

CITY HALL

Written by Aldermen Crombie, Jaffary, Kilbourn, & Sewell. Published by A.M. Hakkert, Ltd., Toronto. 50¢

The moral duty to disclose

By Karl Jaffary

The dust raised by my statements about campaign contributions from developers is starting to clear. The public reaction has been a mixed bag, at least in the media. The *Star* editorial of September 30 makes both points. It says that my "charges undoubtedly reflect fairly widespread misgivings about the relations between Council members and developers." However, it also says that unless I have evidence of the contributions I refer to, I am guilty of irresponsible behaviour. Alderman Rotenberg and Charles Templeton have characterised my statement as "smear tactics" or "McCarthyism." I'd like to deal with that question. The point I want to make is perhaps a subtle one, but I believe it to be based on the ordinary everyday standards of morality that everyone understands.

Council members who won't disclose their sources of contributions have consistently made the point that there is nothing illegal, immoral or improper about anyone contributing to any campaign. My colleague, Archie Chisholm,

has been "charged" on countless occasions by Aldermen Rotenberg and Lamport with accepting contributions from unions. I think it's fair to say that Council agrees that anyone can make a contribution. The issue is not whether developers make contributions. Developers are vitally concerned about what Council does, and they have a democratic right to participate in elections.

If I publicly accuse a man of having committed a murder and I have no evidence, that is irresponsible and slanderous. The same is true if I accuse him of taking a bribe. But what if I say that someone has done something he has a perfect right to do, even if it is something I don't approve of: What if I say to Sam Cass in a public meeting, "Sir, I believe that the number of cars you are trying to get into downtown Toronto will kill us all with their fumes!"? Nobody would say that was improper, and if Cass made no defence, did not produce the facts on car pollution that, in his opinion, justified his policies, then he would be faulted for it.

My point at Council was not that I "charged" certain people with doing anything immoral. My point was that many people believe that many politicians accept contributions and that the failure to disclose those contributions is a moral issue. I can certainly prove that David Rotenberg has not disclosed the source of his campaign funds and *that* is the immorality, not the source of the contributions. In naming the list of those I thought had accepted developer money I accomplished two things. I illustrated my point and provoked public discussion (which I have been trying to do without specific illustrations for almost two years without success). I also found out that Fred Beavis says he does not take money from Meridian, and that is useful and encouraging information.

The moral duty to disclose is a high duty. When City Council passes upon a development proposal, it acts as a judge. The inhabitants of the city can have no confidence that they are getting what Council believes to be the best possible development unless they know that Council has no bias. An appearance of possible bias will destroy that confidence. There is that appearance unless and until there is full disclosure of gifts, favours

and business connections with those who apply for zoning changes. Those who refuse to disclose are not merely sheltering themselves behind obsolete statutes. They are positively undermining the democratic process. That is the essence of my charge.

What if it *were* illegal or immoral for aldermen to accept gifts from developers? Would it then be improper for me to make accusations without evidence? What if I charged that Alderman Mozart O'Toole had taken a bribe and I had no evidence? I think I ought to make the charge if I believe it, *provided* I was prepared to be sued for slander. A slander action is sometimes the only way to get at the truth. Truth is a defence to a slander action. If I said that O'Toole had taken a bribe and he sued me, I would be able to ask him, under oath, whether he had taken a bribe or not, and he would have to answer. A jury would decide the matter. It is a technique which I have seen *The Globe and Mail* use in the last ten years. I remember that paper accusing a politician of being a liar and daring him to sue for libel. If I believed that there was overt bribery on Council and that it could not be denied under oath by the participants, then I would say so and invite the law suit. That is not my belief. I believe that certain members of Council have done the perfectly legal thing of taking money from developers. I further believe that they are morally wrong in not disclosing those contributions. I intend to go on saying so.

in side City Hall

Politics and Planning /10
Etobicoke, by Dick Beddoes /10
South St. Lawrence Market /11
Planning vs. Development /12
B & D Committee /15
Brick Sidewalks Saved /16

Politics and Planners

The final Central Harbour Part II Plan (Metro Centre, Bayfront, and Island Airport) was to have been presented to the Planning Board on September 14, 1971. The pro-development club at City Hall has been eager to get this report passed because its delay has been "holding things up." Yet, at the September 14 meeting, Mayor Dennison unexpectedly appeared to block its presentation to the Board. Why?

The immediate process leading up to this Part II Plan was a study and first draft presented on March 2, which brought little response from the Board; two public meetings, with scant representation from the Board; further study and a second draft, presented on June 22 (barely a quorum); a review by numerous technical agencies (but no further public discussions); an August 17 progress report to the Planning Board. The report had been designated "Highest Priority" in June, yet its treatment by the Board over the summer was marked by a singular lack of interest.

The Mayor's excuse for his intervention was that (1) the Harbour Commissioners and Department of Municipal Affairs had not been consulted (this despite the fact that on pages 1, 2, 5 and 7 the Covering Report states that the Staff *did* meet with both these groups not to mention a letter included in the report from the Department of Municipal Affairs.) (2) he wanted the Chief Planner, Dennis Barker, to meet with the Executive Committee, himself, the Commissioners of Parks, Public Works, and Development, the City Solicitor, and the developer privately in his office. The Mayor appears to be applying political pressure to the planning process. Does he want to persuade the Chief Planner to change the Plan before its official presentation? Does he want time to prepare the offensive so that Board members could be primed to delete "awkward" aspects of the Part II? His objections certainly aren't based on an enthusiasm about what he had read, though he admitted that he hadn't read much of it. Is it a coincidence that Graham Emslie, Commissioner of Development, entered the meeting by the front door at the same moment that Dennison slipped in at the rear?

There certainly are policies in the Part II which the pro-property-anti-people contingent at the Hall would find distressing. (1) Council's new legislation for Metro Centre calls for an end to citizen Participation after the passage of the Part II; the Part II calls for continued public surveillance over the agreements made between Council and the developer (this provides an opportunity to review both the land deals that Council has been making with the developer and the Rail-

ways' ownership or control of land in the area.) (2) Council's new legislation for Metro Centre bypasses the Ontario Municipal Board; the Part II requires a review of rezoning applications by the O.M.B. (3) The Part II recommends redesign of the transportation terminal because the walking distances for passengers in the developer's proposal are unnecessarily great. (4) The Part II asks for rezoning of the site to limit the amount of office space that could be built. (5) The Part II puts forth a phased plan aimed at directing the housing mix of the proposal so that it will coincide with the residential needs of the city. (6) The Part II calls for public control of 25 per cent of the land in the residential area for

parks, to include a 15-acre playing field, as well as two three-acre parks in the commercial area. (7) The Part II calls for Council to seek control or acquisition of the lands in the Bayfront area now owned by the Harbour Commissioners for use as public parks.

The Chief Planner is in a difficult spot. The heat is on, but if he changes the report he will have to provide rationalizations (copies of the blocked report were circulated to various citizens' groups).

Perhaps the easiest way for the Club to act is for one of the politicians on the Board, like Beavis or Archer, to suggest the appropriate changes. Watch the play Thursday, Oct. 14, 7:30 p.m., Committee Room 4.

-Ed.

Etobicoke — a familiar scene

by Dick Beddoes

For the first time in its exotic history, perhaps, Etobicoke elected a few politicians in 1969 whose philosophy differs radically from that of the Old Guard.

There were not many of these "radicals" elected, to be sure. We do not win many votes. Mrs. Ruth Grier, able and articulate, won one of the two Ward 5 seats on the Lakeshore. Alexander Marchetti, a gentle man of abundant caring, was re-elected in Ward 2. I ran second to Marchetti in the same ward. Two new men, Douglas Hanson and Bruce Sinclair, were elected in Ward 3. Neither could be considered radical, but both possess instincts I admire. But their votes for certain schemes — to build a parking lot under Broadacres Park at Burnhamthorpe and the West Mall, for example — did not endear them to all voters in their constituency.

The philosophy of the Old Guard, if it has one, is cribbed from *Babbitt*, Sinclair Lewis's satirical novel about a middle-aged realtor, booster and joiner in Zenith, the Zip City. Babbitt, as Lewis portrayed him in 1922, was unimaginative, self-important, and hopelessly middle class. Sound like anybody you know, John Sewell?

The Old Guard seems to insist, in bumbling Allan Lamport fashion, that all growth is all good. The old boys do not grasp, or cannot, the truth implicit in a recent remark by Dr. Arther Cordell of the Ottawa Science Centre. "Growth for growth's sake," Dr. Cordell said, "is the ideology of the cancer cell."

Let me set down the philosophy I've been fumbling to find in the last 22 months. Many politicians seem to approach urban renewal, say, with an extremely superficial concept.

Our goal should not be to merely restore small, isolated areas at the rotting core of our cities; but, rather, to protect and improve housing in all sections of the municipality. Urban renewal must be

accomplished with as little disruption of the residents as possible, and with the people involved consulted at all stages. The Etobicoke Council "hears" deputations at length, but sometimes I wonder how much we really "listen" to them. When property must be taken for a renewal program, moving and the cost of replacement for similar property should be borne by the provincial Government. Ah, there, Bill Davis. Or Steve Lewis. Land taken for urban renewal should be held by provincial authorities and, to avoid speculation, leased to private commercial or industrial users on terms best suited to the public interest.

Slums like those on Seventh and Eighth Streets on the Lakeshore take their vengeance, as an old banjo-player named Carl Sandburg said. But municipal officials are often frustrated in their attempts to enforce housing codes. Help, help from the province. A provincial government genuinely concerned with the public good should have sufficient balls to help the municipalities control speculators and slumlords.

Ratepayers have discovered they are frequently living in suburban areas that are islands of plums surrounded by developers, or speculators. The technique of many speculators is to seduce local planners and politicians into rezoning a tract of land, then building a future high-rise ghetto upon it. The ghetto is achieved without thought of the sociological impact on people living in high-rise ant hills — numbered caves in enormous jails, W.H. Auden said.

You've got your St. James Town, Bill Kilbourn? In Etobicoke, previous administrations allowed the appalling clutter that is the Jogar development of high rise on the north side of Dixon Road between Islington and Kipling.

In a phrase, strictly Ticky Tacky Township.

(First of two parts, perhaps.)

Standing

in the way of progress



South St. Lawrence Market by Janet Howard

Ever since 1803 when the first Market Square was established by Governor Hunter, Toronto has had a thriving and vigorous market place in the Front-King-Jarvis area; and for a good number of those years politics and vegetables co-existed at the south end of the square. But now it looks as though Toronto's present politicians will be asked to approve the demolition of Old (South) Saint Lawrence Market, and along with it, the remaining portions of our first City Hall, which are part of the market.

Built in 1844 from a design of architect Henry Bower Lane (who also designed Little Trinity & Holy Trinity Church), the City Hall originally con-

tained shops, with a police station in the centre basement and a courtroom directly below the council chamber. Through the years it underwent constant renovations, including the addition of a verandah, on which in 1863 the coffin of a murderer named Greenwood was exposed to convince a doubting public that a suicide in the jail & Greenwood were one & the same person. The end came in 1899 when the new City Hall (now the Old City Hall of another fight) was opened, and the old building, stripped of plush and marble, reverted to its secondary function, that of a market. Three arches, some cross-hatching, eight bricked-in windows and two splendid green doors are left; and the empty council chamber looks out through elegant windows over the interior of a market as vigorous as ever.

The present precarious situation of the

market came about partly because of a five-year old report claiming that renovations would stave off the demise of the building for a brief time only, and would be very costly. So, since the City owns the building, the City Property Department has recommended that as part of an urban renewal plan for the area the market be phased out and eventually demolished. The recommendation is now before the City's committees.

But there are some users of the Old Market, buyers and businessmen, who like the market as it is, and want the old City Hall saved. Although Commissioner Rogers has not allowed them to see the original report on the state of the building, they like its atmosphere and think that some paint and repairs would keep it going for quite some time. They also point out that the operation of the new north market depends on the functioning of the south market, and that although the city has the right to demolish it, it has no legislative authority to build another. So they have formed the South St. Lawrence Market Committee (secretary is Bill Boncheff, 621-4652), and have asked that any discussion of the market's future be deferred until the first of the year. This will give them time to do some studies, and prepare a proposal.

The organization intends to call another public meeting on the fate of the market in a few weeks. If anyone is interested in retaining a useful part of Toronto's rapidly disappearing past, there is still time to act.

Letters

After one attempt at a new type face, CITY HALL is switching back to our old familiar one. The reasons are neatly summed up by a reader in a note scrawled across his renewal form.

Yech!

Your new type face is as illegible as this. Change back! I renew out of need, not pleasure. City Hall will now become the St. James Town of newsletters?

Michael Levin

(In a recent letter Cadillac Property Management asked its tenants to sign a petition in favour of high-rise.)

"Cadillac Letter Ludicrous"

Cadillac Property Management has not been satisfied with controlling our skyline, limiting the amount of land ownership in our so-called free enterprise country, it is now attempting to muzzle the remaining owners and tenants in low-rise areas. It is attempting to set citizen against citizen by inflammatory exhortations to its high-rise tenants to become its spokesmen. It wants to distort the truth, insult concerned citizens and exploit its own tenants.

In reply to Cadillac may I say to tenants: "Give up apartments and renting. Paying monthly rent is out of fashion. There is no return on your money. There are leases with their many ifs, ands, and buts. There are regular hikes in rent. Plus all the nuisances of being a tenant. . . . be an owner . . . be your own man . . . you pay . . . rent with nothing to show for it."

These words are not my own. They are taken from an ad for condominium town-

houses placed in the September 28 issue of the *Star* by another developer — Bramalea Consolidated Development Limited.

Official Plan to be Analyzed

Barker said at the Planning Board meeting on September 28 that he has set up a small task force to do a critical analysis of the Official Plan. Its approach and timetable remain a mystery, but would it help if people let Barker know how they would like to see the Official Plan changed?

Notice: City Council agreed on Wednesday to refer back Works' decision to widen Wellesley St. East (see CITY HALL last issue). Written submissions should be addressed to City Works Committee, City Hall, Toronto. Please write if you have anything to say. Organizations who wish to take a position may do so. Deadline about November 1st.

Planning versus Development

How the Development Department — and a five year rivalry — began

By Graham Fraser

(The following article is a modified version of a chapter of a book that Fraser is writing for A.M. Hakkert Ltd. on urban renewal in Trefann Court.)

The conflict between planning principles and pressure for development is not restricted to Toronto; however, Toronto is in the slightly unusual position of having this conflict built into the civic bureaucracy.

In theory, the lines of authority between the Planning Board and the Development Department are quite clear. The Development Department is supposed to attract development, and the Planning Board is supposed to make sure that developments are built according to sound planning principles. In urban renewal, the Planning Board is supposed to draw up plans, and the Development Department is supposed to implement them. This picture of harmony and teamwork is pure illusion. In fact, planners have been fighting a losing battle in Toronto for a very long time. The victories have been victories of attrition, and often temporary, or last-minute rescues by the Ontario Municipal Board; the losses have been steady and consistent.

However, there is nothing new in this.

Until 1930, there was no department dealing with planning in Toronto at all; when the Department of City Planning and Surveying was created, it was an outgrowth of the surveying work carried on by the Assessment Department. Despite the fact that four separate town planning programs were formulated between 1911 (when planning powers were given to municipalities by the province) and 1930, there was no Official Plan until 1948, and no system of zoning regulations until 1952. Incredibly, until the zoning regulations were introduced, the only controls on development were contained in over 700 bylaws, and some 2,000 amendments to them.

Matthew Lawson: a man with a stubborn determination to bring good planning principles to Toronto

On the death of Tracey Le May in 1954, Matthew Lawson became the Planning Commissioner for the City of Toronto, at a time when the planning department was in a shambles. Le May had been in charge not only of planning in Toronto but of the Toronto & York office as well. This latter was the regional planning body which became the Metro Planning Board, and LeMay had intended it should. The problem was that LeMay was an ambitious man, who could not tolerate the idea of giving any responsibility to a deputy who might get some credit or power. As a result, when Lawson took over, there were very few planners on staff. Lawson had to start from scratch.

Lawson was hired from the University of Toronto School of Architecture, and was the first head of department the city ever hired from outside the civil service. The tradition was that heads of departments should work up through the ranks; as a result,

the municipal civil service was run by a small group of tough old men who had, in many cases, joined the City Hall staff as clerks after graduating from high school, and had fought their way to the top. "You watched for your own, and you fought for your own," a City Hall veteran told me. To them, Lawson was some kind of freak, "the first real outsider."

He was a Scottish engineer from Glasgow, who, after practising engineering, had studied planning at the School of Planning and Research for Regional Development. He was also a man with a stubborn determination to bring good planning principles to Toronto, and the fact that Toronto is still a city of houses, with tree-lined neighbourhoods near the downtown, is, to a great extent, due to Lawson's refusal to yield to the pressure for development from City Council. As one Toronto planner told me, "Matt Lawson really put his stamp on this city. He kept it a low-density city like London."

Walter Manthorpe: Lawson's deputy, but later his chief rival — and a man with a different point of view

Ironically enough, his deputy — and, later, chief rival — shortly after he took over the job, Walter Manthorpe, also looked to London as an example, but in a very different way.

Manthorpe had been the planner in charge of rebuilding the bombed out areas of London, and says with some pride: "I was the guy who set up the standards which allowed high buildings to exist in London." And one of the first things that Manthorpe did when he came to the Planning Board was to rewrite the bylaw which, in effect, brought highrise buildings to Toronto. All of the apartment development that has been built in the last 15 years has been directly affected by the changes that Manthorpe introduced.

In an interview in his executive office at Meridian, which is on the 30th floor of the Meridian complex on Erskine Ave., Manthorpe explained what the change meant. Beckoning me to the floor-to-ceiling window, which looked south on a landscape of highrise towers, Manthorpe pointed down.

"When I arrived in Toronto, the legislation permitted those: you see those three and four storey apartments? They had almost complete coverage of the lot, and I think they would go to three-and-a-half times density." (A density of 3.5 means that a developer built 3.5 sq. feet of floorspace for every square foot of land.) "In London I had designed the site planning standards for the buildings to be built after the war. It involved a concept of angular planes: vertical and horizontal. The result is buildings being set back on the site, going higher. These things are now embodied in the zoning bylaw; I took my London experience, which was not in bylaw form, and rewrote the relevant bylaw. For the first time, it defined the requirements for landscaped open space, and prescribed set-backs for different heights of

buildings. Parking standards were increased to 125 per cent, and the maximum residential density was reduced from 3.5 to 2.5. And what happened?" Manthorpe continued. "For a period of maybe a couple of years, we had no residential development in the city at all. The developers were so frightened. . . it reduced the value of land, and they all went to the suburbs.

"Who were the first developers to come back and gradually start to go ahead with a different form? It was Meridian, substantially and Greenwin. That's one of the reasons why, perhaps, I find myself here now."

The process by which Walter Manthorpe went from being Matthew Lawson's deputy to being a vice-president of Meridian is an interesting one. According to planners who worked under Lawson in the 1950s, there were tensions between Lawson and Manthorpe through that period. According to one planner, Manthorpe waited until Lawson went on his holidays in 1960 before submitting his resignation and returning to England. As he left, ironically enough, he told the *Toronto Star* how much he admired the vigilance of ratepayer associations in keeping planners on their toes. "Their keenness, enthusiasm, vitality, and the amount of time they devoted to issues never ceased to amaze me," he said.

Two years later, Manthorpe was asked to return to Toronto to head — and create — the Development Department. The pressure to hire Manthorpe had come principally from the late Donald Summerville, the tough east-end politician and later Mayor who was then a controller and Budget Chief. Summerville was a fist-banging, no nonsense theatre owner who was becoming more and more exasperated with Lawson's insistence on sticking to his planning principles. He was, as a former Planning Board staffer said ruefully, "really a rough tough bastard, and really the power on Board of Control."

As a Controller, Summerville had indicated his resentment of Lawson several times; at one point, in 1960, he criticized Lawson for urging that the city take steps to prevent deterioration in the East End, saying that this was a "very very foolish approach to the problem," and that Lawson's comments had a destructive effect on property values. As Michael Best of the *Toronto Star* wrote, five years later, "To Summerville — a man of action, and the strong man of Board of Control at the time — Lawson and his staff were a chain around the city's redevelopment neck. He said they were too fussy, too slow in making studies and writing reports, too wrapped up in the goal of creating the perfectly planned city, insensitive to the need for new assessment — now. He thought they were dreamers; and he was a man of hard practicalities."

Donald Summerville: "Toronto needs a 'super salesman' . . . who will attract highrise monuments . . ."

Summerville began to push for the idea of a separate department to attract development to Toronto, as a way of getting around Lawson's refusal to bend planning principles to meet the pressure from City Council. In 1962, after becoming Budget Chief, Summerville put forward the proposal, and, in his presentation of the budget in April 1962, explained it this way: "Toronto needs a 'super salesman' who will study and suggest changes in our building bylaws in commercial areas. It needs a man who will attract highrise monuments of vitality to the city, and it needs a man who will play an important role, in conjunction with this council to get this city moving again . . . Development is, after all, a source of new taxation, and it is the guidepost to what this city can spend without hitting the pocketbooks of our small businessmen and homeowners."

City politicians, hungry for a building boom, greeted



All of the apartment development that has been built in the last 15 years has been directly affected by the changes that Manthorpe introduced

Manthorpe's appointment with enthusiasm. The late Controller Herbert Orliffe commented happily: "Lawson is purely interested in planning principles. Manthorpe doesn't want the city to grow — he wants it to explode. Put them together and you've got the best planning team in North America."

Not surprisingly, it didn't work that way. Very quickly, the gossip was that Summerville had given Manthorpe a mandate to get rid of Lawson, and take his job and reporters speculated in print that he would get it; the planning staff and development department staff became locked in a rivalry which lasted for five years. Both men insisted — and still insist — that there was nothing personal in their differences, but resentment and personal bitterness flourished like poison ivy between the two sets of personnel working under the two men.

One neutral City official recalled the situation that developed: "I remember once I was at a residents' meeting in the Beaches area, where the ratepayers were protesting a proposed highrise development. Someone from the Planning Staff got up, and said: 'From a planning point of view, I cannot recommend this development' — and they all cheered. Then someone from the Development Department got up and said 'From a development point of view, I think it's great — and I'm going to recommend it.' Well, their jaws dropped open. I mean, the residents couldn't believe that one of those guys was supposed to implement the other one's plan!"

One man, who worked under Lawson on the planning staff, remembers the relationship with the development department with some heat, and feels that Manthorpe was less than honest in his dealings with planners. He was trained as a planner, he came from England with an excellent reputation, and he used to write in the English magazines. "But we always felt, in dealing with him, that he was not to be believed, that he would say anything. He tried to be smooth and suave . . . I couldn't see why other people couldn't see through him.

"Two examples," the planner said.

"The Consumer's Gas property came up, and Fred Beavis said 'My God, I've solved the housing problem for low-income people in Toronto for ten years to come,' or something silly like

that, 'We've got 30 acres down here, and we'll put public housing on them.' So we had to report on it in 1965. And we reported that it was a low-lying site in an industrial area, and its northern boundary, Eastern Ave., was a truck route, and its southern boundary was the Gardiner Expressway, and the truck route, Lakeshore Boulevard. It had a railway freightyard by the southern boundary, a railway beside it on another boundary, a paint factory, a varnish plant, a bunch of tank farms south of it, and a plant that made pig feed that smelled to high heaven!" His voice rising in remembered indignation, he continued. "And we said we didn't think it was a good place for people to live. And Manthorpe's report said 'Yes, there are problems, but with careful design. . .'"

"Then there was another one on St. Helen's Ave., where Dundas and College come together, and cross over the main CN/CP line. Somebody had optioned a lumber yard and made a proposal to the Toronto Housing Authority which consisted of four towers, two of 21 and two of 27 storeys for public housing. We figured out the density was going to be 500 people to the acre. Now, Regent Park North and South are 150 to the acre, Alexandra Park is 135, and even Moss Park is only 180. This was going to be 500, or 525 — and the unit density was just incredible. So we had the same kind of report. There were 10 or 12 adjacent lines of railroad track, it was in an industrial area, next to the garage where Eaton's stores its delivery vans, adjacent to an area with a meatpacking plant, and across the tracks from one of those places that crushes cars. And Walter Manthorpe said 'Yes, there are disadvantages, but with careful design. . .!'"

"I mean, some issues are grey, but some are black and white! If the guy's going to say things like that about applications like that, where are his planning ethics?"

Manthorpe himself is equally scathing about planning and planners — particularly architect-planners. With a benevolent smile, he commented "I used to enjoy planning very very much in the early days, because I suddenly realized that here was a profession in which you could do anything you like, and call it planning. But I felt that somewhere along the line, in order to be an effective discipline and an effective operation in a city like Toronto, planners had to realize that there are certain things that have to be left to other people.

"I feel very strongly that there is a limit to the kind of control that planning ought to put on development", Manthorpe continued. Having looked at the whole situation here in Toronto over the past 17 years, the innovations and the new ideas in terms of architectural design and land use have not

come from planning officials, they've come from developers and their architects who come up with new ideas, and then what do you find? Before much longer the Planning Boards and Planning Staffs are adopting them as forms of control. Meridian was one of the first companies to install on a large scale recreational facilities and educational facilities in apartment complexes. What's happening? They're now saying you must put recreational facilities in your apartment building. Tagging along about five years later."

Despite all the predictions in 1962, Manthorpe did not, in fact, get rid of Lawson and get Lawson's job. According to a former Manthorpe subordinate, "he was a hired gun to get Lawson," but turned out to be "the ax-man that didn't — or couldn't — lower the ax." Lawson finally resigned in June 1967, after completing the Official Plan, and in November (ironically, only seven months after John Sewell had appeared at Board of Control representing the Trefann Court Residents' Association and had demanded that he, be fired) Manthorpe resigned. Funnily enough, the day Lawson resigned, he appeared before the Ontario Municipal Board to attack a development that Manthorpe had strongly supported.

The basic conflict in values continues to plague the planning process

When Board of Control hired Graham Emslie as Development Commissioner to succeed Manthorpe, and work with the new Chief Planner, Dennis Barker, the controllers were particularly pleased by the fact that Emslie had no training in the planning field, and no ambition to be a planner. This seemed to solve the problem of conflicting conceptions of what kind of planning should be done, and, for at least the first year, everyone at City Hall seemed impressed by the co-operation and harmony between the two men, and the two departments. However, there is no escaping the fact that one department has the job of attracting development, and the other has the job of trying to regulate and control it. Since City Council is, as always, much more interested in attracting development than in planning and controlling it, the tensions are still there, and the sense of euphoria about the new harmony is gone.

Although Manthorpe and Lawson have left City Hall, the basic conflict in values which runs through any municipal government, but which Toronto has institutionalized into two departments, continues to plague the planning process.

And, as usual, it looks as if the planners — and the city — are losing.

Under the words, "Battle In the Sky," the *Globe* (October 2) presented a long editorial evaluating the conflict about high-rise development in the city. Finding fault with the arguments of "the group who argue that all high-rise is to be deplored," as well as of those who would have us "believe that Toronto's core will be doomed if high-rise apartment construction is halted," the *Globe* finds the debate unenlightened, "strange, blind, loud, partisan statements."

If the arguments seem strange, perhaps the *Globe* does not understand the debate. It is not "high-rise versus low density," or even "high density versus low density." As Graham Fraser's article in today's CITY HALL points out, high density can be achieved without high-rise, and today's high-rise phenomenon has been generated

by specific City legislation which encourages it. Nor is the issue "construction or no construction," as the Mayor would like to cast it, to frighten those concerned about unemployment.

The issue is one of control; control and power. Shall City Council exercise its power to control private redevelopment activity to ensure that the desires of the citizens most affected are met? At the moment, Council accommodates the developer — his needs are clear and easy to meet. It is easy for Council to say that we need buildings, jobs, housing, as an excuse for the disruption of neighbourhood after neighbourhood. But there are hundreds of acres of land unused all over the city — room, as one architect has said, for all the new buildings for the next twenty years. Council allows, even encourages, developers to move into the most valuable residential neighbourhoods to chew up high-priced land at a great rate, justifying high-rent, high-profit buildings which serve only the developers' needs, not the city or its residents. That is what the argument is about. — Ed.

by John Sewell

Are Cars Losing Ground?

A company by the name of Sidco Developments Limited has plans to put up a 13-storey building on the west side of Bay Street, between Charles and Bloor. The lot they want to build on is small, and they were before B & D asking for some relief from the 66 parking spaces the zoning bylaw requires.

There is a principle that if a developer in a commercial area does not want to provide parking, he can make a payment in lieu to the Parking Authority, which then provides the necessary spaces. The payment works out to approximately \$2500 per space (it varies with the location, and the cost of land), and the Parking Authority usually builds a parking building with all the money it collects in this way. This was the arrangement used with 2 Bloor Street West, where the building was going up over the subway, making underground parking impossible.

In this particular case, the Committee decided to allow payment of \$145,000 to the Parking Authority in lieu of providing spaces on the site. But interesting things were said along the way. It was noted that this building is well served by public transit, both bus and subway. Kilbourn said that building more parking spaces would be building "catacombs for a dead city." Bruce agreed, saying that it was foolishness to ask people to bring their cars downtown to fill up parking lots, when they could so easily arrive by public transit.

But Pickett went the furthest. If the statement that the parking spaces will be mostly empty is true then surely we shouldn't ask a developer to provide these spaces. Why should people have to buy their way out of parking requirements which are not needed? We should encourage people to use public transit, he said, and for that reason we should ask for neither the parking spaces nor the payment in lieu.

Beavis and Lamport seemed to agree with Pickett except for the last point: they thought the payment in lieu could be used to help facilitate off-street lots in district shopping areas.

If one looks at this whole debate closely, it is possible to see a hint that some politicians are coming to grips with the argument advanced by the anti-Spadina people — that we should be discouraging cars in the downtown, and encouraging public transit. If people began pushing, I think it would not be too long before we had a bylaw which told people they didn't have to provide parking downtown, or more strongly, that they were not allowed to provide parking.

Rezoning Notification Dealt With

The question of notification to the public on rezonings was finally dealt with, after hanging around on the agenda for over a year. As reported earlier in CITY HALL, community groups in the vicinity of the site to be rezoned are now notified when the application is first made, and thus can appear at the Committee before the Planning Board does its study. Notice to people living on streets (as opposed to community groups) has up to this time been given after the rezoning bylaw has been passed, and then everyone within 400 feet of the site gets a formal notification.

The Committee decided by a close vote that those who own property or are tenants within 1000 feet of the site should be notified when the rezoning application is submitted. Those opposed to the 1000-foot rule felt that in some situations too many people would be notified about a small matter (like putting up a new front porch), and that the 1000 feet should be discretionary. Those in favour of a mandatory 1000-foot notification were Hope, Eggleton, Pickett and Sewell. Opposed were Beavis, Lamport and Rotenberg.

Two other procedural matters were approved: that concept drawings of the proposed building be made available by the applicant, and that consideration be given by the Planning Board to levying a filing fee for rezonings.

Lionstar Problem is Muddled

Eggleton is still very strongly pushing the Lionstar development at Bloor and Dufferin. This is a development that we have covered in some detail over the last year in CITY HALL. At the last Committee meeting, people from the area were again down to say that they were not in favour of a 2.5 density designation for their area, and submitted a letter from the four associations in the area to that effect. This has been causing Eggleton a few problems, since he has been basing his case for 2.5 on the strength of the support of two of these associations. Needless to say, he is attempting to blur the voices in the community which might for all we know, be muddled in any case, rather than get the community together. Specifically, residents were asking about the implementation of the committee's recommendation of August 30, that 2.5 be accepted as *the basis of public discussion*. Could that discussion, they asked, take the form of local block meetings? Their experience seems to be that they get snowed at large general meetings, and that because of language problems (there

are 17 language groups in the area), people no longer feel that large meetings are productive.

Eggleton answered that in fact public discussion has already taken place over the last six months in the form of four or five big meetings, and that the committee recommendation was little more than a formality. Picking up on a suggestion by Pickett, he said that maybe a questionnaire might be an effective way of dealing with the matter. However, he was not convinced that a majority of people were opposed to redevelopment, and that maybe the whole discussion should be put off until a specific development proposal was put forward. (In my language, that means confirm the area's density designation at 2.5, encourage the developer to come forward with a 2.5 density proposal, and then tinker with the proposal to make people happy.) In the end, the whole matter was shelved for two weeks, and we can expect Eggleton to come forward with letters from two of the four community groups to the effect that 1) they are representative of the community at large, and 2) they want a 2.5 density designation.

Anybody Want a Part II?

The proposed 18-storey apartment at the north west corner of Reynolds and Collier was discussed in the CITY HALL issue of April 20. That's the development which leaves five houses smack in the way of a future road alignment, with a huge building fifty feet from the back of the houses. It is also the development which needs an Official Plan amendment, although the Yorkville study (after two years still not approved by Council) says this area is good for high-rise.

It seems the City Solicitor and the Chief Planner have decided against an Official Plan amendment. Instead, they have agreed on a Part II statement. A draft of that was before the Committee on September 27, and it is very simple. It states that the site owned by the developer should be designated as a high-density location. I have heard of doing things for developers — an Official Plan amendment covering the area between McCaul and University, Queen and College was passed for the Windlass development, with an area large enough that it does not appear to have been done specifically for the Windlass people. But here, it is all out in the open: the Part II statement covers only the lands owned by the developer — even though the lot lines jig and jog all over. Be forewarned. Not only can you now get a rezoning to suit your development, we will also provide

you with your own special Part II statement.

It is only fair to report that the Part II statement was not given final approval September 27: on Pickett's request, the whole matter was deferred for two weeks.

Air Raids & Land Mines — W.K.

The rector of All Saints Church told B & D Committee members that what some parts of his parish needed most were the benefits of an air-raid. The houses on the east side of Sherbourne Street north of Dundas are among the oldest left standing in Toronto. Even the huge chestnut trees in front of them can't hide the fact that though they are very beautiful they are also very dirty and run down. I asked about a rehabilitation policy, but, to the obvious pleasure of Beavis, Lampport, et al., Mr. Ellis went on about the virtues of a few well-placed land mines. "The dungeons of Edinburgh Castle are interesting to visit but I wouldn't want to live there," he said. "I'm afraid to go into some of those places." There was a back alley murder there recently.

Under questioning he made it clear he spoke only for himself and had not discussed his stand with his church board or with the bishop.

He chided me gently for asking about the air-raid and the land mines (after he'd repeated the reference five times): "I spoke *cum grano*, of course, Mr. Alderman." "Aw, he wooden unnerstan' that, Reverand, he's just a pefessor," said Alderman Lampport.

Brick sidewalks saved

by William Kilbourn

Works, September 27 — Toronto's last small collection of brick sidewalks has been saved from destruction — if Council accepts a unanimous recommendation of the Works Committee last week and later agrees to the extra cost required when the 1972 capital budget comes forward.

The sidewalks of Chestnut Park and a couple of streets adjacent (parts of Roxborough Street East and Cluny Avenue and Cluny Drive) were due to get the cement treatment next year or as soon after as possible. Bricks are bumpier, more expensive, harder to shovel and walk on, and generally more awkward for city employees and senior citizens, we had been told.

But a deputation of residents, led by the doyenne of Canadian actresses Jane Mallett, and supported by the South Rosedale Ratepayers Association, appeared to plead with us to halt the march of progress and uniformity. Here is a bit

of Mr. Gordon Waldie's presentation:

"Chestnut Park Road and the one block of Cluny Drive form a special area of distinctive, historic and, we believe, unique character in the City of Toronto — not only are the streets laid out in curves and semi-circles, but the wiring is all underground, the lamp standards are cast iron with round globes and the sidewalks are brick. This unusual character is recognized by the TTC which runs sightseeing tours through these streets and also by the Planning Board which used a picture of Chestnut Park Road complete with brick sidewalks and iron lamp standards to illustrate the inside front cover of its 'Plan for Rosedale.'"

Members of the deputation offered to contribute to the extra cost of preferring bricks to concrete and to conduct a fund-raising drive in the area.

Chairman William Archer, however, made a short stout defence of the principle that what was good for the city as a whole should be paid for by the city — obviously the peculiar character of Chestnut Park was something we could all enjoy and benefit from. My motion to save the bricks then passed, even though it was clear to the committee that we were committing the taxpayer to an extra expenditure of some thousands of dollars over the next couple of years.

It would be nice if the City would take the same attitude to the old buildings depicted in the Sewell-Fulford booklet *A Sense of Time and Place*, Jane Mallett told the Committee. "I don't care whether you've read it once already," she told one questioner. "Read it again — I'm giving you my copy just to be sure. Read it, and then *please* DO something about it."

But we had to tell her that the demolition permits are still being issued automatically, on application. Bricks aren't so easily saved when they are part of a nice building that stands in the way of somebody's plans for progress. When the City and other governments decide to give bonuses for fixing up houses instead of razing them we will have a chance to save what's left of pre-war, pre-boom-town Toronto.

South St. James Town Report

Planning Board, September 28:

"There has to be a political commitment to this type of planning, or planning is at an end" — Commissioner Barker

The planning report on South of St. James Town has been mentioned in the media, but it is such incredibly good news for downtown neighbourhoods that everyone should try to get a copy from the Planning Board (telephone 367-7182). It was produced by the Central Area team — the same group who produced the new

Trefann Plan, the Eaton Centre report, the Metro Centre report, and the report on why not to widen Dundas Street. The report urges that people in the community be allowed in the planning process. Barker summed up the whole report in one short sentence: "There has to be a political commitment to this type of planning, or planning is at an end."

It was the politicians on the Planning Board who had the strongest objections to the report. They couldn't give the political commitment which Barker — on behalf of all of us who have been saying it for the last few years, but not nearly as clearly — asked for. Instead, they deferred the report indefinitely.

What happened?

In City Council, on September 17, 9 aldermen voted against approval of the Meridian development in West St. James Town: O'Donohue, Hope, Eggleton, Crombie, Chisholm, Scott, Jaffary, Kilbourn, and Sewell. The press, in reporting the Council debate of September 29 on the same issue, seemed to present a different line-up. In the words of the *Globe* (September 30), Eggleton and Crombie were among those "Voting to give final approval to the St. James Town West rezoning..."

Actually, Council gave second reading to the bylaw on September 30, and on that vote, Crombie and Eggleton voted against the development. Then, on a procedural motion, to give third reading, they joined the majority, wanting to dispose of the matter. But the motion to give third reading on the same day as second reading failed its necessary two-thirds majority, so third reading is put off until October 13. Crombie and Eggleton will be able to vote then again, presumably against, on the substantive issue of approval.

A.E.S.

CITY HALL is a bi-weekly, non-profit publication of A.M. Hakkert Ltd. in association with James Lewis & Samuel. Opinions expressed in each article are those of the writer of that article and do not necessarily reflect the views of the other writers or of the publisher. Comments, letters, or articles of information are welcomed and may be addressed to any of the writers or to the publisher.

Published by A.M. Hakkert Ltd., 554 Spadina Cres., Toronto 179, 966-5196. Distributor for courses, James Lewis & Samuel, 76 Charles Street West, Toronto 5. Written by Aldermen David Crombie, Karl Jaffary, William Kilbourn and John Sewell. Single copy 50 cents. Subscriptions \$10.00 per year; with bound volume at end of year, \$25.00. Group subscriptions mailed to one address, \$5.00 per subscription per year; group subscriptions for school year, \$2.50. Individual full-time student subscriptions, \$6.00 per year. Copyright © A.M. Hakkert Ltd. 7 October 1971, Volume II, Number 2.