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Citer ce compte rendu

The reformers who introduced these changes were not concerned with citizen participation. In fact, most contemporary analysts of the reform movement and its institutional legacies have concluded that siphoning off money and responsibilities to these boards and commissions, dominated by experts, also cut them off from citizen input. Often their meetings were closed to the public, their budgets and therefore priorities determined in a cryptic fashion intelligible only to the experts, and their policies unassailable even by the most determined political pressure.

How ironic to have come full circle and to witness the semi-independent Toronto Library Board defended as a more conducive setting for public participation than City Council. This development should give the student of local government reason to pause.

Without exploring all the implications of this paradox, the importance of decentralization provides a clue to one possible resolution. Most of the contributors comment, and comment favourably, on how decisionmaking in Toronto's libraries was decentralized through the exercise in citizen participation. Despite the anti-democratic features of the independent commissions (intentionally incorporated by turn-of-the-century reformers), large scale city government seems to throw up even more formidable obstacles to citizens seeking to influence policymaking. No matter how open an institution is to citizen input in a formal sense, its scale could be sufficient to deter activists in practical terms.

In the context of these two points, the Toronto library system's experience with citizen participation was a brave experiment on a number of fronts, with important implications for those interested in the history of citizen activism and of institutional reforms encouraging or discouraging that activism. This book serves as an extremely useful source of information and opinion about that experiment; the appendices contain a variety of the most relevant documents, which should be doubly helpful to the historian.

Edmund P. Fowler
Department of Political Science
Glendon College
York University

Notes
1. One is reminded of the now almost moribund Resident Advisory Groups set up for Winnipeggers (in legislation influenced heavily by Brownstone, incidentally). James Lorimer, another important contributor to this volume, was also for a brief time consultant to the Winnipeg citizen participation experiment. See Matthew J. Klieman and David C. Walker, “Winnipeg” in Warren Magnusson and Andrew Sancton, eds., City Politics in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983) and their many useful references.
3. For examples of this point of view, See Bruce Stokes, Helping Ourselves: Local Solutions to Global Problems (New York: W. W. Norton, 1981) and Donald Keating, The Power to Make it Happen (Toronto: Greentree Press, 1975).


Case histories of the urban planning and development process have become a rare commodity in the literature on urban affairs and planning. Those that offer a well developed analysis of Canadian planning examples are particularly scarce, which is why the Hulchanski effort is notable. The report offers a detailed analysis of the development of two major inner city neighbourhoods in Canada: False Creek in Vancouver; and St. Lawrence in Toronto. What is significant about these developments in particular is the fact that they represent a new built form response to inner city renewal efforts. Unlike the massive urban renewal efforts of the 1950s and 1960s which created subsidized housing projects of immense scale, False Creek and St. Lawrence are indicative of an experiment with a development concept that gained popularity in the late 1970s. Instead of addressing housing needs as an isolated land use planning problem, this approach ties housing to broader social policy goals and related planning matters. The outcome is a development approach which seeks to integrate new residential development into the surrounding community, and offers the rich mixtures of land uses, social groups, housing type and tenure, and services representative of the historical role of inner city neighbourhoods. It marks a departure from a single land use philosophy which has been responsible for the dramatic decline in affordable housing downtown and a pronounced loss of diversity in our urban environments.

Hulchanski has prepared a thorough analysis of each of the developments that traces the historical context of the public decision-making processes at play. The planning and development process from initial design requirements through public review to implementation, costs and financing are reviewed in some detail for each case and are linked to discussions of the historical and contemporary political constraints that framed the public debate and decision-making in Vancouver and Toronto. This approach, by linking political concerns with the technical, administrative and financial constraints experienced in each development process, makes these case reports more useful as studies of planning practice than the recent proliferation of analyses.
of the economics of real estate development forms. The social policy objectives, the expected impacts of built form design on users, and notably residential users, and the strategy of neighbourhood as opposed to project planning, are assessed concurrently with the financial and administrative concerns. The detail of the data presented by Hulchanski makes this integration extremely useful as a teaching tool for academics and as a measure for practitioners of the degree to which we have been successful in avoiding the design mistakes of the last round of inner city renewal projects.

These are two separate case studies. The author makes no attempt at a comparative analysis. However, in my opinion this is not a weakness of this report. Each neighbourhood had its own unique development and design strategy and confronted very different contextual constraints. Hulchanski’s treatment of each makes these studies valuable, independently, as contributions to Canadian urban literature. To the extent that the objectives of the False Creek and St. Lawrence developments are similar, a future comparative assessment may well be in order. However, given that neither site has been fully developed, and that post-construction evaluation studies have yet to be completed, we shall have to wait for such a formal analysis.

There is however, a rich detail of information available in this study on two of Canada’s large scale municipal redevelopment efforts. It is a report readily suitable to urban planners, designers and social scientists alike. It will also be a historically important document, when assessments are made of the efficacy of development strategies of the 1970s and 1980s as compared to those of the previous two decades. To learn from our errors and successes will require more case study efforts of the form reviewed here.

Ronald M. Keeble
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute


In the spring of 1893, a 25 year-old Francis Mawson Rattenbury, scarcely one year out of Yorkshire, beat out 66 rivals in the competition to design the new British Columbia Legislative Buildings. The plum commission opened numerous social and professional doors; as the ambitious apostle of the latest English styles, Rattenbury was soon moving easily in the clubs and homes of Victoria’s anglophilic society. Advantageous business and social connections generated a profitable flow of individual domestic and commercial commissions and multiple commissions for eastern enterprises profiting from western expansion. Rattenbury designed branch offices for the Bank of Montreal (1896–1899); resort hotels and terminals for the Canadian Pacific Railway’s Pacific Division (1900–1906); and unexecuted hotels and terminals for the ill-fated Grand Trunk Pacific (1912–1914). Taken together with government commissions which included courthouses in Victoria and Vancouver, Rattenbury’s designs “set the pattern, or patterns, given the number of styles he used, for institutional architecture in British Columbia before the First World War” (p. 3).

The present book attempts with uneven success to provide a comprehensive professional study of a man known more for a few famous buildings and an infamous private life. To the extent that they can be determined from public, corporate, and private archives (Rattenbury’s own plans, sketches, business records and correspondance were lost in a 1910 fire), all of the architect’s commissions are included. Many are illustrated, with plans, elevations, and photographs provided for the most prominent. Rattenbury’s unsuccessful attempts to profit from northern development with a Yukon steamboat line and land speculation along the Grand Trunk Pacific route are also reviewed.

The problems of the study lie in its strictly chronological organization, insufficient critical assessment, and weak handling of the social and professional context of Rattenbury’s career. The problems lie at least in part in the dominance of one source, a recently discovered cache of Rattenbury’s family letters, most addressed to his mother, through which the authors seek to convey “the striking and salient features of his personality, inasmuch as these affected his career” (p. 3). The study proceeds letter by letter, building by building with an indiscriminate and eventually numbing juxtaposition of major and minor details, and insufficient analysis and overview. The treatment of the buildings is descriptive, with parallels to contemporary design offered, but little sense conveyed of Rattenbury’s inspiration or the place of his work in the development of the profession. Given his belief in ‘appropriate’ styles — neo-Tudor Arts and Crafts for homes, Queen Anne for resort and Chateau for urban hotels, Classical and neo-Renaissance for major public buildings, etc. — a more systematic stylistic treatment would have allowed the authors to locate more clearly Rattenbury’s changing designs in relation to contemporary taste, and expand on their view that his “talents as an architect should not be inflated” (p. 3).

Purely conventional in his designs, Rattenbury’s success owed much to his social, business and political connections, yet these contexts are dealt with only incidentally in a book written with little reference to recent work on the historical sociology of turn of the century Canada. Although typical of the ‘networking’ professionals, entrepreneurs, and self-styled gentlemen who directed the province’s development, Rattenbury’s participation in these worlds is individualized.