates therefore, a weak relationship between voting attitudes in development and occupational backgrounds. With the exception of the public

service group, all the other occupational groups showed a substantial amount of division among their members in relation to their votes in development issues.

Table 9-6 provides the results of computations of possible relationships between voting in social services and the five occupational groups. We see that while 4 of the 7 councillors with property industry occupations were pro-social services, and 5 of the 9 professionals were anti-social

Table 9-6

Occupations and Social Services

Occupations	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
Property Industry	4 57.1	3 42.9	7
Other Business	3 50.0	3 50.0	6
Professionals	4 44.4	5 55.6	9
Public Service	2 50.0	2 50.0	4
Others	2 50.0	2 50.0	4
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

services, the other three categories were equally divided between pro-social services and anti-social services. The .06 Lambda obtained for the distribution on the table indicates almost no relationship between the two variables. This shows that voting on social issues is hardly influenced by occupations and business interests.

Next, a new independent variable (area of residence) was introduced and utilized to see if it could explain voting attitudes on development issues in Regional Council, and the following results were obtained:

Table 9-7

Development and Areas of Residence

Area of Residence	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
City	9 56.3	7 43.7	16
Suburb	4 50.0	4 50.0	8
Rural	3 50.0	3 50.0	6
Total	16 53.3	14 46.7	30

Only the City of Ottawa is placed in the City category. The suburbs include Vanier, Rockcliffe Park, Nepean and Gloucester. The rest of the member municipalities are

classified as rural. Gamma for this table is .10 which is far below the .25 accepted level, thus indicating an extremely weak relationship between areas of residence in the Region and voting on development. The table shows clearly that the points of view in each category are about evenly divided. However, results in the individual categories indicate some interesting developments. Among city councillors, we see for the first time that they are divided into two ideological camps - conservative and liberal - which often characterized their stance and voting on development issues at the city level. The seven city councillors in the anti-development category, Bedard, Bourns, Dewar, Greenberg, Hasenack, Kehoe and Kennedy, were generally regarded as belonging to the liberal camp, while the nine in the pro-development group, Boyce, Guzzo, Kay, Law, Lockhart, Nicol, Quinn, Reid and Robert, were often aligned in the opposite camp.

In the suburban group, we see an alignment of one mayor and two reeves - Grandmaitre of Vanier, Haydon of Nepean, MacQuarrie of Gloucester - with Vanier's St-George in the anti category, versus Rockcliffe's Clark, Nepean's Franklin and Mitchell, and Gloucester's Owens in the opposite camp. The split in the rural group is between Hill of Goulbourn, Mlacak of March and Rocque of Cumberland in the pro camp, and Munro of West-Carleton, Taylor of Osgoode and Tupper of Rideau in

the anti camp.

Computing for possible relationship between areas of residence and social services yielded some rather interesting results as shown on Table 9-8 below.

Table 9-8 shows that city councillors were overwhelmingly pro-social services. 11 (68.8%) were positively oriented towards social services compared to only 5 (31.2%) with negative attitudes. On the other hand, 75% of the suburban and 66.7% of the rural councillors were anti-social services. The .57 Gamma for this table indicates a strong relationship between councillors' attitudes towards social services and the areas in which they reside in the Region.

Table 9-8

Social Services and Areas of Residence

Areas of Residence	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
City	11 68.8	5 31.2	16
Suburb	2 25.0	6 75.0	8
Rural	2 33.3	4 66.7	6
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

It is to be expected that city councillors vote more favourably

for social services than their colleagues from the suburbs and rural areas because most social service matters, such as day care and the various forms of welfare assistance to low-income groups affect the City of Ottawa much more directly than the other municipalities. Furthermore, most of the social agencies receiving annual funding from the Region are based in the City of Ottawa from which they also draw the majority of their clients. It is therefore, logical to expect the city representatives in regional council to be more concerned about social services than their counterparts from the other member municipalities.

The next step in the crosstabulation process was the elimination of all unanimous yea votes in both development and social services to see whether the computations would show any differences in the degrees and direction of relationships from those obtained for all the issues. In both issue-areas, issues in which there was at least one dissenting vote are referred to here as contentious issues. There were 27 (out of 148) such issues in Planning and Development, and 22 (out of 117) in Social Services. The medians for nay votes subsequently rose to 13.12% for development and 5.10% for Social Services. The new results are as follows:

Table 9-9

Development and Occupations (Contentious Issues)

Occupations	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
Property Industry	5 71.4	2 28.6	7
Other Business	2 33.3	4 66.7	6
Professionals	2 22.2	7 77.8	9
Public Service	4 100.0	0 0.0	4
Others	2 50.0	2 50.0	4
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

. Lambda for this table is .47 which indicates a significantly strong relationship, about twice higher than the one for all the issues on Table 9-5. This is probably due to the changes which have occurred in the first three occupational categories. 5 (71.4%) of the property industry councillors are now pro-development compared to 4 (57.1%) when all issues were considered. The other business category which was evenly split now shows a 4 (66.7%) to 2 (33.3%) split in favour of the anti-development faction. The anti-development group among the professions increased their number to 7 (77.8%) from 6 (66.7%), while the distributions in the public

service and other categories remain the same as before.

Table 9-10

Social Services and Occupations (Contentious Issues)

Occupations	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
Property Industry	4 57.1	3 42.9	7
Other Business	4 66.7	2 33.3	6
Professionals	4 44.4	5 55.6	9
Public Service	1 25.0	3 75.0	4
Others	2 50.0	2 50.0	4
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

The .20 Lambda computed for this table shows a comparatively stronger relationship than that for Table 9 -6. However, it still remains a marginally weak relationship. The only minor changes occurred in the other business category where the pro side gained one more member to break their previous deadlock, and in the public service category where the previous tie was broken into a 3 to 1 count in favour of the anti group. The other three occupational groups remain the same as before.

Using area of residence and development as the independent and dependent variables respectively, the following table was generated:

Table 9-11

Development and Areas of Residence
(Contentious Issues)

Area of Residence	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
City	9 56.3	7 43.7	16
Suburb	3 37.5	5 62.5	8
Rural	3 50.0	3 50.0	6
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

The only difference between this table and Table 9-7 occurs in the suburban category where the results changed from the previous tie (4 to 4) to 5 to 3 in favour of the anti group. Gamma rose slightly from .10 to .17 which still indicates a very weak relationship, quite below the .25 acceptable level. This tells us that voting on development matters is not significantly affected or influenced by councillors' areas of residence.

Table 9-12

Social Services and Areas of Residence
(Contentious Issues)

Area of Residence	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	Total
City	10 62.5	6 37.5	16
Suburb	3 37.5	5 62.5	8
Rural	2 33.3	4 66.7	6
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

Although the .44 Gamma for this table is slightly lower than the one for Table 9-8, it still indicates a significantly strong relationship between councillors' voting on social services and their areas of residence in the Region. The Lower Gamma is probably due to some slight changes which saw the pro camp in the city lose one of its members to the anti camp but still retaining a 10 to 6 advantage. In the suburban category, the pro camp gained a person from the opposite camp, thereby reducing their disadvantage to a 3 to 5 proportion.

Finally, using only contentious issues, development votes were matched with social service votes to see if there was any relationship between development and social services

attitudes. The results are as follows:

Table 9-13

Social Services and Development Attitudes
(Contentious Issues)

Development	Social Services		Total
	(Pro) 1	(Anti) 2	
1 (pro)	8 53.3	7 46.7	15
2 (anti)	7 46.7	8 53.3	15
Total	15 50.0	15 50.0	30

Table 9-13 shows that 8 (53.3% of councillors who were pro-development were also pro-social services, compared to 7 (46.7%) who were pro-development but anti-social services. On the other hand, 7 (46.7%) with anti-development attitudes were pro-social services, compared to 8 (53.3%) displaying both anti-development and anti-social services attitudes. The results of this table neatly summarize the results of the preceding relationships which clearly show that none of the five occupational groups was consistent and united in its support for and opposition to development and social services. The very weak relationship indicated by the .13 Gamma for the table confirms that there was only a handful of councillors who, irrespective of their occupational backgrounds, were strong on

social services and weak on development, or strong on development and weak on social services.

The programme of correlation analysis utilized is the so-called Pearson Corr which computes Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, r , to measure the strength of relationship between two interval-level variables. Nie and colleagues summarize the functions of Pearson's r this way:

"Besides its role as an indicator of the goodness of fit of the linear regression, it is a measure of association indicating the strength of the linear relationship between the two variables."¹² Thus, Pearson's r measures both the strength and direction of the linear relationship. It varies from +1.00 to -1.00. An r value close to zero indicates that there is little or no linear relationship between the two variables, but any r value approaching +1.0 or -1.0 indicates a strong linear relationship. Mathematically then, r is defined as "the ratio of covariation to square root of the product of the variation in X and the variation in Y , where X and Y symbolize the two variables."¹³ Accordingly, SPSS computes r from the following formula:

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N X_i Y_i - (\sum_{i=1}^N X_i) (\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i) / N}{\{[\sum_{i=1}^N X_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^N X_i)^2 / N][\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i)^2 / N]\}^{1/2}}$$

Where X_i = i th observation of variable X

Y_i = i th observation of variable Y

N = number of observations

It should be noted that this correlation analysis is meant to supplement the results of the crosstabulations, to see if both results tend towards the same or opposite directions.

Table 9-14 below shows the computed r 's and r^2 's for occupation, residence with development, and occupation, residence with Social Services for all issues. The occupational (nominal) variables have been dichotomized into property and non-property, and the residence (ordinal) variables into city and non-city to make this analysis possible. The r 's in both this table and the next have been squared in order to make them comparable to the Lambdas and Gammas of the previous contingency tables in this chapter, and only the r^2 's therefore, are mentioned in this analysis.¹⁴

Table 9-14

	<u>Development</u>	<u>Social Services</u>
<u>Occupation</u>	$r = .12$	$r = -.33$
	$r^2 = .01$	$r^2 = -.11$
	($N = 30$)	($N = 30$)
	$S = .26$	$S = .038$
<u>Residence</u>	$r = -.10$	$r = .20$
	$r^2 = -.01$	$r^2 = .04$
	($N = 30$)	($N = 30$)
	$S = .33$	$S = .17$

Table 9-14 shows that occupation has a negative effect on Social Services with an r^2 of $-.11$, but has a slightly positive effect on development with an r^2 of $.01$. In the next category, we see that there is almost no relationship at all between residence and development, while residence and social services show a positive relationship of $.04$. The strength and direction of these four kinds of relationship correspond to the crosstabulation results on Tables 9-5 to 9-8 which showed a very weak relationship between occupations and development; an almost negative relationship between occupations and social services; an extremely weak relationship between residence and development, and a substantially strong relationship between residence and social services respectively.

For the contentious issues, the computed r 's and r^2 's are as follows:

Table 9-15

	<u>Development</u>	<u>Social Services</u>
<u>Occupation</u>	$r = .12$	$r = -.36$
	$r^2 = .01$	$r^2 = -.13$
	(N = 30)	(N = 30)
	S = .25	S = .03
<u>Residence</u>	$r = -.15$	$r = .14$
	$r^2 = -.02$	$r^2 = .02$
	(N = 30)	(N = 30)
	S = .21	S = .23

Although there are very minor changes in the strengths of three of the relationships, the directions of all of them remain the same as in Table 9 -14. While occupation and development show the same weak .01 correlation, the relationship between occupation and social services grew stronger to -.13. For residence and development r^2 increased to -.02 while that for residence and social services decreased slightly to .02. These minor changes reflect the minor changes that occurred in the alignments within the individual occupation and residential categories for the contentious issues in the contingency tables.

Lastly, development was correlated with social services to see if voting attitudes on one has any effect or influence on those of the other. For all issues, $r^2 = .12$ compared to .19 for contentious issues. These two positive relationships also compare favorably with the results of the crosstabulation. They indicate, as already mentioned, that there is a number of councillors in all the occupational categories who are either strong on development and weak in social services, or weak on development and strong on social services. Being strong means having fewer nay votes or being more favourably disposed toward the issue-area. Being weak means the opposite - more nay votes and unfavourable disposition.

Thus, the conclusion from the results of both the

crosstabulations and Pearson correlations is that the seven councillors with property industry occupations are not any more pro-development or pro-social services, or anti-development or anti-social services than the councillors in the other occupational groups. At no point at all, in the course of the two methods of analysis, did they display the kind of cohesiveness characteristic of a group endeavouring to further the interests of its occupation or business in their voting patterns. The analysis has not also indicated any outstanding relationships between the two variables, occupations and voting in the two issue-areas, to warrant any generalization that councillors' occupational backgrounds have a lot to do with their voting patterns in council. Perhaps, the most significant finding is that support for social services is more widespread among city representatives in Regional Council - a variable (areas of residence) which Lorimer ignored in his hypothesis.

Chapter 9 Footnotes

1. Information about the occupations and business interests of the 1974-76 regional councillors was obtained from official records in the Regional Clerk's office, as filed by the individual councillors before the 1974 municipal elections.
2. The voting records of councillors were compiled from minutes of RMOC meetings between January, 1975 and December, 1976. Copies of the Minutes are available at the Clerk's Office at RMOC headquarters.
3. Paul St-George took his council seat on October 1, 1975, replacing Mr. Parisien who resigned as one of the two representatives from the City of Vanier. He therefore, took part in only 110 council votes on planning and development.
4. This system is contained in the handbook by Norman H. Nie, et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd edition), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
5. Ibid., p.218.
6. Ibid., p.218.
7. See Mueller, John H., et al., Statistical Reasoning in Sociology, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970, p.249.
8. Nie, et al., SPSS, p.225.
9. As defined by Mueller, et al., Statistical Reasoning in Sociology, p.279.
10. Nie, et al., SPSS, p.228.
11. These observers include members of the media who regularly covered RMOC meetings and other activities, leaders of community groups, as well as councillors themselves who voluntarily offered their views.
12. Nie, et al., SPSS, p.279.
13. Ibid., p.280.
14. This procedure is fully explained in E. T. Jones, Conducting Political Research, New York: Harper & Row, 1971, pp.123-132.

PART FOUR

20

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION

As I have already explained in the Introduction, Lorimer's hypothesis assumes that private land developers dominate the decision-making process at city hall in the sense that they are the group with the most influence in the making of important decisions in all issue-areas in the municipality. "Influence" in this respect is used on the premise that when municipal officials make decisions that conform to the expressed wishes or desires of certain groups or individuals by means of persuasion, suggestion or anticipation, the groups or individuals involved are said to have influence over the municipal decision-makers. Throughout this research, the aim has been to try and discover which groups or individuals are most influential in the making of important decisions in the RMOC as revealed by the major and minor case studies as well as by the aggregate data on the occupational backgrounds and voting patterns of regional councillors.

In efforts to sustain, modify or reject the hypothesis, this concluding chapter will feature an analysis of the findings of the two research techniques employed in relation to what I will call provincial, federal, incremental, community and occupational factors affecting the decision-making

process in the RMOC.

Provincial factors involve the various ways by which the government of the Province of Ontario affects the organization and functions of the RMOC. We saw in Chapter 4 that in accordance with its statutory powers over local government, the Province influences regional decisions through its control which is manifested in the policies and activities of numerous provincial departments and agencies. The OMB does not only supervise the financial activities of the RMOC, it has also been holding public hearings into various aspects of the Region's Official Plan and could change regional development policies considerably. The Minister of Housing had to approve the Official Plan before it could become effective. There is also the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs which in 1974 appointed the Mayo Commission to review the organization and functions of the RMOC. It has also been demonstrated (in Chapters 3 and 8) that provincial funds are crucial to the realization of many local programmes such as LISE. Lastly, there is the ultimate power of the provincial cabinet to veto or revise local decisions in planning and other matters.

The formal aspects of the relationship between the Province and the Region, as summarized above, may seem to indicate that the Province has absolute control over the Region, but what is in fact true is that provincial control leaves

some options open to local initiatives. In the case of the Official-Plan, the Province required Regional Council to prepare an official plan for the Regional Area by December 31, 1972,¹ but it was entirely up to regional authorities to decide on the contents and dimensions of the Plan. To ensure public input in the development of the Plan, Regional Council was further required under the RMOC Act to "hold public meetings and public information for the purpose of obtaining the participation and co-operation of the inhabitants of the Planning Area in determining the solution of problems or matters affecting the development of the Planning Area."²

The actions of the Minister of Housing and the OMB lend further evidence to the Province's encouragement of the exercise of local initiatives in planning matters. When the Minister approved the Plan and referred the more controversial aspects of it to the OMB, he did so after reviewing about 66 submissions from groups and individuals in the Region objecting to various aspects of the Plan. Some may dismiss the current OMB hearings into the Plan as mere window-dressing, but the process gives residents in the area further opportunity to influence policies contained in the Plan. There is still the provincial cabinet as a last resort for those who may not be satisfied with the outcome of the OMB hearings. These three instances illustrate how provincial control has become a very useful tool of arbitration between residents in

the Region and Regional Council - a function which, more than anything else serves to strengthen the ideals of local democracy.

In social services, we saw that provincial control also leaves plenty of options for communities with the desire and innovation to put them into use. Although LISE is only a marginal programme in Social Services, lacking all the fanfare of the development of the Official Plan, its adoption in the Region is a clear illustration of how a community can rally around something it wants and gets it. It is true that provincial financial policies do determine the life and scope of many local social programmes, but as a top provincial official explains, it is entirely up to any municipality to implement any programme it wants as long as it can afford to fund it with the exception of the mandatory programmes under the general welfare system.³ Regional Council did indeed decide to go on its own in income supplementation, but financial considerations forced the abandonment of that plan in favour of a continued lobby for provincial participation.

Using the cases of the Official Plan and LISE as our yardstick, we can reasonably conclude that provincial influence on Regional decisions is substantial but by no means complete. Provincial influence is best understood if viewed within the framework of what options and opportunities are available to local authorities beyond the formal provincial

control mechanisms.. This point will be treated further following the discussion of the federal factors below.

Federal factors affecting Regional decisions are manifested in the activities of the various federal departments and agencies in the Region as discussed in Chapter 4. Of special interest for purposes of this study is the National Capital Commission (NCC) which is actively engaged in planning for the development of the extensive federal land holdings in the Region - a function which brings it into direct competition, and sometimes in conflict with regional policies. This unique feature, the large federal land ownership in the area unparalleled in any other Canadian municipality, may raise some doubts about the suitability of the RMOC for testing Lorimer's hypothesis, but as the discussion on the development of the Official Plan indicates, the feature is really an added dimension to the study. For one thing, there is a large number of major private land developers in the area who together hold a lot more acres of land for housing and commercial purposes and who are a lot more active in these respects than the NCC.⁴ After all, the NCC participated like the rest of the community groups in making presentations to Regional Council during the development of the Plan, and there is no evidence to indicate that the alternatives it presented affected policies contained in the Plan any more than those of other groups.

Contrary to counter claims by the two sides (the NCC and RMOC) that one is encroaching on the other's jurisdiction in planning matters, their activities have indeed served to complement one another towards the attainment of what I consider a common goal. While the NCC has a federal (parliamentary) mandate "to prepare plans for and assist in the development, conservation and improvement of the National Capital Region in order that the nature and character of the seat of the Government of Canada may be in accordance with its national significance,"⁵ the RMOC has a provincial mandate to plan for the development of the area in a coordinated and economic manner knowing that the area also is the seat of the federal government. Therefore, although both bodies have different jurisdictional entities within the same geographical area,⁶ and maybe, different methods and criteria for developing those entities, their main objective remains the same, namely, maintaining a viable federal capital area socially, economically, and perhaps politically.

On the basis of the above premise, it is inevitable for the two bodies to solve their differences through consultations and compromise rather than confrontation. This has in fact, been the case with one exception. For instance, as discussed in Chapter 4, some of the differences that existed between the NCC and the RMOC over some federal building projects in the area have been resolved, and two of them, the

Lebreton Flats and the Baseline/Woodroffe Demonstration project, will be under construction sometime soon. The importance of the element of compromise was pointed out and stressed by all federal and regional authorities I spoke to in the course of this study.

However, as we saw in Chapter 7, there has been a major disagreement between the two bodies over the Region's choice of the South Growth Area in the Official Plan. The NCC has flatly stated that it may not yield any piece of land for servicing the South Growth Area if the Region does not reverse its decision and designate Carlsbad Springs for stage I development as previously recommended by regional planning staff. Regional Council action in overturning the staff recommendation and its insistence on developing the South Growth Area demonstrate that the NCC does not have its way with regional decision-makers as much as some people think. The NCC's exercise of its mandate over federal land holdings in the area should therefore, not be automatically interpreted as an exercise of tremendous influence over regional decisions on planning. Its mandate may be a potentially strong influence weapon, but available evidence, as revealed in the discussion of the Official Plan (Chapters 5-7) indicate that it has had only minimal and indirect influence on regional planning policies.

The influence of the provincial and federal governments

on the RMOC could further be explained and perhaps, understood in the context of the so-called Rule of Anticipated Reactions espoused by Carl J. Friedrich.⁷ According to this rule, all persons exposed to influence are inclined to anticipate the reactions of those who exercise the influence, or has the power to issue commands, bestow benefits or inflict penalties. The rule, according to Friedrich, "is most likely to work where a formal but largely dormant power (and command) relationship prevails."⁸ This is no doubt the kind of relationship that exists between the RMOC and the province, and somewhat indirectly, between the RMOC and the federal government.

There is no doubt that regional authorities have constantly anticipated the reaction of provincial authorities at Queen's Park in many of their decisions. We have seen that as a creature of the Province, the RMOC is not only governed by the provisions of numerous provincial statutes, but also its programmes depend very heavily on provincial funding. We saw in the development of the Plan that regional authorities successfully anticipated provincial reactions by putting together a planning document which the Minister of Housing easily approved while referring only the more controversial parts of it to the OMB.

What this means is that, in many of their decisions, regional authorities have to anticipate not only the reactions

but also the provincial policies affecting such decisions. This constant anticipation of Provincial reactions by the Region means, as I already stated earlier in this chapter, that the Province indeed has a lot of potential influence, but the actual influence it exercises over the regional decision-makers leaves plenty of room for the exercise of local initiatives. Perhaps, the ability of regional authorities to successfully anticipate provincial reactions to many of their decisions minimizes not only conflict between the two levels of government, but also reduces any possibility that the Province may translate more of its potential influence into actual influence.

As already noted, another important element in the decision-making process in the Region, is the relationship between the RMOC and NCC. In this regard, both should be able to anticipate what the other is going to say and do in order to avoid conflict and for both to be able to accomplish their goals in planning matters. This has in fact been the case as evidenced by the participation of the NCC in the development of the Plan, and by the ongoing consultations between the two bodies concerning the federal projects discussed in Chapter 4. Perhaps, a breakdown in anticipation on the part of regional authorities brought about the harsh reaction by the NCC on the issue of the South Growth Area. With regard to anticipating federal government policies in general,

Prof. H. B. Mayo best explains the situation in this statement:

It is impossible for a Regional Plan to be very rigid without making guesses at both the size and direction of growth of federal employment. Federal policies to decentralize departments and agencies around the country, or to expand across the Ottawa river into Quebec virtually determine the fate of the Region. No other regional government in Ontario has to consider this unique variable in preparing its official plan, with all the uncertainties that follow from it in terms of public utilities, transit, housing, social services and so forth.

Anticipation of federal policies and reactions is no doubt, an important part of the RMOC decision-making process, and any influence derived from it must be seen as being only a part of the overall influence pattern affecting RMOC decision-makers. It is by no means dominant.

Incremental factors affecting the decision-making process in the region, especially in planning and development matters are derived from earlier studies of the Capital Area. The reports of these previous studies give the Official Plan an incremental outlook in the sense that some of the more important policies contained in it could be traced somewhat to some of the conclusions and recommendations of those reports. As discussed in Chapter 6, some of the initial proposals for the Official Plan, most of which materialized into final policies, were the same as those recommendations contained in such earlier reports as the Grebér Report, Economic Prospects, and Statistical Review. John Wright, Regional Planning Com-

missioner, stressed this fact on two separate occasions. In a submission to the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the National Capital Region, he commented as follows: "The Grebér Report, the Statistical Review, and the work of the Ottawa Planning Area Board had set in motion certain development trends which had to be considered when the Region took over responsibility for planning in the area. It was against this background that the Region began its work."¹⁰

Again, in a statement outlining the historical background to planning in the Region on the opening day (February 14, 1977) of the OMB hearings on the Official Plan, Mr. Wright mentioned the Grebér Plan as a study which has had profound effects on development policies in the Region. He also pointed out that the Statistical Review called for satellite communities outside the Greenbelt, in approximately the same areas that the Official Plan calls for growth.¹¹

In social services too, incremental factors play a significant role. For instance, the final proposal for LISE was based on almost the same principles and criteria as the one developed earlier by the Project Committee of Action '70 Action,¹² which in turn, was patterned on studies of similar projects in Alberta, Wisconsin and New Jersey. Regional Council decisions governing the distribution of funds to social agencies remain the same year after year with perhaps

only a few minor changes to keep up with the times.

The community factors have to do with the over 200 community groups and individuals who actively participated in the development of the Official Plan through written briefs and oral presentations, as well as the 80 and more who took part in the lobbying to develop and adopt LISE in the Region. We saw in the discussion of the major case study on the Official Plan (Chapters 5, 6 and 7) and the minor case study on LISE (Chapter 8) that the various community groups and individuals play an active and important role in the RMOC decision-making process.

In the development of the Official Plan, Regional Council established an elaborate public participation programme aimed at encouraging the various groups and individuals to offer alternative courses of action for the development of the Region. As discussed in Chapter 7, on the basis of the final provisions of the Plan, no actors (groups or individuals) significantly prevailed over the others in terms of overwhelming success in having their alternatives materialize into final regional development policies contained in the adopted Plan. What in fact, happened was that each actor gained a little while losing out in other issues. This is confirmed by the fact that the majority of the actors who originally submitted alternatives to Regional Council filed objections not only with the Minister of Housing but also are currently.

appearing before the OMB to continue their fight on certain aspects of the Official Plan. This group of dissatisfied actors, of course, includes all the major private land developers in the area who are strenuously objecting to policies relating to housing, land conservation and rural development in the Plan.

Accusations by the other actors that the policies in the Official Plan were heavily influenced by private land developers are based on the premise that the areas designated for development in the region are too closely linked to the land holdings of major private land developers in the Region, and especially Regional Council decision to designate the South Growth Area for stage I development and pushing back the priority for developing the 9,000 publicly-owned acres near Carlsbad Springs until well into the next century. While there may be some substance to such a claim, it must be noted that one swallow does not make a summer, in that we cannot make generalizations about the influence of private land developers on the Official Plan on the basis of their ownership of land in the designated growth areas alone. The scale, structure and direction of growth is just one aspect of the Official Plan which also contains other very important provisions on transportation and utilities, cultural resources and community facilities, natural resources and environmental management.

The important thing to note about the above claim is

that land holdings in the designated growth areas is the result of foresightedness and very skilful long-term planning by the major private land developers in the Region. Regional authorities are careful to explain that by mid 1972, Official Plans for 11 municipalities in the RMOC were either already approved or in the process of being approved by the Province. Those plans have all been based on the concept of urbanizing the land within the Greenbelt, and creating three satellite towns outside the Greenbelt to the east, south and west, as originally proposed by the NCC's Greber and Statistical Reports.¹³ They contend that many private land developers presumably worked within this framework and purchased land mainly, though not entirely, in the areas proposed for urbanization in the local municipal official plans. They maintain that approximately 41,000 acres of land were already either designated as urban growth areas in the proposed local official plans, or were known to be held as assemblies of land with a view to urbanization outside the Greenbelt. For instance, Gloucester already designated the east growth area (Orleans) for development in its official plan; Nepean and Gloucester did the same for the controversial south growth area, and March Township adopted the same policy for the west growth area. It is clear therefore, that private land developers had acquired their property in anticipation of local development policies which eventually found their way into the

Regional Official Plan.

The preceding discussion does not imply that the Official Plan is absolutely free of any form of private developer influence. As I have already explained, private developers succeeded in influencing Regional Council to designate the South Growth Area for Stage I development over the repeated objections of other actors, but this one notable success should not be interpreted as domination in every other decision at Regional Council as Lorimer's hypothesis strongly suggests. As an interest group, private land developers competed with other actors to ensure that policies favourable to their interests were embodied in the Official Plan, and as we have seen, they gained some and lost some.

In the minor case study, LISE, we had a clear indication of the success of community groups to influence the development and adoption of a social programme in the Region. Unlike the actors in planning and development who differed widely in their pursuit of regional development strategies, actors in social services are homogeneous in the sense that they are mostly social agencies and individuals interested in or directly affected by welfare policies who seem to differ very little in the pursuit of their goals in the Region. The evidence, of course, as shown in the discussion of LISE, indicates clearly that private land developers are not among the actors trying to influence decisions on social services in the

Region.

The occupational factors are those which are directly related to Lorimer's hypothesis. According to Lorimer, the strongest evidence of the control and influence which the private property industry exerts over municipal politicians is a correlation between the voting records of municipal councillors and their occupations and business interests. To ensure a thorough investigation of the hypothesis, this study has gone beyond Lorimer's technique which merely involved determining the number and percentage of the total number of councillors who are in occupations or businesses that are related to the private property industry, and concluding that private land developers run the municipality if he found that a substantial number of councillors are in related occupations.

We may recall that he found 12 out of 23 or 52% in the City of Toronto (1970-72); 7 out of 11 or 64% in Vancouver (1971-72), and 24 out of 51 or 47% in Winnipeg (1972-74).

In addition to the investigation of a major case study in Planning and a minor case study in Social Services by the use of the decision-making approach, the findings of which have been analysed above, the study also utilized two forms of statistical measures of association as presented in Chapter

9. They are intended not only to elaborate Lorimer's method, but also to complement the decision-making approach. In the first place, following Lorimer's method, it was discovered

that only 8 (26%) of the 31 regional councillors in the 1974-76 council were in occupations or businesses that were related to the private property industry. They were only about a quarter of the total body and far below a majority.

The crosstabulations indicated no evidence of cohesiveness or block-voting by councillors classified under the private property industry occupations in all the development decisions taken by the 1974-76 Council. With the exception of the Regional Chairman who was included in this category because of his engineering background but who was excluded from the analysis because he did not vote, there were 4 pro-development and 3 anti-development councillors in this category according to the criterion of the established median (Table 9-5). With the exception of the public service who were solidly pro-development, 4 out of 4 (100%), the remaining occupational categories were so divided among their members that it is impossible to make any generalization about their pro or anti development voting attitudes. The .21 Lambda obtained for Table 9-5 is well below the .25 acceptable level, thereby indicating a weak relationship between voting attitudes in development and occupational backgrounds.

The results of Table 9-5 are almost identical to those of Table 9-9 when the same analysis was applied to the contentious development issues. The .47 Lambda for the 27 (out of 148) contentious development issues which normally is an in-

dication of a significantly strong relationship between the two variables (voting and occupations), is due to slight changes which have occurred in the first three categories (1 more pro in the Property Industry making that ratio 5:2, 1 more anti in the other business making it 2:4, and 1 more shift to the anti among the professionals making their ratio 2:7).

We also saw that the new independent variable, area of residence, had no significant effect on councillors' voting in both all and contentious development issues. While Gamma for the former is .10 (Table 9-7), Gamma for the latter is .17 (Table 9-11), both indicating a very weak relationship, far below the .25 acceptable level. The crosstabulation results of Tables 9-5, 9-7, 9-9, and 9-11 were confirmed by the Pearson R correlation analysis for all development issues which showed a very weak relationship between occupations and voting on development issues ($r^2 = .01$) on Table 9-14, and a negative relationship ($r^2 = -.01$) between area of residence and development voting (same table). For contentious development issues (Table 9-15), the results are similar, a weak r^2 of .01 for occupations and development voting, and a negative r^2 of $-.02$ for area of residence and development voting.

Results of the crosstabulations and correlation analysis for both all and contentious social services issues indicate an almost negative relationship between councillors'

occupations and their voting attitudes on social services. As shown on Table 9-6 for all social service issues, all the five categories are almost evenly split between pro and anti among their members, and once again displaying no degree of cohesiveness at all. The .06 Lambda for the table indicates almost no relationship at all between the two variables, occupations and voting on social services. For contentious social services (Table 9-10) Lambda rose slightly to .20 which is still an indication of a marginally weak relationship. The kind of relationships revealed in the two tables above are reinforced by the Pearson R correlation analysis which show a negative (r^2 of $-.11$) relationship between occupations and all social service voting (Table 9-14), and another negative ($r^2 = -.13$) relationship between occupations and contentious social service voting (Table 9-15).

The only significant finding that emerged with regards to social services is that there is a significant relationship between councillors' areas of residence in the Region and their voting attitudes in social services. In the first place, it was discovered that City of Ottawa councillors were overwhelmingly pro-social services. 11 out of 16 (68%) of them (Table 9-8) were pro-social services compared to only 5 (31%) with negative voting attitudes. On the other hand, it was found that 6 out of 8 (75%) of the suburban and 4 out of 6 (66%) of the rural councillors were anti-social services

when all the social service issues were considered. The .57 Gamma for the table show a strong positive relationship between councillors' voting on social services and the areas of the Region they represent. Almost the same results were obtained for contentious social service issues and areas of residence (Table 9-12) indicating a strong relationship of a .44 Gamma. These findings are confirmed by the Pearson R correlation analysis which show an r^2 of .04 for areas of residence and all social services voting (Table 9-14), and an r^2 of .02 for areas of residence and contentious social services voting (Table 9-15). The explanation for this positive relationship, as already discussed in chapter 9, may be that welfare matters which concern many low-income groups and social agencies are centred more in the City of Ottawa than the surrounding areas, and since many of these groups and agencies are usually active in the local political scene, it is to be expected that City councillors would vote more favourably for their aspirations than their colleagues from the suburbs and rural areas.

The results of the statistical analysis above indicate that even the 7 councillors with the private property industry did not exhibit pro or anti stance that were radically different from those of councillors in other occupations in both development and social service issues. Their voting patterns in both issue-areas were not strong and cohesive enough to

infer that they were a powerful block at Regional Council. These findings compare favourably with those of the major and minor case studies, especially the former which had traces of private land developer influence, but not extensive enough to warrant the kind of generalization Lorimer makes.

What can be said about decision-making at the RMOC therefore, is that it is characterized by the combined effects of provincial, federal, incremental, community and occupational factors as discussed above. To compromise the effects of these factors, regional decision-makers have followed a rational approach to decision-making as evidence of the major and minor case studies and aggregate data indicate. - According to Charles E. Lindblom, a rational decision-maker would:

1. Identify his problem;
2. Clarify his goals, and then rank them as to their importance;
3. List all possible means - or policies - for achieving each of his goals;
4. Assess all the costs of and the benefits that would seem to follow from each of the alternative policies; and
5. Select the package of goals and associated policies that would bring the greatest relative benefits and the least relative disadvantages.¹⁴

The processes through which the RMOC Official Plan was developed and adopted illustrate how regional authorities tried to follow the five steps above. They identified regional development problems through oral and written presenta-

tions made at public meetings at which residents in the Region stated what they considered to be the goals and development issues of the Region. The planning questionnaire of March 1972, served to clarify the goals identified at the meetings, and were subsequently ranked in the following order of importance: natural environment, urban development, social well-being, and transportation. The search for possible means or policies for achieving each of these goals led to an analysis by planning staff of eight development alternatives derived from the five basic development concepts of core, satellite, linear, corridor and dispersed. On the basis of the analysis, the planning staff recommended the satellite and corridor concepts as being the set of alternatives with the greatest potential to fulfill regional development goals.

In the Initial Proposals and the Draft Plan, the costs of and the benefits that could be derived from each of the selected alternative policies were assessed. This was made possible by the results of technical studies on such areas as transportation, sewer and water services, housing and residential land ownership. Finally, the Official Plan was adopted by Regional Council reflecting the package of goals and associated policies considered to have the maximum benefits and least relative disadvantages in the development of the Region.

As Lindblom and others have shown, there are problems involved in applying the rational approach to decision-making.

They include the "variety of possible problems that can be perceived in an agency's environment; the numerous goals and policies that are potentially feasible; the high cost of information; the personal, ideological and professional interests of policy-makers; structural disharmonies that generate conflict among administrators or between them and other participants in the policy process, and deviant behaviours that occur in administrative units."¹⁵ These factors support Herbert Simon's contention that "complete rationality is an unattainable goal for administrative decision-making in all but the most simple kinds of decisions."¹⁶ This is especially true of the two decisions involving the major and minor case studies examined in this study. The inherent difficulties of the approach may also help to explain why many of the policies contained in the Official Plan are being contested before the OMB.

On the basis of the evidence of this research therefore, it is safe to say that Lorimer's hypothesis suffers from very serious methodological problems. In the first place, as noted in the Introduction, very little of the influence process is susceptible to direct observation, and second, the links between the private property industry and municipal politicians Lorimer talks about are invisible and cannot be proven. Even if such links were visible, as indicated by the growing trend to make local campaign contributions public, it would still be difficult to properly assess their impact on.

councillors' voting attitudes. For instance, it would be quite a task for anyone to try to explain the effects of Irving Greenberg's campaign contributions to Alderman Brian Bourns - Irving Greenberg being the co-owner of the prosperous Minto Construction Company, and Alderman Bourns being one of the anti-development stalwarts in Regional Council. Thus, while the hypothesis may confirm the fears and suspicions of citizens' groups and reform movements in municipal councils across Canada, its assumptions can hardly stand the test and rigors of scientific inquiry - a fact which this study has proven.

Looking back at the three questions posed at the beginning of the Introduction regarding the way in which important decisions are made in the RMOC, the actors with the greatest influence on such decisions, and whether or not the influence by the actors varies from one issue-area to another, we conclude as follows: decision-making in the RMOC is by use of the rational approach, which among other things, is constantly under the combined influence of provincial, federal, incremental, community and occupational factors. No one group of actors dominates the decision-making process in the Region. In other words, the art of influencing regional decisions is not the absolute preserve of any single group of actors. Instead, the kind of influence discovered in Ottawa-Carleton is distributed among the various competing actors according to

their spheres of interest.

The evidence of the study has established that the influence of private land developers in the RMOC decision-making process is limited only to those issues which affect their immediate interests like any other pressure group in the Region. Their influence is not extensive or dominant enough to warrant Lorimer's generalization that the private property industry has seized control of the entire structure of municipal government across Canada. The hypothesis is therefore, not valid particularly in reference to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Chapter 10 Footnotes

1. Required under Section 69(2) of the RMOC Act, R.S.O. 1970, Chapter 407, as amended to January 1, 1976, p.72.
The December 31, 1972 deadline was eventually extended until the Official Plan was completed and adopted by Regional Council on October 9, 1974.
2. Ibid., section 69(1), p.71.
3. Comments made by Mr. Dominic Alfieri, Director, Municipal Welfare Consulting Branch, Ministry of Community and Social Services, in our interview of October 27, 1977.
4. This is based on the assumption that the Greenbelt continues to be maintained for non-development purposes.
5. N.C.C., Tomorrow's Capital, Ottawa, 1974, p.7.
6. I am referring here to the Ontario side where the boundary lines of both the NCC and RMOC are almost the same.
7. Friedrich, Carl J., Man and His Government, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963, pp.199-215.
8. Ibid., p.204.
9. Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission, Ottawa-Carleton in Review, Ottawa, August 1975, pp.141 and 142.
10. RMOC, Submission To The Special Joint Committee Of The Senate And Of The House Of Commons On The National Capital Region, Ottawa, March 1976, p.4.
11. These statements were recorded by the author who was present at the OMB hearings on February 14, 1977, and were later confirmed by a report of the proceedings by Don Butler in The Ottawa Citizen, Wednesday, February 15, 1977, p.53.
12. See Appendixes A and B.
13. This explanation is outlined in Official Plan - Initial Proposals, RMOC, July 1972, p.18.
14. Lindblom, Charles E., The Policy-Making Process, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968, p.13.

15. Sharkansky, Ira, Public Administration, Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970, p.69.
16. Simon, Herbert, Administrative Behaviour, New York: Macmillan, 1961, p.70.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

- Adrian, Charles R., and Charles Press, Governing Urban America, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Agger, Robert E., et al., The Rulers and the Ruled: Political Power and Impotence in American Communities, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Adler, Gerald M., Land Planning by Administrative Regulation: The Policies of the Ontario Municipal Board, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Aiken, Michael, and Paul E. Mott, (eds.), The Structure of Community Power, New York: Random House, 1970.
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz, Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Banfield, Edward, and J. Q. Wilson, City Politics, Cambridge: Harvard MIT Press, 1963.
- Barker, Graham, et al., Highrise and Superprofits, Kitchener, Ontario: Dumont Press Graphix, 1973.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research, New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1964.
- _____, Social Statistics, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Bureau of Municipal Research, Civic Affairs, No. 1, 1972.
- Clark, Terry N., Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968.
- Clarkson, Stephen, City Lib: Parties and Reform in Toronto, Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.
- Dahl, Robert A., Who Governs?, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

- Deland, Robert T., (ed.), Comparative Urban Research: The Administration and Politics of Cities, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1969.
- Dennis, Michael, and Susan Fish, Programmes in Search of a Policy, Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.
- Deorn, G. Bruce, and V. Seymour Wilson, (eds.), Issues in Canadian Public Policy, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974.
- Downs, Anthony, Inside Bureaucracy, Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- Draper, James A., (ed.), Citizen Participation: Canada, Toronto: New Press, 1971.
- Feldman, Lionel D., and Michael Goldrick, (eds.), Politics and Government of Urban Canada: Selected Readings, Toronto: Methuen, 1969.
- Fraser, Graham, Fighting Back: Urban Renewal in Trefann Court, Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.
- Friedrich, Carl J., Man and His Government, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Granatstein, J. L., Marlborough Marathon, Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1971.
- Hawley, Willis D., and Fred M. Wirt, The Search for Community Power, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Hickey, Paul, Decision-Making Processes in Ontario's Local Governments, Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1973.
- Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision-Makers, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Jacob, Philip E., and J. V. Toscano, (eds.), The Integration of Political Communities, New York: Lippincott, 1964.
- Jennings, M. K., Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta, New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Jones, E. T., Conducting Political Research, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

4 OF 4

Kaplan, Harold, Urban Political Systems: A Functional Analysis of Metro Toronto, New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1966.

Lindblom, Charles E., The Policy-Making Process, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1968.

Lithwick, N. H., and G. Paquet, (eds.), Urban Studies: A Canadian Perspective, Toronto: Methuen, 1968.

Lithwick, N. H., Urban Canada: Problems and Prospects, Ottawa: CMHC, 1970.

Lorimer, James, The Real World of City Politics, Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1970.

_____, A Citizen's Guide to City Politics, Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1972.

Lorimer, James, and Evelyn Ross (eds.), The City Book, Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publisher, 1976.

Maass, Arthur, (ed.), Area and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

Martin, Roscoe, et al., Decisions in Syracuse: A Metropolitan Action Study, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961.

Martin, Roscoe, Grass Roots, University of Alabama Press, 2nd edition, 1964.

Masson, Jack K., and D. Anderson, (eds.), Emerging Party Politics in Urban Canada, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Mueller, John H., et al., Statistical Reasoning in Sociology, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

Nie, Norman H., et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Plunkett, Thomas J., Urban Canada and its Government, Toronto: Macmillan, 1968.

_____, Winnipeg: Canada's Third Largest City, an Explanation of its new Government, Winnipeg: City of Winnipeg, 1972.

Polsby, Nelson W., Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Powell, Alan, (ed.), The City: Attacking Modern Myths, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972.

Presthus, Robert, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Redcliffe-Maud, Lord, and Bruce Wood, English Local Government Reformed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Richardson, Boyce, The Future of Canadian Cities, Toronto: New Press, 1972.

Rose, A. M., The Power Structure: Political Process in American Society, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

_____, Governing Metropolitan Toronto, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Rowat, Donald C., Your Local Government, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, (2nd edition), 1975.

_____, (ed.), Urban Politics in Ottawa-Carleton: Research Essays, Carleton University, Department of Political Science, 1974.

Sewell, John, Up Against City Hall, Toronto: James and Lewis Samuel, 1972.

Sharkansky, Ira, Public Administration, Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Simon, Herbert, Administrative Behaviour, New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Spur, Peter, Land and Urban Development, Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1976.

Wildavsky, A., Leadership in a Small Town, Totowa, N. J.: Bedminster Press, 1964.

Wirt, Frederick M., (ed.), Future Directions in Community Power Research: A Colloquium, Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Governmental Studies, 1971.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., The Politics of Progress, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

ARTICLES:

Anton, T. J., "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (March 1963), 425-457.

Bachrach, Peter, and M. S. Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," American Political Science Review, 56 (December, 1962), 947-952.

_____, "Decisions and Nondecisions," American Political Science Review, 57 (Sept. 1963), 632-642.

Best, Patrick, "Too Much Office Space?", The Ottawa Citizen, November 20, 1976.

Bureau of Municipal Research, "Neighbourhood Participation in Local Government: A study of the City of Toronto," Civic Affairs, (January, 1970).

Cameron, David M., "Urban Policy," in G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson, (eds.), Issues in Canadian Public Policy, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974.

Clark, Terry N., "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where, and When?" The Sociological Quarterly, 8 (3) 1967, 291-316.

_____, "The Concept of Power," in Terry N. Clark, (ed.), Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968.

_____, "Methods for Measuring Power and Decision-Making Structures," in Terry N. Clark, (ed.), Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968.

_____, "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," in Fred M. Wirt, (ed.) Future Directions in Community Power Research: A Colloquism, Berkeley, University of California, Institute of Governmental Studies, 1971.

Corbett, Marie, "The Ontario Municipal Board: Planning and Zoning Cases," Osgoode Hall Law Journal, Vol. 14, No. 1, June 1976.

Dahl, Robert A., "The City in the Future of Democracy," in Lionel D. Feldman and Michael D. Goldrick, (eds.), Politics and Government of Urban Canada, Toronto: Methuen, 1972.

_____, "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 11 (July 1957).

Danzer, M. H., "Community Power Structure: Problems and Continuities," American Sociological Review, 29 (Oct. 1964) 707-717.

Freeman, Linton C., et al., "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches," American Sociological Review, 28 (October. 1963) 791-798.

Goldberg, Harvey, "The Property Industry at City Hall: The Case of the City of Ottawa," in Donald C. Rowat, (ed.), Urban Politics in Ottawa-Carleton: Research Essays, Carleton University, Dept. of Political Science, (Nov. 1974).

Hunter, Floyd, "Review of Who Governs?," Administrative Science Quarterly, (March, 1962), 517-519.

Kaplan, Harold, "The Policy-Making Process in Metro Toronto," in L. D. Feldman and M. D. Goldrick, (eds.) Politics and Government of Urban Canada, Toronto: Methuen, 1972.

Kernaghan, Kenneth, "Responsible Bureaucracy: a rationale and a framework for analysis," Canadian Public Administration, Vol. 16, 4 (Winter, 1973).

Kaufman, Herbert, and Victor Jones, "The Mystery of Power," Public Administration Review, 14, 3 (Summer, 1954).

Langrod, Georges, "Local Government and Democracy," Public Administration, Vol. 31, (1953).

Matthews, Neville O., "Small Town Power and Politics," in L. D. Feldman and M. D. Goldrick, (eds.) Politics and Government of Urban Canada, Toronto: Methuen, 1972.

McKenna, Bruce, "The OMB: Citizens as Losers," in James Lorimer and Evelyn Ross, (eds.), The City Book, Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publisher, 1976.

O'Brien, Allan, "Local Government Priorities for the Eighties," Canadian Public Administration, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 1976), pp.102-111.

Price, H. D., "Review of Who Governs?", Yale Law Journal, 71 (July 1962).

Schulze, Robert O., and Leonard U. Blumberg, "The Determination of Local Power Elites," The American Journal of Sociology, 63 (Nov. 1957), 290-296.

Whalen, Hugh, "Ideology, Democracy, and the Foundations of Local Self-Government," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Aug. 1960), 377-395.

Wheaton, W. L. C., "Integration at the Urban Level: Political Influence and the Decision Process," in Philip E. Jacob and J. V. Toscano, (eds.), The Integration of Political Communities, New York: Lippincott, 1964.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS:

Canada, Department of Public Works, 1975-76 Annual Report, Ottawa, 1976.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Canadian Housing Statistics 1975, Ottawa, March, 1976.

Fullerton, Douglas H., The capital of Canada: How should it be governed?, Ottawa, 1974.

Gréber, Jacques, Plan for the National Capital - General Report, Ottawa: National Capital Planning Service, 1950.

National Capital Commission, Annual Report 1974-75.

_____, Economic Prospects - National Capital Region, Ottawa, 1963.

_____, Statement by NCC Chairman to Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Capital Region, Ottawa, May, 1976.

_____, Statistical Review, Ottawa, 1964.

- _____, Tomorrow's Capital, Ottawa, 1974.
- Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Statement of the Honourable René Brunelle, Minister of Community and Social Services on Possible Income Supplement Experiment, Toronto, Queen's Park, May 30, 1972.
- _____, Ministry of Housing, 1976 Municipal Directory, Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1976.
- _____, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Report of the Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission, October, 1976.
- _____, The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act, R.S.O., 1970, chapter 407, Toronto: Queen's Park.
- Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission, Ottawa-Carleton in Review, Ottawa, August, 1975.
- _____, Ottawa-Carleton Review Statistical Base, Ottawa, 1975.
- Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Clerk's Department, Regional Council Minutes, Vols. I-IV, 1974-76.
- _____, Finance Department, 1976 Current Budget.
- _____, Management Services, Policy and Administrative Instructions, December, 1976.
- _____, Office of the Chairman, Submission to the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Capital Region, March, 1976.
- _____, Planning Department, Briefs presented to the Planning Committee in Response to "Draft Regional Official Plan," Vols. 1-18, February, 1974.
- _____, Planning Department, Draft Official Plan for Ottawa-Carleton, July, 1974.
- _____, Planning Department, Final Report on Housing in Ottawa-Carleton, February, 1976.
- _____, Planning Department, Official Plan - Initial Proposals, July, 1972.

_____, Planning Department, Official Plan: Ottawa-Carleton Planning Area, October, 1964.

_____, Planning Department, Official Plan - Summary of Technical Reports, February, 1972.

_____, Planning Department, Proposed Ministerial Modifications to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Official Plan, June 25, 1976.

_____, Planning Department, Report on Alternative Regional Development Concepts, February, 1972.

_____, Planning Department, Transcripts of Hearings and Briefs, April, 1971.

_____, Social Services Department, Low Income Supplementation Experiment, August, 1975.

_____, Works Department, Annual Reports, 1974 and 1975.

_____, Works Department, Report and Technical Discussion on Master Plan of Water Works and Waste Water Control for the RMOC, January, 1970.

Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton, Action '70 Action Information Booklet, March 7, 1970.

Statistics Canada, 1971 Census.

A PILOT PROJECT
TO TEST THE PROBLEMS OF INCOME SUPPLEMENTATION

21/3/70

Supplementation of low income is essential, as clearly stated at Action '70 ACTION. The last data set the poverty level at \$5000 per year. We all agree that families need more money but we must look further. We must look at the human factor.

Poverty breeds problems. The poor family often presents a picture of lack of self-confidence, and discipline, of living for to-day, of over-dependance on society. The consequence of these and of other traits can be, and often is, the perpetuation of the poverty cycle through their children's inability to compete in our society. By itself, an increase of money will not solve these deep-seated problems. It can create either incentive or dependancy. Because of the human factors involved, and because of the complexity of our society, it seems wrong to think of a supplementation programs only in terms of money and devoid of services.

The following pilot project will hopefully take these factors into consideration. It will also be aimed at the needs of the people as they themselves make them known to us. In addition, this project will supply information as to the effects of a supplementation program with a particular type of built-in services.

Concern:

In raising allowances under the General Welfare Allowances and in giving a supplement to the low wage-earner, a precedent is being set. There will be economic repercussions. One cannot forecast all of these, but, we can try to face some of the human factors which can be made known and apply

more money but we must look further. We must look at the human factor.

Poverty breeds problems. The poor family often presents a picture of lack of self-confidence, and discipline, of living for to-day, of over-dependance on society. The consequence of these and of other traits can be, and often is, the perpetuation of the poverty cycle through their children's inability to compete in our society. By itself, an increase of money will not solve these deep-seated problems. It can create either incentive or dependancy. Because of the human factors involved, and because of the complexity of our society, it seems wrong to think of a supplementation programs only in terms of money and devoid of services.

The following pilot project will hopefully take these factors into consideration. It will also be aimed at the needs of the people as they themselves make them known to us. In addition, this project will supply information as to the effects of a supplementation program with a particular type of built-in services.

Concern:

In raising allowances under the General Welfare Allowances and in giving a supplement to the low wage-earner, a precedent is being set, there will be economic repercussions. One cannot forecast all of these, but, we can try to face some of the human factors which can be made known and apply solutions where and when possible. Our concern about people must be more. It must reach their real needs and try to provide the best answers.

General comments:

Supplementation must be, for most people, a step to independancy. We could try to categorize the low-income earners into 2 major groups:

1. Working at their maximum potential because of:

- irremediable ill health,
- inadequate personality
- inadequate mentality.

2. Working below their potential because of:

- lack of development of their:
 - intellectual ability,
 - skill capacity, and
 - personal capacity, which would include the unmotivated, the dependant etc.
- remediable ill-health.

Mr. Groom's proposed questionnaire should give an idea of the percentages of these and of other major categories of people. The persons who are most in need of help and who can most easily be helped to independancy, are of course, the second group. The others need to have their incomes supplemented for life.

THE PILOT PROJECT

Method:

Social animation and leadership:

- get people together in order that they may realize their problems, and
- express their needs as they see them;
- help them plan their own lives; and finally,
- help them develop action: find programmes to answer their

1. Working at their maximum potential because of:

- irremediable ill health,
- inadequate personality
- inadequate mentality.

2. Working below their potential because of:

- lack of development of their:
intellectual ability,
skill capacity, and
personal capacity, which would include the unmotivated,
the dependant etc.
- remediable ill-health.

Mr. Groom's proposed questionnaire should give an idea of the percentages of these and of other major categories of people. The persons who are most in need of help and who can most easily be helped to independancy, are of course, the second group. The others need to have their incomes supplemented for life.

THE PILOT PROJECT

Method:

Social animation and leadership:

- get people together in order that they may realize their problems, and
- express their needs as they see them;
- help them plan their own lives; and finally,
- help them develop action: find programmes to answer their needs by making the best use of all of the available services and adding new ones when really necessary.

The thinking behind this approach is that services are often ineffective when they are completely decided from above. On

the other hand, a person changes through involvement and only if he is motivated.

Possible scope of the project:

The scope will depend to a large extent upon the involvement of the people and on the initial level of functioning of the group concerned. It is predictable that some of the major concerns expressed will be:

- economic problems,
- retraining and up-grading courses,
- school drop-outs,
- recreation and day care services.

Just in facing these few problems, one can see the mobilization of a large number of the community's resources in a concentrated war on poverty and on results.

Objectives:

The results that would come from involvement of a person in his own problems would be:

- motivation,
- encouragement,
- gradual development of a new level of independancy,
- a realization, by the people involved, of their potential and their limits.

The aim is a rehumanization of the many persons who are suffering the results of poverty. The extent of success is not readily predictable.

Implementation:

Because of some of the psychological effects of poverty, the project must be set up in the neighborhoods, otherwise, it will not reach the people. At Action '70 ACTION, there were many complaints about the lack of information made available to them even though it is obtainable from

of the group concerned. It is predictable that some of the major concerns expressed will be:

- economic problems,
- retraining and up-grading courses,
- school drop-outs,
- recreation and day care services.

Just in facing these few problems, one can see the mobilization of a large number of the community's resources in a concentrated war on poverty and on results.

Objectives:

The results that would come from involvement of a person in his own problems would be;

- motivation,
- encouragement,
- gradual development of a new level of independancy,
- a realization, by the people involved, of their potential and their limits.

The aim is a rehumanization of the many persons who are suffering the results of poverty. The extent of success is not readily predictable.

Implementation:

Because of some of the psychological effects of poverty, the project must be set up in the neighborhoods, otherwise, it will not reach the people. At Action '70 ACTION, there were many complaints about the lack of information made available to them even though it is obtainable from a central office. In Ottawa, the ideal locations are:

- in one of the units of each of the major rent-to-income projects (8 or 9),

- Lower Town Urban Renewal Site Office,
- Centre Town: NIC and Percy Street School,
- Vanier City: in a church basement.

All of these locations would be easily attainable.

Office equipment:

As much as possible, furnishings and equipment should be scrounged by the people. Actual costs would include only telephones, paper and other expendable items. Typewriters and the availability of duplicating machines are essential.

All this should not be too expensive.

Staffing:

Most of the work should be done on a volunteer basis, except for the animators. Initially, the animators should be directly responsible to a senior animator or project director. Close ties must be kept with the regional welfare office and with the local office of Social and Family Services, but active direction must be at a minimum. Responsibility to the Ministry will probably be essential because of the need for research into the worth, the feasibility and the effects of a supplementation programme.

Cost:

We cannot be naive enough to predict an immediate saving to the government, but on the other hand it is realistic to believe that

- through concerted efforts, industry can be encouraged to settle in the area,
- a percentage of persons presently on GWA will get work and request supplementation.
- a percentage of low income earners will better themselves and receive supplementation only for a limited time.

Timing:

Office equipment:

As much as possible, furnishings and equipment should be scrounged by the people. Actual costs would include only telephones, paper and other expendable items. Typewriters and the availability of duplicating machines are essential. All this should not be too expensive.

Staffing:

Most of the work should be done on a volunteer basis, except for the animators. Initially, the animators should be directly responsible to a senior animator or project director. Close ties must be kept with the regional welfare office and with the local office of Social and Family Services, but active direction must be at a minimum. Responsibility to the Ministry will probably be essential because of the need for research into the worth, the feasibility and the effects of a supplementation programme.

Cost:

We cannot be naive enough to predict an immediate saving to the government, but on the other hand it is realistic to believe that

- through concerted efforts, industry can be encouraged to settle in the area,
- a percentage of persons presently on GWA will get work and request supplementation.
- a percentage of low income earners will better themselves and receive supplementation only for a limited time.

Timing:

This project could be started very soon.

- Arrangements between the Department of Social and Family Services, in conjunction with City Hall and the Housing Authority to make available small units.

- Hire social animators - preferably some who know the Ottawa area.
- Set up a budget to cover the immediate costs.
- Prepare the required research components.

As soon as an office and an animator are available, work can begin.

Feasibility:

The NIC, a very young project has already shown the feasibility of the method described for this pilot project. Many citizens, welfare recipients and low earners, through their involvement have helped themselves. Welfare recipients, in their own committee have found that their major difficulties are lacks in their education and in their skills. They have interested representatives from many provincial departments. Much experience has been gained by the efforts of the NIC. This pilot project is based on this knowledge.

Ottawa: an ideal setting:

There is much new activity in the City of Ottawa. An awareness of a sense of community responsibility is evident in the major agencies and in citizens' groups. There is a feeling of excitement of the possibility of meaningful action. Some representatives at all levels of government are personally interested in seeing the results of programmes already under way. The mass media has acknowledged the importance of the trend to citizen participation in both the definition and solution of problems.

Conclusion:

Supplementation will bring, to a varying extent, a change in the lives of

- Prepare the required research components.

As soon as an office and an animator are available, work can begin.

Feasibility:

The NIC, a very young project has already shown the feasibility of the method described for this pilot project. Many citizens, welfare recipients and low earners, through their involvement have helped themselves. Welfare recipients, in their own committee have found that their major difficulties are lacks in their education and in their skills. They have interested representatives from many provincial departments. Much experience has been gained by the efforts of the NIC. This pilot project is based on this knowledge.

Ottawa: an ideal setting:

There is much new activity in the City of Ottawa. An awareness of a sense of community responsibility is evident in the major agencies and in citizens' groups. There is a feeling of excitement of the possibility of meaningful action. Some representatives at all levels of government are personally interested in seeing the results of programmes already under way. The mass media has acknowledged the importance of the trend to citizen participation in both the definition and solution of problems.

Conclusion:

Supplementation will bring, to a varying extent, a change in the lives of many people. At a time of positive change, the atmosphere is most conducive for working with people. The people have expressed in very definite terms that the Federal Government's War on Poverty has been nothing but words. They are interested in action. Supplementation of their income is, in their eyes, the basic answer.

1 20/2

APPENDIX BREGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETONLOW INCOME SUPPLEMENTATION EXPERIMENT

Low Income Supplementation Experiment is an experiment to be conducted for twelve months under the provisions and criteria laid down by the Government of Ontario and by the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Its purposes are:

- (a) to ease stress among the working poor and to provide encouragement to remain working rather than to give it up;
- (b) to provide an inducement to some persons on General Welfare Assistance to seek and accept jobs which might otherwise be less economically attractive than dependence on General Welfare Assistance;
- (c) to provide data on work/wage factors as they are affected by supplementation.

1. General Principles that will govern this experiment are:

(a) selection of recipients of supplementation

- (i) only families of two or more will be accepted (only under extreme circumstances will a single person be considered);
- (ii) the family head will be eighteen years of age or over;
- (iii) the family will reside in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton;
- (iv) the family head will be fully-employed;
- (v) a family living in subsidized housing will not be eligible;

Low Income Supplementation Experiment is an experiment to be conducted for twelve months under the provisions and criteria laid down by the Government of Ontario and by the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Its purposes are:

- (a) to ease stress among the working poor and to provide encouragement to remain working rather than to give it up;
- (b) to provide an inducement to some persons on General Welfare Assistance to seek and accept jobs which might otherwise be less economically attractive than dependence on General Welfare Assistance;
- (c) to provide data on work/wage factors as they are affected by supplementation.

1. General Principles that will govern this experiment are:

- (a) selection of recipients of supplementation
 - (i) only families of two or more will be accepted (only under extreme circumstances will a single person be considered);
 - (ii) the family head will be eighteen years of age or over;
 - (iii) the family will reside in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton;
 - (iv) the family head will be fully-employed;
 - (v) a family living in subsidized housing will not be eligible;
 - (vi) a family receiving subsidized day care, homemaker or nursing services generally will not be eligible. It is recognized, however, that unusual cases may arise which will commend discretionary consideration.

1. (b) determination of eligibility

Eligibility will be determined by a simple formula based on monthly General Welfare Assistance rates for a family.

(General Welfare Assistance rate + \$100.00)
less net income = supplementation;

where net income is the gross income minus the following deductions: income tax, Unemployment Insurance Benefits, Canada Pension Plan and mandatory registered pension plans.

(c) cases of Special Assistance needs

In cases where a Special Assistance item of low cost such as drugs of \$5.00 arises, allowance for that item will be made in the budgetary needs. Certain cases may arise where there is a high cost such as the purchase of an artificial limb. These situations will be covered by Special Assistance, item (xi) and the supplementation, if any, will be unaffected. The means test used for Special Assistance items will be applied to the family's income plus any supplementation.

(d) assets

Allowances for bank accounts will be \$500.00 for a couple or one adult and one child plus \$100.00 more for each dependent over one. If needed, a consent to inspect assets (see Appendix "E") will be completed to verify these amounts.

(e) budget limits

The budget set down for this experiment is \$200,000.00 to be utilized over a twelve month period. This means that a monthly maximum to be expended must be set so that as many people as possible will benefit with as much money as possible. At the outset payment will be according to the following schedule:

family of two adults (or one adult and one child) up to a maximum of \$50.00 monthly;

for each additional dependent in the family over one add \$10.00 monthly. The maximum paid to any family shall not exceed \$100.00 monthly. This schedule might have to be adjusted as the experiment progresses. If a large number of people apply and are eligible for supplementation and if this should cause the maximum amount set to be exceeded, selection would have to be on the first come, first served basis.

where net income is the gross income minus the following deductions: income tax, Unemployment Insurance Benefits, Canada Pension Plan and mandatory registered pension plans.

(c) cases of Special Assistance needs

In cases where a Special Assistance item of low cost such as drugs of \$5.00 arises, allowance for that item will be made in the budgetary needs. Certain cases may arise where there is a high cost such as the purchase of an artificial limb. These situations will be covered by Special Assistance, item (xi) and the supplementation, if any, will be unaffected. The means test used for Special Assistance items will be applied to the family's income plus any supplementation.

(d) assets

Allowances for bank accounts will be \$500.00 for a couple or one adult and one child plus \$100.00 more for each dependent over one. If needed a consent to inspect assets (see Appendix "E") will be completed to verify these amounts.

(e) budget limits

The budget set down for this experiment is \$200,000.00 to be utilized over a twelve month period. This means that a monthly maximum to be expended must be set so that as many people as possible will benefit with as much money as possible. At the outset payment will be according to the following schedule:

family of two adults (or one adult and one child) up to a maximum of \$50.00 monthly;

for each additional dependent in the family over one add \$10.00 monthly. The maximum paid to any family shall not exceed \$100.00 monthly. This schedule might have to be adjusted as the experiment progresses. If a large number of people apply and are eligible for supplementation and if this should cause the maximum amount set to be exceeded, selection would have to be on the first come, first served basis.

1. (f) application procedures.

A mail-out kit consisting of return envelope, information pamphlet, instruction sheet and application form (see Appendix "A") will be employed for application. The completed forms with necessary verifications will be mailed back by the applicant and then checked by the interviewer.

If eligible for on-going supplementation, further payments will depend upon regular reports and home or office interviews. An appointment letter (see Appendix "C") will be sent to the family shortly after application and will request an office or home interview whichever is more convenient to the applicant.

(g) items under monthly income (see Appendix "A"), application form, p.3, 4 (b).)

Other income will be treated as it is for General Welfare Assistance cases, i.e. roomer and rental income will be budgetted at 40%, boarder income at 60% while any pensions, Unemployment Insurance Benefits, etc. will be budgetted at 100%. Family Allowance will not be considered as part of a family's income.

(h) items under budgetary needs (see Appendix "A"), application for p. 4-5, 6.)

Allowance will be made for the following items:

- (i) Special diets will need a medical certificate to verify them. Amounts for diets will follow General Welfare Assistance rates;
- (ii) In the case of fuel and utilities the actual costs will be allowed. The rent allowance will be the actual rent up to a maximum of \$200.00 monthly subject to discretionary award in the case of hardship;
- (iii) Travel costs will include trips to and from work and to and from doctor's office. By bus, 25¢ per trip and two trips per day will be allowed. Thus, over 21 working days in a month, a total of \$10.50 can be allowed plus ten extra trips to the doctor's office. By car, 10¢ per mile and \$5.00 extra per month for the doctor's office will be allowed;

- (iv) Drug costs, i.e. prescription drugs, should

interviewer.

If eligible for on-going supplementation, further payments will depend upon regular reports and home or office interviews. An appointment letter (see Appendix "C") will be sent to the family shortly after application and will request an office or home interview whichever is more convenient to the applicant.

- (g) items under monthly income (see Appendix "A"), application form, pt 3, 4 (b).)

Other income will be treated as it is for General Welfare Assistance cases, i.e. roomer and rental income will be budgetted at 40%, boarder income at 60% while any pensions, Unemployment Insurance Benefits, etc. will be budgetted at 100%. Family Allowance will not be considered as part of a family's income.

- (h) items under budgetary needs (see Appendix "A"), application for p. 4-5, 6.)

Allowance will be made for the following items:

- (i) Special diets will need a medical certificate to verify them. Amounts for diets will follow General Welfare Assistance rates;
- (ii) In the case of fuel and utilities the actual costs will be allowed. The rent allowance will be the actual rent up to a maximum of \$200.00 monthly subject to discretionary award in the case of hardship;
- (iii) Travel costs will include trips to and from work and to and from doctor's office. By bus, 25¢ per trip and two trips per day will be allowed. Thus, over 21 working days in a month, a total of \$10.50 can be allowed plus ten extra trips to the doctor's office. By car, 10¢ per mile and \$5.00 extra per month for the doctor's office will be allowed;
- (iv) Drug costs, i.e. prescription drugs, should be accompanied by a receipt or bill. As a general guideline \$5.00 per month for drug costs can be used;

1. (h) (v) Dental and optical services both require, that bills or receipts be produced in order to provide allowance for them. In cases of high cost, refer to page 2, 1(c).

2. Accounting Procedures

- (a) A form 14 (see Appendix "D") will be prepared by the interviewer, requesting a certain amount of payment.
- (b) Accounts will make up a cheque in this amount and mail it (see Appendix "B").
- (c) The mailing date for cheques issued on an on-going basis will be the 25th of each month.
- (d) Any changes will be made on a Form 14 to go to Accounts.

3. Staff requirements will be two clerks (accounting and unit), a part-time receptionist for evening work, two interviewers and a Project Officer. Each must be bilingual.

- (a) Clerks will be responsible for:
 - (i) filing and indexing of cases;
 - (ii) typing;
 - (iii) sorting of incoming mail;
 - (iv) mailing kits and appointment letters;
 - (v) answering telephone inquiries from potentially eligible families;
 - (vi) checking returned applications for necessary documents and calling for them if not included;
 - (vii) accounting procedures.
- (b) Receptionist who will work evenings only, (during the day receptionist for the Community Service Unit will be used) will be responsible for:
 - (i) directing all calls to the proper

- (a) A form 14 (see Appendix "D") will be prepared by the interviewer, requesting a certain amount of payment.
 - (b) Accounts will make up a cheque in this amount and mail it (see Appendix "B").
 - (c) The mailing date for cheques issued on an on-going basis will be the 25th of each month.
 - (d) Any changes will be made on a Form 14 to go to Accounts.
3. Staff requirements will be two clerks (accounting and unit), a part-time receptionist for evening work, two interviewers and a Project Officer. Each must be bilingual.
- (a) Clerks will be responsible for:
 - (i) filing and indexing of cases;
 - (ii) typing;
 - (iii) sorting of incoming mail;
 - (iv) mailing kits and appointment letters;
 - (v) answering telephone inquiries from potentially eligible families;
 - (vi) checking returned applications for necessary documents and calling for them if not included;
 - (vii) accounting procedures.
 - (b) Receptionist who will work evenings only; (during the day receptionist for the Community Service Unit will be used) will be responsible for:
 - (i) directing all calls to the proper people;
 - (ii) giving out, if necessary, pamphlets and kits;

3. (b) (iii) setting up appointments with interviewers for those who drop in as well as for the appointment letters;

(iv) handling any clerical duties that might arise in the evening.

(c) Interviewers will be responsible for:

(i) checking the application form thoroughly and then making calculations to determine eligibility;

(ii) determining on what items will be allowed under the budgetary needs and how much they will be;

(iii) determining on which items will be provided for under Special Assistance and if a voucher or card should be issued;

(iv) completing Form 14's requesting payment or voucher/drug cards for Special Assistance;

(v) completing a letter notifying the family of their eligibility if accepted or a letter notifying them why they are not eligible (see Appendix "B");

(vi) noting on file the action taken and why;

(vii) interviewing people to determine if any changes have occurred due to the supplementation especially in work and wage factors. Existing data can also be verified more thoroughly. If necessary, a Form 3 (see Appendix "E") may be signed;

(viii) completing a follow-up report (see Appendix "F"), noting any changes on files, and then making any adjustments on the cheque by means of a Form 14;

(ix) explaining to the applicant how the amount of payment was arrived at;

(x) outlining clearly his responsibilities to keep Low Income Supplementation Experiment informed of any changes;

(c) Interviewers will be responsible for:

- (i) checking the application form thoroughly and then making calculations to determine eligibility;
- (ii) determining on what items will be allowed under the budgetary needs and how much they will be;
- (iii) determining on which items will be provided for under Special Assistance and if a voucher or card should be issued;
- (iv) completing Form 14's requesting payment or voucher/drug cards for Special Assistance;
- (v) completing a letter notifying the family of their eligibility if accepted or a letter notifying them why they are not eligible (see Appendix "B");
- (vi) noting on file the action taken and why;
- (vii) interviewing people to determine if any changes have occurred due to the supplementation especially in work and wage factors. Existing data can also be verified more thoroughly. If necessary, a Form 3 (see Appendix "E") may be signed;
- (viii) completing a follow-up report (see Appendix "F"), noting any changes on files, and then making any adjustments on the cheque by means of a Form 14;
- (ix) explaining to the applicant how the amount of payment was arrived at;
- (x) outlining clearly his responsibilities to keep Low Income Supplementation Experiment informed of any changes;
- (xi) if the applicant voices any serious problems referring him or his family to a Social Services worker or voluntary counselling agency;

(c) Interviewers will be responsible for:

- (i) checking the application form thoroughly and then making calculations to determine eligibility;
- (ii) determining on what items will be allowed under the budgetary needs and how much they will be;
- (iii) determining on which items will be provided for under Special Assistance and if a voucher or card should be issued;
- (iv) completing Form 14's requesting payment or voucher/drug cards for Special Assistance;
- (v) completing a letter notifying the family of their eligibility if accepted or a letter notifying them why they are not eligible (see Appendix "B");
- ♦ (vi) noting on file the action taken and why;
- (vii) interviewing people to determine if any changes have occurred due to the supplementation especially in work and wage factors. Existing data can also be verified more thoroughly. If necessary, a Form 3 (see Appendix "E") may be signed;
- (viii) completing a follow-up report (see Appendix "F"), noting any changes on files, and then making any adjustments on the cheque by means of a Form 14;
- (ix) explaining to the applicant how the amount of payment was arrived at;
- (x) outlining clearly his responsibilities to keep Low Income Supplementation Experiment informed of any changes;
- (xi) if the applicant voices any serious problems referring him or his family to a Social Services worker or voluntary counselling agency;

3. (c) (xii) completing application forms or helping to do so if the applicant is illiterate or has serious language problems.
- (d) The Project Officer, under the direction of the Commissioner, shall authorize all payments.

4. Evaluation and monitoring

It is recognized that an evaluatory process is needed for an experiment on this sort and that it should be done early in the process. Both evaluation and monitoring assistance will be provided by the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

5. Flexibility

As an experiment, Low Income Supplementation Experiment is designed to be as flexible as possible. However because of the current limit of \$200,000 on the total expenditure and because of the uncertainty of the size of the target population it is desirable to place initial limits on liquid assets levels, monthly maximum payments and monthly budgetary needs. If the response is small due to these limits, the levels of liquid assets and so on will be adjusted accordingly.

Any other unusual situation that may arise will be dealt with through the discretionary powers of the Commissioner.

S. R. Godfrey
Social Services Commissioner

18 August 1975

4. Evaluation and monitoring

It is recognized that an evaluatory process is needed for an experiment on this sort and that it should be done early in the process. Both evaluation and monitoring assistance will be provided by the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

5. Flexibility

As an experiment, Low Income Supplementation Experiment is designed to be as flexible as possible. However because of the current limit of \$200,000 on the total expenditure and because of the uncertainty of the size of the target population it is desirable to place initial limits on liquid assets levels, monthly maximum payments and monthly budgetary needs. If the response is small due to these limits, the levels of liquid assets and so on will be adjusted accordingly.

Any other unusual situation that may arise will be dealt with through the discretionary powers of the Commissioner.

S. R. Godfrey
Social Services Commissioner

18 August 1975

SRG: lsg

20/2 1

This Agreement made in duplicate this 31st day of December, 1975
BETWEEN

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN in right of
Ontario, represented by the Minister
of Community and Social Services
(hereinafter referred to as "Ontario")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON,
a municipal corporation,
(hereinafter referred to as "the Municipality")

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS for the purpose of researching the development
of a delivery system to supplement the income of the working poor,
the Municipality pursuant to The General Welfare Assistance Act
(R.S.O. 1970, chapter 192) is offering a program (hereinafter
referred to as "the demonstration project") of financial assistance
to low income earners residing within its jurisdiction;

AND WHEREAS Ontario is entering into this agreement with
the Municipality so that the Municipality will be eligible pursuant
to subclause ii of clause a of subsection 1 and subsection 2 of
section 19 of Regulation 383 (R.R.O. 1970) as amended under the
said, The General Welfare Assistance Act, to receive financial
contribution from Ontario towards the costs incurred by the
Municipality of the demonstration project;

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consider-
ation of the mutual covenants herein contained and subject to the
terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, the parties hereto agree
as follows:

1. The eligibility of any person for financial assistance
from the Municipality under the demonstration project shall commence
on or after the 1st day of October, 1975 and no eligibility for
financial assistance under the demonstration project shall continue
after September, 1976.

AND

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON,
a municipal corporation,
(hereinafter referred to as "the Municipality")

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS for the purpose of researching the development of a delivery system to supplement the income of the working poor, the Municipality pursuant to The General Welfare Assistance Act (R.S.O. 1970, chapter 192) is offering a program (hereinafter referred to as "the demonstration project") of financial assistance to low income earners residing within its jurisdiction;

AND WHEREAS Ontario is entering into this agreement with the Municipality so that the Municipality will be eligible pursuant to subclause ii of clause a of subsection 1 and subsection 2 of section 19 of Regulation 383 (R.R.O. 1970) as amended under the said, The General Welfare Assistance Act, to receive financial contribution from Ontario towards the costs incurred by the Municipality of the demonstration project;

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The eligibility of any person for financial assistance from the Municipality under the demonstration project shall commence on or after the 1st day of October, 1975 and no eligibility for financial assistance under the demonstration project shall continue after September, 1976.

2. Subject to clauses 3, 4 and 7, Ontario agrees to pay to the Municipality an amount equal to 50 per cent of the cost to

the Municipality of the demonstration project paid or incurred by the Municipality in accordance with this agreement where such cost has been approved by the Director of the Municipal Welfare Consulting Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services (hereinafter called "the Director") of Ontario and where such cost does not exceed the sum of \$200,000.

3. The classes of persons eligible for financial assistance under the demonstration project and the maximum amount of financial assistance payable to any such class or to any person in a class shall be determined by the Director.

4. In determining the eligibility of any person for financial assistance under the demonstration project and the amount of assistance payable to such person, the Municipality shall administer such test of his or her financial need, at such times and in such manner as may from time to time be prescribed by the Director.

5. The Municipality agrees to maintain and ensure the availability for examination and audit by the Director or by any person designated by the Director of such records and accounts respecting the provision of financial assistance under the demonstration project as the Director may from time to time require.

6. The Municipality shall, during and after the demonstration project, collect and make available to Ontario such statistical and other information relating to the project as the Director from time to time may require and that will enable Ontario to make an evaluation of the project.

7. Except where otherwise provided in this agreement, all policies and procedures relating to applications to the Municipality for financial assistance under the demonstration project and governing application by the Municipality for reimbursement from Ontario for amounts payable pursuant to clause 2 of this agreement, shall be determined by the Director.

the Municipality of the demonstration project paid or incurred by the Municipality in accordance with this agreement where such cost has been approved by the Director of the Municipal Welfare Consulting Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services (hereinafter called "the Director") of Ontario and where such cost does not exceed the sum of \$200,000.

3. The classes of persons eligible for financial assistance under the demonstration project and the maximum amount of financial assistance payable to any such class or to any person in a class shall be determined by the Director.

4. In determining the eligibility of any person for financial assistance under the demonstration project and the amount of assistance payable to such person, the Municipality shall administer such test of his or her financial need, at such times and in such manner as may from time to time be prescribed by the Director.

5. The Municipality agrees to maintain and ensure the availability for examination and audit by the Director or by any person designated by the Director of such records and accounts respecting the provision of financial assistance under the demonstration project as the Director may from time to time require.

6. The Municipality shall, during and after the demonstration project, collect and make available to Ontario such statistical and other information relating to the project as the Director from time to time may require and that will enable Ontario to make an evaluation of the project.

7. Except where otherwise provided in this agreement, all policies and procedures relating to applications to the Municipality for financial assistance under the demonstration project and governing application by the Municipality for reimbursement from Ontario for amounts payable pursuant to clause 2 of this agreement, shall be determined by the Director.

2072

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Regional Municipality of
Ottawa-Carleton has hereunto affixed its corporate seal attested
to by its proper signing officers and the Minister of Community
and Social Services has hereunto set his hand and seal.

SIGNED IN THE PRESENCE)

QF :

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

by

CHAIRMAN

DEPUTY
CLERK

Minister of Community
and
Social Services

APPENDIX D

SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

OF

OTTAWA-CARLETON

WHAT IS IT?

The Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton is a citizens organization through which individuals, groups, public and voluntary agencies are able to collaborate on local social needs. It concentrates its efforts as it has for the past 50 years, on identifying the needs and gaps in the provision of social services, promoting new programs and mobilizing the community in the process.

Like social planning councils across Ontario, it aims to be a place where people can raise new community issues and receive a coordinated response.

In Ottawa-Carleton the Council participates in neighborhood redevelopment plans and the social planning of new communities. It also provides animators for citizen participation in such planning.

In addition, it deals with provincial and national issues directly or through its membership in the Ontario Council for the Council and the Canadian Council on Social Development.

WHO FUNDS IT?

The Council is a non-profit organization, voluntary and independent, financed through a combination of United Way funds (60% of Council's budget),

Contracts for service (e.g. C.M.H.C., N.C.C., City of Ottawa's Department)

Government Grants (Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Provincial Youth Secretariat, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton)

Contributions from Service Clubs and others

The Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton is located at 85 Plymouth Street (K1S 3E2) in the Red Cross building at the corner of Bronson and south of the Queenway.

Call 238-3658

For further information contact the Executive Director or the Associate Executive Director. The same number for the COUNCIL ON AGING, the YOUTH COORDINATION COUNCIL and the CENTRAL VOLUNTEER BUREAU.

THE COUNCIL ON AGING

Documented the language needs of a large group of local agencies and recommended a coordinated action.

Uncovered gaps in residential services to particular groups in home support services.

Identified inadequacies in senior citizen housing and suggested design improvements which were incorporated into a model project in Ottawa.

Proposed the back-to-school supplements, Christmas supplements and dental services which are special assistance programs available to welfare recipients in Ottawa-Carleton though not necessarily available in other municipalities.

Made the initial request for a Social Service Course at Algonquin College.

Started the Youth Services Bureau and the Community Information Centre as Council services.

Helped design the social plan for the LeBreton Flats community.

Initiated and coordinated the planning and development of the Community Service Centres in Lower Town and Dabhouse ward.

Coordinated the efforts which resulted in a publicly funded transportation system for the disabled.

Publishes a "Bulletin" and "Volunteer Opportunities" with supplements for student volunteer opportunities and summer volunteer opportunities.

Advocated more direct involvement in housing by regional government and the local municipalities particularly for low income people.

Negotiated dental services for the children of working low income families.

Led the push for day care services for children in Ottawa-Carleton as it did the "Home Care" program.

Provided community development assistance in planning new and old communities in Lower Town, Ottawa West, Dabhouse ward, LeBreton Flats and the Eastern Community.

Proposed the Citizen's Committee for the Regional Department of Social Services, provides the Secretariat for it and advocates similar citizens committees for other municipal government functions.

Provides organizational staff and secretarial resources to citizen groups such as the Federation of Citizens Association, Ottawa Tenants' Council for Public Housing and the Ottawa Senior Citizens Council.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

It is administered by a rotating Board of Directors composed of 36 CITIZENS who are concerned about the social well-being of the community. They have the assistance of a permanent professional staff in various backgrounds such as social work, education, community development, psychology and nursing. Together they form committees and task forces to undertake studies and sponsor workshops to deal with particular social needs and problems. In addition, many others contribute numerous hours of voluntary time working with Council sponsored groups and projects.

This combination of staff and volunteer activity has forged strong links over the years between the Social Planning Council and the many organizations, groups and individuals serving the community. At the same time the Council has built up formal ties with some 87 member agencies.

It is this BROAD NETWORK of contacts which allows the Council to provide a comprehensive view of the social needs of the community, a capability which many other organizations depend upon. For example, its Council on Aging and its Youth Coordinating Council have both been given mandates by government to plan and coordinate in their respective fields. Also, the Regional Municipality and the City of Ottawa use the Council to review and advise on the annual applications for social service grants.

The Council works closely with the United Way and its member agencies by providing funding priorities, recommending on applications for membership, monitoring program standards and doing research studies on request.

The Council operates one direct service program through the CENTRAL VOLUNTEER BUREAU, a coordinating body for volunteers in the community.

A member agency of the
United Way Ottawa-Carleton

END

07 02 79

FIN