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ABSTRACT

This thesis evaluates the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek development in West Vancouver, British Columbia. The site spans 215-acres and is part of a series of residential projects by British Pacific Properties (BPP). The planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan (ADP) began in 2005 was approved in 2008. The approval of the development within the lifecycle of Council (3 years) was a critical underlying factor in the process. The ADP accommodates 736 dwelling units in six neighbourhoods connected by a unique mountain pathway allowing for the preservation of 55% of green space on the site.

The analysis and evaluation of the planning and design process is based on a variety of qualitative and quantitative data including academic and practitioner sources as well as in-depth interviews with key stakeholders.

The Rodgers Creek planning and design process is path-breaking and inventive in its use of a high level of public participation. The process was multi-layered and included detailed background work, integrated technical sessions, a unique project-specific working group comprising unpaid industry advisors and innovative review, evaluation and implementation tools. The process was based on transparency, openness, trust, flexibility, inclusiveness and collaboration. By involving all stakeholders, it bridged the gap between the community, local government and the private sector. The participatory approach led to the development of a plan that produced a more sustainable model of development that was accepted by the community and easy to endorse for elected officials.

Urban development problems arising from conventional processes call for new planning and design processes. The results of the evaluation suggest that better processes may lead to better outcomes. The Rodgers Creek development points to the importance of engaging stakeholders and forming an integrated team. The concept of a tailored working group to respond to the characteristics of the development could be transported to other large-scale residential developments to produce better forms of development. The success of the Rodgers Creek planning and design process should provide greater confidence for future stakeholders to engage in a similar process.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Innovative residential development outcomes sometimes involve path-breaking and experimental multi-stakeholder planning and design processes. If you always do what you always did, then, other things being equal, you will always get what you have always got. There is great potential to break this cycle and investigate new and progressive processes. There is often a convergence of factors that lead to the introduction of innovative and experimental multi-stakeholder processes. This chapter provides a general introduction to multi-stakeholder processes and sets the context for the case study of a 215-acre residential development referred to as the Rodgers Creek Area development, located in West Vancouver, B.C.

The Rodgers Creek Area development is not a standard large-scale residential development and did not use a conventional planning and design process. The project is unique in terms of its history and the majority ownership of the land by British Pacific Properties. It is also unique in terms of the characteristics of the site. It is large, undeveloped, located close to downtown Vancouver and encompasses many physical constraints, including steep terrain and a multitude of creeks. The topographic and ecological constraints of the site meant it was essentially undevelopable under the application of the traditional planning process. It called for something very different from past approaches. The solution was to develop an innovative and experimental planning and design process that included an unprecedented level of public participation demonstrating that unconventional sites require different and types of processes.

British Columbia’s planning system has a degree of flexibility in its policies and processes that enable innovation. When new planning and design processes are introduced, as in developing Rodgers Creek, it is essential to reflect on and evaluate the successes and failures of the process. More importantly, it should identify improvements to refine the existing planning system. This research focuses on the ways in which multi-stakeholder planning and design processes inform decision making for large-scale residential developments.

1.2 Problem Statement

Planning and design processes respond to changes in society, the environment and the economy. Planning processes have moved from an era of ‘planning for the people’ toward more inclusive and participatory processes of ‘planning with the people’. Through modifying planning and design processes, efficiency and effectiveness can be improved to produce better outcomes.
The multitude of recently introduced planning approaches and design concepts such as new urbanism, smart growth, eco-development, green building and sustainability create challenges for planners. How these approaches and concepts are being implemented through planning and design processes needs to be assessed. The community is demanding better processes and better outcomes.

In the Upper Lands of West Vancouver a number of urban development concerns had emerged including lack of housing variety, oversized houses, site coverage too great, setbacks not big enough, disconnected neighbourhoods, removal of natural landscape and density too low. These urban development concerns resulted from development approvals under the conventional planning process and pointed to the need to seek a better process and more sustainable outcomes.

Development is becoming increasingly contentious particularly as cities grow beyond their confines. As a result, large-scale greenfield development is increasing to accommodate population growth. For large-scale residential development there is an increasing tendency towards large multi-stakeholder processes to handle difficult sites. More innovative processes are being sought to address contentious development. While development is becoming more contentious, societal environmental awareness is on the rise. Matters concerning sustainability have been pushed to the forefront of planning and underlie every planning decision. There is potential for multi-stakeholder planning processes to be constructed to produce more sustainable and innovative outcomes. But there are also substantial challenges in their implementation. Identifying lessons to be learned from evaluating the unique multi-stakeholder planning and design process engaged for the Rodgers Creek Area development could point towards important changes to multi-stakeholder planning and design processes for future large-scale residential developments.

1.3 The Purpose of This Research

This study examines the multi-stakeholder planning and design process used in the Rodgers Creek Area development from the perspectives of the landowners and their consultants, District staff, Council and community volunteers who were involved in the public participation process. Although it makes reference to the outcomes of the process, the primary focus is on the ways in which the multi-stakeholder process informed decision making. The evaluation can be broken down into three key interrelated components:
1. Identification of issues pertaining to current planning and design processes and outcomes through examination of new expectations and approaches in planning practice.

2. Evaluation of stakeholder perspectives and their satisfaction with the planning and design process and final outcome.

3. Comparison of stakeholders’ perceptions of the new, unconventional multi-stakeholder process used for the Rodgers Creek development and the existing standard process that would normally be applied to large-scale residential developments.

Putting new processes into practice is challenging. The planning and development industry is seeking more efficient processes and better outcomes. Multi-stakeholder processes are increasingly becoming more complex and the interests of all stakeholders need to be better met. This evaluation provides insights into how better planning processes can lead to better decisions and outcomes. The importance of these factors may play a significant role in future changes to planning systems locally, regionally and potentially across Canada.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

This master’s thesis aims to evaluate how multi-stakeholder planning and design processes inform decision making for large-scale residential developments. This is achieved through the following objectives:

1. To investigate the factors that create the planning and design context in progressive large-scale residential development

2. To analyze the increasing role of multi-stakeholder participation in planning and design processes.

3. To develop a framework for evaluating multi-stakeholder planning and design processes for large-scale residential development.

4. To undertake a case study analysis of a large-scale residential development (Rodgers Creek Area, West Vancouver B.C.) and to evaluate multi-stakeholder planning and design processes.

5. To identify implications for the planning and development industry when the municipality, the developer and the community come together to produce a very different outcome than in the past.

6. To make recommendations for the improvement of multi-stakeholder planning and design processes.
1.5 Research in the Field to Date

There is substantial research on the key influences on planning systems ranging from the need to solve urban development problems that have shaped planning practice to the desire to achieve preferred forms of development through new planning approaches and design concepts. There is also a significant amount of literature on how multi-stakeholder participation in planning processes has changed over time, as well as structured decision-making processes that often guide the process. Additionally, an abundance of literature on negotiation, mediation and facilitation techniques for public participation in the planning process exists. Other useful sources of information include the many studies that evaluate planning development outcomes.

While there is much attention on the outcomes of development and the public participation aspect of the process, there is a lack of studies on the overall planning and design process. It is too often taken for granted that the existing process is set in stone and the developer and the community need to work around it, but this is not the case. It is evident that the planning and design process can be changed. When an opportunity arises to try something new and to experiment with innovative approaches, it is valuable to study and learn from it. There is, however, a gap in the literature on frameworks for evaluating multiple planning and design processes for large-scale residential development projects. Planning and design processes for large-scale residential development often involve a variety of stakeholder participation techniques, but these are often considered in isolation rather than together. This gap in the literature provides a significant research opportunity and has encouraged this research project.

A more detailed analysis of the research in the field is provided in Part II.

1.6 Structure

The thesis is structured in six parts. Part I provides a general introduction to the topic and the context of the Rodgers Creek Area development. It includes a problem statement, aims and objectives of the research. This chapter provides an overview of the thesis and the purpose of the research.

Part II sets the context for the research including an overview of the urban development problems and challenges facing planners, and planning concepts and approaches reflecting community desires and expectations. It then examines multi-stakeholder participation in planning and identifies key challenges impacting the planning process. Finally, criteria are established for evaluating the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process.
Part III outlines the methodology used to undertake and analyze the field work within the conceptual framework of the research.

Part IV provides a description, interpretation and analysis of the results of the Rodgers Creek Area case study and its relationship to the literature.

Part V contains an evaluation of the core steps in the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process.

Part VI concludes the research with an overview of the contextual factors and comparison to the conventional process. It summarizes the key findings and recommendations outlining the implications for the development industry and planning.

A series of appendices also contribute to the research including the Working Group Guidelines and Key Principles and an Executive Summary.

1.7 The Context

Regional Context

Vancouver’s population has grown from just over 1 million in 1971 to 2.3 million in 2008 (BC Stats, 2009). Most growth has occurred outside of the core creating decentralization and associated issues, including destroyed habitats, depleting agricultural land, traffic congestion, rising housing prices and increasing land values (Tomalty, 2002). These issues have been at the foundation of regional planning in Vancouver over the past 25 years.

The Greater Vancouver Regional District, (GVRD, since renamed ‘Metro Vancouver’), created in 1967, was established under provincial legislation to deal with a complexity of issues spanning across the 21 municipalities, Figure 1-1. It has dealt with matters concerning water, sewer, waste systems, parks, housing, air quality, labour relations and strategic regional planning. It was also responsible for the creation of the Liveable Region Plan (1975), which responded to strong growth pressures in the region. After much consultation the Liveable Region Strategic Plan was adopted in 1996. The strategy was declared a Regional Growth Strategy by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in 1996 and given statutory power under the Growth Strategies Act (1995).
The Liveable Region Strategic Plan (1996) was built around four key policy directions: (1) protect the green zone; (2) build complete communities; (3) achieve a compact metro region; and (4) increase transportation choice. This regional strategic planning has shaped the growth and development of municipalities in the Lower Mainland. The District of West Vancouver on the North Shore mountain slope is located outside the growth concentration area defined in the Liveable Region Strategic Plan and only comprises 3% of the total Metro land use area.

The Liveable Region Strategic Plan has been the main influence on planning and development at a regional level and is reflected in the Regional Context Statement contained in West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan. Planning within local government areas has been largely undertaken by the District staff on a local and project-based scale.

**Local Context**

Nestled between the North Shore Mountains and the Pacific Ocean, West Vancouver spans 89 square kilometres (sq. kms) and is connected to downtown Vancouver via the Lions Gate Bridge and through North Vancouver by Highway 1 and the Second Narrows Bridge. The Upper Levels
Highway is an east/west connector that provides access to the Horseshoe Bay ferry terminal and the Sea to Sky Highway. Marine Drive also runs through the locality providing a scenic route along the waterfront linking West Vancouver neighbourhoods to North Vancouver and the Lions Gate Bridge, Figure 1-2.

**Figure 1-2. West Vancouver Locality Map**

West Vancouver is known for its beaches, mountains and recreational facilities. It comprises several unique village areas and residential developments in a distinctive natural setting. Development spans from the shoreline up the slopes and is limited to the 1200-ft contour line under current policies. As development progresses west across the slopes, it is faced with increasing challenges including the steep topography and intricate creek system.

West Vancouver is home to just over 40,000 residents. It has an affluent and ageing population, which predominantly reside in single detached dwellings. Table 1-1 below provides a summary of the key housing, land use and population statistics for West Vancouver and the GVRD.
Table 1-1. Summary of Key Statistics for West Vancouver and the GVRD (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Vancouver</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>2,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population over 55 years of age</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population over 65 years of age</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average population growth rate</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average density</td>
<td>484 persons/ sq.km</td>
<td>736 persons/sq.km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings</td>
<td>18,060</td>
<td>870,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied dwellings</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average occupancy rate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total housing stock - detached dwellings</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total housing stock – duplex/ row</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total housing stock - apartments</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total land protected watershed, recreation or protected natural areas</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total land open and undeveloped</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total land for residential</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total land for other uses including roads, utilities, institutional and commercial</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2007; Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department, 2008; Statistics Canada, 2006a; Statistics Canada, 2006b; Statistics Canada, 2006c; Statistics Canada, 2006d; Statistics Canada, 2006e; Statistics Canada, 2006f)

West Vancouver has a markedly ageing population with nearly one quarter of its population over 65 years of age and 39% over 55 years of age (Statistics Canada, 2006c), Figure 1-3. The ageing population will have a significant influence on the type and form of housing that will be sought in the future and played a significant role in the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area.
West Vancouver has experienced periods of boom, decline and steady growth. The area experienced rapid population growth from the 1920s to 1970s. Growth began to slow in the 1970s and 1980s and then started to decline (Statistics Canada, 2006a). By the mid-1980s, the population grew at a steady but slow rate. At the last census, the District of West Vancouver experienced a growth rate of 1.7% (Statistics Canada, 2006b). This slow growth rate reflects decreasing land supplies, average occupancy rates and demographic shifts associated with the ageing population, Table 1-2.

Table 1-2. Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W. Van</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W. Van</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>232,442</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>37,144</td>
<td>1,166,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>4,786</td>
<td>349,364</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>35,728</td>
<td>1,268,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>7,669</td>
<td>409,318</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>36,266</td>
<td>1,380,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>586,172</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>38,783</td>
<td>1,602,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>19,197</td>
<td>694,425</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>40,880</td>
<td>1,831,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>25,454</td>
<td>826,798</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41,421</td>
<td>1,986,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>31,834</td>
<td>933,091</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42,131</td>
<td>2,116,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>36,440</td>
<td>1,082,352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Statistics Canada, 2006a)

Population is expected to grow at a slow but steady rate over the next 10 years, Figure 1-4.
Although greenfield development in West Vancouver has been progressing at a steady rate and its occupancy rate of 2.5 is consistent with the regional average, the overall density of the District is much lower than that of the region (Statistics Canada, 2006e), Figure 1-5. The overall density of development in 2006 was 484 persons/ sq.km (Statistics Canada, 2006b). This compares to the Metro density of 736 persons/ sq.km, reflecting the low density form of development in the area.
This low density development is characterised by 71% single-detached dwellings (West Vancouver, 2009). The housing market has typically responded to the desires and expectations of the community, which is highly affluent and the second highest income area in Metro Vancouver. The average household income in West Vancouver (in current dollars) rose from approximately $87,000 in 1991 to $155,000 in 2006. This compares to an average household income for Metro Vancouver of $73,000 in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006d).

West Vancouver’s population were accommodated in 18,057 dwellings in 2006 of which 16,839 were occupied (Statistics Canada, 2006b). Of the residential development that was occupied, most was owner occupied, with 13,000 dwellings owned in 2006 and only 4,000 rented. This compares to an ownership rate in Vancouver of 531,725 owned and 285,045 rented (Statistics Canada, 2006f).

West Vancouver comprises mostly residential development with some commercial but no agriculture or industrial development. In 2006, commercial development only comprised 0.2% of the total municipal land use while 20% was open and undeveloped, 23% was protected watershed, 28% was recreation and protected natural areas, 18% was single family dwellings and only 1% was residential development of another type (Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department, 2008). The remaining land use area comprised roads, transport, utilities and
institutional uses, **Figure 1-6.** Much of the land in West Vancouver is protected for its environmental characteristics, strengthening its unique character as a regional recreation and environmental resource.

**Figure 1-6. Land use in West Vancouver**

![Image of land use in West Vancouver](source: West Vancouver, 2009)

West Vancouver preserves a significant proportion of undeveloped land in the region for future growth with 20% of its land open and undeveloped (Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department, 2008), **Figure 1-7.** While future development is restricted from expanding up the hillside by the 1200-ft contour line, there is still opportunity for greenfield development to the west of the Rodgers Creek Area development up to Horseshoe Bay. This includes the development of a future village immediately adjacent to the west of the site. In 2001, the Upper Lands Report identified 1,600 acres of undeveloped land below the 1200ft contour. Of this land, 700 acres were identified as environmentally sensitive, 380 acres had a 35-50% slope and the remaining 520 acres had a 0-35% slope and were considered suitable for further investigation for development (Planning and Lands Department, 2001). The Rodgers Creek Area development spans 215 acres leaving large greenfield tracts of land in the Upper Lands area. As a result, large-scale residential development will play a significant role in the continued development of the area.
The planning and design process engaged for the Rodgers Creek Area development and the final Area Development Plan produced are better understood through an appreciation of the unique context, historical patterns and future forecasts of housing, land use and population characteristics for West Vancouver. These are at the foundation of the project.

This chapter has provided an overview of the research and an introduction into the regional and local context surrounding the Rodgers Creek Area development. The following chapters in Part II set the context for the research.
2.0 THE NATURE OF PROGRESSIVE LARGE-SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the nature of progressive large-scale residential development. It focuses on how planning processes have evolved, the need to solve urban development problems and the way in which new expectations and desires shape the form of development. Current planning approaches and design concepts that are at the foundation of large-scale residential development are described. The basic structure of the current planning process is then outlined.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how planning for large-scale residential development has changed to give context to the urban development issues, new expectations and approaches that influence the planning process today. It establishes that there is a need to continually improve the planning and design process. This chapter also discusses the challenges in introducing new ideas, experiments and innovations into planning for large-scale residential developments.

2.2 Concepts of Large-Scale Residential Development

Planning is concerned with managing change. The environment, society and economy are continuously changing and successful planning involves both a plan and process that responds and seeks to guide this change.

The nature of large-scale residential development is largely influenced by approaches in planning and design concepts. Today such approaches include sustainable development, ecological sustainable development, integrated resource management, eco-design, smart growth, compact growth, transit-oriented development, new urbanism, sustainable urbanism, liveable communities and green development. These approaches respond to current societal concerns and desires for a new form of urban development. While there is an abundance of new approaches, they have commonalities with differences.

Development comes in many different forms ranging from alterations, additions and restorations to existing development as well as new development such as infill, brownfield and greenfield development. Greenfield development is new development on undeveloped land. The size of this can vary from one unit to hundreds. It is generally considered by practitioners that any residential development over 25 lots or a capital investment of $50 million or more falls within the category of large-scale development. Large-scale greenfield development is unique, particularly
in or near cities due to depleting land supplies. The Rodgers Creek Area development is thus a large-scale greenfield development.

Greenfield development presents many opportunities for planners and designers. Although every site has individual constraints, the prospect of creating something new from the outset is a rare opportunity. Extensive literature and numerous experts provide varied ideas on how to plan and design development. There are numerous planning approaches and design concepts that provide direction for new development but also add to the complexity and uncertainty surrounding large-scale residential development.

The planning of such large-scale residential developments is often referred to as area planning or neighbourhood planning. At a more detailed level, master plans, development frameworks and urban design frameworks are developed. Over the past two decades, there has been a substantial increase in large-scale planning. Major projects are often subject to a different planning process than that which applies to smaller projects due to the challenges associated with these larger projects, including the scale, resource requirements, externalities, complexity of issues, regional significance, community interest, number and mix of stakeholders often with competing interests, economic uncertainties and the large number of approvals, laws and permits that apply.

Planning for large-scale residential development involves much more than a simple rezoning or subdivision plan. This form of planning involves strategic thinking about physical change at a large scale and addresses land use, the form and character of development, movement patterns, infrastructure and utilities, socio-economic and cultural context, the natural environment and integration with surrounding neighbourhoods (CABE, 2004).

Planning for large-scale residential development is a lengthy process. Years or even decades can lapse between when the site is identified for potential development to when development occurs on the ground.

2.3 Planning and Change

The large-scale planning of neighbourhoods or areas has been a core focus of planners, urban designers, architects, landscape architects and sociologists for many years dating back to Ebenezer Howard’s garden city concept in 1898. Although planning and design has traditionally focused on the built environment, its focus on the environment and society has grown steadily over the years.
Up until the 1960s planning was predominantly problem based. During the mid-20th century planning shifted from substance to procedure (Carlman, 2005). The focus was on the means for achieving results based on the belief that better processes will produce better results or decisions.

Factors generating the need to improve the planning environment are important because they instigate change. Hodge (2003) suggests there are two principal reasons why a community engages in planning. These include:

1. The community wishes to solve some problems associated with its development; or

2. A community may wish to achieve some preferred form of development. These two community needs are interrelated.

Planning and design processes for large-scale residential development often respond to both of these factors.

2.3.1 Need to Solve Urban Development Problems

Much of the planning approach that viewed planning as a solution to urban problems remains embedded in planning systems today. Urban problems have evolved and include sprawling development, low-density development, overuse of natural resources, destruction of natural areas, social inequities, homelessness, air pollution, water quality and supply, waste management and peak oil. These issues vary between cities and regions but extend globally.

Broad-based urban development concerns affect current and future development. At a global scale such concerns relate to governance, trade, business, globalisation, climate change, energy, water, the environment, supply of resources, sustainable development and the economy (United Nations, 2009 and World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 2009). These issues are reflected in current initiatives and programs supported by the United Nations and World Business Council for Sustainable Development.

At a national scale urban issues facing Canada include creating economic capacity and growth, social and community services, affordable housing and homelessness, public safety, emergency preparedness, managing cultural and heritage resources, efficient use of resources, transportation and infrastructure, immigration, climate change and energy and environmental protection (Canadian Institute of Planners, 2009 and Federal Canadian Municipalities, 2009 and Boyd, 2004).

Planning at a local level presents different challenges, including public participation in planning, NIMBYism, the ageing population, cultural aspects, preserving natural areas, safety and security, urban sprawl, provision of utilities and services and placemaking (Hodge, 2003).

Development problems have changed over time and they continue to change because cities and towns are continuously changing. The problems that confront cities not only vary through time, but also vary at different scales. A common feature of all planning systems is the need to deal with problems associated with growth and development.

These urban problems often result from poor planning, lack of knowledge and unexpected changes in the community, the natural environment and the economy. The community is not willing to accept urban problems from past outcomes. Significantly, it is increasingly voicing demands for better quality living environments. As a result, “the real need for community planning arises because people in a community wish to improve their environments” (Hodge, 2003:3). New expectations are different from the past. The public decides what is relevant and then seeks that it be addressed in the planning process and subsequent outcomes. Numerous planning approaches and design concepts have been created in response to urban problems and are often implemented through amendments to legislation, building codes, guidelines and procedures. In the case of large-scale residential development, these approaches and concepts often have a significant impact on the type and form of development that proceeds as well as the process that is engaged.

### 2.3.2 Desire to Achieve a Preferred Form of Development

There is a broad range of planning approaches and design concepts such as sustainable development, ecological sustainable development, integrated resource management, smart growth, healthy communities, compact growth, transit-oriented development, new urbanism, sustainable urbanism, liveable communities and green development. These planning approaches and design concepts influence the planning system and even more significantly they influence large-scale residential developments. They often respond to the desire to achieve a preferred form of development.
Planning has long been based on the consideration of achieving ideal urban environments and the aspirations or desires of the community. Utopian ideals are reflected in past planning approaches such as the Chicago School’s City Beautiful movement (1893), Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City concept (1909), the Radiant City model (1920s) and Greenbelt initiatives (1928). This utopian and visionary aspect of planning still to this day is an element of planning and is reflected in the practice of planning for large-scale residential development.

The search for better planning processes and outcomes is reflected through the following quote from Albert Einstein:

“The world we have created today as a result of our thinking thus far has created problems that cannot be solved by thinking the way we thought when we created them.”

(Einstein in CNRTEE, 1996:3)

While it is not possible to provide a comprehensive review of planning approaches and design concepts in this thesis, Table 2-1 provides an overview illustrating what has influenced desired forms of development today.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning approach and design concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without comprising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Bruntland Report, 1987)</td>
<td>The three pillars of sustainability: 1. sustainable economy 2. stable society 3. healthy ecosystems (O’Riordan, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New urbanism</td>
<td>New urbanism promotes the creation and restoration of diverse, walkable, compact, vibrant, mixed use communities composed of the same components as conventional development, but assembled in a more integrated fashion, in the form of complete communities. These contain housing, work places, shops, entertainment, schools, parks and civic facilities essential to the daily lives of the residents, all within easy walking distance of each other. New urbanism promotes the increased use of trains and light rail, instead of more highways and roads (New Urbanism Organisation, 2009).</td>
<td>New urbanism is based on the following principles: 1. walkability 2. connectivity 3. mixed use and diversity 4. mixed housing 5. quality architecture and urban design 6. traditional neighbourhood structure 7. increased density 8. smart transportation 9. sustainability 10. quality of life (New Urbanism Organisation, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart growth</td>
<td>Smart growth is town centred, transit and pedestrian orientated, and has a greater mix of housing, commercial and retail uses. It also preserves open space and other environmental amenities (Smart Growth Organisation, 2009)</td>
<td>Smart growth is based on ten core principles: 1. create a range of housing opportunities and choices 2. create walkable neighbourhoods 3. encourage community and stakeholder collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning approach and design concept</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Key Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated resource management (IRM)</td>
<td>Integrated resource management is a planning and decision making process that coordinates use of multiple resources. It is multifaceted, interdisciplinary and involves integration across sectors. It brings together piecemeal approaches to management and recognizes the value of integrating resources (O’Riordan, 2008)</td>
<td>The four “R” hierarchy is behind the concept of IRM: 1. Reduce 2. Reuse 3. Recycle/reclaim 4. Recover (O’Riordan, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Compact development | Compact development is land use planning that creates a higher density core with good accessibility and reduces automobile dependency. The concept developed in response to urban sprawl | Key characteristics of compact development include:  
- Mixed use development  
- Concentration of development in a central area/core  
- High-density development |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning approach and design concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ecologically sustainable development (ESD) | Ecologically sustainable development is using, conserving and enhancing the community’s resources so that ecological processes, on which life depends, are maintained, and the total quality of life, now and in the future can be increased (NSESD, 1992) | Key concepts relating the ESD include:  
  - Intergenerational equity  
  - The precautionary principle  
  - Biodiversity conservation (NSESD, 1992) |
| Transit-orientated development (TOD) | Transit orientated development is the creation of compact, walkable communities centred around transit thereby reducing car dependency (Transit Orientated Development Organisation, 2009) | Components of TOD include:  
  - Walkable design with focus on pedestrian movement  
  - Train station well located and key feature of town or city  
  - A regional node containing mixed uses within a close proximity  
  - High density residential development located within 10 minute walking distance of station  
  - Collector support systems including buses, light rail, street cars etc.  
  - Inclusion of bicycle, rollerblades and scooters as a means of transportation  
  - Reduced parking within 10 minute walking distance of town centre/ station (Transit Orientated Development Organisation, 2009) |
The wide array of planning approaches and design concepts overlap considerably. They are not equal in their widespread use or application. Sustainable development is probably one of the most important concepts impacting planning and design in the 21st century. Since it was popularised in the 1980s there have been attempts to make the concept of sustainable development more precise and a more useful tool in legal contexts. Definitions and interpretations of sustainability vary. Today aspects of sustainability are commonly included in current planning laws, codes and guidelines. Smart growth and new urbanism concepts are also commonly applied in mainstream planning practice.

More recent efforts to implement sustainable development in practice are promoted through concepts such as smart growth, new urbanism and integrated resource management. These concepts are considered variants or refinements of sustainable development. They are often considered more pragmatic and easier to implement into practice than sustainability, which is harder to define. They are also criticised as only offering partial perspectives on sustainability. Further approaches that support these ideas include liveable communities, creative cities, sustainable new urbanism, green development, ecodesign/development and healthy communities.

While the planning approaches and design concepts are fundamental to the way planning is practiced today, Ian McHarg’s *Design With Nature* approach to planning, which was developed in 1967, is at the core of how planning is practiced today. The *Design With Nature* approach is based on preserving natural resources and letting the landscape inform the design. It recognizes that nature is not uniform but is intrinsically variable, and it is nature that should provide the pattern of development not the other way around (McHarg, 1992).

McHarg highlights that natural processes, which are often considered in isolation, interact with one another and have implications for development. The process of overlaying this information graphically in a ‘sieve analysis’ can then be used to determine the capacity for development (McHarg, 1992). McHarg’s design with nature approach appears to be resurfacing in planning today. This is seen through the emphasis on the need for development to respond to the site and surrounding context as well as the integration of the base data.

While McHarg’s approach and other planning approaches and design concepts are important, principles from a variety of planning approaches and design concepts are often drawn upon in the planning and design of developments. Determining what principles can be achieved for a particular development is dependent on the individual characteristics of the project.
Planning approaches and design concepts such as McHarg’s emphasize the ecological and give less attention to economic and social dimensions of sustainability. There are often competing social, environmental and economic goals and tradeoffs that need to be made.

The way in which the planning and design process is designed can have a significant influence on the final form of development. This is discussed in Part III of this thesis.

2.4 Barriers and Opportunities for Improving Development

Planning approaches and design concepts are concerned with managing growth effectively. However, there are barriers to applying these concepts to large-scale residential developments.

As previously highlighted, environmental concerns are widespread. Changes to environmental systems are resulting in increased effects on climate change and the availability of resources (O’Riordan, 2008). While there is a desire to reduce impacts on resources, significant population growth puts increased demand on resources. The fragmented management of resources between various agencies creates major challenges to integrating resource management in residential development (O’Riordan, 2008).

Statutory planning frameworks (provincial and local) are designed to improve certainty but if not flexible can restrict the form of development that occurs. Other restrictions relate to uncertainty surrounding the impacts of new processes and technologies as well as opposition to change (satisfaction with status quo). As a result, planning often resorts to reactive strategies in response to urban development problems rather than adopting a more proactive approach.

Geographic concerns can also limit the form of new development. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. Every site and every project is different and must be dealt with individually. Although the planning approaches and design concepts can provide guidance, the way in which they are applied differs from case to case.

Other key barriers impacting the form of development are business and commercial considerations. Residential development must be profitable and marketable. Affordability can create constraints on design and technology. As planning processes are involving more stakeholders, conflicts of interests can arise due to the complexity of issues surrounding contentious large-scale residential development. Engaging the private sector in committing to achieve a particular form of development can also be challenging. Here lie issues of implementation and enforcement which bring the question back to who is responsible and should
be held accountable for achieving sustainable development. The relationship between urban form and sustainability remains a core challenge for planning.

While there are many challenges and barriers to improving development, there are also opportunities to meet these challenges. Education on awareness and responsibility towards sustainable development is at the core of creating long-term change in the private and public sector. It is important to reach a common agreement and begin capacity building to respond to change.

Creating change at a higher level of authority and regulating sustainable development through policies, strategies and licences is essential for short- and long-term implementation. Using economic incentives and precedents will encourage the private sector to commit.

Planning for large-scale residential development is becoming increasingly complex. The process involves more stakeholders than ever before and more approvals and permits than ever before as well as stricter laws and policies.

In a paper prepared as part of the World Urban Forum by Seasons et. al. (2005) entitled ‘The Planning City: Vancouver Working Group Discussion Paper,’ it is suggested that sustainable development is a work-in-progress and there is much controversy over its interpretation and application. They suggest that planners ‘learn by doing’ and that a key component of learning is understanding the challenges of urban planning innovations and experimentations.

2.5 Common Steps in Planning and Design Processes

Planning processes for large-scale residential developments have traditionally progressed sequentially through a number of core steps beginning with identifying the project through to implementing a final plan. This phasing is not necessarily done in strict sequence but rather uses links and feedbacks to review decisions.

Systematic approaches to planning are in place to ensure environmental, social and economic consideration are integrated into projects from the outset. Integrating these considerations into each step of the process can allow for tradeoffs so opportunities for sustainable development can be maximised (DUAP, 1998). Systematic approaches provide a degree of certainty to developers and the community as well as accountability for local government.

Key steps common to the planning process pertaining to large-scale residential developments are outlined in Figure 2-1.
Figure 2-1. Key Steps in the Planning Process

- Site identification and strategic planning for future development (who: municipality + developer)
- Site analysis and assessment (who: developer)
- Explore development options and feasibility (who: developer)
- Prepare draft development plan (who: developer)
- Submit proposal
- Negotiate and make tradeoffs (who: developer + municipality)
- Amend plan (who: developer)
- Advertise and consult the community (who: municipality + community)
- Amend plan based on recommendations from community input (who: developer)
- Recommend determination (who: municipality)
- Public Hearing (who: municipality + community)
- Determination by Council (who: municipality)
- Refusal/ approval subject to conditions (who: municipality)
2.6 Conclusion

While this chapter has focused on development outcomes rather than the process, it establishes the context, issues and influences that have created today’s planning processes. Literature tends to focus on what we want from development, but does not describe the processes we need to apply to get there.

While planning approaches and concepts have a significant impact on large-scale residential development, the changing nature of participation in the planning process is also important. Planning is becoming increasingly participatory with a wider array of stakeholders ranging from specialist experts to the general community. These changes in participation are also having a significant impact on planning and design processes. The following chapter discusses the changing nature of participation in the planning and design process.
3.0 THE CHANGING NATURE OF STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING AND DESIGN PROCESSES

3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the changing nature of stakeholder participation in the planning and design process. Planning and design processes were traditionally undertaken by experts behind closed doors. Today, much has changed and planning and design processes are increasingly collaborative, participatory and open to a variety of stakeholders ranging from professionals to general members of the community. Firstly, this chapter examines the nature of stakeholder participation, how stakeholder participation has changed, the variety of techniques applied in participation and the importance of stakeholder participation in the planning process. Finally, it will outline key challenges that impact the planning and design process from the perspective of the public and private sector.

Stakeholder participation in the planning process refers to the participation of an individual, group of individuals, organizations or political entity’s who are affected by or have a specific interest in the outcome of a decision. Stakeholders can include relevant parties from the public and private sector as well as the general community. Public participation differs from stakeholder participation because it refers specifically to the participation and input of members of the public in making decisions or solving problems under government authority. Stakeholder participation in planning encompasses a much broader spectrum of which public participation is a part.

It is important to acknowledge that the term ‘public participation’ may often be referred to under different terms, sometimes these different terms have the same intent but to some very different meanings are attached (Dorcey, 2009). The term ‘public’ is also referred to as ‘civic’ and ‘community’. While the term ‘participation’ is often used synonymously with ‘involvement’, ‘engagement’ and ‘consultation’ but these may have different interpretations. For example, ‘consultation’ is a means of merely informing and advising rather than actively participating, which is what is implied by the term ‘participation’.

This chapter addresses both stakeholder participation and public participation in planning and design processes.
3.2 The Nature of Stakeholder Participation in Planning and Design Processes

Planners were originally thought of as technicians. That was how planning was taught and practiced. The municipal planner is no longer solely responsible for making decisions relating to development. Today expertise, technical advice and opinions are sought from a variety of disciplines sourced from both within and outside of government. For large-scale residential development the number of stakeholders involved in the planning and design process is greater than ever before. With the increasing number of people with a stake in projects, one of the biggest challenges for governments is deciding the role that public participation will play in the process.

Expectations for stakeholder participation in planning have changed. There is a growing movement towards more inclusive processes: “participation is a fundamental part of sustainable decision-making…most important, we see a decided shift away from technically driven decision-making processes, to processes that are more inclusive” (Seasons et al., 2005:50). Improved stakeholder participation is often considered to reflect better decision-making processes.

Stakeholder participation has led to greater contributions into the design of developments. It is no longer satisfactory for development to merely meet technical standards. A more integrated approach is required: “Traditionally, urban planners have met statutory requirements to advertise a planning issue and hold a public meeting to discuss it. While meeting legislative requirements, this approach clearly falls short of meaningful consultation. This traditional strategy seems to have been replaced with more comprehensive consultation programs in response to expectations of accountability and transparency in government decision-making” (Seasons et al., 2005:51). The desire for stakeholders to have greater, more meaningful input has led to the increasing role of public participation in the planning process.

The way in which stakeholder participation and public participation has changed is reflected in the introduction of new, innovative and experimental participation processes to manage development and resources. Dorcey (2009) suggests that over the last 40 years there have been two major waves of experimentation and innovation with the possibility of a third wave developing. The first wave occurred from the mid-1960s to the late 1980s and saw the emergence of environmental and social concerns in policy and public participation. During this era public participation developed from simple awareness raising to incorporating local perspectives in data collection and planning (Reed, 2008). Innovation was seen in assessments for project development and experiments were evident through communication and participatory techniques (Dorcey, 2009). Concerns emerged over time, however, relating to the cost and effectiveness of environmental...
policies and public participation. As a result, innovative approaches to public participation declined.

The second wave of change Dorcey suggests occurred in the mid-1980s when sustainable development grew in popularity sparking interest in environmental policy. Public participation increased with new experiments on negotiation, facilitation and mediation as well as multi-stakeholder processes, conflict resolution and consensus building. Public participation moved towards techniques that recognized that the use of participation in planning was becoming the norm to support sustainability agendas (Reed, 2008). By the mid-1990s economic issues again moved to the forefront of planning in Canada and environmental and sustainable policy matters along with public participation experiments and innovations were placed on hold (Dorcey, 2009). While public participation in innovative planning practices is falling, the overall base level of participation has been increasing.

Dorcey suggests a third wave may be developing now due to several trends. First, global concerns over sustainability continue to rise. Second, governance processes are in question over concerns related to the implementation and subsequent achievement of results from new experiments and innovations introduced in the first two waves. While there is uncertainty about the future direction for participation in planning and design processes, stakeholder participation is increasingly participatory and continues to change and respond to lessons learned from past experiments and innovations (Reed, 2008).

The selection of participation techniques and processes remains highly political and involves power balances between stakeholders. The way in which processes are designed will ultimately determine the power stakeholders have to act on their interests. Therefore, the structure of stakeholder participation is an important element in the planning and design process.

The International Association for Public Participation created a spectrum of public participation illustrating the role of public participation in planning today based on experience in recent decades, **Figure 3-1**. Public participation goals range from minimum involvement of merely informing the public to more participatory goals such as empowerment. These goals correspond to increasing levels of public impacts and each has different techniques which are used for implementation.
Figure 3-1. Participation Spectrum

More recently the collaborative model (International Association for Public Participation, 2007) also often referred to as ‘partnerships’ or ‘shared decision making’ models is increasingly being used in planning. The collaborative model requires that the stakeholders have equal access to information to make informed decisions. It also involves sharing power between stakeholders.

The way in which public participation models have evolved over time has seen the redistribution of decision making power and a shift of planning for the people to planning with the people.

(Source: International Association for Public Participation, 2007)
3.3 Techniques for Public Participation in Planning and Design Processes

Effective public participation is important to the planning and design process. Advanced communication tools are increasingly being used to provide alternate avenues for communication; these include Internet-based information and feedback sites. There are advantages and drawbacks of different types of techniques. Each serves a different purpose. They can be used to share information, compile and give feedback or bring people together.

Techniques to share information are an essential component of the planning and design process. Techniques for public participation such as printed public information material serve the purpose of informing the public. Such methods can be useful for reaching a large proportion of the community but they can limit the ability to communicate complex information (International Association for Public Participation, 2006. Note: the following paragraphs are based on this reference unless otherwise indicated). Websites can be useful techniques for reaching across distances with minimal costs. They can provide a good source of more detailed information but limit access to those with computer and Internet availability. Other information sharing techniques include briefings, expert panels, featured stories, information kiosks/exhibitions, list serves and email, news conferences, press releases, technical reports and television. While these techniques are useful for sharing information with the public, they do not allow for feedback or meaningful discussion.

Techniques for public participation can also be designed to compile and give feedback resulting in an increased level of participation. For example, community liaisons or facilitators are often used in large-scale residential developments to reach out to key organisations. This role can be undertaken by the municipal staff or specialist consultants representing the landowners. While this can enhance community involvement it is important to monitor progress. Other techniques for compiling and giving feedback include comment forms, computer-based polling, in-person surveys, Internet surveys/polls, interviews, mailed surveys/questionnaires, resident feedback registers and telephone surveys/polls. These techniques provide opportunities for feedback but again do not provide for meaningful discussion.

Techniques to bring people together to participate vary significantly in their purpose. They may be used to achieve all levels of goals on the public participation spectrum from informing to empowering participants. Open houses and public hearings can be used to inform and/or consult the community. Open houses usually involve information stations, which are normally set up to address different issues. These can be useful in informing the community, answering questions or facilitating one-on-one or small group discussions. It is important but sometimes difficult to
document the feedback. It is also equally important that the feedback be addressed. Public hearings are a legal requirement in the planning process in British Columbia used to obtain the positions of the community. It provides an opportunity for public input but does not allow for rebuttal or constructive dialogue.

Charrettes and advisory groups are used to involve and collaborate with the public. Ongoing advisory groups involve a representative group of stakeholders to provide input on certain matters. While this can be useful in obtaining input on a particular matter, these groups often do not have a comprehensive view on other matters pertaining to the project. There is also the risk that the community and/or Council may not embrace the recommendations or that the group may not reach consensus. Charrettes are a technique of stakeholder participation, which involves intensive sessions where the participants collaboratively design the project in a short period of time (Condon, 2008). They are often used to foster innovative and creative ideas and promote joint problem solving by bringing everyone together. **Table 3-1** outlines guiding principles or rules applicable to charrettes.

| **Table 3-1. Guiding Principles for Charrettes** |
| --- | --- |
| **Condon (2008)** | **Walters (2007)** |
| 1. design with everyone | 1. involving everyone from the start to foster a shared common vision |
| 2. start with a blank sheet | 2. manage the process effectively to build trust between the team and the public |
| 3. build from the policy base | 3. work across disciplines to maximize group learning and productivity |
| 4. provide just enough information | 4. work in short feedback loops to test ideas and stimulate public participation |
| 5. talk, doodle, draw | 5. work in detail to test the feasibility of all concepts |
| 6. charrettes are jazz not classical | |
| 7. lead without leading | |
| 8. move in, move out, move across | |
| 9. the drawing is contract | |

Other techniques to bring people together include citizen juries, kitchen table meetings, computer assisted meetings, dialogue techniques, fairs and events, focused conversations, focus groups, panels, public meetings, task forces, field trips, workshops and world cafes. Bringing people together provides an opportunity for meaningful input into the planning and design process.

The sharing of information, compilation of input, providing of feedback and bringing people together are key components of public participation in the planning and design process. Because planning for large-scale residential development is complex in terms of the type of issues it addresses, wide array of stakeholders involved, planning process engaged and context it
embedded in, it is essential that a variety of public participation techniques are employed each to serve its own purpose. The greater the variety of techniques, the greater the number of people involved and the types of involvement. Selecting a combination of public participation techniques for a project should be appropriate to the nature of that particular project.

The techniques used for stakeholder participation need to respond to the type of decision and the extent of impact of the decision. The greater the level of impact, the more community interest and desire to have participation at the higher end of the participation spectrum where stakeholders partake actively in the decision-making process and have a more equal distribution of power. The public benefits from making meaningful contributions to the decision-making process and the opportunity to share their expertise and knowledge.

The different techniques for public participation entail different cost and time requirements. Ideally, it would be most effective to select techniques that are time and cost efficient while achieving appropriate levels of public input. Resource availability within may facilitate or restrict public participation techniques. By and large in project-based developments the municipal staff costs are passed on to the developer. Because of this it is essential to gain the cooperation and commitment of the developer and agreement among stakeholders on roles and responsibilities at the beginning of the process.

Public participation is largely undertaken by volunteers in the community. These are usually people that are civically active, have a strong interest in the planning and development of the area or are directly or indirectly impacted by the development. While there may be no financial or material benefits from participating there are psychological benefits, including personal enjoyment, sense of contributing and giving back to the community, networking or meeting new people and learning and developing skills. In some situations the developer or the municipality will host a dinner, cocktail party or make a donation to a charity to acknowledge the public input. Although there are benefits there is also the risk of the process failing, interests being overlooked and input not flowing through to the final plan.

Current models for stakeholder participation illustrate that planning processes can range from very little stakeholder input to significant input in the outcome of the development whereby stakeholders are active members of the planning and design team. Seasons et al. (2005) in their paper titled ‘The Planning City’ suggest that “there is a continuum of participation models and styles, starting at one end with processes that are essentially information sessions with minimal opportunity for meaningful participation by the public, to full and meaningful participation by the public at the other end of the continuum. Sustainability encourages something closer to the latter
end of the continuum, on the assumption that a rich and robust dialogue with multiple stakeholders will enhance our understanding of complex urban issues, provide insights regarding solution possibilities, and generate buy-in to implementation decisions” (Seasons et al., 2005:50).

3.4 Key Parties in Planning and Design Processes

How stakeholders are involved in the process is almost as important as who is involved. Who prepares a plan is important to the outcome “whether it is prepared by the private or public sector will affect its relation to the planning context” (CABE, 2004:16). For large-scale residential developments the core groups of stakeholders are sourced from the government, private sector, and the community, “no one man, no board, no council, no developer, plans or builds, alone a whole community” (Milner, 1962 in Hodge, 2003:91). Potential stakeholders involved in the planning process are outlined in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Potential Stakeholders in Planning and Design Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Government Interests</strong></th>
<th><strong>Private Interests</strong></th>
<th><strong>Community Interests</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mayor</td>
<td>• Land and property owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal planning representative</td>
<td>• Funders/ investors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal engineer</td>
<td>• Project manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal environmental officer</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highway/ roads authority</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BC Hydro</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional rep</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant landscape architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fire service</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant ecologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police authority</td>
<td>• Developer/ consultant liaison officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emergency services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Condon, 2008)

The wide array of stakeholders also brings a wide array of backgrounds, interests and expertise into the process. It is useful to have a variety of interests but participation should be coordinated in such a way that it facilitates effective interaction and negotiation amongst the key parties.
3.5 Effective Public Participation in Planning and Design Processes

Public participation plays an important role in the planning and design process. Reasons for using public participation stem from the desire of members of the public to have a say in matters concerning their community. While large-scale residential development may be owned and funded by the private sector, the social, environmental and economic benefits are widespread. Through involving the public in the planning and design process, the outcome is likely to respond more appropriately to the needs and desires of the community.

Research points towards increasing and improving public participation in planning and design processes. But providing an opportunity to participate is not enough. Participants must be able to participate in a meaningful and effective way. There are significant benefits to effective public participation for stakeholders and the general community.

Benefits of public participation at the individual level relate to empowerment, equity, trust and learning. These benefits can be experienced by all stakeholders involved in the process. In terms of power, public participation has the potential to empower stakeholders through giving them power to influence the decision and capacity to engage in the decision making. It can also increase public trust and help build relationships (Reed, 2008 and Alex, 1995). Furthermore, the quality and equity of decisions can be enhanced through addressing a greater diversity of interests, needs and desires. Without the true engagement of participants in the decision-making process, solutions may not be sustainable as “the quality of decisions made through stakeholder participation is strongly dependent on the nature of the process leading to them” (Reed, 2008:2417). Learning can also be promoted through effective communication, education and knowledge sharing.

Benefits of effective public participation on the planning process include reducing stakeholder conflict. Better processes should avoid and resolve conflicts more effectively. Benefits also include an increased perception in the general community that the decision making was transparent, holistic and fair. Involving the public in planning decisions has practical benefits for municipalities, landowners and developers. The response of the general community to planning decisions is important. With community acceptance, a plan is “… more acceptable, more popular, easier to vote for by the politicians and easier to implement” (Bousfield, 1976:9).

The previous chapter highlighted the emergence of sustainability and sustainable development. These concepts are complex and require integrated decision making to address a diversity of interests that conventional decision making does not address (CNRTEE, 1996). Greater
consideration is given to the decisions we make today and their impact on future generations. Communities are demanding greater and more meaningful involvement. Changes in practice are seeing greater involvement of the community at all stages of the process as “it is not enough to consult people about decisions that will impact their lives they must be fully engaged from the start” (DETR, 2000 in Walters, 2007:163).

While there are significant benefits of public participation, the participation procedure or method needs to be designed and undertaken effectively to result in such benefits. The International Association for Public Participation has outlined core values for the practice of public participation, Table 3-3. These values highlight key characteristics of the public participation process that are essential to making better decisions which reflect the interests and concerns of the stakeholders involved.

Table 3-3. IAPP Core Values for Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(International Association for Public Participation, 2009)

These core values highlight the importance of stakeholder selection, meaningful use of input, addressing of needs and interests, self-designed processes and the adequacy of information. These values are useful but do not provide a comprehensive framework for measuring the effectiveness of public participation. Beierle and Cayford (2002) suggest five outcome-oriented social goals for public participation. These goals include (1) incorporating public values into decisions, (2) improving the substantive quality of decisions, (3) resolving conflict among competing interests, (4) building trust in institutions, and (5) educating and informing the public (Beierle and Cayford, 2002 in Dorcey, 2009:9). While these goals reflect responses to social problems associated with public participation, Knight, Chigudu and Tandon (2002) identified three governance goals for public participation. These include (1) fulfilling basic needs,
(2) strengthening associational aspects of society, and (3) enhancing participation of citizens (Knight, Chigudu and Tandon, 2002 in Dorcey, 2009).

The social goals of Beierle and Cayford (2002) and the governance goals of Knight, Chigudu and Tandon (2002) are important outcome-oriented goals. These however do not focus on the process. Procedural goals focus on who is involved, when, how and where. These procedural goals are important in shaping effective public participation.

### 3.6 Consensus Processes

The use of consensus-based processes in Canada is increasing. CNRTEE (1996) defines a consensus process as follows:

“... one in which all those who have a stake in the outcome aim to reach agreement on actions and outcomes that resolve or advance issues related to environment, social and economic sustainability. In a consensus process, participants work together to design a process that maximizes their ability to resolve their differences. Although they may not agree with all aspects of the agreement, consensus is reached if all participants are willing to live with the total package.” (CNRTEE, 1996:4)

Consensus-based processes bring together a diversity of knowledge and expertise to resolve complex problems through developing creative and innovative solutions. They often result in benefits which extend outside of the project including improved relationships between stakeholders and greater respect and understanding of different perspectives between stakeholders. Consensus processes may also lead to more balanced and informed decisions through greater commitment and responsibility to the process, results and implementation (CNRTEE, 1993).

The Guiding Principles of Consensus Process that were developed by the Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and Economy (CNRTEE) in 1993 outline common characteristics that are fundamental to the consensus process. These are outlined in Table 3-4.
Table 3-4. Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and Economy

1. Purpose driven: People need a reason to participate in the process
2. Inclusive not exclusive: All parties with a significant interest in the issue should be involved in the consensus process.
3. Voluntary participation: The parties affected or interested participate voluntarily.
4. Self design: The parties design the consensus process.
5. Flexibility: Flexibility should be designed into the process.
6. Equal opportunity: All parties must have equal access to relevant information and the opportunity to participate effectively throughout the process.
7. Respect for diverse interests: Acceptance of the diverse values, interests and knowledge of the parties in the consensus process is essential.
8. Accountability: The parties are accountable both to their constituencies, and to the process that they have agreed to establish.
9. Time limits: Realistic deadlines are necessary throughout the process.
10. Implementation: Commitment to implementation and effective monitoring is essential for any agreement.

(Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and Economy, 1993:8).

A more detailed description of the CNRTEE principles is provided below:

**Principle # 1 – Purpose Driven**
The stakeholders have an informed understanding of the consensus process and realistic view of available alternatives. If the group concludes consensus is the best option, then a greater commitment to the process and outcome will be developed.

**Principle # 2 – Inclusive not Exclusive**
Including significant parties affected by the decision or its implementation is important to avoid potential for the process to be undermined by those not included.

**Principles # 3 – Voluntary Participation**
Consensus processes are based on voluntary participation. Volunteers need to support the process and make necessary time commitments. Participation of all parties ensures all interests are incorporated.

**Principle # 4 – Self Design**
All participants should have an opportunity to contribute to the design of the process. Each process should fit the circumstances of the situation. Participants should control the mandate, agenda and issues discussed. It may be beneficial to have an impartial third party to make
suggestions. At the beginning participants should define issues clearly, address the suitability of
the consensus process as opposed to other alternatives, and clarify roles, rules and
responsibilities.

**Principle # 5 – Flexibility**
Dealing with the unanticipated is best addressed through designing flexibility into the process.
Feedback from participants should be continually incorporated into the process.

**Principle # 6 – Equal Opportunity**
The process should be open, fair and equitable. It should provide opportunity for all parties to
effectively participate. It should address differences in knowledge, experience and resources.
Training could be required to enhance equal opportunity.

**Principle # 7 – Respect for Diverse Interests**
The group will include a diversity of values, interests and knowledge. Through sharing and
learning participants’ understanding is enhanced resulting in improved trust and openness.
Recognising and addressing stakeholder values and interests is core to the process. Addressing
past conflict can be achieved through identifying common interests despite differences in value.

**Principle # 8 – Accountability**
Participants representing organisations or groups should speak for the interests they represent.
Mechanisms for providing feedback and reporting to constituencies need to be established to
enhance commitment and understanding amongst constituencies. Keeping the public informed
and updated is also important.

**Principles # 9 – Time Limits**
Establishing reasonable and clear time limits for completing the process and reporting results is
essential. Setting milestones helps the process stay focused. Flexibility is required to adapt to
any potential timing changes.

**Principle # 10 – Implementation**
The group needs to be satisfied that their agreements will be implemented. Stakeholders need to
discuss the goals and how results will be handled. Making a commitment to implementing the
outcome is essential. For decisions that involve government action, their part is important.
Support and commitment to any follow-up is also critical. Establishing a post-agreement
mechanism for monitoring and implementation to deal with problems that arise is important.
The CNRTEE (1993) principles also highlight that every situation is different and no single approach applies. Consensus approaches need to be tailored to the specific circumstances of the project.

### 3.7 Stakeholder Challenges Impacting Planning and Design Processes

The concept of multi-stakeholder participation acknowledges the variety of interests at play in the decision-making process. Planners are not only faced with the challenges of addressing urban development problems, but they also face impediments that directly and indirectly impact participation in the planning process. Challenges for stakeholder participation in the planning and design process could dictate the type of process and the degree to which stakeholders are engaged.

It is important to identify stakeholder interests and determine who the benefits of a decision fall to. If the people accepting the risks are not the same people reaping the benefits, they will be less willing to accept it. These underlying factors can have significant impacts on the way stakeholders engage with the process.

There are three key groups of stakeholders in decision making for large-scale residential developments. There are those in government charged with deciding on the development proposal, those with a vested interest in the proposal and those that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposal (Alex, 1995). The challenges that these stakeholders face can have an impact on the effectiveness of the planning system.

**Government Stakeholders**

The municipality is generally the primary decision-making authority for large-scale residential developments in British Columbia. Challenges facing the municipality include lack of resources to allocate to the development assessment process. Resources include budgets, time and staff. Such constraints may result in insufficient information, data and research as well as delays.

Another important issue is politics and power. Planning decisions are often politically based because the final decision making power often lies with Council rather than municipal planners. In many cases the Councillors have little or no training or experience in planning. Large-scale residential planning processes can span over long periods of time and changes in political agendas and elected representatives during the process can lead to positive or negative effects on the outcome.
Current local or provincial laws, policies and guidelines can sometimes be restrictive and outdated creating another challenge for planning and design. There is often fear of changing the status quo and experimenting with innovative processes or designs. While their may be positive results from changes in policy or staff, there is also significant risk. New laws or policies introduced during the planning and design phase of a project can create obstacles and possibly override work already undertaken. Similarly, changes to key municipal staff working on the project can lead to conflicting judgements and advice.

Due to the segmented structure of most municipalities, there is a tendency to address problems in isolation rather than provide a consistent and integrated approach. Bringing stakeholders together into multi-stakeholder processes creates the challenge of dealing with varying interests and conflicts and creating genuine opportunities for public participation to address community interest.

**Private Stakeholders**

Land and property owners, consultants, developers and financiers make up the private stakeholder segment. The key challenges facing the developer predominantly relate to the business and commercial aspect of development. The development must be profitable. The policies that the municipality create must allow it to make a profit. In terms of greenfield development, the developable area, density, FSR, height, setbacks and other planning controls need to be designed so that the development makes a profit. The community needs to understand the business and commercial aspects of development and planning. Too often the community fails to acknowledge this and resorts to NIMBYism. But not all new development is bad development. The profit of the development needs to be reasonable to attract investment and lower risk.

These commercial matters must be addressed in the planning process in order for it to be effective. Creating a fully participatory process "calls for considerable skill in designing processes that involve all affected interests effectively in the decision-making and do not inhibit investment" (Hodge, 2003:312).

Another key challenge for private stakeholders is uncertainty. There can often be uncertainty associated with the planning process, development assessment times, market conditions, community reactions and municipal support or opposition.
Consultants often aim to achieve development that is unique and leading edge. Using their expertise and experience they often want to put their mark on the development in terms of innovation and creativity, which will ultimately enhance their reputation.

**Community Stakeholders**

Traditionally the community has had minimal power and influence in the planning and design process. Today that has changed considerably, yet access to planning and design processes vary and communities still face numerous challenges. Although the community might be 'involved' in the process, they face the challenge of having genuine, meaningful input and capacity to influence the final decision. The value of their contributions is often overlooked.

There are also issues of trust between the community and other stakeholders which may be embedded in long-term conflicts. Inadequate technical expertise and experience to comprehend matters may also inhibit the ability to participate effectively.

### 3.8 Conclusion

Stakeholder participation in the planning and design process has varied widely over the last 30 years in terms of intent, techniques and design. It is becoming more important and having more influence on outcomes. The challenges to participation are also well established. These need to be balanced with the benefits so that stakeholder participation is effective.

Participation in planning and design processes is moving towards giving stakeholders choice so that things are not determined for them. Urban issues facing planning are sophisticated and therefore require a process that matches this sophistication. Merely informing stakeholders is no longer adequate, rather greater and more meaningful participation can potentially lead to positive benefits.
4.0 FRAMEWORK

4.1 Introduction

This thesis draws upon the literature to analyze and evaluate the Rodgers Creek case study and to answer the following three key questions:

1. What was the planning and design process?

2. What worked well in the planning and design process?

3. What are the implications for applying the process to future large-scale residential projects?

The research employs two frameworks for assessing the case study; (1) an analytical framework, and (2) an evaluative framework, Figure 4-1. The first part of the assessment will describe the process, illustrate how the process has evolved over time and analyze the techniques employed. The second part of the assessment will focus in greater detail on part of the process. The part selected for evaluation includes the core steps of the planning and design process where the majority of work occurred, Figure 4-2. A critical evaluation of the core components of the process will point to how well it worked and potential implications for applying the process to future large-scale residential projects.

Figure 4-1. The Framework
4.2 The Analytical Framework

The first framework is the analytical framework. The analytical framework is both descriptive and analytical in nature. It involves identification and description of the types of planning and design processes engaged for Rodgers Creek from the establishment of the Upper Lands Steering Committee in 1996 through to the adoption of the bylaws in 2008, Figure 4-2. It will establish a timeline for the process, describe the types of processes, address the purpose and objectives of the different techniques, and identify who was involved and how. Finally, it will discuss how the public participation techniques fit with and employ the methods and techniques of participation as identified in the literature. In particular, the analytical framework will draw upon the framework developed by the International Association for Public Participation (2007).

The analytical framework is illustrated in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1. The Analytical Framework

| 1. | What were the different techniques and processes used in the planning and design of the Rodgers Creek development? |
| 2. | Who was involved in these techniques and processes and in what ways? |
| 3. | How do the techniques engaged for public participation compare to the guidelines developed by the International Association for Public Participation? |
| 4. | Did the outcomes of the techniques and processes meet their purpose and objectives? |
| 5. | What challenges were encountered with the different techniques and processes? |

4.3 The Evaluative Framework

The second framework is the more focused evaluative framework. The evaluative framework will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the planning and design process focussing on the core steps of the process, including the technical sessions and sieve analysis, the Working Group and the public open houses (2006-2008), Figure 4-2. While reference will be made to the overall process, the focus of the evaluation has been limited to the steps in which the majority of planning and design work occurred.

This framework focuses on consensus building in multi-stakeholder processes and will draw upon principles for guiding the consensus process developed by the Canadian National Round Table on Environment and Economy (CCNRTEE) (1993), Table 4-2.
Table 4-2. The Evaluative Framework

- Purpose driven – those affected by the decision are involved in the decision-making process
- Inclusive not exclusive – those with a significant interest in the project are involved in the decision-making process
- Voluntary participation – stakeholders participate voluntarily
- Self design – stakeholders design the process
- Flexibility – the process is flexible
- Equal opportunity – stakeholders have equal access to effective participation and access to information
- Respect for diversity of needs, knowledge and interests
- Accountability – parties are accountable to constituencies and the process
- Time limits – realistic deadlines
- Implementation – consideration of implementation

(Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and Economy, 1993)

The purpose of the analytical and evaluative frameworks is twofold. First, it is important to analyze and evaluate how the planning and design process for Rodgers Creek evolved over time. Second, it is worthwhile to assess how the achievements of the earlier processes for involving stakeholders contributed to making possible the success observed in the innovative approaches taken in the last couple of years. This analysis will point to what worked well in the process, how the process could be improved and implications for applying the process to future large-scale residential projects.
Figure 4-2. Application of Framework to Rodgers Creek Process

Analytical Framework

- Upper Land Steering Study and Report (1996-2001)
- Envisioning Study and Notebook (inc. 9 pillars of sustainability) (2006-2008)
- Technical sessions/the sieve analysis (2006-2008)
- Public Open Houses (2007)
- Review and Evaluation (2008)
- Town Hall Meeting (2008)
- Implementation/Adoption of bylaws (2009)

Evaluative Framework

- Upper Land Steering Study and Report (1996-2001)
- Envisioning Study and Notebook (inc. 9 pillars of sustainability) (2006-2008)
- Technical sessions/the sieve analysis (2006-2008)
- Public Open Houses (2007)
- Review and Evaluation (2008)
- Town Hall Meeting (2008)
- Implementation/Adoption of bylaws (2009)

Note: The Analytical Framework provides a broad overview of the entire process from beginning to end while the evaluative framework focuses more critically on the core planning and design steps that occurred in the later part of the process.
5.0 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction
The primary focus and purpose of the research was outlined in Chapter 1; this Chapter details the methodology adopted for the research. In conducting the study, a number of research methods were employed including: in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and document analysis drawing upon both quantitative and qualitative data from primary and secondary sources.

5.2 Conceptual Framework
The research aims to evaluate how multi-stakeholder planning and design processes inform decision making for large-scale residential developments. The objectives (outlined in Chapter 1) include:

1. To investigate the nature of progressive large-scale residential development that creates the planning and design context.
2. To analyze the increasing role of multi-stakeholder participation in planning and design processes.
3. To develop a framework for evaluating multi-stakeholder planning and design processes for large-scale residential development.
4. To undertake a case study analysis of a large-scale residential development (Rodgers Creek Area, West Vancouver B.C.) and to evaluate multi-stakeholder planning and design processes.
5. To identify implications for the planning and development industry when the municipality, the developer and the community come together to produce a very different outcome than in the past.
6. To make recommendations for the improvement of multi-stakeholder planning and design processes.

5.3 Research Process
The research began with the selection of a case study. The Rodgers Creek Area was selected because the project was current and the planning and design process was unlike conventional processes. The outcomes envisioned for the project were also inventive and original. The case study inspired the research and directed it towards an evaluation of multi-stakeholder processes for large-scale residential developments. The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate how
multi-stakeholder planning and design processes inform decision making for large-scale residential developments. The evaluation provides insights into how better processes can lead to better decisions and outcomes. It then points to recommendations for multi-stakeholder planning and design processes.

Initial examination of the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design processes revealed that the processes comprised a complexity of different techniques and processes and that these were influenced by the unique characteristics of the project and its surrounding context. Rather than taking a component of the process it was important that the process be looked at in its entirety. Analysing the whole process provides a much richer understanding of what the process was, what worked well and what the implications are for applying it to future large-scale residential development. To further build on the analysis, the core steps were identified and evaluated in greater detail. While the research is broad, it draws attention to the substance of the process.

Once the case study had been selected, the research began with a literature review on the progressive nature of large-scale residential development and the changing nature of stakeholder participation. This created the foundation for the framework for the research. When the framework was established interview questions were developed, participants were selected and in-depth interviews undertaken. The interviews were transcribed, coded and analyzed. The qualitative research method was selected because it provided an opportunity to explore the stakeholders’ perspectives in greater detail.

The analysis and evaluation brought together a variety of quantitative and qualitative data ranging from academic sources, practitioner guides, municipal planning documents and reports, specialist reports, websites, newspaper articles and historical statistics. Academic and practitioner sources were used to develop an understanding of the research topic as well as contextualise the case study. The following sections provide greater detail on the setting, subject, procedure and analyzes.

5.4 Setting, Subject and Procedure

**Sampling Strategy**

There were some 50 individuals, groups and organisations involved in the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area development. Of these, 15 people were selected to participate in this research. The participants were distributed between the government and private sector and comprised four government representatives, two landowners, four consultants and five community citizens. All participants were directly involved in one or more phases of the planning and design process.
Units of Analysis
The 'maximum variation sampling' technique was used to allow common characteristics to emerge from the research despite variations in the characteristics and roles of the participants. The unit of analysis (Patton, 1990) is individual stakeholders. The sampling frame was limited to individuals involved in the planning and design of the Rodgers Creek Area.

Characteristics of suitable participants also include exposure to the planning design process (i.e., they were involved in one or more phases of the process) and involvement over one year with the project. Variables between participants included their roles, responsibilities, interests, experience, expertise, age, gender and background.

It was planned to interview as many stakeholders as possible to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the planning and design process.

Procedure
Initially stakeholders were identified through the literature review and snowball or chain sampling by informal discussions with stakeholders to create a respondent pool of potential participants (Patton, 1990). Once the respondent pool was created respondents were selected based on their willingness to participate. Those with the greatest involvement in the process were selected first.

Initial contact was made via mail including an introductory letter explaining the interview process and requesting voluntary consent from the participants. This was followed by scheduling an appointment and finally the interview.

Type of Data
Semi-structured in-depth interviews were undertaken with each of the participants. Standardized open-ended questions and follow-up probes were used to ascertain the participants’ opinions on key themes and concepts.

The duration of the interviews ranged between 45-180 minutes. Interviews were audiotaped with the consent of participants (to allow for detailed content analysis) and post-interview response forms were prepared to supplement the tapes (Minichello et al., 1995). The post-interview response forms were completed by the interviewer following the interview through interpreting and noting overall concepts and quotes. Post-interview reflections were also prepared for each interview noting key themes and responses. These forms have not been included as an
appendix due to the quantity of the data, but they are available for analysis should they be required.

5.5 Analyzes

The post interview response forms were coded through a standardized analysis identifying common themes and variables (Babbie, 2001). Variables were counted and clustered into categories. Key categories are reflected in the evaluation criteria, Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Categories for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in Process</th>
<th>Themes for Analysis</th>
<th>Themes for Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lands Steering Study and Report (UL)</td>
<td>Description (DES)</td>
<td>Purpose Driven (PD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning Study and Notebook (EN)</td>
<td>Success (SUC)</td>
<td>Inclusive (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Sessions/ the Sieve Analysis (TS)</td>
<td>Challenges (C)</td>
<td>Voluntary (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Working Group (WG)</td>
<td>Opportunity (O)</td>
<td>Self Design (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Houses (POH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation (REV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal Opportunity (EO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meeting (TH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation/Adoption of Bylaws (IM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Factors (CON)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time Limits (TL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation (IM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key variables were correlated to identify key patterns and relationships. Data were summarized and condensed for presentation and interpretation.

5.6 Assumptions and Limitations

A summary of assumptions and limitations include:

- There was no comparable base case scenario to compare the case study to. Rather the research relies on the professional opinions and previous experience of the stakeholders involved in the process. There were too many differing variables between the Rodgers Creek Area development and similar projects.
• The research was limited to the opinions of people directly involved in the planning and design process; other stakeholders directly or indirectly impacted by the development were not included in the research.

• The research primarily focuses on the planning and design process rather than the outcomes of the development. A more comprehensive study could include an evaluation of the outcomes of the development, whether it met the objectives it set out to and how it stands up against sustainability indicators.

5.7 Ethics

The interview process, analysis and presentation of results from the interviews were conducted in accordance with UBC ethics policy. Detailed information on the topic area of research and the interview procedure is outlined in the ethics application forms; approval from the ethics panel is attached at Appendix 1. As previously indicated, signed consent forms from participants were obtained prior to conducting the research.
6.0 PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the characteristics of the participants included in the study including their position in the planning process.

6.2 Characteristics of Participants

Overall there were some 50 stakeholders who were involved in the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area development. Of these stakeholders 15 were interviewed as part of this research, refer to Table 6-1.

Table 6-1. Selected Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Council</th>
<th>P. Goldsmith-Jones (Mayor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.E. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.R. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.J. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.R. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.S. Soprovich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Geri Boyle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinne Ambor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent Dozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Fung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Leavers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private sector Landowners</th>
<th>British Pacific Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Roeck Limited represented by the Roeck family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortium represented by Edward Wong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Aqua-Tex Scientific Consulting Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holland Barrs Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pottinger and Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burrow Huggins Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calum Srigley Design Consultant Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapman Land Surveying Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creekside Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golder Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>InterCAD Services Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall 15 stakeholders were interviewed as part of the research. There were four government representatives, two landowners, four consultants and five community representatives. Of the community representatives all participants were citizens of West Vancouver and each of them had some involvement with the public participation component of the planning process. Three of the citizens represented a community organisation.

Table 6-2. Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Interest</th>
<th>Term of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Interest</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Interest</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Interest</td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants selected range in their roles in the Rodgers Creek process and also vary in their background and experience. This is illustrated through the variety of sectors participants represent with an emphasis on planning and environment, Table 6-3.

Table 6-3. Summary of Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political science</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Community relations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mix of participants provided a rich variety of perspectives. These perspectives were shaped by their background, expertise and experience as well as their role in the Rodgers Creek Area planning process. Participants included the vice-chair of the Working Group, the Roeck family who own a 5-acre parcel of land making them the smallest landowner in the area. Participants included an elected official who was elected into office in 2005. Interviews were also undertaken with the General Manager of Development for BPP, as well as numerous consultants retained by the developer and municipal staff. The Streamkeepers were interviewed. The participants provided rich insights into the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process.

6.3 Conclusion

This overview of participant characteristics provides a basis for analysis of the results. The participants were carefully selected to include the key players in the process and incorporate an appropriate distribution of government and private sector stakeholders.
7.0 OVERVIEW

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview and introduction to the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area. It outlines the background work that led and informed the planning and design process. It also discusses technical components of the project and how that was integrated with public involvement.

7.2 Background of the Project

The Rodgers Creek Area development is part of a series of residential projects by British Pacific Properties. British Pacific Properties was founded by the Guinness family who in 1931 acquired 4,700 acres of land in West Vancouver from the municipality. Since this time they have been slowly developing their land for residential purposes (Planning and Lands Department, 2001). Their developments in West Vancouver include the British Properties, Chartwell, Westhill, Canterbury and Whitby Estates.

British Pacific Properties has a long history within the region, "during the Depression, a syndicate controlled by the Guinness beer family of Ireland paid less than $50 a hectare for 1,600 hectares of land on Hollyburn Ridge, then built the Lions Gate Bridge in 1938 to woo the wealthy to a new suburb high above the small summer cottages that then lined West Vancouver Shores. Today hundreds of multi-million-dollar mansions with commanding views fill the original British Properties and Whitby Estates, the company’s most recent development" (Bohn, 2008:1).

British Pacific Properties (BPP) is the primary owner of greenfield land in West Vancouver. Their monopoly of land ownership in the Upper Lands has provided a unique opportunity for strategic comprehensive planning for future development in West Vancouver, Figure 7-1.
Figure 7-1. Upper Lands Ownership

The Rodgers Creek Area is situated on the foothills of Cypress Mountain in West Vancouver overlooking the Vancouver city skyline, inner harbour and islands beyond. The Rodgers Creek Area is located some 6km from downtown Vancouver which is separated by Burrard Inlet and linked to the downtown core primarily by the Lions Gate Bridge. The site spans approximately 215 acres across undeveloped land just north of the Upper Levels Highway and Cypress Bowl Road (District of West Vancouver, 2008).

The site is bound by Whitby Estates to the east, a 1200-ft contour to the north and Pipe Creek to the west. Existing residential development, Cypress Bowl Road and Mulgrave Independent School adjoins the site immediately to the south, Figure 7-2.
Although the Rodgers Creek Area is undeveloped, it contains second growth forest with 30 watercourses of varying description and quality, steep terrain, sensitive environmental resources and habitat, history of logging activity and a history of use for recreational purposes including hiking, skiing and mountain biking, Figure 7-3 and Figure 7-4 (District of West Vancouver, 2008).

Figure 7-3. Slope Analysis

(Source: Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)
The Rodgers Creek Area has three landowners, the largest being BPP, which owns 195 acres of the 215 acre site. The other two landowners include the Roeck family and E.Wong who own 5 and 15 acres, respectively.

In 1958, prior to the planning and development of the Upper Lands, the municipality set out to limit development to a maximum elevation of 1,200ft. The limit was reconfirmed in their 1973 guidelines for Upper Lands development and again in 1980 and 1988 in the Official Community Plan (OCP). This limit was originally created to minimise costs of water servicing and snow clearing. It also created an edge to development just below the winter cloud line (Planning and Lands Department, 2001).

Investigations into the suitability of the site for development began in 2001 when the Upper Lands Study was being undertaken. At the municipal level, local government is responsible for developing Official Community Plans (OCPs) that respond to the higher level of regional plans. These OCPs provide more specific detail for planning and development at the local level.

The OCP for the site, approved in 2004, identified the area as a 'Future Neighbourhood Area' to be developed and required the preparation of Area Development Plans to establish land use and development objectives for the neighbourhoods. The more detailed design and planning process began in 2006 with the Envisioning workshop followed by technical sessions and the Working
Group. In 2008, the Area Development Plan (ADP) for 736 residential units including bylaws for the zoning and a Phased Development Agreement were approved for the Rodgers Creek Area. The Rodgers Creek ADP was the first plan of that nature to be prepared for West Vancouver.

“Area planning is softer [than masterplanning] and it has more of a public function. It is somewhere between subdivision of land and the OCP. It is not embedded in our planning legislation in this province, and I’m not sure I would want to see it embedded because it limits creativity.” (P1)

West Vancouver’s long-term vision for future development includes the continuation of development to the west of the Rodgers Creek Area, **Figure 7-5**. This will include the planning and development of Cypress Village in the next phase of development which is not expected to commence for approximately 10 years. The village concept played a significant role in the planning and design of the Rodgers Creek Area, “with a new village, the Upper Lands will have a social and economic focus with a number of community, recreational and institutional uses located together. Among these uses are envisioned: a community centre, a library branch, restaurants, shops and local services, an elementary school and active recreational facilities” (Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008:14).

![Figure 7-5. Future Development of Adjoining Undeveloped Land](https://example.com/figure7-5.png)

The Rodgers Creek Area development was advanced differently from traditional development because it adopted a science-based approach and has a community-based plan that was created by a unique planning and design process that engaged the landowners and their consultants, District staff, Council, community volunteers and the general public. It also has a strong focus on sustainable development and is expected to achieve development very different from previous residential development in the Upper Lands.
7.3 Overview of the Planning and Design Process

The Rodgers Creek Area is unique in terms of location and environmental characteristics. It is a large greenfield site situated close to downtown Vancouver. It has steep topography and an abundance of watercourses running through the site. Based on the statutory setback requirements and overlapping buffers the site was essentially undevelopable.

The failures of the conventional planning process and the subsequent urban and environment problems that faced West Vancouver required the establishment of a new process. The new process was more focused on sustainability and integrated. Table 7-1 highlights the key differences between the conventional and new process and its outcomes.

Table 7-1. Key Differences between the Conventional and New Planning Process and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Planning Process</th>
<th>New (Rodgers Creek Area) Planning Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed process.</td>
<td>Self designed, more flexible and more responsive to the specific project characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion of stakeholders.</td>
<td>More inclusive of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed-door process.</td>
<td>Open and transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentious approvals process.</td>
<td>Less contentious approvals process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation of stakeholders.</td>
<td>Better integration between stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc development.</td>
<td>More comprehensive development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of housing variety.</td>
<td>Greater variety in types of housing seen in the shift to multi-family housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>Increased connectivity through mountain pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development not sensitive to landscape.</td>
<td>Scientific approach to planning and adoption of Ian McHarg’s <em>Design With Nature</em> methodology based on <em>Landscape Inform Design</em>. This led to the pod-style development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of natural landscape.</td>
<td>Greater preservation and connectivity of natural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses too large, site coverage too high and density too low.</td>
<td>Greater variety in size of units, higher density, reduction in roads and bridges and larger amounts of natural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability issues.</td>
<td>Improvement of relative affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to address sustainability.</td>
<td>Movement towards greater sustainability, particularly on the environmental component. The social and economic components of the development remain weak but may be strengthened with the development of the future Cypress Village adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of urban development problems, issues with the existing process and the unique characteristics of the development a new planning and design process was developed, Figure 7-6.

Figure 7-6. Key Phases of the Planning Process

The planning and design process for the preparation of the Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan was multi-layered. The District recognized that conventional approaches to planning and development for the Upper Lands were not appropriate for this project and did not meet community expectations. A change of Council in 2005 and a new District Senior Planner in 2004 responded to concerns by embarking on an entirely new approach implementing a more collaborative and transparent model at the technical and community level.

The planning and design process can be broken down into a number of key steps including:

**Phase 1 - Background**
1. Upper Lands Study and Report
2. Envisioning Study and Notebook

**Phase 2 – Technical Analysis**
3. Technical Sessions/The Sieve Analysis

**Phase 3 – Working Group**
4. The Working Group
5. Public Open Houses
Phase 4 – Bylaw Development and Consideration

6. Review and Evaluation
7. Public Hearing/Implementation/Adoption of bylaws

An overview of the Rodgers Creek planning and design process is illustrated in Figure 7-7.
Figure 7-7. Overview of Planning and Design Process

Upper Land Steering Committee established (1996)
District endorsed Liveable Region Strategic Plan (1998)
District amended OCP (1998)
Upper Lands Report (2001)
District amended OCP (2004)
Envisioning Notebook (inc. 8 pillars of sustainability) (May, 2006)
Technical sessions began
Assessment of physical characteristics of the land
Data integration – the ‘sieve analysis’
Established Working Group (January 2007)
Explored development options
Drafted key organizing principles for the Area Plan
Public Open House – sieve analysis and drafted key organizing principles (June 2007)
Finalized draft key organizing principles
Prepared components of Draft Area Plan, with options as appropriate
Draft Area Plan reviewed
Public Open House – Draft Area Plan and options (December 2007)
Revised Draft Area Plan based on community input
Sustainability Review and Evaluation (February, 2008)
Finalized proposed Area Plan and presented to Council (April 2008)
Selected option, drafted 3 bylaws and presented to Council (July 2008)
Public Hearing - proposed Area Plan (July 2008)
Adoption of 3 bylaws - OCP Amendment/ Zoning Amendment/ Phased Development Agreement (September 2008)
7.4 Conclusion

The planning and design process involved a number of processes and public participation techniques. The process and techniques occurred at different stages, involved different stakeholders in different ways and had different intentions. For the purpose of this analysis and evaluation the process has been broken down into four phases: (1) Background, (2) Technical Analysis, (3) Working Group, and (4) Bylaw Development and Consideration. The following chapters describe and evaluate the key phases in the process with reference to the public participation framework developed by the International Association for Public Participation (2007) and the guiding principles of the consensus process developed by CNRTEE (1993). The analysis and evaluation highlight what worked well, challenges that were encountered, opportunities for improvement and potential for applying the process to future large-scale residential development.
8.0 PHASE 1: BACKGROUND

8.1 Introduction

The Upper Lands Study and Report was the first step in the planning for the development of the Rodgers Creek Area. This step was important in establishing strategic direction for the area. The study established the need for development and then the question became: ‘how should the site be developed?’ From that point on planning focused on the way in which development should occur. The Envisioning Study and Notebook (2005-2006) occurred almost four years after the Upper Lands Study. During this time BPP was involved in the development of land east of the site and put aside plans for the Rodgers Creek Area. At this time a stalemate occurred from a breakdown of trust between the developer and community as a result of problems arising from urban development. In order to address the stalemate a new design team was introduced in 2004 with the intention of instigating better forms of development. The Envisioning Study and Notebook was the first significant site-specific step in progressing the planning and design process for the area. The Envisioning Study and Notebook was an initiative by the developer that involved multi-stakeholder participation and played an important role in sparking interest and discussion on the future development of the area. It also played a key role in the final design of the project.

Figure 8-1. Phase 1 Process Diagram
8.2 Description

8.2.1 The Upper Lands Study and Report

In 1988 the OCP noted the need to review policies pertaining to the undeveloped land above the Upper Levels Highway (known as the ‘Upper Lands’). In 1993 the OCP was updated to introduce emerging environmental principles for the area.

In 1995 an initial proposal for the development of the Rodgers Creek Area was presented to the municipality. Council deferred the application pending a review of all policies pertaining to the planning and development of the Upper Lands.

In 1996 at the same time as the release of the Liveable Region Strategic Plan, the ‘Upper Lands Steering Committee’ consisting of municipal staff, landowners and local citizens was created to help in the development of the Upper Lands study, which included 6,265 acres of undeveloped land, Figure 8-2.

Figure 8-2. Upper Lands Study Area

(Source: Planning and Lands Department, 2001)

The Upper Lands Report (2001) was based on municipal growth estimates of 4,000 new households over the next 25 years for the municipality. The purpose of the Upper Lands Report was to “lay the groundwork for a community-driven, long-term vision for the Upper Lands” (Planning and Lands Department, 2001). It created direction for future development and planning decisions affecting the Upper Lands. It established a long-term vision and objectives for the area. It was intended to protect the environmental qualities of the land and ensure appropriate land uses. The Upper Lands Report was adopted by Council in 2001.
The community building principles developed by the Steering Committee and outlined in the report include:

1. Create a strong community
2. Establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities
3. Encourage a diverse community
4. Focus on environmental and economic sustainability

(Planning and Lands Department, 2001)

Following the Upper Lands study, the OCP was updated in 2004. Municipal regulations (subdivision, creek, tree and zoning bylaws) were subsequently amended and changes to the Districts procedural policy and practices were made, Figure 8-3.

**Figure 8-3. Implementation of Upper Lands Study**

![Diagram of the report review process](Source: Planning and Lands Department, 2001)

Changes to the OCP set the framework for the preparation of Area Development Plans (ADPs) in the Upper Lands by the landowners and Council, Figure 8-4.

**Figure 8-4. Area Development Plan Guidelines**

ADPs are documents that guide the future development and growth of an area. The scope and content for an ADP set out in the OCP is as follows:

1. Describe how and the degree to which the plan achieves the four key building principles of the OCP.
2. Provide a comprehensive inventory and analysis of the area's terrain, creeks and other natural features.
3. Include an analysis of how natural characteristics and environmental considerations are used to identify lands that are suitable for development and those that warrant special protection.
4. Provide a proposed land use plan, including types of housing, overall square footage, coverage, local parks, open space and community facilities.

5. Locate and develop preliminary design for major roads and trails and other public facility requirements and describe how the proposal integrated with existing systems.

6. Describe implementation requirements including general servicing, sources of funding, legal agreements and guidelines for future development of specific sites.

7. Assess the development’s financial implications to the District.

(Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)

8.2.2 The Envisioning Notebook

The Envisioning Notebook is a conceptual vision for the development of the site that was coordinated and prepared by BPP to provide a platform for discussion on the future development of the site. The intent of the Notebook was “to serve as a primer for an ongoing collaborative process with the residents and council of West Vancouver” (BPP, 2006:3). The Notebook was based upon the direction established in the Upper Lands Report.

A team of 15 technical experts was assembled in November and December 2005, Figure 8-5. The team participated in a two-day workshops to envision new possibilities for the future development of the Rodgers Creek Area and future Cypress Village. The Envisioning Notebook was presented by BPP to Council in May 2006 initiating discussion on the development of the site.

Figure 8-5. Stakeholders Involved in the Envisioning Workshop

Maurice Pez, Architect
Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect
Marta Farevaag, Urban Planner
Rich Skapski, Civil Engineer
Mark Holland, Planner/Landscape Architect
Andrew Pottinger, Public Relations
Jim Malick, Environmental Consultant
Doug Ramsay, Architect/ Civil Engineer
Michael Huggins, Architect
Richard Henry, Architect
Calum Srigley, Architectural Visualizer/Illustrator
Patrick Lucey, Environmental Consultant
Barry Downs, Architect
Harold Kalke, Real Estate Development
David Beers, Editor/ Writer
The first workshop involved identifying sustainability practices that would best apply to the hillside development. The second workshop explored innovative ideas for neighbourhood design, sense of place, character, infrastructure and integrating development with the environment. It identified three key themes that characterised the vision for the area. Firstly the idea of living with nature, Secondly the importance of the village concept and finally connecting the residential neighbourhoods to the mountain (BPP, 2006).

These themes were carried through to the final key directions in the ADP, which included:

1. Cypress village – the future planning and development of a new village with shopping and services
2. Mountain pathway – a gentle gradient link between the residential neighbourhoods and the future village
3. Concentrating density westward – concentration of higher density development close to the village

(Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)

The Envisioning saw the introduction of the ‘8 Pillars of Sustainability’, a set of sustainability principles introduced by Mark Holland. Although not designed specifically for the Rodgers Creek Area they were a means to organising thinking and identifying potential constraints.

“It is a framework of how to apply sustainability to a development project. It came from many years of having to deal with sustainability in the real world.” (P3)

The ‘8 Pillars of Sustainability’ include:

1. A complete community
2. An environmentally and community friendly transportation system
3. Green buildings
4. Multi-tasked open space
5. Green infrastructure
6. A healthy food system
7. Community facilities and programs
8. Economic prosperity

(BPP, 2006).
8.3 Public Participation Techniques

8.3.1 The Upper Lands Study and Report

The process behind the Upper Lands Study and Report involved a variety of public participation techniques. Research indicates that while the Upper Lands Steering Committee was the primary method of public participation, open houses and resident surveys were also undertaken (Planning and Lands Department, 2001). These methods range from informing and consulting through to involving and collaborating with the public (IAP2, 2007).

The Upper Lands Steering Committee was established by Council in late 1996 and concluded in mid-1999 (Planning and Lands Department, 2001). The Upper Lands Steering Committee consisted of staff, members of the public and landowners. The group was responsible for providing input into the study. Their role included gathering and reviewing information on the land, assisting with the production of mapping, holding public open houses and conducting resident surveys. However, when the Steering Committee concluded, the remaining two years of work and final report was prepared by the Planning and Lands Department staff.

The Upper Lands Steering Committee reflects the advisory group public participation technique as defined by the International Association for Public Participation in their public participation toolbox. An advisory group is “a group of representative stakeholders assembled to provide public input into the planning process. It may also have members from the project team and experts” (IAP2, 2006:12). This advisory group model is reflected in previous similar studies in West Vancouver.

8.3.2 The Envisioning Notebook

The Envisioning process engaged for the Rodgers Creek Area reflects the charrette model (IAP2, 2006). More specifically, it reflects what Condon (2008) defines as a ‘visioning charrette’ in which the team “produces explicit depictions of what a community would look like and “the output of the visioning charrette is a series of compelling but speculative drawings” (Condon, 2008:17).

It was a catalyst for fostering creative ideas as seen through the development of the mountain pathway. Through bringing experts together it promoted joint problem solving and creative thinking. However, the charrettes and notebook were an initiative of the developer and the consultants. The process excluded input from the municipality and the community.
There was a wide range of public participation techniques engaged during the background phase. The outcomes from these processes (e.g., the Upper Lands Report and Envisioning Notebook) were pivotal instruments that shaped the processes which were engaged later in the process.

8.4 What Worked Well

1. *Established strategic direction for growth and development in the Upper Lands*

The Upper Lands Study and Report was a significant step in the Rodgers Creek process because it led to changes to the OCP in 2004 that set the foundation for future development through establishing a vision and principles as well as introducing the requirement for the preparation of detailed ADPs and other information required for new development.

2. *Established site-specific direction for the Rodgers Creek Area and sparked discussion on the future development of the site*

The Upper Lands Study and Report triggered discussion on the future of the Upper Lands which led to the initiation of the Envisioning of the Rodgers Creek Area. Both documents highlighted the need for a change from the status quo of development and the conventional planning process by introducing ADPs and establishing direction for the development of the area. This had a significant impact on the planning process for Rodgers Creek and stimulated discussion on the future development of the site.

3. *Fostered innovation and creativity producing concepts that were carried through to implementation*

The concepts and ideas outlined in the Envisioning Notebook are reflected in the final ADP. The charrette-style process engaged for the Envisioning Notebook sparked creativity. Innovative concepts like the mountain pathway may have not developed outside of these intensive sessions between the specialists with different expertise, including environmental, economic, design, planning and engineering.

The mountain pathway concept was a key achievement and was identified in this analysis and evaluation as the most unique feature of the ADP. The mountain pathway is “a wide path with gentle gradients for pedestrians, cyclists and other users and is proposed to link all the neighbourhoods in the Rodgers Creek Area to each other and to Cypress Village” (Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008:14). The mountain pathway follows the contour of the hillside linking the neighbourhoods together. The pathway is characterised by viewing platforms, bridges, parks
and playing fields (BPP, 2006). The pathway is intended to link the residential areas to the future Cypress Village and to operate much like the seawall does but on the hillside. The interviewees recognized the importance of the Envisioning:

“The interesting thing from my end was the interest of BPP in doing something different.” (P1)

“How high in the sustainability performance you can get has to do with creativity, knowledge and expertise in green design and how the teams work together in an innovative process trying to achieve these different outcomes.” (P3)

“I think it is very important to start with an envisioning to start to nail down the identity and reputation and try to get some rich ideas onto the table that help move to special things that the development can be or should be. I think that was a really critical part.” (P3)

4. Commitment to sustainable development

Another major achievement during the background phase was a commitment towards achieving a more sustainable form of development. This was seen through the principles outlined in the Upper Lands Report, subsequent amendment of the OCP and adoption of the ‘8 Pillars of Sustainability,’ which led to development of a site specific sustainability strategy.

“A determination was made that they would seek to come up with a design of what we loosely call the ‘sustainable community’ without at that point really understanding what sustainability was.” (E2)

“The sustainability strategy was done early on as part of the envisioning of the project and was carried out all of the way through.” (P3)

The commitment that BPP made at the beginning of the process to pursue sustainable development was a major achievement because it was carried throughout the project and reflected in the final ADP.

8.5 Challenges

The Upper Lands Study comprised public participation techniques but the advisory group contribution appears to be disjointed from the final report. The final two years of work and final report were undertaken by the Planning and Lands Department. The extent of contribution from the advisory group is unclear. Furthermore, minutes and records from the committee have not been disclosed raising questions about the credibility and transparency. While the Upper Lands Study was a valuable step, the study and report was time intensive and took five years to complete.
The Envisioning process was developer-led and did not impose on municipal resources, but it also did not involve the municipality. As a result, when it was finally presented to the municipality they were on the outside of the process and faced with a proposed design concept to which they had not contributed and in which they had not been involved.

Another challenge for implementing an Envisioning process into planning for large-scale residential development is the cost. It is an expensive process that was fully funded by the developer.

8.6 Recommendations

The establishment of a strategic direction for the future growth of the Upper Lands was a key step in the process. It was the start of significant changes to the traditional planning process for greenfield development in West Vancouver, including recognition of the importance of environmental factors and the need for a comprehensive approach to planning. The Envisioning was a key step in the Rodgers Creek Area planning process because it encouraged innovation and creativity. It led to a creative vision and the development of rich ideas. While there were a number of strengths to the process, there were also a number of challenges. These point to the following recommendations, Table 8-1.

Table 8-1. Phase 1 Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Undertake regular review and evaluation of existing development and processes to identify need for change</td>
<td>• Proactive approach of identifying the need to change from status quo rather than being reactive&lt;br&gt;• Identifying urban development problems as they arise&lt;br&gt;• Identifying outdated processes and looking for opportunity to improve</td>
<td>• Review and evaluation of development is often not undertaken due to resource constraints&lt;br&gt;• Process can be mandated and embedded in legislation therefore difficult to change&lt;br&gt;• Development and process change is often politically driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish strategic direction for greenfield areas and ensure it is current and addresses any urban development problems and desires for new development</td>
<td>• Opportunity to involve public early in the process&lt;br&gt;• Opportunity to establish strategic direction leading to policy/legislative change&lt;br&gt;• Detailed analysis provides</td>
<td>• Resources constrain strategic planning work&lt;br&gt;• Community desire for new development often overlooked&lt;br&gt;• Strategic direction often politically driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Potential Benefits</td>
<td>Potential Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensure process is open and transparent</td>
<td>• Increase credibility of process and outcomes</td>
<td>• Lack of transparency and openness raises questions about credibility of process and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Document and record the process</td>
<td>• Availability of public records on the process increases credibility and improves access to information</td>
<td>• Lack of public records and documentation on the process reduces access to information, credibility and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Look for opportunities to improve time efficiency</td>
<td>• Reduce the overall length of the process</td>
<td>• Resource constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identify and acknowledge community input</td>
<td>• Input from the community obtained through public participation techniques should be clearly identified to make input more meaningful</td>
<td>• If contribution is not clearly identified, credibility is reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Start the process with a charrette-style visioning processes to spark creativity and innovation and establish a design concept</td>
<td>• Foster innovation and creativity</td>
<td>• Creating a strong Envisioning team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish a design concept/character</td>
<td>• Commitment and resources from developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bring together expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time efficient method of gaining effective input from multiple parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish sustainability objectives and principles at the outset and tailor to suit the circumstances of each project</td>
<td>• Collective input into tailoring a sustainability strategy to the project</td>
<td>• Motherhood statements and lack of definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish strong direction</td>
<td>• Committing to achieving things that may turn out not practical or possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ensure the process is inclusionary not exclusionary. The invitation for participation in the visioning charrette could be opened to the municipality.</td>
<td>• Richer collection of ideas</td>
<td>• Lack of municipal and public involvement create exclusionary process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Start building relationships/trust earlier</td>
<td>• Additional cost to the developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.0 PHASE 2: TECHNICAL SESSIONS

9.1 Introduction

The technical sessions occurred throughout the planning and design process starting in 2006 and finishing in 2008. These sessions brought together a variety of stakeholders to contribute to the planning and design of the development. This chapter provides an analysis and evaluation of the technical sessions.

Figure 9-1. Phase 2 Process Diagram

9.2 Description

The technical session phase included the establishment of a technical team, which consisted of the landowners and their consultants and District staff, Table 9-1. The technical team met regularly throughout the planning and design process with the meetings commencing in August 2006. In this phase the technical team undertook a detailed assessment of the physical characteristics of the land and prepared a sieve analysis that integrated the data.
The technical analysis involved the collection of base data on the characteristics of the site and integrating the various data sets concisely and graphically. The data collected formed an extensive foundation that was used in a sieve analysis process which highlighted the complex interactions amongst various factors in the landscape. The method engaged for this analysis is based on Ian McHarg's *Design with Nature* approach to planning and development which was developed in 1967. There was a strong commitment to letting the 'landscape inform the design', which stemmed from McHarg's approach.

"Here is a book that comes out of the 60s and 70s perspectives...he laid out essentially the same process we used here...I don’t think Ian McHarg’s ideas were used for 30 or 40 years." (E2)

"I think most of the consultants on the team were trained in the McHarg overlay methodology." (P4)

"It was really about the landscape inform design." (P2)

“…and that was the main difference in that we weren’t tied into ‘this is what we are going to do on this site, how are we going to fit it in’? [Rather the approach was] ‘here is the landscape: how can we fit in development?’ It was a very different process.” (E1)
"We had this base to work off and you could always go back to that and say, 'look we are not in here anymore, we need to go back to that,' and I think that that was really key." (E1)

“We just kept going back to ‘What does the landscape tell us?’” (M)

“This process really helped us identify what was on the ground and what is the landscape all about and how is that going to inform the development as opposed to just ram-rodding a development into a landscape that does not necessarily fit.” (P2)

The layered information included topography, slope analysis, geotechnical conditions, vegetation inventory, setback lines, detailed assessment of all watercourses and their proper functioning condition, mapping of trails, recreation and cultural features (Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008). Once the mapping was complete the technical team worked collaboratively in workshop meetings overlaying data through applying the ‘sieve analysis’ method, Figure 9-2.

“We got to apply a very classic technique called Design With Nature…what takes it to another level is that the developer was willing to sit with us and work through [the base data]…because how do you make sense of all of this complex information? This sieve technique was a way of integrating the data in a way to make sense of it, help us go to the next stage….It was done as a ‘short sleeve’ session which had BPP, the District staff there and several key consultants involved.” (P1)

“We were really committed to that sieve because we had been part of that process. It’s again that commitment to it.” (P1)

**Figure 9-2. Sieve Analysis**

![Sieve Analysis Diagram](Source: Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)

Following the sieve analysis the technical team identified potential areas for conservation and development which were examined later in more detail, Figure 9-3. It was the sieve analysis that pointed to where the developable areas were.
The development plan also saw the clustering of six distinct neighbourhoods, each with its own architectural character and unique mix of building types, Figure 9-4.

Senior District staff formed an interdisciplinary team, while a wide variety of experienced consultants were brought in by the landowners (District of West Vancouver, 2009). The process involved weekly meetings of the technical team initially for the preparation of the sieve analysis, then on an ongoing basis throughout the project. The meetings involved 8-20 people per meeting. The purpose of the technical meetings was to bring together the different disciplines into one team and openly work through the project collectively. The composition of the technical team changed depending on what the agenda was for each meeting. There was a significant emphasis on site visits in which the entire technical team would go onsite to contextualise the development.

“I think a huge part of it was being on the ground and understanding the physicality of it…again the landscape informed the development so being there and seeing it was critical.” (P2)

“There are certain trees and rocks and things you just don’t see on a plan. So it should be mandatory, absolutely mandatory to see the site.” (E1)
“When you look at a two dimensional map and use prescriptive measures you don’t get a sense for what is there…I think that a key component for everybody is to get on site…looking at maps and prescriptive measures you only see half of the picture.” (D1)

Throughout the planning and design process an Overview Report was created to summarise and graphically present the work undertaken in the development of the ADP. Initially it was drafted in October 2007 and amended throughout the process to reflect changing ideas and input. To this end, “the Overview Report was prepared to provide a summary of the proposed ADP in a succinct and highly graphic form” (Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008:iii). This document, prepared by the developers’ consultant, brought together the information and became the key product of the entire planning and design process.

“The actual Overview Report started out as an idea of putting things down on paper, collecting it in some format. So we decided to produce this 11” x 17” format not really thinking that it would become such an official document but to have a place where different decisions could be made and it started to become an official version.” (P4)

9.3 Public Participation Techniques

The technical team did not actively engage the public. Rather it was a closed group consisting of District staff, landowners and their consultants. The format of the technique engaged for the multi-stakeholder process reflects that of an implementation charrette and also comprised elements of a consensus-driven process as defined by the Canadian National Round Table on the Environment and Economy (1993). An evaluation of the technical sessions using the guiding principles for the consensus process is provided in Chapter 12.

The sieve analysis in particular reflected the charrette-style format consisting of short sleeved\(^1\) meetings. Ongoing technical sessions followed and ran parallel to the Working Group. Meetings were intensive sessions where the stakeholders with diverse knowledge and expertise were brought together to develop innovative and creative solutions. It also fostered creative thinking and joint problem solving. However, the technical meetings ran over two years of the process whereas charrettes are usually four to seven days in length (Condon, 2008).

“There were ongoing meetings with staff, consultants and the developer. It was really quite an unusual thing and it was a real collaboration in a sense that people weren’t doing a whole bunch of work and then coming and presenting it to staff, which is usual that there was this back and forth…It was a workshop-driven process.” (P4)

---

\(^1\) Short sleeved meetings refer to intensive collaborative sessions whereby participants roll up their sleeves and actively participate.
9.4 What Worked Well

1. Recognition that the existing process was not working well and needed to change

The first major achievement within the technical session phase was the recognition of the need to change from the conventional planning and design process for large-scale residential developments. The initial presentation of information and communication between the District and BPP was disjointed and exclusive; it pointed to the need for a more meaningful process.

“It was a kind of interesting dilemma because you had these individual workbooks and it was a big document, lots of work had been done. The real issue was the integration of the information…It was a lot of information to read and say ‘yes that works’ or ‘no it doesn’t’ unless you are somehow involved in the development of that information. And that was what I saw as the challenge…they gave a brief presentation and they wanted a response. The challenge I find is how do you respond when you walk in cold to a meeting? Not very meaningfully, that is really what happens. Not a very meaningful response. So the dilemma, or the question really became: How can we really make this meaningful and ensure that we meet those objectives along the way? For various reasons, that didn’t start off right away.” (P1)

“I think one of our challenges particularly in the early stages of working with the Working Group was that BPP and some of their consultants always wanted to present the end plan. But you had two kind of build up to that and they were always going to the end and it was important to go through those steps.” (P1)

2. Integrated design team

The second major achievement was the formation of the integrated technical team which saw the introduction of District staff into the design process. They had input into how the project was designed rather than being presented with a design and asked to provide feedback. The design team was knowledgeable and experienced. The expert-driven design team was identified by interviewees as a key strength.

“I doubt if there was a more comprehensive thorough and fully engaged design and planning team anywhere. Certainly I have never seen one and I have seen some good ones, so I think it was quite extraordinary.” (E2)

“This project would not have gone as well as it did without a lot of experienced people on the team.” (P3)
“There was never a lot of resistance to taking a look at anything and bringing in top flight North American quality consultants.” (E3)

“One has to compliment the developer for bringing in a very good project team.” (Eng)

“That is one thing that made it unique from the very start was that we were confident in the baseline information of each discrete variable and that confidence was not just that we had good consultants doing it but one, we could set the standard for what we wanted to see and two. We could also go out on field and discuss it.” (P1)

“I think the single most important difference was the weekly meeting…where the senior staff of the municipality sat at the table they didn’t delegate this to juniors, so they were actually part of the design team.” (E2)

“You bring people out of their silos and make them cross over in terms of their disciplines, which is far better.” (E1)

3. Open and transparent discussion

Thirdly was the openness and transparency. The way in which the technical sessions unfolded was that the stakeholders came together and put their cards on the table allowing for an open and transparent dialogue. This enabled the process to become more inclusive, flexible and respectful.

“This process was different in so far as it did a lot of this assessment of the physical characteristics of the land. It started with the background work and it started with a policy framework that allowed us to have an open and transparent conversation.” (P2)

4. Commitment to McHarg’s ‘Design with Nature’ approach and the sieve analysis

Finally, commitment to the McHarg design approach was another major achievement, “too often data is collected, but has little effect on the next stages of a physical planning project. In this case, one of the key achievements of the project was the integration of the extensive data base. This was done through a sieve analysis process in order to reveal the complex interrelationships among the many factors in the landscape” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:2). The sieve analysis saw a rich compilation of base data which was based on Ian McHarg’s Design With Nature approach. The commitment to this concept and willingness of all parties to create the strong foundation for the project was another major achievement.
“What makes it different? I think it was first sustainability by design, design with nature, landscape inform design. Within that context it means that the last thing that you are going to do in the actual planning and design process is to determine where you are going to build a building, not the first thing.” (E2)

There was a lot of focus on getting the foundation right. The foundation created confidence in the plan.

“We needed to do the background work first and we needed to have an understanding of what was on the ground.” (P2)

“We put a great deal of effort into making sure that foundation was right.” (P1)

“So there was a kind of real in-depth knowledge of the site that was unusual for most development processes.” (P4)

“There was a great level of detail that actually took place way beyond what you would normally see. It is necessary? It gives you great confidence in your plan.” (P1)

### 9.5 Challenges

The key challenges faced in the technical phase included:

1. **Getting key players to commit to a new process**

   There was much uncertainty about what the new process would look like. There was no template or precedent known among the participants.

2. **Obtaining commitment to the time and cost for the foundational work (i.e., sieve analysis)**

   The technical work was expensive and time intensive. It was funded by the land owners. Obtaining financial investment for the detailed foundational work is a challenge.

3. **Overcoming past power and trust issues between the developer and municipality**

   Overcoming issues of the past, building trust and maintaining it was a challenge throughout the Rodgers Creek process. This was successfully addressed but there was always the risk that it was going to erode.
“I think that the risk is that somebody loses trust along the way. And when that starts to erode it is hard to repair.” (E1)

4. Varying interests and levels of risk among parties

For example, the difficulty in having multiple land owners in a comprehensive plan is that development cannot occur in a piecemeal fashion, which may make the process more lengthy for smaller landowners.

“It would have been nice being a smaller developer to see it move faster because we didn’t need to do as much planning as BPP did and in the meantime the market has collapsed.” (D2)

“Our issues were easy to resolve. Very, very simple problems to overcome. BPP was in a vastly different position; they had huge tracts of land.” (D2)

“Staff wanted to look at it and the community wanted to look at it in a holistic sense….It would have proceeded a little more efficiently if dealing with only some of the elements in there but at the same time we wanted to deal with it comprehensively.” (P2)

“There was a little bit of difficulty with other property owners. That became a little bit cumbersome …They started to come together because they realized for them to be successful they had to come together.” (P5)

5. Dealing with the unanticipated

The technical team were faced with unanticipated challenges including broadening of issues and emerging parties.

6. Determining what is practical vs. what is desirable

The competing interests between the parties created difficulties in making a determination between what was practical and what was desirable.

9.6 Recommendations

The technical sessions were useful in bringing together knowledge, information and skills to collectively reach planning and design solutions. The integrated engagement of the key players and their meaningful involvement was a critical part of the planning and design process that may be replicated as a model in other large-scale residential developments. A summary of the key recommendations arising from the analysis and evaluation are outlined in Table 9-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognize the need to change from the conventional process</td>
<td>• Identifying problems allows for development of solutions</td>
<td>• Change in planning processes is often politically driven requiring political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk and uncertainty of what the new process might look like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bring together the physical characteristics of the site into a sieve analysis</td>
<td>• Importance in setting a solid foundation for the project</td>
<td>• Significant resource commitment required to undertake specialist studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing work required later in the project</td>
<td>• Desire to jump to the final design rather than invest effort in base data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality baseline information created confidence later down the track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on the landscape first allowing the application of McHarg's design approach <em>Design with Nature</em> to help guide the design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Form a purpose-driven, integrated multidisciplinary design team and ensure stakeholders put their cards on the table for open and transparent discussions</td>
<td>• Participants learnt new skills through interacting with one another</td>
<td>• Obtaining commitment from landowners to come to the table difficult due to risk and uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fostering creativity, innovation and joint problem solving</td>
<td>• Nature of past relationship between municipality and developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating knowledgeable and experienced consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include all landowners and relevant municipal departments in meetings and site visits</td>
<td>• Creates a sense of ownership over the final plan</td>
<td>• Resource constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prevents issues arising later in the process</td>
<td>• Variations in levels of risk and investment between land owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Builds trust and relationships</td>
<td>• Difficulty in managing all the groups and ensuring everyone is involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Potential Benefits</td>
<td>Potential Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Promote a process that is self designed by participants and tailored to the project | - Resources can be invested where needed  
- Participants can benefit by building relationships/trust  
- Process is flexible, not restrictive  
- Rewarding for participants | - Difficulty of competing interests  
- Risk of excluding affected party |
| 6. Promote flexibility within the process but provide structure to ensure certainty is provided to land owners and their consultants | - Improve certainty through providing direction  
- Flexible rules allow for adaptation to unexpected  
- Greater innovation and creativity | - Policies or regulations that mandate the process  
- No clear structure to the process  
- No template or precedent to follow  
- Conflicting opinions on the best alternate process |
| 7. Create equal opportunity for input and access to basic and technical information | - Different forms of information available to address varying levels of expertise and knowledge  
- Overview report to summarise and present work graphically and keep team informed  
- Sense of ownership created through input | - An undefined informal process can create uncertainty  
- Lack of rules  
- Existing policies may be restrictive, not flexible  
- Dealing with the unanticipated |
| 8. Build relationships, trust and respect between stakeholders through openness and transparency | - Improve communication between stakeholders  
- Increase efficiency in joint problem solving  
- Enhance flexibility | - Loss of trust during the process may be difficult to re-establish |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. Make the technical team accountable to their constituencies and organizations. An equal distribution of power amongst team members creates a sense of accountability to the process | • Equal distribution of power enables open and honest discussions  
• Accountability ensures commitment to the process | • Breaking through existing power structures barriers can be challenging  
• Dominating personalities |
| 10. Consider time limits and deadlines from the outset and continually manage throughout the process | • Regular meetings between the technical team ensure the project is continually progressing | • Pressure to make things happen when they are outside of your control  
• Unexpected issues slow process |
| 11. Address implementation and practical considerations from the outset. Planning, design and construction should be integrated | • A good plan is also a practical and implementable plan  
• Improve time efficiency by not wasting time on ideas that are not possible for the development | • Unforeseen changes (e.g., market changes, technology etc.)  
• Deciding what is practical vs. what is desirable, particularly from a sustainability perspective |
10.0 PHASE 3: THE WORKING GROUP

10.1 Introduction

The Working Group was the primary public participation component of the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area. It was unique because the Working Group representatives were not randomly selected community members, rather they were selected based on their expertise and experience in the development industry. They were a unique group of unpaid advisors. Public Open Houses were held to further involve the community and supplement the Working Group. The open houses provided an opportunity for the general community and special interest groups to have input into the planning and design process. This public process was supplemented by a private community liaison process led by BPP.

Figure 10-1. Phase 3 Process Diagram

10.2 Description

West Vancouver Mayor Pam Goldsmith-Jones took office in 2005 and part of her mandate was to change the existing advisory groups to the project-based Working Groups. Council recognized the existing advisory groups were not effective, were outdated and needed to change. In 2007 the District of West Vancouver changed their existing Citizen Advisory Groups to a new approach of community involvement in what they termed Working Groups. The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group was the first working group to be established in West Vancouver, since this time the municipality has adopted a number of working groups for various projects. The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group was set up in January 2007 and ended in April 2008.
The Working Group members were not appointed by Council, rather they were appointed by a Committee which was allocated the responsibility of setting up these working groups. Council is not permitted by legislation to appoint a working group. Council can only appoint formal committees that come under the rules of in camera. So council created a community engagement committee and it appoints Working Group members and can allow more flexible rules. There are three members of council and three members from the community on that committee. The elected members selected the Working Group because the citizens didn’t want to choose.

“Legislation that governs local government [restricts the power of Council]. Council cannot appoint a Working Group. Council can only appoint these formal committees that come under all of the rules of ‘in-camera’…We put this Community Engagement Committee in place and it appoints members and can allow looser rules.” (P1)

“It took a lot of confidence on the part of Council to say ‘okay, we will let that group make the appointments,’ and Council liked it because it kept them at arms length about who is on the committee and who decides.” (M)

“Council has been removed from the pitched battle, which I like because we should be operating at a high policy level and letting staff get work done. We should not be involved in the details at all.” (M)

The Working Group that was involved in the project was not a standard group. It was comprised of professionals with design, planning, environment or development experience. The Working Group comprised nine West Vancouver citizens. Eight of the nine members were providing expert or specialty advice or representing a District group or major interest in the future development of the Rodgers Creek Area, **Table 10-1**. There was one citizen with no expertise.

**Table 10-1. Rodgers Creek Area Working Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Barker</td>
<td>West Van Streamkeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Kalke</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Malley</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Musson</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jak Redenbach</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Rylands</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Walker</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rosen</td>
<td>Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Bailey</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the West Vancouver Working Groups has a council member assigned to it with the purpose of keeping Council better informed. Councillor Rod Day was assigned to the Rodgers Creek Working Group and the members of the Working Group selected the Councillor as the chair for the group.

“In the guidelines for the Working Group, which is the work that the Community Engagement Committee did, we would recommend that a member of Council not be the chair because [it could] be a bit of a power imbalance…I would not recommend that because it could politicize something that would not benefit from that.” (M)

“I am aware that he [Rod Day, the chair of the Working Group] briefed Council throughout the process not just at the end…it was a more active role so they could become better informed.” (Eng)

The Working Group was provided with a mandate which charged them with the responsibility “to envision a future community for the Rodgers Creek Area and establish detailed principles for the Area Development Plan, taking into consideration the Upper Lands principles and processes described in the OCP. Community facilities and potential land use patterns in adjacent lands may be part of the consideration” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:4).

While the process was somewhat informal and flexible, the Working Group contributed to the development of Working Group guidelines to provide structure to the process (Appendix 2). The guidelines outlined the following:

- Purpose
- Duties
- Origins of work/project background
- Composition
- Landowner role
- Term, significant milestones and desired outcome
- Meeting schedule
- Decision-making approach
- Support/professional services utilized
- Approved budget

(Rodgers Creek Area Working Group, 2008)

The Working Group endorsed the background work and sieve analysis prepared by the technical team. That work set the foundation for them to move onto discussing design aspects of the project.
The Working Group meetings were open to the public. This was a significant change from the way the previous Citizen Advisory Groups had functioned. The public were invited to observe, offer comments and ask questions during the Working Group meetings.

“The Working Group meetings were open to the public and other stakeholders like Mulgrave School were able to come and make presentations.” (D1)

Based on the background work, existing policy direction, and community input, the Working Group prepared key design principles.

“The Working Group distilled all the information we [the Technical Team] had done and the OCP and said here are the key principles that we think are important in a lot more detail. It built upon the OCP and then the next phase after that was to have a plan and make sure it addresses these principles.” (D1)

In addition to the Working Group process, two open houses were held with the general public in June 2007 and December 2007. These open houses occurred concurrently with the Working Group and operated as a secondary method for public input into the planning and design process. The feedback during these meetings resulted in changes to the design. A series of meetings were also held with other stakeholders including the recreational users to discuss recreational trails and pathways adjacent to the Rodgers Creek Area.

Additionally, BPP engaged in its own community liaison in which it consulted and informed a number of other agencies and organisations in the community. While the open houses were aimed towards the larger population, the community liaison pursued by BPP ran parallel to this and was a more targeted form of community involvement that was built into existing networks and tied into both the Working Group open meetings and the public open houses.

“Mainly my interface was ensuring that what I considered to be opinion leaders and stakeholders within the public were briefed and aware of upcoming meetings and felt that they were, or got all of their questions, answered. That they felt ahead of the herd…we dealt with any of their issues or questions prior to going into public open houses.” (CR)

Community groups that were involved in the open houses or the community liaison are outlined in Table 10-2 below.
Table 10-2. Community Groups

| West Vancouver Streamkeepers Society          |
| North Shore Mountain Bike Association (NSMBA) |
| Old Growth Conservancy Society               |
| Members of Local Conservancy and Hiking Groups |
| Mulgrave School                             |
| BPP Home Owners Association                  |
| The Chamber of Commerce                      |
| The Community Arts Council                    |
| Library Foundation                           |
| Rotary Clubs                                 |

10.3 Public Participation Techniques

The Working Group process differs from conventional ongoing advisory groups because they were involved with the design of a specific project and because it adopted a fishbowl process rather than a closed door approach which was common to the previous advisory groups. The Working Group reflects the principles of an ‘implementation charrette’. The charrette style meetings were used as a vehicle for generating the design principles. However, the Working Group was not a typical charrette because it took place over 14 months whereas charrettes typically last four-to-seven days (Condon, 2008).

The Working Group comprised expertise from a variety of specialities, reflecting the composition of a charrette team (Walters, 2007). While the Working Group was not a typical charrette, it illustrated elements of the technique and adapted them to the circumstances of the project. For example, common principles between the charrette technique outlined by Condon and the Rodgers Creek Area Working Group include: “design with everyone”; “build from the policy base”; “lead without leading”; and “move in, move out and move across”. While not based on drawings, it followed some of the common charrette principles.

The charrette principles of Condon (2008) and Walters (2007) highlight the importance of identifying those affected by the project and getting them involved at the beginning of the process. Getting the community involved in the design team results in a mutual authorship and greater widespread acceptance of outcomes.

The typical charrette process outlined by the National Charrette Institute and The Lawrence Group in Walters (2007) is illustrated in Figure 10-2. The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group and open houses followed a similar process, Figure 10-3. As with a charrette, there were a
number of pre and post activities that occurred to support the process (i.e. phase 1 – background, phase 2 – technical sessions, and phase 4 – bylaw development and consideration). The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group and Open Houses did not start and end the planning process for the ADP.

**Figure 10-2. Typical Charrette Process**

![Typical Charrette Process Diagram](Source: Walters, 2007:172)

**Figure 10-3. Rodgers Creek Phase 3 (Working Group) Process**

![Rodgers Creek Phase 3 Process Diagram](Source: Walters, 2007:172)

The Working Group phase informed, involved and collaborated with the public. The Working Group was based on a collaborative level of public participation as defined by the International Association for Public Participation in their *Participation Spectrum* (2007). The public open houses brought people together (IAP2, 2006) and were designed to inform the community as defined by IAP2’s ‘Public Participation Spectrum’ (2007). The targeted liaison and sessions held after the open houses were a means of consultation to obtain feedback with the affected parties.
The municipality and Council sought advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporated solutions and recommendations.

The liaison officer was useful in reaching out to those who were not directly involved but may have had an interest. It was useful in compiling and giving feedback. It also enhanced opportunities for participation (IAP2, 2006).

While originally designed under the collaborative model, the Working Group phase had elements of the empowerment model because at the conclusion of the process Council implemented the suggestions of the community.

The municipal website, local newspaper and community newsletters were used for advertising of the Working Group and open house meetings. Agendas and minutes from these meetings were also available. There techniques were useful for sharing feedback (IAP2, 2006).

The Working Group was a consensus-based process as defined by the National Round Table on the Environment and Economy (1993). An evaluation of the Working Group phase under the guiding principles for the consensus process is provided in Chapter 12.

10.4 What Worked Well

The Working Group became the steering committee for the process and undertook its work in open sessions. The Working Group was involved in the project for 14 months and undertook 19 meetings. Tasks undertaken by the Working Group included:

- Site visits
- Review of technical information
- Review of evolving versions of the ADP presented by the District staff, landowners and their consultants and other stakeholders
- Meeting with Council twice firstly to provide updates on key issues to be resolved and finally to present its report along with the proposed ADP
- Involvement in the two Open Houses to obtain input from the general community
- Establishing Key Organizing Principles and assisting in the development of objectives for the ADP (Appendix 3)
- Encouraging landowners to design more sustainable development
- Providing specific direction on issues included in the Overview Report (Rodgers Creek Area Working Group, 2008 & District of West Vancouver, 2009).
1. Multidisciplinary expert-based Working Group

The Working Group was unique because it was a multi-disciplinary group with a high level of experience in, and knowledge of, the development industry. The composition of the group was beneficial and improved efficiency. It also operated as a secondary resource to the District and developer.

“I saw ourselves as kind of a resource for the staff and developers and their process.” (P5)

“The stakeholders of the Working Group had as much expertise on it as the clientele did so they could ask ‘well what do you want us to do?’” (P3)

“There were a couple of guys on that Working Group like Harold Kalke and Frank Musson and Brian Walker. We are talking about guys that have had very successful careers in what they have done — Harold as a developer, Frank as an architect, Brian as an engineer. They run big companies…So we were lucky to have guys like that.” (P5)

“Out of the nine members there was one person picked as a representative of a person that lived in the area and he had probably the least amount to contribute…So you could fill up your Working Group with people that have no expertise and I think that is a risk to the quality of the group.” (E3)

“When you start putting that package together they are well schooled people right. They have all got their science, they have got their background and that is what they contribute to.” (E3)

“I think they were selected based on (a) their expertise and (b) their willingness to participate. A lot of people had already participated. They were civically active people.” (P2)

“We had some wonderful people on the Working Group and not everybody has access to people with that level of expertise coming forward and wanting to be involved.” (P1)

“And we picked people with knowledge, people like Michael Rosen or Harold Kalke who do this for a living.” (M)

“That was because we wanted it to succeed and we wanted people who could bridge that gap between citizens and the developer.” (M)
2. Community-driven policy change

The biggest achievement of the Working Group was the changes to the density requirement in the OCP. All of the participants interviewed highlighted the importance of this achievement.

“We met with Council…and at that meeting we put it out…we think to achieve social diversity we need to go over the OCP. We wanted to get a read about what the Council members thought about that. So those [participants] in the group that were concerned about challenging the OCP wanted to see it. We didn’t get slammed. And from that meeting on those members of the Working Group who were concerned about exceeding the OCP started to back off and then we all decided to go for smaller units so what we have are more units up there but we still have the same amount of floor area right. And that was a big breakthrough, a huge breakthrough.” (P5)

“Well certainly the OCP was very restrictive with the 2.5 issue but to the credit of both the District staff and Council the suggestions that came from the Working Group have been adopted by Council which allowed the modification of the 2.5 units per acre to something a little higher.” (Eng)

“The biggest one was density and the OCP talked about target density and the Working Group went against that and recommended as you know not only a higher density but the bylaws that exist beyond that so that was a really a significant step…I think if it had been staff driven and an Advisory Committee it wouldn’t have got to that. But a Working Group with a fair amount of authority and some people that were very cognoscente were able to steer that change.” (E3)

“I think that it was a very fortunate thing that at the end and through the Working Group advocacy that the density of the development was increased from the 2.5 units per acres.” (P4)

“The sudden recognition within the Working Group that the entire OCP planning process had placed a design constraint on everyone…I think that it is a huge revelation of the Working Group and I think that the design team, the developer and consultant gave a huge sigh of relief that now we have the flexibility that you really and truly want.” (E2)

“I think the biggest influence is on the shift from units per acre to a FSR model which changed the distribution of everything and how it fell across the hillside and it had a massive effect on the whole plan…If the community Working Group wouldn’t have been implemented I firmly believe that we probably wouldn’t have ended up with the FSR model.” (D2)

“I am pretty confident that it would not have not have happened without the direction of the Working Group. Staff had no problems with it but I think the Working Group really embracing that and really asking that question and giving that direction was really one of their key achievements.” (P1)
3. Greater and more meaningful community involvement

Another key achievement was the recognition and involvement of the community interest groups in the Working Group and also through the open houses. The Streamkeepers played a significant role and had representation on the Working Group. The Working Group was struggling to develop design guidelines so Streamkeepers decided to table their principles so they were clear on what their concerns were. The principles were designed to guide development in the Upper Lands, Table 10-3.

**Table 10-3. Seven West Vancouver Streamkeepers Principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fish and fish habitat are preserved and protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Watercourses are protected from change of course, piping, unnatural erosion and other human impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stormwater systems are designed to enhance watercourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Watercourses remain open and unimpeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stream health is maintained when impervious cover is minimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Natural, undisturbed areas (open spaces) and green connectivity belts are maximised and planned into housing complexes, and horizontal connections are treated as importantly as vertical connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Natural vegetation is retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Imaginary reference: West Vancouver Streamkeepers Society, 2007:1)

The Streamkeepers principles were a catalyst for the Working Group to move forward. They developed seven principles with the assistance of outside resources and the Working Group elected to go with them. BPP and staff also supported them.

“It was such a great achievement for us to be recognized and to have our principles adopted into the document.” (E3)

“How do we get the most responsible development that respects what our concerns are?...Why don’t we table Streamkeepers principles and get them in there before the Working Group gets to it?...And that ended up being a catalyst that initiated the Working Group to go forward.” (E3)

“The Working Group elected to go with those seven principles…when you open up this Overview Report they are there, now they are not listed one to seven but I can identify where each one of those principles was incorporated…Those particular principles were basically accepted as guiding principles not just for this but for the municipality.” (E3)

“Streamkeepers involved in the Working Group put forward a set of working principles that were incorporated right into the plan so I think that they were well included because streams made up such an integral part.” (E1)
The public open houses were successful in identifying affected parties that had been excluded from the process. The open houses revealed a strong interest from the North Shore Mountain Bike Association (NSMBA) and Mulgrave School. Following the public open houses further consultation occurred to identify concerns and develop alternatives. The result of the input from the public open houses was changes to the road design and relocation of existing trails. While this added time and cost to the overall process, it demonstrated that the open houses were a meaningful and effective technique for public participation.

“There was some invaluable data that came from some of the public meetings.” (Eng)

“The plan was actually changed to reflect some input. It was good to see the plan morphed over time to take that into account.” (E1)

“…and what a miracle that it [the town hall meeting] wasn’t a big battle in the end. Everybody that came with public input was positive, I mean I have never seen anything like it. I can’t really explain it. Really surprising.” (M)

Although the public open houses raised contentious issues, through addressing concerns and interests it has led to better ongoing relationships and trust between the municipality, community groups and the developer. The public open houses and targeted community liaison provided an opportunity for community groups who had not previously been involved in the planning process to participate in a meaningful way.

“At the end of the day they [the public] came out and supported it. They felt they could trust us.” (D1)

“…and our first open house was quite interesting because the mountain bike contingent came out and said ‘you missed something’ and the Working Group heard that, and it was great and it actually led to building a stronger relationship with our recreational communities.” (P1)

“I think the other relationship we really built which was nice was with the mountain bikers. That was very negative level based on years before….that there is going to be an ongoing relationship.” (P1)

“The amount of consultation that took place with the stakeholders to deal with those issues, they obviously felt they had more input now.” (CR)

“The standard planning process did not provide for any official recognition of any of these [community] groups within the planning process, the traditional planning process.” (CR)
4. Openness and transparency creating greater community and political buy-in

The community-driven Working Group and open houses were open and transparent and resulted in greater community and political buy-in to the recommendations, acknowledging that “a good professional must strive to garner public input and a lot of this work involves public education. The best way to educate the public is in the public to allow them to see the design process in action” (Walters, 2007:170).

The open Working Group meetings and the extent of information and detail available to the public at the open houses illustrated the transparency and openness of the overall process. The interviewees indicated that this detail and transparency at the open house led to the community support demonstrated at the town hall meeting.

“If you confront the average citizen with the full range of technical information required to be processed and analyzed, they are far more willing to accept the conclusions of the experts about balancing those issues than if they are presented with the conclusions without having seen the detail…When this is not done and things are presented as ‘this is what we have concluded is the best way to do things,’ they are very suspicious about it.” (CR)

“When the information is presented in these open houses and they see how you arrived at that conclusion they seem to accept conclusions that they would not otherwise accept…it’s just a much better way of interfacing them, it seems like overkill but it seems to work.” (CR)

“I think people really appreciate the effort that has gone into really understanding the site in great detail.” (P4)

“The fact that this [detailed information] is available to the public in the early stage is important. They might not necessarily read it or understand it but they know it is available…[they] can see a lot of work was done so they feel comfortable.” (D2)

The effectiveness of the open houses was illustrated through the eventual support shown from the NSMBA, which was initially opposed to the proposal: “who would’ve thought you would have mountain bikers boasting their approval for a plan that means a popular trail will be closed” (Bardsly in Kirshnan, 2008:1).

The openness and transparency added credibility to the overall process. The discussions were not behind closed doors; they were very much in the open.
“You could say it [open houses] added credibility to the process, it also showed that we missed something [the mountain bikers and schools interests].” (P1)

5. Targeted community liaison

The targeted community liaison that was undertaken by BPP resulted in specific issues being dealt with as they arose and prior to public open houses.

“They [the municipality] don’t generally see it in their interest or mandate to be as intimate and selective as I was. You know I saw my role as supplementing the public process with a private process or briefing people that I felt was likely to have an interest in the project in one way or another and anticipating their concerns and so on. And I don’t know that traditional planners would do that. They tend to follow a process that is scrupulously equal to everyone, they do not select.” (CR)

10.5 Challenges

1. Changing the planning process

Introducing a new process to replace the conventional process was controversial because it was politically driven which meant the new mayor had to face up to some upstanding people and say “we don’t want to do it your way anymore”. It took great confidence for Council to support such change.

“So from my point of view on the public policy side, our community, probably most communities, have moved way beyond specialized citizens who sit over here and weigh in and what was also happening was Councillors were going ‘well who are they?’ And the advisory groups were saying ‘well Council never takes our advice’ so again a total disconnect, and I thought that was a traditional and old fashioned approach and we would get rid of it, which was a bit controversial because you are saying to upstanding people: ‘We don’t want to do it your way anymore.’” (M)

“Pam Goldsmith-Jones got the new format going which was the Working Groups and I think that that was partly due to the fact that a lot of the people who worked in the committees were somewhat dissatisfied with the kind of reports that went in, and the reports that went in the committees were essentially reports from staff with addendums from the committees whereas with the Working Groups it is more that it is the report of the Working Group that goes to her not influenced by staff which is a great improvement.” (E3)

“Maybe it was the reluctance of this Council [opposed to other Council’s in other municipalities] but they wouldn’t even receive the reports so that was a pretty low standard.” (P1)
“My basic premise was that the community was going to be at the centre of what happens in Rodgers Creek and the process is going to be managed by the citizens who were on the Working Group.” (M)

“It was a new Council at the time and they wanted to establish these Working Groups.” (D1)

“The Council and Mayor wanted to create a different model for community engagement.” (P2)

“We went from an advisory committee model to a Working Group model and the idea was that the Mayor in Council said we would like to specify Working Groups to work on projects.” (P2)

2. Getting players on board

At the beginning there was much uncertainty about the Working Group and some reluctance from the developers about giving power to the group. The idea was to have the community at the centre of the Rodgers Creek Area plan and the process was going to be managed by citizens.

“At the beginning I was reluctant about having too much public involvement…you don’t want to have something designed by a committee.” (D1)

“The developer also had to feel comfortable too…the [Working] group was tailored for the development.” (P2)

“I think in the beginning it was a leap of faith for people.” (M)

“...I didn’t know if it [the Working Groups] would work. I thought if it didn’t work, well that is it for me.” (M)

“A Working Group cannot make decision. A Working Group just comes up with some suggestions that go to Council.” (M)

Getting the right mix of people on the group was also a challenge.

“You do want to look at your Working Group in terms of building a group that can work together…having everybody rubber stamp is not at all what you want.” (P1)
3. Motivating the public to participate

In terms of the participation of the general public the community liaison officer for BPP indicated that we have a ‘disinterested public’. While efforts were made to involve the public, it was difficult to motivate the general public to participate.

4. Identifying affected parties

The outcome of the public open houses suggest that consultation with the community groups could have occurred earlier and resolved matters earlier in the planning and design process. Issues arising late in the process are difficult to resolve and result in needing extra resources (i.e. time and money) to address successfully.

“BPP spent a lot of time and effort providing resources to the process getting [community groups] input.” (P4)

Identifying stakeholders affected by a decision can be difficult when legal issues are involved. There were issues of public use of private land and whether the mountain bikers had any rights. These issues prevented them from being included earlier in the planning process.

“We didn’t really recognize the mountain bike people as a key stakeholder until quite late in the process…both the District and the property owners were scared of liability issues associated with unregulated mountain biking down these steep hills.” (CR)

“The District and BPP in a similar related way we refused to recognize their rights and treated them as trespassers and posted signs warning people ‘private property, do not enter’ all with a view to protecting the company and the municipality from liability issues if people were hurt.” (CR)

“It is not the mountain bikers property…you walk a bit of a tightrope. Do you involve these people early and give them more power than they actually have? I don’t know.” (P2)

Identifying those affected is important because overlooking affected parties can lead to difficulties later in the planning process when they finally become involved: “If you miss one of these crucial players, it is quite likely that there will be implementation difficulties eventually when the involvement of that person is required” (Condon, 2008:28). Most interviewees identified that NSMBA and Mulgrave School could have been better involved and their opportunity to participate came late.
“The obvious thing was the mountain bikers not being included until later in the process…their profile in the process became very high over a miniscule component of the whole plan.” (CR)

“I don’t think that the school’s interests were taken into account early enough in the process.” (D2)

There was a consensus amongst the majority of interviewees that the NSMBA and Mulgrave School should have been consulted earlier in the process to avoid raising such contentious issues that resulted in significant design changes. The outcome in the Rodgers Creek Area development points to the success and usefulness of public open houses but it also raises questions about how stakeholders could have been more effectively involved earlier in the process.

5. Dealing with issues from the past

Trust issues from the past can exacerbate current concerns and create difficulty in reaching a resolution. In 2005, the municipality dismantled and destroyed mountain biking equipment and trails that were unsafe and had been constructed over many years in an ad hoc fashion. This created a difficult relationship between the mountain bikers, land owners and municipality.

“They had trust issues with both the municipality and the developer.” (D1)

“You have to get a level of trust and there are certainly some challenges of trust on both sides.” (E1)

6. Changing interests

The changing concerns of stakeholders needs to be addressed. Making false assumptions about their interests can lead to conflict or issues.

“I think unfortunately because there was focus on this idea that the school knew what was going to happen, it doesn’t change the fact that any one of us should have thought to think that just because that is what was talked about several years ago, it isn’t necessarily what they are going to want today.” (D2)

“The school also became very active in expressing that they weren’t going to accept the original collector route that ran along by the school despite the fact that I was privy to the meeting in which it was understood that that was what the design was when they were buying that land.” (D2)
“They were so frustrated never knowing what is going on and nobody ever talked about their neighbours. There are hundreds of people there everyday at school; it is a private school so they own it. You think we would include them.” (M)

7. Presenting enough information, but not too much

There is a risk of presenting detailed and complete plans that suggest the planning and design is final. The public open houses are intended to be mechanisms for input and discussion rather than a presentation of what has already been decided.

“There was a lot of discussion about that first open house and what we should do. A lot of people wanted to present plans because they knew that things had been done and again it was kind of reigning things back and saying ‘no, if you start presenting a plan it looks like a done deal, help people buy in’. And certainly the plan looked different. We added whole elements on the recreation side.” (P1)

10.6 Recommendations

The Working Group and public open houses were useful in reaching out to large numbers of people. The concept of tailored working groups that respond to the characteristics of the project can be transported to other large-scale residential developments. This new form of community engagement may replace the standard advisory committees which may not be attuned enough to the particular circumstances of the project. The working group and technical team had separate functions but worked together in an integrated way which brought significant benefit to the process and outcome. Table 10-4 summarises the key recommendations arising from the analysis and evaluation of the Working Group component.
### Table 10-4. Phase 3 Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Review existing public participation techniques and obtain political support to implement a new process | • Council can be kept separated from the process  
• Better, more effective participation | • Controversy surrounding changing the process  
• Existing legislation may be a barrier  
• Initial resistance to committing to a new process  
• Political risk implementing a new process |
| 2. Establish purpose-driven working groups that are: | • Operate as an external third-party resource to the municipality and developer  
• Suggestions are community based but practical  
• Efficiency of process improved  
• Common interests link members together  
• Trust and respect gained quickly due to expertise  
• The developer and Council feel comfortable with the group selection | • Risk of creating a group that does not work well together  
• Difficulty in obtaining interest from professionals in the community |
| - Selected by developer and committee appointed by council  
- Focus on one project only  
- Expert-based  
- Open minded and innovative  
- No opposition to development (not should development occur, but rather how should it occur)  
- Make suggestions, don’t make decisions | | |
| 3. Identify significant interest groups and ensure they are informed and aware of the process through community liaison and advertising | • Empowering special-interest groups  
• Gaining valuable input and local knowledge  
• Community liaison targets individuals and groups while advertising reaches out to the broader community | • Failing to identify those with a significant interest may create issues later in the process  
• Strong opposition may be difficult to overcome  
• Past issues with groups will impact their response |
| 4. Ensure process is transparent and open to the general community | • Public can observe, offer comment and ask questions  
• Community consulting community can benefit the process  
• More meaningful input | • Difficult if controversial development and strong interest |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Make participation voluntary but acknowledge participation at the end of</td>
<td>• Satisfaction of contributing to the community, learning new skills, opportunity</td>
<td>• Time commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the process</td>
<td>to work on something innovative, avenue for fostering relationships, trust and</td>
<td>• Rewards may appear as bribery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gaining respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity to pursue interest in being elected into Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Allow process to be flexible and self designed but provide guidance and</td>
<td>• A model has been established and precedent set through the Rodgers Creek Area</td>
<td>• Lack of clarity on the role, rules and responsibility of the group can be frustrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>Working Group. This will increase efficiency and certainty for future large-scale</td>
<td>for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential developments that adopt a similar approach</td>
<td>• No one-size-fits-all approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The process can be tailored to the project and evolve as it progresses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide technical and basic information to the group</td>
<td>• Basic and technical information ensures all members are up-to-date and understand</td>
<td>• Different levels of expertise and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appoint a chair to ensure Working Group members have an equal opportunity</td>
<td>• Have someone to manage the process</td>
<td>• Strong personalities may dominate over weaker personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for participation</td>
<td>• Provides structure</td>
<td>• Electing the council member as chair may politicize the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensures all participants have an opportunity to contribute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Build relationships and trust within and outside of the group to create</td>
<td>• Common interest amongst members helps guide process</td>
<td>• Diverse group has different values and priorities that need to be balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect</td>
<td>• Relationship and trust beneficial outside of the Rodgers Creek project</td>
<td>• Past issues between group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge and expertise helped build trust built with Council, District and owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Potential Benefits</td>
<td>Potential Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. Make Working Group members volunteers and provide them with substantial power to influence the process and the project. Although a more formal means of accountability would create greater confidence, the informal accountability to the process and public was successful | • Power seen through their ability to influence policy change and have recommendations endorsed  
• Accountability to the process is developed as trust and respect is developed  
• No accountability means the group can make unbiased third party decisions  
• Although not officially accountable, the openness and transparency of the process creates an informal accountability to the community | • There is no formal accountability  
• There is uncertainty regarding who the Working Group is representing  
• Difficulty for Working Group members to separate their day-to-day role with the Working Group role |
| 11. Establish and manage deadlines | • Regular meetings ensured the project was continually progressing  
• Milestones help keep project on track | • Uncertainty and efficiency can be weak when new processes are introduced  
• Dealing with the unexpected may slow the process |
| 12. Overlap the Working Group with the sieve analysis. Setting up the Working Group earlier could have reduced the overall time of the process | • Potential to reduce the overall length of the process by having the technical team and Working Group operating in parallel  
• Opportunity to endorse the foundation work and move on from that point | • The foundation work needs to be complete, starting the group too early would place additional pressure on volunteer time |
| 13. Include implementation considerations at all stages in the planning process | • The experience of the Working Group members ensures that practicality and implementation considerations are addressed | • At the conclusion, Council is being asked to have confidence in the work produced by the community, not the municipality  
• The Working Group is not involved in the development permit stage or ongoing monitoring |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Hold public open houses once sufficient information has been prepared to</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity for input from community groups and citizens who may have been</td>
<td>• Difficult to motivate public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtain input from the broader community</td>
<td>left out</td>
<td>• No need to involve too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adds credibility to the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies issues that have been overlooked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Address input from open houses effectively</td>
<td>• Recognition of concerns that have been overlooked</td>
<td>• Significant issues may result in additional resources (time and money) to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolve issues of the past</td>
<td>successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build better relationships and trust</td>
<td>• Overlooking issues raised defeats purpose of open house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Respect shown towards contentious issues</td>
<td>• Trust issues from past exacerbated by current concerns and create difficulty in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a plan that will be better accepted</td>
<td>reaching a resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provide full information to the public</td>
<td>• Illustrates the transparency and openness of the process</td>
<td>• Risk of presenting detailed and complete plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Use targeted community liaison as a secondary method of public participation</td>
<td>• Specific issues are dealt with as they arise prior to open house</td>
<td>• Difficulty in identifying the key stakeholders particularly when legal issues are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prevent issues arising late in the process which may be difficult to resolve</td>
<td>involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Identify stakeholders affected at the beginning of the process and avoid</td>
<td>• Prevent unforeseen issues from arising late in the process</td>
<td>• Stakeholders’ concerns/ interests can change despite past agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making assumptions about individuals/ groups interests</td>
<td>• Eliminate conflict/contention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Create opportunity for private targeted liaison to coordinate and work</td>
<td>• Better communication</td>
<td>• Potential for bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with municipality</td>
<td>• Identify issues more effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce resource strain on municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.0 PHASE 4: BYLAW DEVELOPMENT AND CONSIDERATION

11.1 Introduction

The Sustainability Review and Evaluation followed the public consultation and preparation of the draft Area Development Plan. Although the step was an initiative led by the developer, it was important in evaluating performance and building confidence in the plan.

While the developer was undertaking the Sustainability Review and Evaluation, the Area Development Plan was finalised and presented to Council as two different options. Council selected an option in April 2008 and instructed staff to prepare bylaws and a community benefits package. Three bylaws were created and presented to Council and subsequently adopted at the public hearing in July 2008:

1. OCP amendment bylaw
2. Zoning amendment bylaw
3. Phased development agreement bylaw

Figure 11-1. Phase 4 Process Diagram
11.2 Description

11.2.1 Review and Evaluation

In February 2008, Holland Barrs Planning Group Inc, a consultant retained by the developer, undertook a Sustainability Review of the ADP to evaluate the project — how well it performed and how it could be improved. While Holland Barrs Planning Group Inc had not been part of the technical team directly involved in the project they had participated at various stages in the process by providing advice.

“He [Mark Holland] wasn’t part of the design process. He was brought in at the beginning and then brought in at the end, occasionally advice was sought…I think that was a really useful exercise and I think that Council and the community actually benefited enormously from that approach.” (E2)

The sustainability evaluation was based on the ‘8-pillars of Sustainability’ that were adopted during the Envisioning phase. The criteria for assessing each pillar included:

- Standards/benchmarks
- Reference/comparison case studies
- Contextual opportunities and constraints
- Project strategies and policies
- Project performance (technical and developer initiatives)

(Holland Barrs, 2008)

The evaluation rated the project highly and drew the following conclusion: “Considering the constraints that included topography, density limits and other factors, the project performs very well and shows leadership in many areas” (Holland Barrs, 2008:44). It made recommendations for options to be considered for improving sustainability performance. These included increasing density, the provision of social housing, and providing alternative transport support and greener buildings. The evaluation acknowledged the challenges of achieving greater performance on sustainability, which will be addressed at the development permit stage.

11.2.2 Bylaw Development

The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group presented the proposed Area Development Plan contained in the Overview Report in April 2008. In this proposal were two housing mix options. Option A was for 536 units and Option B was for 736 units. Council was also presented with a
report on the Fiscal Impact of the proposed development options and a proposed community amenities package.

Option A was based on the traditional 2.5 units per acre density restriction set out in the OCP but this requirement was considered outdated and Option B was selected, which included 736 housing units with 13% single family, 3% duplex/triplex, 14% townhomes and 70% apartments. The plan also stipulates that 30% of all apartments would be less than 1,000 sq.ft in size. While the density cap was lifted the upper total floor area limit of 1,875,000 sq.ft remains unchanged. The amended housing diversity requirement is unique in that it will change the long established patterns of residential development in the Upper Lands and contribute to greater housing choice, Table 11-1.

Table 11-1. Options for Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment size</td>
<td>No. of units</td>
<td>% of units</td>
<td>No. of units</td>
<td>% of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 sq.ft or smaller</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 2100 sq.ft</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2100 sq.ft</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total apartment units</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average apt. size</td>
<td>2255 sq.ft</td>
<td>1635 sq.ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/triplex</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per acre</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)

Following Council’s decision to go with Option B they instructed staff to prepare bylaws implementing the recommendations of the Working Group. District staff were also directed to work further on a final community benefit package, “Council voted in favour of drafting bylaws for development Option B, which would see the area rezoned to accommodate 736 housing units – 198 more units than proposed in Option A and 361 units over what would be allowed under current zoning” (Tumato, 2008a:1).
The District staff drafted three new bylaws:

- an OCP amendment bylaw which succinctly described the Rodgers Creek ADP (Option B) and set out development permit guidelines for the Rodgers Creek Area
- a zoning amendment bylaw which created one zone for the entire planning area and provided land use and density certainty, with measured flexibility
- a phased development agreement bylaw to secure a significant community amenity package and provide protection to the developer by securing the ADP for up to 10 years from future zoning amendments

(District of West Vancouver, 2009)

The zoning amendment and phased development agreement for Rodgers Creek was the first bylaws of this nature to be introduced to West Vancouver.

The three proposed bylaws were presented to Council on July 7, 2008. In accordance with Provincial legislation, a public hearing was held on July 28, 2008 and closed that same evening. The Ministry of Transportation approval of the rezoning was received on September 8, 2008 and all three bylaws were adopted on September 22, 2008 (District of West Vancouver, 2009).

OCP Amendment Bylaw

The OCP Amendment Bylaw (2008) established to:

- Override the existing 2.5 units per acre requirement and allow for a maximum 736 dwelling units and a maximum 1,875,600 million square feet of building area.
- Designate 55% of land area as environmentally protected green space.
- Avoid fragmentation of environmentally sensitive lands.
- Provide for a diversity of housing: maximum 120 one and two bedroom dwellings, minimum of 100 cluster or townhouse units, and 30% of apartment units of 1000 sq ft or less in size.
- Ensure inclusion of adaptable design elements.
- Offer diversity of housing in each of the six neighbourhoods.
- Provide higher density at the Western end of the Rodgers Creek Area adjacent to the future Cypress Village (which will include commercial, residential and civic uses).
- Area adjacent to school (outside of Rodgers Creek) to be used for the purpose of school facilities. This is subject to future rezoning and development permits.
- Connect Chippendale Road to upper Cypress Bowl Road.
- Ensure roads are functional, sympathetic to the terrain and cause minimal site disturbance.
• Provide a mountain pathway and trail network that connects the six neighbourhoods to one another, the existing development and the future Cypress Village.
• Provide multiple public places along the pathway that support a variety of activities for different age groups.
• Incorporate cultural history (logging/ski lifts) and natural features (viewpoints, boulders and waterfalls) in activity nodes.
• Strive for innovation, green buildings and infrastructure; that is buildings and infrastructure with lower energy and water consumption, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and that enhance sustainability and create a healthy living environment.
(District of West Vancouver, 2008)

Zoning Amendment Bylaw
The purpose of the zoning amendment bylaw was for it to provide certainty, with appropriate flexibility (District of West Vancouver, 2009). While extensive work had been undertaken in the Envisioning, technical sessions and Working Group, the ADP was not a set of final construction drawings and flexibility was needed to ensure it remained a leading edge development over its 6-10 year construction/development period. There was no template for such zoning so the District developed minimum and maximum’s aimed at achieving a sustainable community (District of West Vancouver, 2009).

The zoning amendment bylaw developed by the District rezoned the site from R.S.7 Single Family Zone 7 and R.S.8 Single Family zone 8 to a Comprehensive Development Zone Three (CD3). It includes the following policies:
• permitted uses per development area
• maximum unit type requirements per development area
• minimum percentage of floor areas per development area
• total maximum floor space per development area
• restrictions for subdivisions
• maximum site coverage
• building heights per area and building type
• minimum yard dimensions per building type
• off street parking and bicycle storage
• garbage and recycling facilities
• landscaping
(District of West Vancouver. 2008b)
Phased Development Agreement Bylaw

The Phased Development Agreement was based on provincial legislation introduced in June 2007. The changes to the Local Government Act allowed for preparation of PDAs. The PDAs allow developers protection for up to ten years from zoning amendments and in return commitment to community amenity packages. The PDAs are implemented through bylaws.

The Phased Development Agreement Bylaw outlines the key elements of the community amenity package, which includes:

- the green building strategy and building accessibility standards as set out in the ADP
- provision of a serviced site of approximately 0.8 acres for District use
- a $7.94 million phased cash contribution to the District consistent with the District’s community amenity policy
- the recognition of certain mountain biking routes as long-term recreational resources
- the extension of Chippendale Road (a collector road) to Cypress Bowl Road in advance of development in order to better manage the impact of construction trucks on existing neighbourhoods

(District of West Vancouver. 2008a)

In addition to the PDA, “future residents of the West Vancouver’s Upper Lands will be getting a full-scale rugby field after BPP donated $1 million to the municipality for its construction…the $1 million donation is over and above the $7.94 million officially committed by BPP to the creation of amenities for the new neighbourhood” (Weldon, 2008:10).

11.2.3 Public Hearing

The final public hearing occurred in July 2008. At the hearing presentations were made and there were unusual levels of public support for the project: “West Vancouver residents showed up in full support of the Rodgers Creek development bylaws at a public hearing Monday night. Around 100 residents packed the municipal hall to voice their approval of the plans principles of environmental and ecological sustainability” (Krishnan, 2008a:1).

Although the public support was high, there were concerns raised regarding traffic and the proposed community benefits package (Kirshnan, 2008a).

“The presentations that were made out of that night count roughly with 17 people supportive of it and four that were neutral maybe reach out on negative but two of them were to do with community benefits; was the municipality extracting value? Not necessarily negative against the plan, the density or the direction but was the community getting enough?” (E3)
Council passed the third reading of the Rodgers Creek Area bylaws with a 6-1 vote, with Council Vaughan in opposition (Kirshnan, 2008a).

11.3 Public Participation Techniques

There was no public participation in the review and evaluation steps of the Rodgers Creek Area planning process. Rather it was a specialist report prepared by experts. The public was also not involved in the preparation of the final implementation documentation but the bylaws were based on the recommendations of the Rodgers Creek Area Working Group.

The public hearing was the final opportunity for public participation in the Rodgers Creek Area planning process. It is a technique that brings people together and allows for input but not for rebuttal or constructive dialogue. A public hearing as defined by the International Association for Public Participation is “formal meetings with scheduled presentations offered. Typically, members of the public individually state opinions/positions that are recorded” (IAP2, 2006:13).

The public hearing was a means for informing the public under the International Association for Public Participation’s Public Participation Spectrum (2007). Unlike open houses it did not lead to consultation. While public hearings provide an opportunity for the public to speak without rebuttal, they do not foster constructive dialogue and are usually held merely to meet legal requirements.

"What you want to do at a public hearing is minimise the number of people that speak and at least have half of the people for and half the people against, then your doing okay. But in this case you didn't have very many people speak at all. So it shows you that by the time we got to this stage people were happy." (D1)

11.4 What Worked Well

11.4.1 Review and Evaluation

1. Review and evaluation creates confidence in the plan and the process

The Sustainability Review and Evaluation was a useful evaluation tool that linked back into the original commitment to sustainability made at the outset of the project during the Envisioning. While sustainability was a key underlying concept during the planning and design, it was useful to evaluate how well it achieved what it set out to. It was a very useful step as it created confidence
in the ADP for the developer, municipality, politicians and community. It also created a sense of
satisfaction for those involved in the planning and design.

“...that approach [of review and evaluation] brought benefit to the process.” (E2)

“...we analyzed the report card on pure performance, ‘how well do we think this place is going to
perform?’ And secondly, we also looked at it and said, ‘If you were going to do better what would
you do better?’ And when we got to the end of that I think we concluded that there were only a
couple of things that we thought were a reasonable path. One might be that they achieve a slightly
higher level of green performance.” (P3)

The key strength of undertaking the Sustainability Review and Evaluation was that it assessed
the ADP. It pointed to how well the technical team and Working Group had done.

“The sustainability report card was something that was different, very few projects do a report card
after they have done the planning to see how well they had done.” (P3)

The project was rated highly, which created confidence in the quality and performance of the ADP
which may have impacted upon the subsequent steps in the planning process — the public
hearing and implementation.

2. Greater integration of sustainability review of new experiments and innovations into planning
processes

Implementation, review and evaluation of results on new experiments and innovations were seen
in the Rodgers Creek Area process. These steps point to supporting the third wave of
experimentation and innovation, a theory outlined by Dorcey (2009). They further show a
movement towards improving sustainability and the processes that enable it. This builds upon
the first wave, which Dorcey suggests was the emergence of environmental and social concerns
in policy and public participation. The second wave which was the growing popularity of
sustainable development in environmental policy, increase in public participation, multi-
stakeholder processes, conflict resolution and consensus building.
3. Greater commitment to sustainability, bridging the gap between sustainability planning and outcomes

The review and evaluation component is important. Review and evaluation are often excluded but are needed to bridge the gap between sustainability planning and outcomes. Often responsibility for sustainability and implementation is an undefined area but its importance is increasingly being recognized. The Sustainability Review and Evaluation illustrates developer and municipal commitment to more sustainable development.

4. Identification of opportunities for improving sustainability at development permit phase

The review and evaluation was also useful in identifying the ways in which the project can be improved to achieve better performance. Such recommendations may be useful in the implementation or the planning and design of phase two, the future Cypress Village.

5. Review and evaluation tailored to address the circumstances of the project

The evaluation varied from traditional evaluations because it accommodated the limitations and what would be considered reasonable for the site and development.

“Part of the analysis included what we thought was reasonable which was an important observation. Many sustainability frameworks don’t take that into account.” (P3)

11.4.2 Bylaw Development

The bylaws created for the Rodgers Creek ADP were unique. Firstly the legislative change to the OCP allows greater flexibility on density. Secondly, the phased development agreement bylaw locked in the approval and secured a significant community benefits package.

OCP Amendment Bylaw
The OCP amendment bylaw enabled flexibility on the design to adapt to the changing market.

“Another key feature was the cap on units and a cap on square footage so we can play around to meet market demands right now.” (D1)

Zoning Amendment Bylaw
The zoning amendment bylaw saw the developer commit to certain things at the approval stage. The Rodgers Creek Area development has a lot more sustainability features than previous BPP
developments. This was the first time they were specific and made commitments at the zoning stage.

“I think what is unique about this is that we committed to this at the zoning stage…for someone to commit to these standards at the zoning stage, I’m not aware of anyone else doing that. I would rather do it voluntarily than have it mandated because LEED isn’t always the best thing to use.” (D1)

**Phased Development Agreement Bylaw**

The phased development agreement bylaw operates as a safeguard for the developer in terms of locking in development approval for 10 years as well as the municipality by securing the community benefits package.

“Another outcome of this process was the 10-year phased development agreement. Our zoning is locked in for 10 years. So we can make these kinds of commitments knowing that a change of Council cannot downsize us and make it not work anymore.” (D1)

“This [ADP] covers 10 years of development and when we go through each development permit area that process is sped up. It only took us two months to get a development permit. It used to be a six month process. Because we have talked about it and we know what the issues here.” (D1)

**11.4.3 Public Hearing**

1. **Success of community consultation illustrated through high levels of public support from the general public and affected parties at the public hearing**

At the final public hearing the number of people that spoke was unusually low and those who did raised concern over the community amenities package, impact on taxpayers and traffic. The concerns raised were not significant. The overwhelming community support at the public hearing suggests that the public consultation undertaken prior to the meeting was successful in addressing the concerns of the community.

The approval and adoption of the ADP without many objections was a major achievement.

“The fact that the thing got adopted, it got approved relatively painlessly, was an indication that the public at large or the community was accepting of it.” (P5)

“You just didn’t see many people who had an issue with the final plan….they were very few and far between if you look at the number of people that supported it versus those who opposed, it was a tiny fraction.” (CR)
“I think there were really surprising levels of support.” (P4)

“By the time it got to the public hearing people had already had their say and it was really a non-event which is what it should be really.” (D1)

“At the public hearing which is the last chance for public input, I can’t remember how many people spoke, but no one spoke against it. I have never seen that before.” (D1)

While public hearings as a technique for public input have been subject to many criticisms, in the Rodgers Creek Area development it pointed to the success of the extensive public consultations held prior to the meeting, the success of the design team to address the concerns raised by the public and the transparency and detail that was evident throughout the process: “When members of the public defend the plan, the professionals know they have done a good job” (Walters, 2007:171).

The NSMBA encouraged their members to support the project. This was a major achievement which followed their initial opposition to the development evident at the open houses: “The next opportunity for the voices of mountain bikers to be heard will be the public hearing on July 28th at 7pm in the West Vancouver Council Chambers on the proposed Rodgers Creek bylaws. The West Vancouver Council Chambers don’t have room for as large a crowd as North Vancouver and we don’t want to overwhelm them, but we do want to show support for this plan and what it promises for the trails. Especially if you are a West Vancouver resident or business person, please come out and make your presence known” (Bader and Bardsley, 2008).

It showed that those who knew about the project and took and interest in it, were highly satisfied, “thanks to cooperation between BPP and the District of West Vancouver on the Rodgers Creek development, recreational trails have been integrated into the current planning process, thanks in no small part to the impressive turn out of well informed and well behaved mountain bikers at the June 2007 open house” (Bader and Bardsley, 2008).

“Council had to go through a public hearing tradition but because we front loaded the whole process with substance the decision point almost became secondary.” (M)
2. Openness and transparency creates confidence amongst community and politicians resulting in greater buy-in

The openness and transparency of the process led Council to have greater confidence in the plan. They had the power and decision-making ability.

“At the end of the day Council has the ultimate power to say ‘no’.” (D1)

“Council is the ultimate decision-making authority and I think that the power is with them.” (P2)

“Ultimate power rests with the Council…I think it is fair to say that Council’s may respect the input from the public more than they did a long time ago.” (E3)

“Council were briefed on the process. They attended or were briefed on the open houses. One of the Councillors was the chair of the Working Group meetings…so by the time it actually officially got to Council they were pretty clear on how the process had gone and were satisfied that the results were being recommended by the Working Group.” (P4)

Community acceptance of a plan points towards its popularity and makes it easier to endorse and implement by politicians (Bousfield, 1976). The public hearing operates as a safety net for those that may have missed an opportunity to participate earlier in the process.

11.5 Challenges

11.5.1 Review and Evaluation

There were several challenges that impact this step. The work was undertaken by a third party. While it was viewed by the developer as an independent assessment, the municipality indicated it was not a fully independent assessment as the consultant was retained by the developer. A more neutral assessment would have added credibility to the results. Furthermore, the municipality indicated that they would have liked to have undertaken their own review and evaluation but the time, cost and resources were not available to do so.

“We had Mark Holland’s assessment of it. There was a bit of a confusion with roles sometimes because we viewed Mark as BPP’s consultant as Holland Barrs had been retained by them but that is not how they viewed it which is interesting.” (P1)

“We actually thought of having a peer review of the project from a sustainability perspective and you know I think the idea was really good…but time didn’t allow for that to happen.” (P1)
Another challenge highlighted by a participant was the lack of clarity regarding sustainability targets. Setting targets early in the process provides clarity and more certainty about how the project will be rated at the end of the process.

“If we had developed a set of targets towards the beginning [it would have provided] more clarity about what we were trying to do.” (P3)

The Rodgers Creek ADP is a stronger model for sustainable development than previous development in the Upper Lands. The environmental aspects of the Rodgers Creek Area project were of core focus in the planning and design process and as a result the project performs well on environmental objectives. The economic side of the project will also bring some benefit to the community through taxes, the community benefits package and strengthening of the economic base. The environmental and economic outcomes are strong but there were challenges on meeting social sustainability objectives due to the land use and market for BPP developments. Although there were challenges on the social side, the mountain pathway which connects the development add significant social and community values to the project. While the main gains from the project are environmental benefits, the social and economic components may be strengthened with the development of the future Cypress Village adjacent to the site. It was outside the scope of this thesis to assess the sustainability outcomes of the project.

11.5.2 Bylaw Development

While bylaws have been created, the detailed design of each phase will occur at the development permit stage. The success of implementing the ADP will only be evident over time.

“It’s the implementation stuff that will play out to see if it is successful. Because to be a good plan, the next stage of that is implementation. It is a good saying that your reputation cannot be built on what you say you’re going to do. So they have said what they are going to do and we have to see if they are going to do it and make sure that happens.” (E1)

“They have development permits so there is quantifiable and qualifiable things that they have committed to and there are also timelines associated to a number of these.” (E1)

“I feel like we have put some good checks and balances in place to make sure that the implementation plan is feasible and we are moving and we are meeting with the developer to check on the implementation and that is a far cry from the way we used to do it so it’s good.” (E1)

“As the [Working] Group checks out that is when the Streamkeepers work really starts with the development. The other people go about their lives but the Streamkeepers work starts now paying attention to are they going to live up to the things that they said.” (E3)
“Now we have got to take it to the next level which is the execution of this plan...we are still vigilant in holding to this and I think that we have to be.” (P1)

“...we meet [BPP] on a regular basis not as regularly but we meet on a regular basis so I can make sure things are moving ahead in a timely manner and as many concerns as possible are dealt with upfront.” (P1)

Executing the plan remains a challenge. The Streamkeepers expressed concern over the execution of the ADP based on failures of previous BPP developments, which resulted in poor quality construction and damage to the natural and urban environment.

There concerns were documented in local newspaper articles. One article suggested fines had been issued to the construction company building the development, “the development in British properties has been slapped with fines on two separate occasions in the past 16months from silt from the site washed into the stream” (Seyd, 2007:5). Another article described the mud slide that caused evacuation of housing, “residents of an exclusive West Vancouver subdivision were ordered out of their homes Friday after a hillside drenched with heavy rain collapsed onto their road” (Weldon, 2007:5). Similar concerns were raised by the interviewees.

“And that is my point of contention. The presentations are great and the plan is great, but how are you going to execute it?” (E3)

“...the notorious infamous ‘rain garden’...it was an ephemeral stream that was really planned for. The way that the contractor had executed the design ended up with basically the whole hillside washed down onto the road and they evacuated some houses, it was considered serious.” (E3)

“In a lot of past developments BPP has sold the land and it becomes developed at a level outside of their control...BPP said during the Working Group meetings that they would develop this on their own. They have their own construction group company and they will do this on their own. I will be very very disappointed if they start farming this out to other people because all of a sudden we are back where we were.” (E3)

“Now we haven’t been exactly happy with how they [BPP] have done things.” (E3)

“We have instigated two site visits to the site because we insist we want to see what is happening and how they are doing things...it shows that we are still interested and that we are watching them.” (E3)
“But we do have to watch them because we know from past experience that despite what they say and what they tell everyone, they don’t always do it that way and even their own sub-contractors may not be doing exactly what they say even though they give instructions.” (E3)

“We feel that we are the only people independent that can say ‘why are you doing this?’…to some extent I think we can say ‘there is another way to do it.’” (E3)

“The procurement process actually is one of the single largest barriers to innovation and the implementation of significant innovation…the bidding process is not designed to do anything other than highest degree of compliance with the lowest cost. What the hell has that got to do with innovation? Nothing.” (E2)

The ADP shows a lot of detail but it is intended that the design morph over time to reflect new trends. The municipality intended for the development to respond to changes and be current.

“My only worry is sometimes this plan has a lot of images and shows you where houses are going to be exactly and a lot of people perceived it that way.” (P1)

“As we move through the development in these areas I expect them to take everything that they have done here and keep it current, keep it new and keep it fresh because in five years hopefully we know more about how to build these kinds of buildings that work better with the terrain. I don’t want them to get locked into this. It is not a masterplan, these are not the actual building forms that are going to go up, we need to adapt and be current the entire time” (P1)

The overall ADP process was lengthy but the development permit process should be much faster.

“…when I started here in March 2006 they [BPP] were hoping to have an approved plan by the end of 2006. It wasn’t until the end of 2008 almost two years later. Whether that initial expectation was realistic or not, I don’t know. It definitely took a year or so longer than we thought it would take. I am hoping that we get back that time with the development permits.” (D1)

11.5.3 Public Hearing

Public hearings do not allow for constructive input into the planning process. This step is a legal requirement which many of the interviewees indicated is now outdated. Traditionally “public hearings are usually held in a formal hearing room, where consultants dressed in expensive suits stand at the front of the room and present elaborately illustrated plans to sceptical citizens assembled in rows below. The hour or two devoted to the public hearing is too short for substantive critique, and it is far too short for productive collaborative problem solving. Moreover, proposing and testing alternatives or evaluating and negotiating community benefits is impossible in such a context. All citizens can do is voice their objectives, which they often do stridently.
Elected officials at the local level are notoriously cowed by the appearance of 20 or more angry voters even though that number might constitute a tiny fraction of the constituents actually affected by their actions” (Condon, 2008:57).

The process places immense pressure on politicians to respond to the majority response at the hearing with little consideration given to other public consultation input and responses throughout the process.

“Often with other municipalities you get to a public hearing stage as you are required by law and people want to debate the issues. But it’s not a place for people to learn about the development or to debate it. They basically say if they are for or against it. People don’t understand because they often don’t get involved until the public hearing and that creates a lot of conflict, a lot of confrontation and at the end of the day no one is happy with the outcome.” (D1)

Traditionally, there was an application, an information session and a public hearing. In planning processes of the past the public hearing was the only avenue for participation so issues would build up and when they were finally raised it was difficult to do anything.

“There isn’t any standards for any particular group until the public hearing and what happened traditionally under that [conventional] model is all of the issues get stored up till the end and then you come into the decision making process with a lot of unresolved concerns and it is very difficult to resolve them.” (CR)

“I think that the thing about the public hearing is that it is a voting session, it is yes or no. You can’t change the plan in the midst of the public hearing without going back so it is hard to take information at that point you really have to do all of your work ahead of time if you are going to effectively involve the public. The public hearing is just the endpoint and it is not a place for the public to be effectively involved. It becomes a do or die for the developer and for District staff and for Council. They have to make these do-or-die decisions; it is very adversarial this type of arrangement.” (P1)

“I like the idea that as a developer you are required to stand up and answer for what you are proposing to do, because if you can’t convince the people that it is a reasonable design then it probably isn’t.” (D2)

11.6 Recommendations

The Sustainability Review and Evaluation was a fundamental step in the planning and design process. It was useful because it provided insight into how the plan will perform once implemented. The public hearing is a risky step in the planning process. For Rodgers Creek it
was favourable to the final outcome, but there is a lot of weight on this final step which has the risk of undermining efforts put into the public consultation step. The implementation of the ADP brings together all the background work, public consultation and technical design work. The ADP is not a legal document, rather the policies created at the implementation stage will shape how the site develops. The developer and municipality expressed confidence in the implementation tools. They both expressed that the policies provided both certainty and flexibility. The success of the policies in implementing the plan and providing safeguards for the developer, municipality and community will only be shown over time. **Table 11-2** summarises key recommendations arising from the analysis.

**Table 11-2. Phase 4 Summary of Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree at the outset of the planning process that a Sustainability Review and Evaluation will be undertaken</td>
<td>- Provides assessment of performance</td>
<td>- Time, cost and resources available to complete review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create confidence in the plan</td>
<td>- Risk that the assessment will provide negative results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify opportunity for improvements in the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish the criteria and targets for the Sustainability Review and Evaluation so there is something to work towards and measure off</td>
<td>- Something measurable to work towards</td>
<td>- Not setting targets early enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond to circumstances of project</td>
<td>- Lack of clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disagreements between parties about what is desirable and practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree on a mutual third party to undertake the assessment or create a project team with representatives selected by both the developer and municipality</td>
<td>- Improve credibility and accountability</td>
<td>- Resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Find ways to address recommendations to enhance sustainability performance integrated into the design</td>
<td>- Make review and evaluation purposeful by responding to recommendations</td>
<td>- Difficulty in addressing recommendations late in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use education to create awareness and stimulate responsibility for sustainable development</td>
<td>- Enhance commitment and understanding towards sustainability</td>
<td>- Resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Potential Benefits</td>
<td>Potential Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Review legislation requiring public hearings</td>
<td>• Greater flexibility</td>
<td>• Political pressure to respond to majority response – little consideration of previous work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of outdated process</td>
<td>• Legislative change required at provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obstacle for developer, District staff and politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No avenue for constructive input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Invest in successful and effective public consultation early in the process</td>
<td>• Reduce risks at public hearing stage</td>
<td>• Risk of missing something and it arising at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide phased developer agreements to secure the approval and community</td>
<td>• Certainty to developer, municipality, council and community</td>
<td>• Locking things in can reduce flexibility and ability for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits packages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ensure commitments made at zoning stage to be carried through to</td>
<td>• Improve confidence in implementation</td>
<td>• Locking things in can reduce flexibility and ability for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development permit stage</td>
<td>• Set minimum benchmark for development</td>
<td>• Detailed design occurs at development permit stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provide flexibility in approval to allow flexibility in design to respond</td>
<td>• Respond to changing market</td>
<td>• Difficult to provide certainty of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to market changes</td>
<td>• Not locked in</td>
<td>• Too much flexibility may override the approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ADP not a final plan and can adapt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide for ongoing management and monitoring of implementation</td>
<td>• Ensure plan is carried out as intended</td>
<td>• Resource constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify opportunities for adaption if needed</td>
<td>• Execution of plans may be poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction techniques may result in damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk of outsourcing work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reduce time of process or make up by fast tracking development permits to</td>
<td>• Fast development permits possible because of strong foundational work</td>
<td>• Every project is different with different concerns/ issues so time will vary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account for longer ADP process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Extend the multi-stakeholder processes into the implementation phase so as</td>
<td>• Strengthen connection between planning and implementation</td>
<td>• Enabling the multi-stakeholder group to have a meaningful impact on implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.0 EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL SESSIONS AND THE WORKING GROUP

12.1 Introduction

The Rodgers Creek Area planning process reflects elements of a consensus process. The analysis highlights that the planning and design process comprised a number of steps. To provide a more in-depth examination of the consensus process an evaluation of the Phase 2: Technical Sessions and Phase 3: Working Group was undertaken. The Rodgers Creek Area planning process was not a typical consensus process. Consensus processes typically involve all stakeholders working together to reach an agreement (CCNRTEE, 1996). In the Rodgers Creek Area planning process all of the stakeholders were not at the same table. Nonetheless, the various participatory techniques came together and produced an outcome that satisfied all of the stakeholders. Consensus was reached. The guiding principles for a consensus process developed by the Canadian National Round Table on Environment and Economy (CCNRTEE, 1993) have been selected to evaluate the project. These principles are outlined below.

CCNRTEE Guiding Principles for the Consensus Process:

1. Purpose driven
2. Inclusive not exclusive
3. Voluntary participation
4. Self design
5. Flexibility
6. Equal opportunity
7. Respect
8. Accountability
9. Time limits
10. Implementation

12.2 Principle 1: Purpose Driven

Consensus processes need to be purpose-driven whereby all parties need to see sufficient reason to participate (CCNRTEE, 1996). Potential motivations to participate include:

- Frustration with status quo
- Uncertainty about the strength of their position
- Desire for greater and more direct control over the outcome
- Desire to avoid a continuing high profile and politically divisive dispute
- Concern about the cost of a prolonged dispute
- Desire for finality

(CCNRTEE, 1996:16)
Getting the parties to the table is the first key step in a consensus process. For the West Vancouver Council, they were drawn to the consensus process because the conventional process was not working and it was an opportunity to avoid a potentially contentious situation. Through developing working groups and making it a community-driven process, politicians can avoid making controversial decisions. Open and fair processes can improve public image.

The municipality expressed frustration with the conventional planning process and the type of development that was being produced. Their control in the process was often overridden by political agendas and the power and influence of the developers. These motivations led the municipality to seek a better process.

Initially there were some reservations from the land owners about giving up control and risks of inviting the District staff into the design team.

“You sit down, have a map with some information on it and you are gritting your teeth because that is the point you are going to know. The District says you can put some buildings here or you can’t. It’s a little nerve racking…and that was tense. It was a little bit of a tense time in terms of the partnership with the District…But as soon as we got to a place where we could establish a set of criteria that everyone agreed upon and understood, as I said, [it] made good common sense. It all went extremely smoothly from there.” (D2)

“Going into that process there were some worried that staff might want to protect this and consult on that and the developer wouldn’t have any developable land in the end but at the end of the day because we worked together so closely we were all on the same page by the time we got there. And the sieve analysis was a consensus effort that everyone brought into and agreed with it and everybody had an opportunity on the technical side to influence it. Then we had a base plan of all of our information.” (D1)

“Council, staff and the public all wanted more input in the earlier stage and this process allowed them to have that without the developer giving up too much control.” (D1)

Despite initial uncertainty, the landowners came on board and supported the new process because the conventional process was a barrier to developing the site. This led to cooperation with council and the municipality.

“BPP didn’t really have any choice in some ways and maybe thought we are going to have to change our business.” (P2)
“They [BPP] couldn’t get Rodgers Creek through the planning process to fourth reading using the old design process so we knew at that point that the old process was no longer profitable simply because you couldn’t do it.” (E2)

“They [BPP] could have done what they had always done but that would have resulted in the landscape being trashed under the existing zoning… While they may have been legally permitted to do that, could they have actually have built all of the infrastructure and met all of the regulatory requirements around the creeks and sold that in this market that is here now? This is an interesting question and I am not qualified to answer. Because if the answer is no, or even if there is a substantial measure of uncertainty, you have got a very interesting comparison because we know this has worked.” (E2)

“I don’t think you would have had a project if you had gone through a more standard process…In fact it would have been ugly.” (P3)

“I think everyone will agree we needed a better system because we always found it was a battle right to the very end…so from our perspective we wanted a smoother process and there was willingness from everybody to get a different process.” (D1)

 “[BPP sought] consultants who said we can do something different and we can still make a heck of a lot of money building houses and doing the stuff that we like to do but in a more environmentally sustainable way.” (P2)

The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group participants saw an opportunity to have a greater influence on the outcome. Another key motivation for Working Group participants was the opportunity for experimentation and innovation.

“West Van is pretty good at saying ‘we want to push the envelope’ certainly with our current political direction. We want to be innovative, we want to be open to new ideas and we want a leading edge. So you need those people at the table. Different ideas are important but there is a certain ability about working together.” (P1)

“There is the professional reason and most folks don’t want to be doing a project that is kind of behind mundane or average or even behind. Everyone or certainly the professional team is drawn towards achieving sustainability because it is professional, it is interesting, it is innovative, it is cutting edge right now.” (P3)

Everyone put their cards on the table and invested in the process. This brought the stakeholders together to drive the process together and have open and honest discussions.
There was a range of motivations between the different parties that brought them to the table. Notably, there was a general consensus that the conventional process was not working. There were no comparable precedents given the uniqueness of the site and developer. While there was much uncertainty about how the new process would unfold, there was a commitment to developing a process tailored to the circumstances of the project and responding to the failures of the conventional process and outcomes.

12.3 Principle 2: Inclusive Not Exclusive

The second guiding principle for consensus processes is making the process inclusive through involving those with a significant interest in the issue (CCNRTEE, 1996).

CCNRTEE suggests that the consensus process should include the most important stakeholders. Typically the stakeholders with significant interests would include the proponents (BPP, Wong and Roeck), regulators (District of West Vancouver), environmental groups (West Vancouver Streamkeepers), and municipal council. There were different circles of participation in the Rodgers Creek process. Those in the Working Group did not necessarily have significant interests in the Rodgers Creek project but rather had an interest in planning, development or the environment.

The combination of public participation techniques was designed to improve the inclusiveness of the process and get parties involved earlier.

“So what this process did was got everyone involved at the earlier stage so they could have input and understand the process and they felt comfortable that their needs and wants and issues were being addressed.” (D1)

The interests of stakeholders vary hence the risks and stakes in the development also varied for the stakeholders. Despite these differences, the process was inclusive. For example, the unequal split in land ownership did not exclude the smaller landowners from participating in the process. In fact they were encouraged to participate.

“There were several small landowners in the mix as well and they were invited to be part of the process. They came to the technical meetings and had their own consultants and that was very much an offer that was made by BPP because BPP allowed them to be part of the process without having to pay for the process.” (P4)

“I think that BPP showed a tremendous amount of patience.” (P2)
“The areas that we didn’t have any ownership or influence in obviously we had no input to that but we had a lot of input into the areas that we had an influence in.” (D2)

“BPP were definitely the lead, the momentum leader in getting the entire ADP process through and they seemed to have a lot more experience in dealing with the District and all of those things…we sort of treated this as an education process so we sat on all the technical committees, we sat in on everything and were welcome to do so.” (D2)

The Working Group was intended to be a cross section of the community. The meetings were designed to be inclusive and open to the general public. Working Group meetings were advertised and they allowed for the public to participate and contribute to the decision-making process. This opportunity was further enhanced by the community-led open houses.

“The Working Group was open to the public which was very unusual.” (P4)

“I think everyone had the opportunity but did they take it? I don’t know.” (P5)

“The District I think did a fair job of publicizing the Working Group and its openness to public scrutiny, its transparency.” (CR)

“People that were interested in that kind of thing had plenty of access to participate in it.” (CR)

The different techniques and steps in the process ensured maximum inclusiveness. Research into participative processes shows that, “the greater the diversity of perspectives, experience and knowledge within problem-solving teams, the less the chance that important information will be overlooked and the better the chance of finding innovation solutions to seemingly intractable problems” (CCNRTEE, 1996:26).

Inclusiveness adds credibility to the process and ensures interests and insights from the affected parties are brought into the process. It also helps improve buy-in to the final plan through creating a sense of broad-based ownership.

Identifying those that should be included involves asking questions like “Who should be represented here?” and “Who is not here who should be?”. If parties emerge during the process that should have been included they may be added into the process if required. Initially several key stakeholders were overlooked, namely Mulgrave School and the North Shore Mountain Bikers Association. The public open houses were key to highlighting this and resulted in the Working Group addressing those key concerns. The community groups were added into the process.
Those opposed to the development and who seemed uncooperative or unwilling to budge from their position were not included in the process. Leaving such parties out, however, can undermine the outcome. The Working Group was mandated not to discuss if development should occur, but how it should occur: “The land is already zoned for housing. The questions are what type of housing will be built and where will it be built” (Bohn, 2008:1).

“I think the question that we had for the Working Group for was not ‘should development occur?’ but ‘how should it occur?’” (P1)

“Nobody on the group said ‘I don’t think we should be developing up there’ and that was interesting. We all had to get past that point.” (P2)

“Streamkeepers…I guess if they had their ideal approach there would be no development there…On the other hand they provided valuable input.” (Eng)

The open Working Group meetings and public open houses were avenues for non-participants to involve themselves in the process. While those opposed to development were not included in the Working Group, they were not excluded from the process entirely.

The inclusiveness was also illustrated through the inclusion of the Streamkeepers. Having Streamkeepers at the table was important because they have been very critical of how streams in the Upper Lands have been addressed in the past and they had a significant interest in the project. The Streamkeepers had not been involved in the decision-making process for previous BPP developments. Their involvement in Rodgers Creek through the Working Group has seen greater involvement and empowerment.

“It was important that they [Streamkeepers] sit at that table because ultimately if we didn’t address their concerns they were going to be our biggest critic.” (P1)

“We wanted to empower Streamkeepers to bring their values into the process and I will never forget the day that they said ‘we have got these seven top values but they are never going to listen to them’ and I said to them ‘no, those are the values that guide the entire thing.’” (M)

“So we [Streamkeepers] were at the back end looking at what started and we were the recipients of the problem. I think the idea was to get us at the front end [of the planning process] to avoid that…this was an opportunity to get in ahead of the game.” (E3)

“We think we [Streamkeepers] played a fairly major role…We were so elated at being invited to participate at the level we were invited to.” (E3)
Ensuring the inclusiveness of the process was a challenge. The Senior District Planner was responsible for managing the technical sessions and also for overseeing the Working Group process. She indicated it was challenging making sure everyone was involved and dealing with competing interests.

"Managing the different groups and making sure everyone was involved was a bit challenging at times…the joint meetings and working together was a challenge. So I had three groups…they were all huge, they weren't just two or three people so that was probably one of the biggest challenges."

(P1)

"...large groups managing them and making sure everybody actually was involved. Having no template to work from and being prepared for unexpected things along the way [were challenges]."

(P1)

While there was an opportunity for inclusion to be enhanced, the Working Group and open houses demonstrate a movement from planning for the people to more inclusive and participatory processes of planning with the people. The movement from technically driven processes to more inclusive illustrates a shift towards more sustainable decision making (Seasons et al, 2005).

### 12.4 Principle 3: Voluntary Participation

The third guiding principle for consensus based processes is ensuring that participation in the process is voluntary. Freedom to participate is important and parties should be given the right to leave at any time. Setting ground rules can help ensure commitment to the process.

Voluntary participation benefits the process because participants are more likely to commit to the outcome if they participate freely. They will develop a sense of responsibility and feel an obligation to make it work. It helps establish good relationships and provides the process with integrity and strength (CCNRTEE, 1996).

The technical sessions were not a public process. However, the Working Group and public open houses comprised voluntary public participation.

The Rodgers Creek Area Working Group was made up of a combination of people applying and the committee recruiting specific people. Several members were civically active people and had previously been part of various advisory groups.
“...you had to apply [for a position on the Working Group]. In the case of Rodgers Creek I think I probably recruited a couple of people as well.” (M)

“Pam-Goldsmith Jones sent out a letter with respect to the Working Groups saying that there was an opportunity to represent the community and we would like to know what your interest is in doing that.” (E3)

The Working Group members participated voluntarily and partook in 20 meetings throughout the process. While receiving no financial compensation they had the opportunity to network, develop relationships with key people in the industry, learn new skills, and work on something innovative as well as the satisfaction of contributing to the community.

“So absolutely I got a lot out of it and as I said the relationships that you make with political people, staff, fellow Working Group members, other developers…I like meeting people, making friends, networking, yeah so I got a lot of satisfaction out of that.” (P5)

In West Vancouver, several Working Group members have since been elected into Council. People run for council because the Working Groups are similar in nature. The Working Groups are a catalyst for community members to explore the possibility of becoming an elected official.

“On Council now there are four new members of Council and every single one of them was either on a Working Group or community board.” (M)

“Councillors really naturally relate to it [Working Groups] because there isn’t really much difference when you decide to run [for Council]...it’s usually because you want to improve the public debate or you have been part of something that has been so rewarding.” (M)

Participation was voluntary but it is important that participation is recognized. West Vancouver Council thanked Working Group participants by hosting an annual thank you party for all volunteers in the community.

“Sometimes they will be paid, but if you pay them it just looks like they are working for you. I recommend them to sometimes give money to non-profit organizations or charity or try to find some way to thank them or to honour their commitment but without it seeming like you are buying them off.” (P3)

“[Council] do an annual thank you to the leadership in the community, the volunteer leadership, not just volunteers because we have so many…I changed that completely because it started to become a boring sit down dinner and nobody really wanted to go so I changed it to a cocktail party and I thought no one is going to come because I have just sort of cancelled these advisory groups
and they are all mad at me and it wasn’t like no one would come but 400 people out of 400 invitations came. So it was a breath of life into a renewed way to engage with the public.” (M)

The voluntary participation saw Working Group members commit to and take responsibility for the outcome. It also added integrity to the process.

12.5 Principle 4: Self Design

It is important that the parties design the consensus process, which is the fourth guiding principle of consensus processes outlined by CCNRTEE (1996). The self-designed process highlights the flexibility of consensus processes rather than prescribed rule-driven conventional processes. At the beginning of the process the parties need to agree upon a structure.

Providing structure to the process reduces misunderstandings. The team should develop a constitution, Table 12-1.

Table 12-1. Guidelines for Ground Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground rules about ‘who, why, what, where and when’</th>
<th>Ground rules about ‘how’?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How they will interact (rules of procedure)</td>
<td>• Standards of conduct and behaviour during negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why (the objective)</td>
<td>• Media relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What (the issues that are and are not up for discussion)</td>
<td>• Confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who (the parties who should be at the table)</td>
<td>• Provision and sharing of expertise and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When and where (the schedule and logistics)</td>
<td>• Records of discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resourcing the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CCNRTEE, 1996:41&44)

Establishing a framework provides direction and gives the parties control over the process. It can be flexible.

The Working Group did not have a model or precedent to follow. It was the first group of this nature within the municipality. Building from the scope of work provided by Council, the Working Group used its power to steer the process. There was an initial lack of certainty and direction, but the Working Group developed a set of guidelines that provided structure to the process. The guidelines addressed purpose, duties, origins of work, composition, roles, terms, milestones, desired outcome, meeting schedules, the decision-making approach, support and budget (Rodgers Creek Area Working Group, 2008).
"I remember the first part of the process we struggled as a group to try and figure out what our role was. Possibly a better definition of the role, but it's hard because it's an evolving thing." (P5)

“It got frustrating during our process with the Working Group because the Working Group wasn’t necessarily given a very clear concept of what their mandate was…and they expressed a lot of frustration on that.” (D2)

“…on one hand I want to say that the Working Group process was by and large totally positive but it got quite frustrating and I think it was frustrating for them. It got frustrating for us simply because it just felt too broad.” (D2)

“…and the Working Group, once they were in place they were directing the process too. So they would say we want to have more information on this and we would go and put together a presentation on this and take it back and give it to them. So they started driving the process in the same way the technical group had driven the process.” (P4)

“We sort of set out the framework and they touched in with us every now and then and made a decision in the end.” (M)

The technical process was self-designed and not prescribed or legislated. The lack of precedents for large-scale hillside development meant it did not follow any specific model.

“As a professional it was a very exciting process to go through, very demanding along the way because there isn’t a rule book. Rule books make it easy but this was creative…I think it was a very rewarding process; the ability to integrate all of that complex information and coming up with a new direction for hillside development.” (P1)

“I guess the other really big change was that there wasn’t a template we were working off…sometimes there would be curved balls, things you don’t expect.” (P1)

“Everybody really looked at this with just totally open eyes as to anything was possible.” (E1)

“I would say right up to the end of the day it was evolving right to the point where it was time to go to Council.” (D1)

“In terms of process Geri was the point person there but we would certainly have a say in it.” (D1)

“…a lot of that [responsibility] fell to Geri and she was sort of feeling this out as she went you know. I don’t think anybody had any real experience in this sort of thing before so it is not a criticism of capabilities as much as it is just a learning process.” (D2)

“…it was a process of inventing things as it went along.” (P4)
“As planners you can do all of this wonderful textbook planning but it doesn’t always work that way.”
(P1)

The benefit of self designing the process is seen through the flexibility it enabled. This flexibility has the risk of creating uncertainty which is seen through conflicting opinions regarding time limits. Providing greater structure to the process may have addressed some of that uncertainty.

“It could have been done a little more visually maybe so people really understood where you are in the pipelines.” (E1)

12.6 Principle 5: Flexibility

Designing flexibility into the process is the fifth guiding principle for consensus processes. The process can be tailored to the needs and circumstances of the project. Flexibility is required to respond to changes and unanticipated surprises. Flexibility in attitudes towards diverse interests is also required. Changes that may arise include representative changes, new parties emerging, issues broadening, a change of priority, disputes arising over facts, externalities on the process, more time needed and doubts over feasibility of settlement. Processes shouldn’t be indefinitely flexible but able to adjust.

The Working Group process was flexible within the power it had been allocated. The flexibility of the process is illustrated through the Working Group’s ability to amend the scope of work provided by council. There was confusion at the start as members didn’t understand how flexible it could be. Council allowed the group to write their own terms of reference.

“I remember saying to someone ‘rewrite the terms of reference’ and they said ‘we can’t rewrite the terms of reference you know, Council has given us those terms of reference.’ And I said, ‘oh no they haven’t, the community engagement committee has tried to get the ball rolling but you guys should feel that you can change it and get back to us.’ So that was a more natural kind of process and I think it takes a high degree of trust.” (M)

“I think we felt that even though we were given the scope of work I think the group felt sufficient flexibility existed that if we felt the scope wasn’t appropriate then we would make recommendations.” (Eng)

Initially there were disputes within the Working Group challenging existing municipal policies. The success of the Working Group in challenging the requirements of the OCP demonstrates the flexibility the process enabled. This flexibility empowered the group and broadened their thinking.
“When you start looking at the multifamily the average size is something like 2500 sq ft. It was so ridiculous so we said ‘you need to reduce the size and they said ‘we can’t do that because then we will be over the OCP.’ So this is where we had a difference in opinion within the group. Some of the group said ‘so what if we go over the OCP? We have been asked to provide our advice and opinion we should not be constrained by this number in the OCP. If it’s not giving us this social diversity then we should recommend to go beyond.’ And others would say, ‘What are you talking about, you can’t go beyond the OCP, that’s just going to be a disaster. There is no way the politicians will go beyond that.’” (P5)

“That particular [Working] Group was not afraid once they realized that there was a fundamental potentially fatal flaw. They weren’t afraid to say we need to go back and challenge what this entire community agreed to over the last ten years which was the official community plan because it might actually be wrong.” (E2)

The technical team was also flexible. Its foundation on informal interactive sessions was the basis of its flexibility.

Not only was the process flexible, but staff allowed flexibility in the existing policies which enabled greater creativity in design. For example, the variations to the environmental setbacks show the extent of flexibility. This flexibility led to building trust.

“We were not always following prescriptive measures. Everything was up for discussion and it would be debated and backed up by more information or more studies.” (D1)

“…while [the RAR] says we don’t want to see any habitat loss within 30 metres top of bank we were flexible on that so we gave up and gained areas and it was again being able to have that flexibility in terms of land base.” (E1)

“The key issue is or was the creeks. You have so many creeks on that property that if you looked at the then West Vancouver approach to protecting creeks it was a RAR Riparian Area Regulation approach that was modified to suit the communities needs so there were some very very substantial setbacks, essentially go to the top of the bank and you go 30 metres on either side, which almost always took you down the next side of the bank.” (E2)

“…our land would have no development on it if the 30 metre setbacks had been enforced.” (D2)

“…we mapped the creeks, we mapped the District setbacks plus the RAR which is the Provincial setbacks. We would look at the area between and say let’s be practical on some of this area in between we want to preserve that has particular environmental benefits in some places.” (D1)
The way in which decisions were reached and conflicts resolved also points to the flexibility of the process. Tradeoffs were collectively negotiated to resolve conflict at both the Working Group and technical sessions. The response of the Working Group and technical team to issues raised at the open houses point to the success of flexibility to broaden issues and address emerging new parties.

“Sometimes we felt that we would have to give up something just to move forward. Like a trade-off, it was important to us to keep things moving.” (D1)

“One of the most contentious issues was the road alignment. We had to come up with some kind of solution. At the beginning of that process there was some conflict even amongst staff but at the end of the day we worked through it and everyone had a say and there was consensus in the end.” (D1)

“I can’t think of any instances where we didn’t agree and there was unresolved conflict or unhappiness.” (D1)

“[conflicts were addressed through] interest-based problem solving…sometimes you have meetings and if you don’t agree on something you close the door and hash those things out, you negotiate.” (P2)

“In general, I was always expecting there to be some blowout but we never had that and I think the reason why is because we communicated all the way along and diffused problems all the way along.” (E1)

“...I didn’t think it was going to be that way. I expected a fight. But it turned out that everyone’s interests started to point in the same direction.” (D2)

“At times we had differences of opinion on a few issues and I think we might have taken a vote or we might have just left it open to deal with in another meeting...but those kinds of things didn’t surface too often...I might remember saying to myself I don’t necessarily agree with that but it’s not a deal breaker for me so I’m willing to go along with it...the tradeoffs were the most important thing.” (P5)

Flexibility was evident in both the Working Group and technical sessions. Flexibility resulted in a better process and product. It also promoted better communication and interaction amongst the parties.
12.7 Principle 6: Equal Opportunity

The sixth guiding principle of consensus processes is equal opportunity which refers to all parties having equal access to relevant information and the opportunity to participate effectively throughout the process. To be able to participate effectively parties require financial resources, technical information and specialized expertise and negotiation skills (CCNRTEE, 1996).

Inequalities in the information and participation can occur: "With all this diverse technical information surrounding the negotiations, non-experts and parties with little or no access to specialized knowledge can easily feel overwhelmed as they try to hold their own with stakeholders who do have expertise" (CCNRTEE, 1996:61). A common information base was provided through the Overview Document. The integrated sessions promoted sharing and discussion of information cross-disciplines. The technical team was a resource to the Working Group when required.

The Working Group and technical team both comprised a mix of some with more knowledge or experience than others. All participants, including the less experienced and less knowledgeable, had an opportunity to participate and contribute as much input as they liked.

"I think everybody was considered; no one was given special consideration." (E1)

"Some of the information was very technical and other information was really basic." (D1)

"If we all consider ourselves equal in that regard we get a lot farther so the battling is gone, which is great." (M)

"I think you make it for what you want." (P5)

"I was given every opportunity I needed or wanted to make my case." (P5)

"I think that all members felt that they had a right to make their views known on other issues." (Eng)

Some participants had more to contribute than others as a result of their experience or personality. There were more influential people in the group and some spoke more than others, but everyone had an opportunity to contribute.

"You have a lot of strong personalities. Some of us were stronger or weaker than others." (P5)

"With any Working Group there are probably some stronger personalities than others. Perhaps their points of view have more influence than someone who sits back and doesn’t say very much,
but there were enough strong personalities on the Working Group that no one dominated it. It was balanced in the end.” (Eng)

“It’s tough because everyone is used to being the leader and calling the shots and now you have to work together… I think it worked quite well given the strength of the people on the group.” (P5)

“The people there were generally comfortable in expressing their opinions. Certainly, some people had more expertise than others.” (P2)

Not only did the Working Group members have equal opportunity to participate, but the public who were also invited to the Working Group meetings and open houses had access to the information and had an opportunity to participate.

“The public information meetings were advertised in newspapers so people had the access and the ability to participate if they wanted to and the District I think did a fair job of publicising the Working Group and its openness to public scrutiny, its transparency.” (CR)

“There was no reason why people that were interested in that kind of thing could not participate – there was plenty of access to participate in it.” (CR)

“The public were given ample opportunity to participate in the process.” (P2)

There was an equal opportunity to provide input and access information.

**12.8 Principle 7: Respect**

Respect is the seventh guiding principle for consensus processes (CCNRTEE, 1996). It is based on parties accepting the diverse values, interests and knowledge of each other.

Respect and appreciation for diverse perspectives is important. Exploring different points of views will help develop a solution whereby all parties can live with the final decision. Mutual respect for different values can foster trust.

CCNRTEE suggests that commitment made at the beginning of the consensus process can improve respect. Commitment should be made to consistently show respect, to share knowledge and information and to invest time (CCNRTEE, 1996). Establishing common interests between the Working Group members enabled the group to work together.
The basis of respect between members of the Working Group was informal contact built into the process. Such contact included joint fieldtrips, sharing food and opportunities to celebrate (CCNRTEE, 1996). The informal contact can foster friendships.

“The community relationships that were built were another key outcome for us. They now have an appreciation for what BPP does and gives back to the community.” (D1)

“You get to meet and work with people in the community and forge some friendships and relationships… that is important to me.” (P5)

“I think the other good thing that came out of the group was that we have all established a personal relationship with other people involved.” (E3)

“At this level there is a lot of freedom to connect with the people so I would say the relationships have definitely strengthened and that serves the whole community on an ongoing way.” (M)

Respect was shown towards the diversity of knowledge and varying interests between the different parties.

“…and the Working Groups do consist of different values and different priorities so it’s not like we were all coming from the same direction to start with.” (P5)

“I think what is important is that you have a group as we did you have enough diversity amongst that group and you get a balanced result from it.” (Eng)

“I remember we had this interesting discussion while we were trying to establish the guiding principles that we had done and we had some debates over different priorities and different emphasis on things but by and large we are all coming from the same kind of principles about being sensitive to the environment, looking for social diversity and trying to minimize the footprint. We were all kind of exposed to the fundamentals.” (P5)

“People would respect what others have to say.” (D1)

“Respect was never an issue through this process.” (D2)

The members of the Working Group and technical team were experienced specialists each bringing unique knowledge to the table. There were also a variety of interests. The expertise of participants and openness of the process encouraged honest discussions which led to the building of trust within and between groups.
“They had experience and their expertise which led them to have a certain respect for the process.” (D2)

“The Working Group certainly had Council trusting in their opinion that was the key thing.” (P2)

“I think the knowledge that the developer was a knowledgeable one and the Working Group also had some knowledge so there was I think some trust.” (Eng)

“They [the Working Group] were accommodating to the idea that we had a process that was new and everybody was feeling it out.” (D2)

“The old power really shifted and trust developed between the owners which didn’t exist before and in the process.” (M)

“I think Council developed a high degree of trust and I think it has always wished to have that.” (M)

“…get the cards on the table and you can have some honest discussions as opposed to you know BPP being fearful of staff.” (P2)

“Geri did a very good job of establishing a trust between the developer, the community and Council to all come to the table.” (P2)

“There was a high degree of trust.” (P2)

“Over the years we have built a bit of trust with the main property owner BPP…the key to this whole process was trust…certainly everybody was willing to put their cards on the table.” (E1)

“Back to the idea of trust… you can come to a common understanding. Before that, there was never any iterative process of development. It was always a one way, you send us the information and we will send you back our thoughts and now it is very much an open dialogue and I am confident it is much better.” (E1)

“I learned if you can work on that trust in the early stage it may seem to take a lot of time in gaining it but it is really worthwhile…it really takes a few people that are willing to take a chance put things on the table and once everybody sees that everybody else is putting cards on the table that is how you build trust.” (E1)

Respect was shown throughout the entire Rodgers Creek Area planning process. The openness of the process was a key to developing relationships and trust within and between parties. Respecting diverse interests was also addressed through collectively developing practical solutions.
12.9 Principle 8: Accountability

Accountability is another important guiding principle for consensus processes (CCNRTEE, 1996). Consensus processes give greater control over the final decision than conventional processes, as a result accountability to constituencies and the process is important. Being accountable means having someone to answer to for decisions and actions.

Accountability to the broader public is harder to define as “the negotiator may also need to be accountable to broader, ill-defined interests that are difficult to represent or are hard to communicate with – future generations or the broad public who, although numerous individually, have only a small stake in decisions under negotiation” (CCNRTEE, 1996:80).

There was no formal accountability to the process. The technical team was accountable to higher powers. The accountability was important in building trust. All professionals/experts have professional affiliations/standards they are accountable to. BPP is accountable to their owners and board of directors. Staff is accountable to Council and the community. Accountability is important for the community to trust in the information and determinations of the technical team.

“There is always a higher power. We hire consultants that are registered professionals…Council is accountable to the public…the Working Group is accountable to the community. They represent the community…staff are responsible to both Council and the community at large…the hiking group and the Streamkeepers group are accountable to their constituencies as well. There is a high degree of accountability in this.” (D1)

For the Working Group, the Streamkeeper representative was accountable to the Streamkeepers, but most of the parties were only accountable to the process and indirectly accountable to the public.

The interviewees lacked clarity on the accountability of the Working Group, whether they were accountable to the public or not. CCNRTEE (1996) suggests that public interest in the consensus process is illustrated through a diversity of community representatives or through elected officials. This suggests the community representations on the Working Group were accountable to the public.

There were varied opinions amongst the interviews on the accountability of the Working Group members. While some of the participants interviewed thought they were not accountable to anyone, others felt that they were accountable to the public.
“For me, maybe it’s a bit different for the Streamkeepers who have certain mandates, I’m not representing anyone. I have presumed that I have been selected because either I have certain values or expertise or a certain background but I don’t have any responsibilities that I am representing anyone.” (P5)

“It’s interesting because in other Working Groups or other committees because when the people on them get appointed all of a sudden they think they are representing the community and I say, ‘No, we are not representing the community, that’s what Council does, you’re on your own.’” (P5)

“Well we were part of a Working Group so we were accountable to Council and in that respect we were accountable to the public of West Vancouver…I think most of us understood that we were there representing the public and the final outcome of our report was to make a recommendation to Council.” (Eng)

“We [Streamkeepers] are not under anybody’s influence.” (E3)

“The Working Group became the voice for the public.” (P4)

“The people in the Working Group were generally not representing anything.” (P4)

“There was a representative from the Streamkeepers who reported to the Streamkeepers.” (P4)

“I think by and large they felt accountable to the public and that they were challenged with the idea of challenging the development to become the best it can be and they had a very real and strong capability of influencing where this thing was going to go.” (D2)

“I was accountable to the fellow Working Group members and to myself but no I didn’t feel I had to be accountable to anyone.” (P5)

Working Group members did not have a high level of formal accountability, but because of the relationships and trust formed, they felt accountable to one another and there was respect of the process. The equality and inclusiveness evened out power distribution within the technical team and Working Group.

A desire to participate as a community representative in the future or become an elected official also creates a sense of personal accountability.

The absence of any formal accountability meant that the Working Group was an external third party and could provide impartial recommendations.
“The Working Group was good in this process because they were like an impartial judging entity who could stand back and look at all points of view…And in that sense I think they were remarkably useful.” (D2)

Input from the technical team and Working Group into the final plan created a sense of ownership and accountability.

“It was really something quite special to be there and see the genesis of that mountain pathway, see how excited everyone was about it.” (D2)

“I thought it was a fairly empowering process.” (P2)

“Everyone in the room takes ownership. There is no adversarial position because everyone is part of the design team.” (E2)

Accountability of the Rodgers Creek Area Working Group was created through the transparency and openness of the process. Maintaining an open and visible process is an important safeguard (CCNRTEE, 1996).

“Discussions were not behind closed doors… I think it was the Working Group and their openness. The fact that they conducted all of their meetings in the open that really made the difference here. That is a really big part of this whole system.” (P1)

“None of the meetings were private…and people said at the time ‘I’m not comfortable meeting in public’… And my response was, ‘We are not going back,’ so it was quite exciting.” (M)

Accountability expectations in planning processes continue to rise (Seasons et al, 2005). Comprehensive and transparent public processes respond to accountability concerns.

12.10 Principle 9: Time Limits

Time limits as a guiding principle for the consensus process refer to making realistic deadlines (CCNRTEE, 1996). Setting time limits at the outset and getting time commitments from all parties establishes a more effective process. Clear, credible and public deadlines provide reassurance and structure.

CCNRTEE suggests that (1) deadlines should be taken seriously but also used as an opportunity for assessment and learning; (2) use interim milestones; and (3) talk about time from the outset (CCNRTEE, 1996).
For Rodgers Creek, this was the first ADP for the locality and the technical sessions and Working Group were both new processes. The processes were designed as the project unfolded creating a challenge for predicting time limits. Furthermore, the site comprised a multitude of issues that were unforeseen, also creating an obstacle for setting time limits.

Deadlines on the flowcharts established by the District and developer were often exceeded. The re-evaluation of deadlines reflects the flexibility of the process and suggests it was an opportunity for learning. The project was constantly progressing which was ensured through the regular meetings.

There were varied opinions amongst the participants interviewed regarding the overall length of the entire process. Some indicated that it was appropriate given the circumstances (e.g. resources, site constraints, etc.) while others indicated it was longer than needed and could have been more efficient. Improving time efficiency was identified as an opportunity by most interviewees.

“It was completely unrealistic.” (P5)

“…they [Council] let us do our thing. It probably took longer than they hoped.” (P5)

“I think in our first meeting someone optimistically suggested that it should be through in six months. I remember making a comment that I had gone through a similar process with another development in West Van called Evelyn Drive, which took one year and it was a quarter of the size.” (Eng)

“….the dates [on the flowcharts] were always wrong. We started with a six month [deadline] which went to nine then to twelve and then to whatever it was. That more or less fell into place. None of these things can be rigid; they have to be modified as you go along, but you need that to establish a set of timelines and goals.” (Eng)

“We were hoping to move it along at a faster pace.” (D2)

“They [deadlines] were passed many times…I remember we made versions of this [process diagram] a number of times, saying that this will happen on this day and then it wouldn’t happen.” (P4)

“It was expensive and it was long but it is pretty consistent with other projects that I have been part of.” (P3)
"I didn’t find the process terribly onerous or lengthy…If you talk to my mum she will give you a different answer. She was really frustrated that it was taking so long she has become an old woman waiting for this to happen." (D2)

"From staff’s perspective I would say the main constraint was time." (P1)

"The biggest constraint was probably staff time. They did not have a big staff and there were a lot of things going on at the time. Geri in particular had to work a lot on weekends to get stuff together to meet timelines." (D1)

"The District is a small municipality and they provided a lot of resources and it was a strain for them to do that." (P4)

There was a suggestion that the Working Group could have been established earlier in the process and worked parallel to the technical team. Some interviewees indicated that this would not have improved efficiency because the background work, the foundation, needed to be established first.

"The Working Group should have been created earlier and worked more in parallel with the technical group. That might have made it more efficient." (P4)

"It does take a lot of time to generate stuff so having that work done up front really allowed us to focus and given that they endorsed that and it was sound they were able to move from that point." (P1)

Impacts affecting time limits included lack of control over external work and resources.

"Everybody wanted it now but making it happen when you didn’t really control all of the players in it was the challenge." (P1)

"It was frustrating sometimes you didn’t have the information that you needed necessarily to make those discussions." (P2)

"It was the consultants who did all of the work. Staff would say we need this and the consultants would go and produce that. We did a lot of work even for the municipality. For example, the two public open houses our office produced the display material. And this document [Overview Report] was always produced by us." (P4)

"The staff were in a lot of ways ahead of the developer." (P2)
“Staff bent over backwards to be as efficient as possible and to provide very timely responses.”
(P2)

“Probably for the first time I felt like the municipality was out ahead of the developer. We knew what was coming as opposed to the other way around when the developer is chasing us. It was us asking them to submit information not them asking us to review it.” (E1)

The process was a learning curve for all the stakeholders. Were it to be replicated again there would be opportunity to be more time efficient including obtaining more detailed input upfront.

“If they [various departments within the municipality] had been able to apply themselves in detail at the beginning, maybe some things would have been a bit different but it’s always that balance.”
(P1)

“Going back we would probably avoid some of the minor pitfalls and time sucks that we fell into but when you are doing things for a first time there are always those things so I think we did a great job working around that.” (E1)

“I think the effectiveness could have been a little bit better if we had been able to deal with some issues up front.” (P1)

12.11 Principle 10: Implementation

The final CCNRTEE guiding principle for consensus processes is commitment to implementation and effective monitoring. Consideration of implementation improves the quality and efficiency of discussions. It ensures the plan is practical. Consideration should be given to the technicality and legality of the plan.

The Working Group members were concerned with community response to the proposed ADP and implementation mechanisms. They were also concerned with project feasibility and the practicality of the design. There was recognition that the development needed to be profitable and marketable. Their expertise was an advantage because of their familiarity with development projects.

“The impact on tax payers wasn’t obvious. But at some stage you go to the public, and what do they care about? They want to know are taxes going to go up because of this or are they going to go down?” (Eng)

“I think in general the Working Group members were not particularly concerned about profit or loss for that matter. Again we had architects on board and developers. We had people who understood
both design and cost issues and certainly from the developers point of view what was feasible and what wasn’t feasible in terms of the economics of the project.” (Eng)

“I think everyone realized that any project for it to go ahead has to return a reasonable profit.” (Eng)

“Everybody appreciates that the developer is entitled to make a profit otherwise we wouldn’t be in business.” (D1)

“I think even though the developer perhaps didn’t agree entirely with some of the suggestions of the Working Group, more or less I think they understood that suggestions were made in the best interests of the community, and I think the developer also probably understood that they were in the best long-term interests of the developer.” (Eng)

“By and large they were acutely aware and sensitive to the nature of the impact on us as developers.” (D2)

Implementation also played a large role in the technical sessions. The mix of stakeholders ensured that consideration was given to the practicality. Practicality played a big part in implementation considerations.

“At the end of the day, this is about optimizing the return on investment both for the developer, for the occupants of the development that is the community and at a larger scale for the municipality or the region.” (E2)

“We have never designed like this before. We almost exclusively seek the lowest possible cost to achieve compliance with a set of regulations.” (E2)

The practical element was evident in that the planning and design was integrated with construction.

“BPP now have their own construction company. It was important to bring the planning and design together with the construction.” (P1)

“You have got the construction guys sitting at the table and telling you that is a really neat idea but we haven’t got the foggiest idea of how to build that, right...They are intimately aware of how a design change or a different construction technique is going to produce in terms of an outcome because they are going to have to market and sell that outcome.” (E2)

After the Working Group wrapped up, the municipality completed the associated implementation bylaws. Following approval, implementation and monitoring began. There were different interests within the Working Group and technical team on the implementation. For example, the
Streamkeepers indicated that they are pursuing an active involvement in the implementation through monitoring the construction independently.

“As the group checks out that is when the Streamkeepers work really starts with the development. The other people go about their lives but the Streamkeepers work starts now paying attention to: Are they going to live up to the things that they said?” (E3)

There were different interests on the technical team with the smaller landowners having a more personal interest in the implementation.

“…my sisters and my mother and I have an option and an interest in moving up on the hillside into the development itself….so we have a very personal connection to this….But it’s different to the motivations of the BPP but in the end our greatest concern was fundamentally implementing a good design that was also financially feasible.” (D2)

Different interests in implementation and monitoring also needed to be addressed. There was significant consideration given at all steps in the process to the practicality, legality and implementation. This was possible because of the high levels of knowledge and expertise.

**12.12 Conclusion**

The Rodgers Creek planning and design process was not a typical consensus process but the evaluation of the project using CCNRTEE guiding principles for the consensus process points to what worked well, what didn’t and opportunities for improvement.

The integrated engagement of the key players as a team and the concept of the tailored working group to suit the BPP development were the two core elements of the planning and design process that may be applied as a model to future large-scale residential developments. The key lessons for multi-stakeholder planning and design processes for large-scale residential development emerging from the evaluation are outlined in Table 12-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Lessons</th>
<th>Purpose Driven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify a need to change the process through acknowledging the failures of the conventional process and the outcomes it produced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get the key players to take risks, come to the table and cooperate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive not Exclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include stakeholders with significant interests early in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure stakeholders with even minor stakes in the development are encouraged to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a combination of participatory techniques to improve inclusiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for affected parties that emerge during the process to be effectively included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure public processes are open to improve opportunities for participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a working group that has a diversity of perspectives, experience and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower local organisations and groups by inviting them to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive processes add credibility to the process, address interests of affected parties and help achieve buy-in to the final plan through developing a sense of broad-based ownership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in public processes should be voluntary because it leads to greater commitment and a sense of responsibility to the process. It also adds integrity and strength to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of volunteer participation include building relationships with people within the industry and community, learning new skills, opportunity to work on something innovative and satisfaction of contributing to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary participation should be acknowledged and celebrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants should self design the structure or constitution for the process outlining ground rules for who, why, what, where, when and how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process should be structured but flexible thereby reducing uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process should be flexible to effectively respond to changes and unanticipated surprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in process and policies empowers stakeholders and encourages creativity and imagination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Lessons

**Flexibility from all parties in the negotiations helps strengthen trust.**

- Ensuring an element of informality and interaction helps facilitate better and more open communication amongst parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal Opportunity</th>
<th>Provide a common information base (e.g., overview document).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated sessions bringing together different disciplines, promotes sharing of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The technical team should operate as a resource to the Working Group when required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage all stakeholders to participate and contribute. Be cautious of dominating personalities or those with more experience or influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Exploring different points of views and demonstrating respect can foster trust between parties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to show respect, share knowledge and information and invest time helps build respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify common interests and goals within and between groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage informal interaction (e.g. joint fieldtrips) to foster friendships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The expertise and experience of parties combined with the openness of the process led to honest discussions which built trust within and between groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Accountability to the process and constituencies is important for the community to trust in the information and final determination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where no accountability exists, the relationships and trust built between parties throughout the process create a sense of accountability to one another and the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers desire for future civic or political opportunities can create an informal accountability to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An unaccountable third party can be useful in providing unbiased and impartial recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to the process from parties leads to a greater sense of ownership and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The openness and transparency of the process demonstrates accountability and is an important safeguard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time Limits       | Set realistic, clear, credible and public deadlines and milestones at the outset of the project and gain commitment from parties. |
### Key Lessons

Use the Rodgers Creek Area process as a precedent to provide guidance in developing deadlines and milestones.

- Create flowcharts to illustrate how the process will proceed.
- Look for opportunities to reduce the overall time. This may involve overlapping steps within the process when possible.
- Invest time upfront to establish a strong foundation and to avoid revisiting steps in the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation (including technical and legal) considerations should be addressed at every step in the process to ensure the planning and design is practical.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profitability and marketability of the project should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and design should be integrated with construction considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater consideration should be given to opportunities for the continuation of multi-stakeholder processes in the implementation and monitoring phase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.0 CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

13.1 Introduction

This thesis has described and analyzed the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area development. It also provided a more detailed evaluation of the technical sessions and Working Group. The analysis and evaluation points to what worked well. This chapter identifies the context in which the new process was embedded. The contextual factors impact future replication of the Rodgers Creek process in other projects.

13.2 Challenges of the Conventional Planning Process

The process of developing plans for the Upper Lands had always been contentious. There was no area planning or comprehensive planning for the Upper Lands, rather it was a piecemeal approach. Development applications were prepared by developers and often resulted in conflict with the District. Staff would make recommendations to Council but these were often not heard and it would come down to a political decision and power play between Council and the developer. The conventional process did not involve the community in a meaningful way.

“The approvals that we gave before Rodgers Creek was called South Mar Creek and I was a Councillor not the Mayor yet, and it was just screaming matches in the Mayor’s office, bullying tactics in public, in-camera Council meetings. On everybody’s part, I’m not blaming any one party but clearly this was not working very well and clearly the community wasn’t part of it.” (M)

“Maybe it was the reluctance of this Council but they wouldn’t even receive the reports so that was pretty low standard.” (P1)

“Fairly contentious or adversarial process between the developer and the planning department.” (CR)

“As these major greenfield areas are being developed there doesn’t seem to be an overriding area planning process, which is really what we are doing now, so that was a big change.” (P1)

“There was a void which was this mid-level planning process.” (P1)

“I thought that was a traditional and old fashioned approach and we would get rid of it which was a bit controversial because you are saying to some upstanding people, ‘We don’t want to do it your way anymore.’” (M)

The failures of the conventional planning process called for something new and very different from the past.
13.3 Urban Development Problems

The desire to solve urban problems associated with development was identified by Hodge (2003) as a reason why communities engage in planning. For the Rodgers Creek Area urban development problems led to the introduction of a new process and a new form of development: “In commencing this project, District Staff was well aware that previous approaches to the physical planning of the Upper Lands were not appropriate – the ‘end product’ was not what the community wanted and District staff review of the ‘end products’ was an ineffective approach to addressing complex issues” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:9).

Not only were their issues with the process, but the process had created unfavourable development. The form and size of existing BPP development in the Upper Lands was criticised by all of the participants interviewed.

Urban development concerns included:

- Lack of variety in housing product, too single family orientated
- Houses too big
- Site coverage too great
- Setbacks not big enough
- Disconnected neighbourhoods
- Removal of natural landscape
- Density too low

These development concerns are highlighted through the following quotes from participants:

“The neighbourhoods that march across the mountain have been fairly disconnected.” (M)

“I don’t want to be too critical of the past development but I don’t necessarily think that the landscape did inform the development. I think that there was a development ideal about providing a certain type of housing…and you can see when you look over at Whitby Estates and it’s a big ugly clear cut.” (P2)

“The homes had gotten so big that it didn’t appear that there was much lot left. Initially we thought over time the landscape will come in and mask that somewhat, and I think 5-10 years from now people may look at it differently but now all they can see are the big houses with no trees.” (D1)

“I think that there was a strong feeling that the previous developments on BPP land were not sensitive enough to the environment, that they were too single family orientated, that the houses
were too big, that they covered too much of the site, that they didn't leave enough space between houses.” (P4)

“When you look at West Vancouver from the Vancouver side and all of the scarring on the hillside as people refer to it, I don’t think that at the community level anybody was happy with what was happening…I think the Mayor felt that.” (E3)

“To allow single-family homes basically resulted in a clear cut of the hillside and massive problems with run off and drainage and scars on the landscape and roads, which needed a lot of cut and fill.” (Eng)

West Vancouver has some of the most expensive real estate in Canada. The average household income is $165,000; this compares to $73,000 for the GVRD (Statistics Canada, 2006). The BPP developments are becoming increasingly so expensive that only a select few can afford them. The increasing cost and exclusiveness was identified by interviewees as a growing problem.

“Land is very expensive now. You have to pay a few million for a chunk of land that doesn’t warrant putting on a $50,000 shack versus a two or three million dollar house on top of that so you can afford to buy a million dollar piece of property that only a select few can afford to purchase.” (Eng)

“There is nothing terribly affordable in West Vancouver. To be blunt it is really high end. But it is a vast improvement on what was being proposed in the initial start of this process.” (Eng)

“It is a hard one because you are dealing with the most expensive real estate in Canada. This was always an issue.” (E3)

“You are dealing with the higher end market, so people with money are going to have a certain kind of lifestyle; almost all of them can afford anything they want.” (P3)

Not only has past BPP development in the Upper Lands resulted in housing issues, it has also resulted in environmental concerns. Impacts of past construction have had detrimental environmental impacts including mudslides on steep slopes and mud in streams. Environmental damage has occurred during construction from heavy wind and rain. The development sites often have large openings and large amounts of water coming down the hill.

“BPP is a very careful developer but there were also issues with mudslides and problems with getting mud intro streams and the perception that it was dangerous to have that kind of construction going on uphill from existing residential areas.” (P4)
“There have been examples of environmental issues and the management or protection of the environment in previous subdivisions, which had been a source of contention.” (CR)

“We had made a number of complaints about how they were doing construction and how they were or what their effect was on the creeks...we were getting streams discoloration and we found excavations being pushed into the riparian zone, the water being pumped into the stream…” (E3)

The urban and environmental problems created through development were a key factor resulting in the change to the process.

13.4 The Desire to Achieve a Preferred Form of Development

The community’s desire to achieve some preferred form of development was identified by Hodge (2003) as a reason why a community engages in planning. It was a key contributing factor to the change in this planning process.

Planning trends and concepts are continually evolving. Industry trends show a shift towards more sustainable development including green building, adaptable design, mixed use development, resort style amenities, and more sustainable forms of transport.

From the outset of the project the stakeholders involved in the Envisioning, the technical sessions and the Working Group were familiar with sustainability concepts. There was a desire for sustainability, innovation and creativity to be incorporated into the project.

“We had all of the key players who already in their own right made that shift [towards sustainability] or recognized the need to make it, so it was a moderately easy sell — and to get people to agree to a critical thinking process, a design process, a planning process that gave rise to the outcome.” (E2)

“There is the professional reason and most folks don’t want to be doing a project that is kind of behind mundane or average or even behind. Everyone or certainly the professional team is drawn towards achieving sustainability because it is professional, it is interesting, it is innovative, it is cutting edge right now.” (P3)

“A lot of the people sitting around the table I think bought into the fundamentals of those principles.” (P5)

Sustainability has been a key interest of the development industry since the mid-1980s (Dorcey, 2009). It was the main trend impacting the Rodgers Creek Area development. While aspects of other planning approaches and concepts such as new urbanism, smart growth, IRM, compact
development and ecological sustainable design were considered, there were many difficulties in applying these to the Rodgers Creek Area development because of the physical constraints. Rather than applying specific prescribed principles to the project the basis of the sustainability approach was embedded in Ian McHarg’s *landscape inform design* approach to planning. The McHarg methodology saw the development of a sustainability strategy tailored to the development. The result was development that responds to the characteristics of the site. It was a more sustainable form of development inline with the desires for a preferred form of development.

“You establish what kind of goals you want to achieve and there are best practices that are common to achieve those goals, and so then you work your way through them and you try and achieve the highest end of performance that you can.” (P3)

“The process is to create a unique approach to sustainable development that is appropriate to the project. There are design practices in everything — architecture, landscape architecture — and every project is unique. There is not a set rule that you do with anything; you always tailor everything to that project. Sustainability is no different and again sustainability is not a list of things that thou shall do but it is a set of outcomes you are trying to achieve in terms of performance. You find the most unique way you can for that project to make it work.” (P3)

“The point is that we are trying to achieve a different outcome so how do we do it best on this hillside?” (P3)

“There are two fundamental pieces to that difference. The first one is we are not following a prescribed list of things to do we are working to try to achieve a different outcome. There are many different ways of achieving it and you choose the ones that fit best to your project. Secondly, again it is not just a list of things you are trying to do; with everything you do you are trying to achieve as many outcomes as possible, so social, economic, environmental benefits form every dollar you spend.” (P3)

“The focuses of the [envisioning] workshop was to go through all the things that one might do to make places sustainable and cull from that long list the things that might work on the site and try as hard as possible to incorporate them into the design principles…There were a lot of things that couldn’t be done.” (P4)

Developers respond to the changing characteristics of the market. If there is demand for a certain type of development then they provide it. Societal environmental awareness is on the rise and shifts in demographic patterns have led to changes in the market. There is greater demand for green building, adaptable housing and smaller units.
West Vancouver has an ageing population with 39% of the population over 55 years of age and 23% over 65 years of age (Statistics Canada, 2006c). The ageing population is influencing the type and form of housing that is being sought. This raises the question, “why change after 75 years of single-family-detached success? There’s a couple of things. The market is getting more mature….many [older people] want smaller accommodation but they want to live in their neighbourhoods where they raised their families” (McLean in Eustace, 2007:8). This ageing population and changing demand pointed to deficiencies in the market.

The changing demand was also identified in the socio-economic analysis prepared for the Rogers Creek development, “The housing supply in West Vancouver will not adequately accommodate the population as it ages. Based on the demand projections presented in their report and all known in existing and upcoming supply, the District can only accommodate its anticipated population for the next 2 years” (Colliers International in Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008:26).

“...if there is a market for green development then the developers provide that right.” (P2)

“West Vancouver at the time was also a community in transition. Traditionally it was mostly single family homes, large houses and large lots. Now the demographics has aged such that the people that have lived here and raised a family that wanted a large home and large lot they want to stay in the community with something smaller and more manageable, and that product isn’t available to them…there was a need for much more diverse type of housing…there was a need for planning that preserved more green space.” (D1)

“Now that this global crisis is here I think we are going to see two changes. The first is that I actually think there is going to be an increased awareness of the role of a healthy sustainable economy directly linked to healthy sustainable ecology within the context of a neighbourhood and then broadly in the community, but I also think you are going to see a change in the form and character of the homes. There will always be a market for large homes on small or even estate lots — that is a cultural thing, especially in the west. But what I think you are going to find is a much tighter more dense smaller design footprint with much larger elements of the landscape left intact simply because it is going to be more efficient and effective.” (E2)

The preferred form of development is changing. There has been increasing desire within the industry and from local government to provide more sustainable forms of development. This desire balanced with market demands led to the need for a change in development form in West Vancouver. As societal environmental awareness rises, plans promoting sustainability will achieve greater community buy-in.
“The whole idea with sustainable buildings and energy efficient buildings is so much in the public eye right now that when we start hearing of these things being put in place through this process it was much easier to accept positive change.” (D1)

“…that was the case in West Van with the Mayor and Councillors and a lot of the neighbours were interested in green…those were really key critical drivers.” (P3)

The urban development problems and desire for a preferred form of development were two interrelated community needs. The planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek Area development responds to both of these factors.

13.5 The Unique Characteristics of the Developer

The Rodgers Creek Area development is unique in terms of its history. “Over the years BPP has played a significant role in shaping the community, housing at least 4,500 families in the area to date” (McLean in Eustace, 2007:8). The Guinness family has a long history of development in the Upper Lands, Table 13-1. BPP is a powerful entity based on their monopoly of land ownership in the Upper Lands and their long-term ongoing investment in West Vancouver. They still have enough land for 50 years of development (Eustace, 2007).

Table 13-1. BPP Community Projects

- Built Capilano Golf and Country Club and Park Royal Shopping Centre
- Provided land for the TransCanada Trail
- Made land available for Hollyburn Country Club
- Created Normandy Park, Finch Hill Park, Westhill Park, Lawson Creek trails and McDonald Creek trails
- Made land available for Mulgrave School
- Provided funding for the extension of the West Vancouver Library
- Provided land and now constructing a regular size rugby field with artificial turf for the community on Cypress Bowl Road
- Provided major funding for storm water protection for existing residential properties
- Provided Hadden Creek and McDonald Creek fish ladders
- Currently constructing the Chippendale Connector joining the newest British Properties neighbourhoods to Cypress Bowl Road

(British Pacific Properties, 2009)
The uniqueness of the developer was identified by interviewees.

“The District of West Vancouver is very fortunate because I don’t think they would ever be able to execute an ADP process quite like this if they didn’t have the benefit of a massive landowner like that in the area.” (D2)

“BPP has owned that hillside for 100 years and they always have another 100 years yet to go with the rest of the land and so they are a very big player in West Van, and they are very, very responsible cooperate citizens. They are not just trying to get in and get out.” (P3)

“It shows that they are invested in West Vancouver for the long term.” (M)

“It’s a very unusual situation where you have one landowner that owns almost everything. More often with this kind of ADP you have multiple land owners and the stakeholders are much more diverse.” (P4)

“Inbuilt relationship with the community that is as old as the community itself is very unusual circumstances.” (CR)

Another important influence was that the developer had the desire to ‘do the right thing’ and a willingness to invest significant resources into the process, the primary land owner “…BPP Ltd shared the common vision of creating a leading edge sustainable community” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:9). Its history in the community has resulted in trust, “the brand means stability, trust and quality” (McLean in Eustace, 2007:8).

“They are very much interested in being seen as cooperate citizens doing the right thing.” (P4)

“There would be others who wouldn’t have had the patience or the willingness to put into the resources for the analysis.” (P5)

“A lot of the green sustainability stuff obviously costs more money but it is the right thing to do.” (D1)

“We made a commitment at that point, for example, LEEDS silver equivalent. This wasn’t a requirement of the municipality but we thought we should be doing it as a responsible company.” (D1)

The uniqueness of the developer, its desire to produce better development and its monopoly of land ownership impacted the success of implementing a new process.
13.6 The Unique Characteristics of the Site

The Rodgers Creek Area site comprised significant environmental challenges. The site has steep terrain, second growth forest, sensitive ecological habitat and approximately 30 watercourses of varying description and quality.

“Moving east to west the first land that they developed in the 1930s, 40s and 50s was relatively flat, but as you move further west it becomes steeper and more challenging.” (D1)

“This is a lot steeper, a lot more challenging, the houses are a lot bigger.” (E3)

“…and indeed the development site as you move west becomes steeper and steeper and that dictates a change in development.” (Eng)

“Rodgers Creek wasn’t going to work particularly well for that [conventional development] anyway because it was much steeper than what they were building on before. There were more creeks which I think everyone realized weren’t going to be piped.” (D2)

The topographical and ecological constraints of the site created a challenge for development on the site. Based on the prescribed setback in the requirements the majority of the site was essentially undevelopable. As a result, it was in the best interests of the developer to seek a new and more flexible process.

The uniqueness of the Rodgers Creek Area site is not only physical but also geographical. Its size and proximity to a major city makes it geographically unique. It is on the fringe of key regional recreational and environmental resources.

“I see ourselves in the region for the Lower Mainland and I see the North Shore as being the outdoor recreation backyard for two million people, and I don’t want to see it become all big houses for a few because I think we all should benefit. So that is tricky but I think in terms of how people live now a days accessing what is here is becoming more and more important. And I understand people take an afternoon to get out into nature; they don’t take two weeks because they don’t have two weeks. That to me is a long-range driver for West Van.” (M)

These locational attributes combined with its many physical constraints including steep terrain and a multitude of creeks make the site unique.

The Rodgers Creek Area is part of the strategic development of the Upper Lands. The next phase of development is the future Cypress Village. Consideration of the bigger picture and
future development played a significant role in the design and participants’ perspectives on the development.

“Rodgers Creek in isolation isn’t really dealing with too much of this, but it is part of a bigger puzzle.” (D2)

The unique characteristics of the site meant the developer needed to change the form of development and work with the municipality to develop a process tailored to the circumstances of the project.

13.7 Community Attitude Towards Change

The community was an important influence on the planning process and had greater involvement than ever before. It had the power to enable or disable the development. There are several ways in which the community invited a change to the planning and design process. Firstly, there was a lot of dissatisfaction with urban and environmental problems. Secondly, there was a desire for a new form of development. And finally the development was ultimately not contentious and the community was not completely opposed to change.

The urban and environmental concerns of past development spread amongst the community. The developer, municipality and council were aware of these problems and did not want to continue the pattern of development but instead wanted to improve on their past practices.

“…the community was opposed to continuing on with that kind of pattern.” (E3)

“The change was driven by the community. Everyone wanted to see things done differently.” (D1)

“This isn’t good enough for West Vancouver. We don’t want to do development like that anymore.” (P2)

The residents of West Vancouver comprise mixed attitudes towards change. Part of the community is willing to change and adapt while part of the community is satisfied with the status quo and opposed to change. Change was possible because there was some willingness amongst the community to change and adapt. There wasn’t complete opposition.

“There are two real sides in West Vancouver. There are people who are progressive and expect that change is going to happen but say they want to manage that change effectively and in a classy way they want, or they have, high expectations in terms of design. They want to preserve some of the character of West Vancouver, and there are some that don’t want change at all.” (P2)
“There are certain parts of the community that don't want any development at all, which is not unusual.” (P4)

“Historically, a lot of planning ended up as a conflict between people who were opposed to growth and those who were in favour of growth, and the sustainability principles seemed to reconcile a lot of those. In other words, they indicated that you could have growth that was not detrimental if it was well done and, in fact, that it was a better idea than not having it.” (CR)

“I would say very uncomfortable with change. If you take a big picture, say on a scale of 1 to 10, I would say 8.” (CR)

“There are certainly a number of people in West Vancouver who feel there should be no growth and development.” (Eng)

It is important to recognize that the Rodgers Creek Area development was not a contentious development in comparison to other large-scale residential development. The Rodgers Creek site is somewhat isolated and does not have many neighbours so the development was not as contentious as other large-scale residential developments may be. Participants interviewed speculated that the community at large was not aware or concerned with the development. The process does not guarantee that issues would be successfully resolved if applied to more contentious developments that have greater community interest.

“The general public were not interested unless something was actually impacting their own neighbourhood and this didn’t impact many people’s neighbourhoods.” (CR)

“…it is not next door to anybody, it is not controversial. So I would say they don’t know about it. The people that do know about it I would say were highly satisfied that they felt that it was well done.” (CR)

“I think that most of the community frankly still know nothing about it. Re: the average person if you were to poll him/her would say the number of people who are aware of what Rodgers Creek is, where it is and what it entails, you know you say it's going to be 25% have heard of it.” (CR)

“The knowledge about Rodgers Creek was almost non-existent…the general knowledge of the public about what you did and what was achieved. Although we had the public meetings, they really didn’t know what the hell was going on at the top of that hill, they really didn’t… they really didn’t know a lot about it and that did surprise me.” (E3)
The changes to the planning process and public participation were a result of the community’s attitude towards change and the fact that it was not a contentious development with a low level of community interest. The community was not willing to accept the continuation of past outcomes and demanded better process and better results.

13.8 Power and Politics

The political context was the key driving force behind the success of implementing a new planning process. The changes would not have been carried out without the political support and will for change.

“The political will is very important as a foundation for moving forward.” (P1)

“I think the barriers would be political. There has to be the political will to change the way things were done.” (P2)

“If the local government isn’t prepared to make adjustments than pursuing an innovative thing may not be practical just because they don’t want you to do them even if they are the right thing to do.” (P3)

The Mayor was the main instigator of changes to the planning process. From a political perspective, it was risky to implement such change.

“What my platform was running for Mayor was generally to move away from advisory groups and reinventing public consultation. From a Council point of view, the need was to start to shape communities above the highway based on community values.” (M)

“It is a big project where a political career can be made or broken on you know.” (D2)

“I think that the BPP board, and Jim Mclean and Pam Goldsmith-Jones really deserve a huge amount of credit for having the courage to do something really quite different.” (E2)

“There is a hazard to the politician in the sense that they might not get re-elected.” (E2)

The unique characteristics of the developer, its history and investment in West Vancouver gave it power. Concerns were growing amongst Council and staff that this power was too strong and intimidating. The new process redistributed power and created a more equal playing field. Through redistributing power, the stakeholders were empowered with the ability to engage in decision making and influence the plan (Reed, 2008 and Alex, 1995).
"We need to put that power in check. It had just become way too strong and intimidating to staff and intimidating to politicians, and that is not any of the people who are there but the history." (M)

"I think that the power was fairly well and strategically divided up between the Working Group, staff and the developer." (P2)

Politics plays a large role in planning processes, particularly for large-scale developments. While the Rodgers Creek process achieved greater input, the final decision rested with Council. Councillors often have little or no training or experience in planning. There is a disconnect between the planning and design process and political recognition of the long-term implications. There is a need for upfront education of politicians because they are the driving force behind policy and process changes.

"At the end of the day that is always a political decision…whatever we do in the context of the project it is always with that political ideal in mind." (E2)

"There is a complete disconnect between the planning and design process and the long-term implications." (E2)

"So the approach that we have taken and others including members of this team is to engage in far more education upfront so you find a way to get at least to the politicians such that they will hopefully put enough pressure on the staff to do something a certain way." (E2)

"I think we missed a real bat. We didn’t educate any politicians really other than a couple that were party to the process… I think we have a governance problem where we don’t treat our politicians as professionals at the municipal level." (E2)

"We had a substantial amount of political support. We had the Working Group and a world class design team with a world class developer — still a crap shoot at the end of the day about how they are going to vote, but I think you substantially reduce the wildcard element if you have a group of politicians that are properly educated, properly trained. They are professional and they understand what is really truly at stake." (E2)

Changes in political agendas need to be considered. The Rodgers Creek Area development was pushed through prior to an election to ensure any potential change of political parties wouldn’t impact work already undertaken, as "sometimes an impending election may provide powerful incentive for parties to reach agreement" (CCNRTEE, 1996:89). The final decision was also political: "Once we agree to this, no matter what happens for the next three councils…their hands will be tied" (Vaughan, in Krishnan, 2008a:1).
The new process was favourable because it was community driven. CCNRTEE (1996) suggests that government is often drawn to consensus-based processes to diffuse contentious situations. Community-driven processes often result in easier to implement decisions.

Power and politics played a significant role in planning and design processes. The political context was favourable to changing the process for the Rodgers Creek Area development.

13.9 Policy and Regulatory Barriers

British Columbia’s planning system and more specifically West Vancouver’s planning system allowed for sufficient flexibility to change the planning process to enable innovation.

Municipal policies aimed at controlling development were also flexible for the Rodgers Creek Area. For example, the development permit policy had the potential to be restrictive and have a significant impact on the development because of the number of creeks, but it was designed to allow for flexibility which encouraged development that was more suitable for the site.

While the OCP was originally considered restrictive because of the cap it placed on floor space and density, the technical team and Working Group were able to support changes to the policy that were subsequently adopted by Council.

The policy and regulatory context for large-scale residential development in West Vancouver was not restrictive and did not create a barrier to changing the process. This is not necessarily the case for all municipalities.

13.10 Conclusion

The contextual factors around the Rodgers Creek Area development are unique and at the foundation of the project’s success. The project was assisted by the perceived need for change which emerged from problems with the conventional planning process, urban development problems created by past development and the desire for preferred forms of development. The context is also characterised by the uniqueness of the site, developer and community, all which stimulated commitments to do better. The political setting in which the change occurred as well as the existing policies and regulations were also favourable to the new process. Finally, the key players all had an interest in changing the process.

The development of an innovative and experimental planning and design process at Rodgers Creek demonstrates that unconventional sites require unconventional processes and variety in
the types of processes. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. A summary of the contextual factors is provided in Table 13-2.

Table 13-2. Summary of Contextual Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of existing process</th>
<th>The unique characteristics of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc development, not a comprehensive approach</td>
<td>Steep terrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentious development approval process resulting in conflict</td>
<td>Multitude of watercourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendations not considered</td>
<td>Prescribed setback regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political decision</td>
<td>Rare large greenfield area close to city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No meaningful involvement</td>
<td>Site on fringe of regional recreational and environmental resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban development problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of variety in housing product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses too big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site coverage too high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks not big enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of natural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental damage from poor construction techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The desire to achieve a preferred form of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical team and Working Group familiar with sustainability concepts and industry trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical team and Working Group experienced, knowledgeable with a desire for creativity, innovation and leading edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to tailor sustainability approach to development project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing market trends include demographic shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political desire for more sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance what is desired with what is practical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community attitude towards change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with urban and environmental problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for new forms of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a contentious development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completely opposed to change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major key driving force behind change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political risks of implementing new process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of BPP was dominating and intimidating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final decision rests with council – need for removal from process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect between planning and design process and political recognition of long-term implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for education of politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want community-driven recommendations that are easier to implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy and regulatory barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy framework was flexible and enabled a change of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies controlling development were flexible enabling design variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-driven influence resulted in statutory policy changes that otherwise would not have been achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unique characteristics of the developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BPP history and power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BPP domination in land ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BPP future development and investment in locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BPP commitment to ‘do the right thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness and ability to invest significant resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.0 COMPARISON OF THE OLD AND NEW PROCESS, IMPACTS ON THE OUTCOME AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

14.1 Introduction

The previous chapter established the context behind the Rodgers Creek Area planning process. This chapter highlights how the outcome of the process is different from the past. It further discusses the implications for applying the Rodgers Creek Area process to future large-scale residential projects.

14.2 What is Unique about the Rodgers Creek Plan and Process?

The Plan

While it is outside of the scope of this thesis to assess the plan, interviewees indicated that the most unique element of the plan was the mountain pathway which is three metres in width and extends 2.4 kilometres across the development site.

“I am excited about the mountain path especially if I do end up living there I will use that mountain path. I think that that is fundamentally a part of why it is such a good design.” (D2)

“That mountain pathway is a unique unifying element used to characterize it. It is going to function like the seawall does down here, but up there. So that is a unique feature.” (P5)

“…and one of the principle benefits in this neighbourhood is the path so my hope would be that this development benefits far beyond the geographical area that it is in and helps to revitalize the older neighbourhoods as well.” (M)

“It [the mountain pathway] was a wonderful concept and it is one of the things that really strongly links this community.” (P1)

“It is important for people to appreciate how much a project can be driven by landscape and the environment. I think there are also a lot of interesting ideas about how to fit landscape, architecture and recreation onto a steep slope.” (P4)

Other unique elements of the plan included the preservation of the natural environment, the pod-style development and the housing form and density.
West Vancouver has traditionally had a much lower density than the GVRD reflected in its single-family trend. The density of the Rodgers Creek Area development was vastly different from other development in West Vancouver, Table 14-1. It was a significant change from past BPP development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Vancouver</th>
<th>GVRD</th>
<th>Rodgers Creek Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/ Triplex/</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008; District of West Vancouver, 2009; Source: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2007; Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department, 2008; Statistics Canada, 2006a; Statistics Canada, 2006b; Statistics Canada, 2006c; Statistics Canada, 2006d; Statistics Canada, 2006e; Statistics Canada, 2006f)

The Process
There were three elements of the process that were identified as being unique. The first was the integrated technical team that saw the municipality become part of the design team. The second was the Working Group, which was project based and made up of industry specialists. And finally, it is distinguished by the overall transparency and openness of the process, which has led to increasing public trust and relationships. This reflects the benefits of effective processes identified by Reed 2008 and Alex 1995. The community involvement supports greater community and political buy-in (District of West Vancouver, 2009:9).

“I think there were really two unique elements to it. One was the Working Group and the other was staff’s involvement with BPP and BPP’s willingness to have us on a regular basis. Those are two unique elements, and what makes it even more unique is they were combined under one project.” (P1)

“That the community could steer as powerful and established a force as BPP, and you know I think that they now see the huge benefit of that.” (M)

“I think having a very open process is what really sets this apart from other processes that I have seen and the openness is the foundation. It made a big difference.” (P1)

“I think what makes it unique is its openness and transparency, and in terms of the process transparency, trust.” (P2)

“I think that it was a group plan and by that I mean everybody really has a stake in it. Right up to now we have the school involved and the students and, again, it was a super inclusive process.” (E1)
"I think the openness and transparency were good." (P2)

Another unique element within the process was the cooperation and collaboration, “equally important was that the process proceeded openly with an unprecedented level of cooperation and collaboration among participants” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:2).

14.3 Was the Approach of the Rodgers Creek Development Successful?

It was outside of the scope of this thesis to determine if the overall approach was successful or not. Rather this study broke the process down into the different techniques or steps and identified what worked well and what could be improved upon. While a judgement cannot be made on the success of the approaches, participants interviewed spoke very positively about the process and the plan. This is highlighted through the following quotes:

“I don’t think anyone really saw how neat the outcome could be and what a departure it could be for West Van because this is a very traditional place.” (M)

“The plan spoke for itself.” (D2)

“I think from an ecological conservation point of view it is probably one of the best hillside developments in Western Canada.” (P3)

“In particular the hillside ecological management is some of the most thorough and best work that has been done in B.C. and the design quality is excellent. Green building have been pursued all of the way through…and right now they are putting together lots of innovations. I’m not sure I’d make that many changes. For what they are working with, the market they are working with, the West Van community, I think they did an excellent job.” (P3)

“Is anyone else doing it right now? I don’t know of anyone else so I think it has been a pretty good first cut. And there are things that we would do different next time but this time it was a good first step.” (E1)

“I think for me personally it identified that there is actually a planning process that is successful that we can use to accelerate a far more sustainable type of development.” (E2)

“So I think at the end of the day this particular project has been hugely influential in potentially accelerating the adoption of really truly integrative sustainable design for what it is worth. Time will tell of course.” (E2)
The process improved community involvement in the planning and design process. But improving involvement alone is not enough. Participation needs to be meaningful and effective. The Rodgers Creek Area development demonstrated how input can be effectively incorporated; this was illustrated through the support shown at the final public hearing.

14.4 Were the Stakeholders and the Community Satisfied?

Participants interviewed indicated their general satisfaction towards the Rodgers Creek Area planning process and its outcome. However, they did highlight challenges and opportunities for improvement throughout the interviews.

The Working Group

“I think we are very happy. Well, we are a lot more happy then we used to be.” (E3)

“We were so elated at being invited to participate at the level we were invited to…It was such a great achievement for us to be recognized and to have our principles adopted into the document.” (E3)

“I’m largely very satisfied. As I say, I may have even been in favour of a little bit more density, perhaps more units duplexes and quad-plexes rather than single family homes but I don’t feel very strongly on that issue.” (Eng)

Council

“The confidence that the community and council had in the outcome in this process was exhibited by them moving forward to adopt the bylaws, that was very rewarding to see that actually happen. It was an expression of confidence.” (P1)

The Technical Team

“So there were improvements, yes, but there were some really good points that I would do again.” (P1)

“I thought that the process was very good, excellent.” (P2)

“In 15 years of doing this, it is the best one that I have been involved in.” (E1)

“Did they have faith in it? The outcome worked so I think they will be more comfortable with it.” (P1)
“But in this case the way it was set up and the way it ended up running was better than we could have hoped.” (D1)

“I was very satisfied that we have a plan that works financially, that works well for the shareholders.” (D1)

“How radical the design was, how ground breaking it was, how forward thinking it was, and if you were in this process like we were without having had any experience in other large plans like this being implemented, it just seemed to make good common sense.” (D2)

“I think in general to answer the question very happy, and I think that the specifics of the area in which we are involved.” (D2)

“To remain totally cooperative throughout the whole process is a pretty extraordinary thing. And I am starting to realize that I had it pretty good on this one.” (D2)

“Oh, I guess if we were ranking on a scale of 1 to 10 I would say 15.” (E2)

The Community

“The public themselves were very very pleased with the new process…the shift in everybody’s attitudes was noticeable.” (E1)

“The design process had produced something that the community was highly favourable to.” (E2)

“I think it was a very successful model.” (CR)

“But by and large, I think it was pretty well accepted.” (P5)

The interests of the stakeholders appear to be better met and satisfied through the new multi-stakeholder planning process.

14.5 How does the Rodgers Creek Process Compare to the Conventional Process?

How does the Rodgers Creek Area planning process differ from the conventional planning process? Participants interviewed were asked to compare the process to the conventional process. It was evident that the two processes were very different.
“You can’t even compare them because they are so different.” (E1)

“Do think that this process is quite different from anything I have ever seen and I have been at this game now essentially since 1964. I have been doing this a long time and I don’t ever remember anything that resembles this.” (E2)

There were several key differences between the processes. Firstly, staff and the community were invited to have input upfront thereby providing them influence on the design of the project as well as the process.

The process reduced conflicts more effectively while demonstrating a movement from ‘planning for the people’ to ‘planning with the people’. It shows a movement to more inclusive and participatory community-driven processes.

The new self-designed process is more inclusive, enabling parties to contribute to the design of the process rather than following the prescribed rule-driven conventional process.

“Previous to this, the developer would have done all the work with the consultants. The environmental work and everything and then submitted it as one package…and then you start these negotiations with the municipality on how to fine tune it…But it becomes somewhat confrontational because you have a plan and then you’re trying to change the plan as opposed to working out the plan together…They were unhappy with the process because they were asked to comment at such a late stage. There was very little opportunity for change at the time…the people just didn’t feel like they had been included in the process.” (D1)

“In the past, staff weren’t happy because there was no input upfront. The community groups were not happy because they didn’t have input upfront and then Council is brought in at the end and they don’t understand what’s gone into it, and they are being asked to comment at the end stage.” (D1)

“The older process is less elaborate and less inclusive.” (CR)

Secondly, the process was seen to be more transparent, holistic and fair. This was an improvement on the conventional process which was largely undertaken behind closed doors. This enhanced respect and accountability.

“If Council tried to host a dialogue about changing housing forms we would get nowhere. It is very different when the community says to the community, ‘What do you think?’” (M)

“Now it is very much an open dialogue and I am confident it is much better.” (E1)
The project-based Working Groups were a significant change for the District. These Working Groups have been carried through to other projects and as a result there are very few advisory groups remaining. The new process is less segmented and better integrated.

“I feel very strongly that the Working Group approach is much better than was the previous one that we explained that it goes through a planning committee and cascades down to other committees or design panels of advisory parks and so on. This is much better. It is better to put people that you think should have an interest under one group.” (Eng)

“…but rather than us going to three different committees, one on architecture, one on engineering and one environmental. They wanted a single Working Group that could get into the ADP.” (D1)

“…so they would go to the planning committee, which was basically planners with a few extra bodies on it to determine if the land use was appropriate, and that may take three or four or six months and so on and so on. And then if they think things should go ahead, then it probably cascaded down to engineering advisory, and maybe parks and recreation for their input and goodness knows who else or other committees, so another three or four or six months later you got the result of the planning committees viewpoints. Then staff once again and Council members sat in and before you know it a year and a half has passed and none of these other committees have the benefit of listening to the planning one in the first instance, and you go back and fourth…this has got rid of that. It puts all of these representatives together at the outset and one voice is heard…It is a much better approach to the process. That is the very important thing that came out of it.” (Eng)

“We have very few standing committees now.” (M)

The conventional process was not designed to address a diversity of interests and deal with the complexity that large-scale residential development entails. In comparison, the new consensus process is made up of a number of different techniques which came together to produce innovative and creative solutions. It was specifically designed to respond to the particular circumstances of the Rodgers Creek Area development. The new process addresses complexity and brings together knowledge and expertise. It allowed participants to work together as equals.

Conventional processes see the decision being made by authorities; “this is the conventional means by which environmental decisions are made in Canada” (CNRTEE, 1993:9). Typical characteristics of the conventional process include making formal representations to decision makers, little or no need or opportunity for those affected to communicate. The process is usually guided by procedures, regulations and precedent, and the decision is made and announced. Moreover, competing interests are often not addressed. The public hearing is a legal necessity
and the manner and extent that public input is incorporated into the final decision is often completely neglected.

14.6 How does the Outcome Differ from what would have occurred if the Conventional Process had been applied?

This research focused on the ways in which multi-stakeholder processes inform decision making. It did not assess the outcome, but participants interviewed indicated that the final ADP vastly differed from original proposals for development on the site.

“Yes, it varies a lot. I remember 15 years ago there was not nearly as much green space; it was predominantly single family. It was much different from what was envisioned 15 years ago or even 5 years ago. When I first came here there was a lot more development in certain areas. There was a lot of development that was challenging engineering-wise not to mention the environmental impacts.” (D1)

“There isn’t a huge difference between the 2005 and 2008 plan but there is a huge difference between 2005 and 1999, for example.” (D1)

“You should see some of the early designs. Mum and I were digging out stuff from 15 years ago and it is atrocious, it is terrible.” (D2)

Participants also agreed that the process created a change in the form of development. The most significant design elements in the Rodgers Creek Area development include the shift in the type of development towards multifamily, the pod-style development that allowed for large contiguous areas of open space and the reduction in roads and bridge crossings.

“It would have been different.” (P1)

“Would it be different? Yes. Absolutely. I think that you probably would have ended up with a pattern of development more similar to what you have seen before.” (P2)

“I think that if it had been pre-zoned it probably would have been developed at 2.5 units per acre.” (P4)

“Changing from the old way of doing business where the last development had 85% single family, 15% multifamily to this time where we had 85% multifamily, 15% single family, it was a huge change.” (E1)

“Smaller units, definitely a smaller footprint than if you were to take a model to create something like the mountain pathway, which links everything to an upcoming commercial centre and does that
in a way which strongly discourages car traffic [and promotes the] large preservation of green area, protection of riparian areas. All of those things are so different than what they have done in the past.” (D2)

“So by taking the environment first what happened was we got pods. …it was really the outcome of using the land. But creating this as one large contiguous open space natural area — and it is one of many — that was in fact an achievement of this process that wasn’t possible I think otherwise.” (P1)

Another important comparison was the comprehensive nature of the plan despite multiple land ownership. Previous development was fragmented and ad-hoc. In contrast, “Pam Goldsmith-Jones stressed the importance of keeping the mountain accessible to walkers and cyclists, and finding one central plan for all four owners” (Altmayer, 2007:1).

“The ways that the planning had gone in earlier times were subdivision by subdivision, and at some point prior to 2004 and 2005, there was a sort of gravitation towards saying that there had to be a bigger scope of planning. And while people agreed there needed to be a bigger scope of planning and larger area plans were being developed elsewhere in the province, how to do it was not clear.” (CR)

“That was certainly the Working Group who had said no this is one plan this is not a bunch of individual subdivision plans that are pieced and taped together. You kind of get on board with the principles here. So that was certainly an achievement. That just wouldn’t have happened if we had of used a traditional approach.” (P1)

“And staff wanted to look at it, and the District and the community wanted to look at it in a holistic sense so some of the initial options that we saw from some of the private landowners outside of BPP were not good, and it wasn’t reflecting what we wanted to see.” (P2)

“It would have proceeded a little bit more efficiently if dealing with only some of the elements in there but at the same time we wanted to deal with it comprehensively.” (P2)

“There was the perception in the community that they didn’t want to be doing piecemeal development; they wanted a more comprehensive planning process.” (D1)

“Between the two of us, we are looking to develop 25 acres independent of BPP and that didn’t really get anywhere because even at that time the District was hesitant to do anything without the involvement of BPP, which was frustrating for us, but I think from a planning point of view probably rightfully so because you really need to tie it all together.” (D2)
The importance of the comprehensive nature of development is seen through design elements like the mountain pathway that would not have been possible without the cooperation of the various landowners.

“It is a mountain sidewalk — it is a little different — then it becomes a path continuity linking these neighbourhoods is extremely important. If you go subdivision by subdivision you just are not going to get that kind of thing happening.” (P1)

The change in development outcome will be seen at the build-out of the project which will take place over a six-to-ten year period and require development permits at each phase. The District is confident it will change the appearance of the hillside and respond to community expectations. As the new plan envisions it, “the view will not be a constructed hillside of homes, but of a network of forest neighbourhoods; there will be opportunities to choose from a diversity of housing: 1000 sq.ft. apartments, 2000 sq.ft. apartments, townhouses, single-family-homes and accessory housing; creeks and environmentally sensitive areas will be protected and residents will be able to enjoy them as they walk on the many mountain paths and trails for recreation or on their way to the new Cypress Village” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:9).

The Rodgers Creek project suggests that planning processes can be constructed to produce better, more innovative and more comprehensive outcomes.

**14.7 Applying the Process to Future BPP Development in West Vancouver**

West Vancouver contains a significant proportion of undeveloped land in the region and has capacity to support future growth. Some 20% of the land in West Vancouver is open and undeveloped (Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department, 2008). BPP owns land to the west of the Rodgers Creek site up to Horseshoe Bay. This includes the future Cypress Village adjacent to the site. As a result, large-scale residential development will continue to play a significant role in the development of the area.

The potential for applying the Rodgers Creek Area planning process to future BPP development in West Vancouver was discussed with the interviewees. There was a general consensus that the process should be replicated and used for the next phase of development, Cypress Village.

“It raises the bar on what West Vancouver residents expect and demand for development on our hillside for sure.” (E1)
“What is important to Rodgers Creek is the next development over which is the so-called village area.” (Eng)

“And what it did for BPP was it established a process for the future that is a successful model. This kind of process will help us get through that without confrontation.” (D1)

“But again because we have worked out what works, next time we go through this, it won’t take so long. So by taking risks up front you are reducing risks.” (D1)

“It will be very interesting to see if that plays itself out with the next stage of BPP’s development, which is Cypress Village. Can we replicate that same process and go beyond what we achieved with Rodgers?” (E2)

“Now the next development by BPP once again is going to be a big piece of acreage and I think they should go through it again.” (E3)

“I think the Rodgers Creek planning process has been well accepted by certainly by Council…So I think it is going to be used as there is further development to the west of this Rodgers Creek Area. I would be very surprised if that did not occur.” (Eng)

“I think that the fundamental process would remain the same. For example, if we were looking at Cypress Village today the first thing we would do would be to get all of the staff and evaluate that, do a sieve analysis and get a Working Group. Start talking to other stakeholders. So the basic mechanics of it I don’t see changing, maybe some tweaking here and there.” (D1)

The Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process has raised the bar and established expectations from Council, staff and the community: “For the community, the Rodgers Creek ADP and implementation project has two primary impacts. First, it sets a positive standard for future projects in terms of community engagement. The community can expect that it will be asked to play a major role in the development of such plans and that its concerns are taken seriously” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:8). This is seen through the road alignment, recognition of mountain bikers and the open and transparent process.

In a way the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process was a trial. Learning from that experience the process can be improved and replicated. Seasons et al (2005) suggest that planners ‘learn by doing’ and that understanding the challenges of urban planning innovations and experiments is a key component of creating more sustainable development.

“I think if we did it again I would say that everyone who is involved would have a better understanding of what the process was.” (P1)
“I think it would be easier going through the process, one having confidence that it can work and everybody’s concerns would be taken into account.” (P1)

“Going back, we would probably avoid some of the minor pitfalls and time sucks that we fell into but when you are doing things for a first time there are always those things so I think we did a great job working around that.” (E1)

14.8 Applying the Process to Other Development

The analysis and evaluation provided in this thesis highlights the uniqueness of the Rodgers Creek Area development. It outlines what made it work and how it can be improved. But what are the implications for applying the process to future large-scale residential projects?

The potential for the Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process to be applied to other development was an issue of contention amongst the interviewees. They were asked if the same process could be applied to a different project, different site, and different developer in a different municipality. There were mixed responses ranging from a strong desire to see the process replicated to significant doubt as to whether the process would be successful because of context factors.

“One thing I haven’t mentioned is can it be applied elsewhere? Definitely.” (P1)

“Understanding the land and the Working Group and those two pieces of the puzzle are important to replicate not only in greenfield sites but other urban contexts.” (P2)

“It is certainly applicable to other projects.” (E1)

“Can we replicate it somewhere else? Not only can we, we must. Right?” (E2)

“It must be applied again. Because I think if it isn’t we are going to continue building what we have always built.” (E2)

“Yes. Absolutely. Yes, I think it can. The idea of doing a sustainability strategy and an envisioning session, the ecological walk through with management on the plan involved detail and mapping out, and an advisory Working Group with the local government is always a good idea. Yeah, I think it can be. The Working Group may be a little harder to do on a small project just because it was such a big project, so important that a lot of people were prepared to review the plan and work with the development team. On a full project, I think most of the lessons and most of the process can be applied in many other projects.” (P3)
“I think it would be great. I think it is the first step in a change of the traditional process.” (E3)

“To me that is just a lot of commonsense and I don’t understand why it wouldn’t be applied in the future and even now.” (Eng)

“I think it has potential in other communities and for other developers.” (Eng)

The circumstances of the Rodgers Creek Area development were unique. The circumstances fitted the process, or rather the process was designed to suit the circumstances of the project. As a result it may create challenges for replicating it in different environments.

“The outcome of them is somewhat dependent more upon the circumstances than the process.” (CR)

“Each neighbourhood project is different, the market is different, the company is different the regulator, the local government, is different and often the people who are involved are different.” (P3)

“I think for each project you have to modify the process to be appropriate for it.” (Eng)

The District believes that the process can and should be replicated and used as a model: “The process used for this project is readily transferable to any jurisdiction with some adaption to the specifics of the issue being considered would be essential and appropriate, provided the process remains founded on openness and mutual respect” (District of West Vancouver, 2009:9). In particular, the integrated technical sessions and the concept of tailored working groups designed to suit the circumstances of the project could be transported to other large-scale residential developments.

The key challenges for replicating the process are outlined below:

**Challenge 1 – Political and regulatory barriers**

Some municipalities have prescribed processes which may create difficulties in introducing the new process. Furthermore, there needs to be political buy-in and support. There has to be a will to change the process.

“A lot of municipalities have a very prescribed process.” (D1)

“But you have to have the buy-in from Council and staff, if you don’t it wont work.” (D1)
“Getting people to understand what Einstein published in one of his 1905/1906 papers and that was ‘the same kind of thinking that gave rise to the problem cannot be used to find a solution’.” (E2)

**Challenge 2 – Comprehensive planning**

Comprehensive planning is required. A piecemeal approach will not work. Rodgers Creek benefited from BPP’s monopoly of land ownership. There is a need to have cooperation between landowners, which is possibly more easily obtained through less owners and greater monopoly.

“I am doing this other project. You try and bring a few players to the table that are more or less sudo equal in their positions in a plan, and it very quickly becomes a soup of egos and independent interests, and it is very hard to get a cooperative spirit happening. And I just don’t think you can do something like we have done on the hillside if let’s say BPP was even 50% land owner…I think you can only really bank on being able to implement something like this at this scale if you have got that kind of dominance in the ownership so that is what I would see as a limitation to do this.” (D2)

Conflicts of interest can arise due to the complexity of issues, particularly with more contentious developments.

**Challenge 3 – Site size**

The size of the site needs to be large enough to move components around and you need to have a developer willing to invest the resources into the planning process.

“I think that if it was a different developer it could have gone a number of different directions.” (P5)

“But it can only really happen if you have a large site and can push development around.” (P4)

“It is got to be more than 20 or 30 acres and a greenfield.” (P1)

“Well, I think to take it and apply it to another project would be difficult. It was the developer who paid for it all. You have to have a project that has enough potential profit and a large enough site.” (P4)

“Would you do a similar thing for smaller development? I don’t think it is necessary.” (E3)

“You can’t just scale this down and say you need all of this for every…you know, if you had a 30-lot development what do you do? Common sense, do you need a $250,000 traffic study to tell you what 25 lots are going to generate however many more cars? I think not. It doesn’t make sense.” (Eng)
“I think the process is appropriate but perhaps a much lesser level of input is also appropriate. I think taking a year and a half for smaller development is perhaps appropriate.” (Eng)

“Someone could take the appropriate bits out of this and say this is what we think is appropriate for smaller development.” (Eng)

“It was probably more extensive then perhaps for a smaller single form of development.” (Eng)

**Challenge 4 – The contentious nature of the project**

Rodgers Creek was not a notably contentious development. Concerns were raised that the process would not be effective for more contentious projects.

“I think the circumstances of this particular project were very favourable to this process working. I could see a different piece of property in a different location — you apply this process to it and it wouldn’t work at all…you cannot apply this process to a more contentious environment and solve it.” (CR)

“There weren’t many irresolvable issues in this particular case…we didn’t really have people upset because the impacts were actually not big…this happened to be a process that fit very well to the circumstances.” (CR)

“I have seen other advisory groups work very well in other circumstances and other kinds of public consultation processes work well or run into trouble. It isn’t something in a process itself that resolves the problem.” (CR)

**Challenge 5 - Time and cost**

The Rodgers Creek planning and design process was expensive. The landowners need to be willing to invest the time and cost into the process.

“From a District perspective, the costs weren’t that great and that was because BPP essentially paid for staff time…They costed it out $900,000 for all of the consultants to deliver the information, to deliver the area plan, and it included the bill that we issued them for the area planning process and for staff time.” (P1)

“It might be more cost to the municipality to make it happen when you have multiple landowners.” (P1)
“We talked about community amenities and that and we had to put up so much cash. I’m not necessarily convinced that there was justification for all of that because some of the other things we did didn’t have monetary value to the community.” (D1)

“They are contributing an enormous amount of economic benefit to the community.” (P3)

“All of the effort that they have put in will serve them very well in the long term. So quite honestly while it has been expensive from their point of view it has been highly beneficial.” (Eng)

“While the front end work may seem large it will certainly streamline all of the smaller subsequent processes that fall out. I think it was worthwhile because it was really the Area Development Plan that sets the tone for that.” (E1)

“And of course those processes happen a bit faster but it is always a struggle or battle getting the development through...This covers 10 years of development and when we go through each development permit area that process is sped up. It only took us 2 months to get a development permit. It used to be a 6-month process. Because we have talked about it and we know the issues here.” (D1)

“It definitely took a year or so longer than what we thought it would take. I am hoping that we get back that time with the development permits.” (D1)

Municipal resource budgets, time and staff may pose a constraint.

The various public participation techniques entail different time and cost requirements. It is necessary to select techniques that are time and cost effective while achieving appropriate levels of input. Resource availability will facilitate or restrict the public participation techniques. It is essential to gain cooperation and commitment from the developer and agreement amongst stakeholders on roles and responsibilities at the beginning of the process.

**Challenge 6 – Risks**

The Rodgers Creek Area planning and design process was new and innovative which meant it was risky to the developer. There was also a risk regarding time and cost investment and uncertainty surrounding the design outcome. The process somewhat minimised the risk through its transparency and accountability.

“It was a longer process which was a risk in terms of timing and the market.” (D1)

“…well I guess you don’t know what the product is going to be.” (P1)
“Planners have a strong emphasis on process and a belief that the process will bring you the right product. …while you fundamentally believe in the process you always have a little bit of doubt.” (P1)

“The process had a lot more risks for them than us.” (P1)

“A transparent process that integrated information into it really does a good job to minimize risk.” (P2)

If the people accepting the risks are not the same people getting the benefits, they will be less willing to accept it.

**Challenge 7 - Precedents**

Rodgers Creek set a precedent creating greater confidence for its future replication. The process established can be used as a model. The success of the process in achieving better outcomes can only be determined as the development proceeds.

“I think that if it is successful that it will be copied throughout the rest of Metro Vancouver.” (E2)

“Hopefully in a year from now I can tell you we have one going over there and one over there.” (P5)

“The Working Group model seemed to work well and I have tried to integrate that model into other stuff I have worked on.” (P5)

“I’m promoting this approach where I can in other municipalities that I’m involved in both on the private and public side…I think the success in other situations might also be a function of who is actually on it and how well they work together and their willingness to find compromise and back off on certain things…I think other municipalities should use it.” (P5)

**Challenge 8 – Creating a professional working group**

The Rodgers Creek Working Group was a unique group of unpaid advisors each with expertise. Replicating such a group may be difficult in a different context. The demographic composition of West Vancouver made it possible to pull together a range of experts who were willing to meet the time commitments the process called for.

There is often fear of changing the status quo and pursuing innovation or experimental processes.
14.9 Conclusion

This chapter identified what makes the Rodgers Creek plan and process unique. It discussed participant perspectives on the success of the process and their satisfaction with the outcomes. It provided a comparison to the conventional process and potential outcomes it would have produced had the process not been changed. Finally, it highlights the potential for replicating the process for other BPP developments in West Vancouver and other developments.

Rodgers Creek was advanced as an innovative approach from the start and required new public participation processes to engage the community in making changes from the status quo. The ADP sets direction for development but is largely conceptual. While some elements of the ADP will be implemented through the OCP and bylaws, the more detailed design of the development will be determined at the development permit and implementation stage.

The Rodgers Creek ADP planning process has established new expectations and standards for future projects in West Vancouver in terms of public participation and innovation in both process and outcome. There are several key elements of the process that standout as being unique. These include:

- A new form of strategic comprehensive planning for the municipality
- The unique characteristics of the site, its location and its developer
- An open and transparent process
- A new form of public involvement
- Inclusiveness and genuine recognition of community concerns resulting in significant design changes
- Integration of expertise and skills between the public and private sector
- Development that is vastly different from previous and adjoining development
- Statutory changes resulting in greater housing diversity
- A scientific approach enabling the protection of creeks and environmentally sensitive areas
- Commitment to letting the landscape inform the design
- Linking of neighbourhoods by the mountain pathway
- The introduction of new methods of implementation

The two key elements from the Rodgers Creek planning and design process that may be transported to other large-scale residential developments are the integrated technical sessions and the concept of tailored working groups to suit the circumstances of the development.
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Appendix 2. District of West Vancouver, Working Group
Guidelines: Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group

DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES

RODERS CREEK AREA PLAN WORKING GROUP

1.0 PURPOSE
To envision a future community for the Rodgers Creek Area and establish
detailed principles for the Area Development Plan, taking into consideration the
Upper Lands principles and processes described in the Official Community Plan.
Community facilities and potential land use patterns in adjacent lands may be
part of the consideration.

2.0 DUTIES
The Working Group will assist staff in the development of a Rodgers Creek Area
Plan by:
- reviewing the work done to date,
- establishing detailed principles for the Area Development Plan
- providing direction on issues associated with implementation aspects of the
Area Development Plan.

Once a draft Area Development Plan is prepared, the Group will review and
provide advice on the draft plan. The advice of the Group will be forwarded to
Council as part of a staff report.

3.0 ORIGINS OF WORK/PROJECT BACKGROUND

The OCP provides policies to guide the development of the Upper Lands —
objectives for the Upper Lands, four community building principles, a framework
for identifying and acquiring public lands to meet long term community needs,
and development strategies. It also provides that Area Development Plans be
prepared "in order to establish future land use and development objectives for
neighbourhoods and to create more detailed Development Permit guidelines for
subsequent implementation and subdivision designs." The scope of an Area
Development Plan is set out in Policy UL6 (see attached OCP 2004, pages 107
and 108).

The four community building principles which are to guide all actions in the Upper
Lands are:
1. create a strong community
2. establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and
   mountain qualities
3. encourage a diverse community
4. focus on environmental and economic sustainability
The Upper Lands section of the OCP 2004 is attached and forms part of the Operating Guidelines.

4.0 COMPOSITION

4.1 Community Representation: 9 community members providing expert or specialist advice, or representative of a particular district-wide group with a major interest in the future of the Rodgers Creek Area:

- 1 from West Vancouver StreamKeepers
- 1 leading edge developer
- 1 Engineer with an understanding of mountainsides and sustainability
- 2 individuals with an environmental background
- 3 members with a background in Planning, Architecture and Landscape Architecture and an understanding of mountainsides and sustainability
- 1 citizen interested in the future of the Rodgers Area

4.2 Potential Conflict of Interest: Members should declare possible conflicts of interest to their working group Chairperson. The Chairperson will determine whether or not the member should be excused from participating in a discussion. (For reference, conflict of interest guidelines are in the Council Committee General Terms of Reference.)

4.3 Council Lead: Councillor Day

4.4 Staff Lead: Geri Boyle, Manager, Community Planning

5.0 LANDOWNER ROLE

British Pacific Properties (BPP) is the principal land owner within the Rodgers Creek Area. There are three others landowners in the planning area: Roeck's with one 5 acre lot, the Wong holdings of three adjacent 5 acres lots and Mulgrave School. These landowners may be present at all meetings of the Working Group, unless the Group determines that they wish to meet In-Camera. It is anticipated that the landowners, or their consultants, will present information to the Working Group to increase the Working Group’s understanding of:

- the attributes of the area,
- the opportunities and challenges that development of the area presents, and
- the development interests of the landowners.

See also Section 9.0.

6.0 TERM, SIGNIFICANT MILESTONES AND DESIRED OUTCOME
Adoption by West Vancouver Council of an Area Plan for Rodgers Creek.

7.0 **MEETING SCHEDULE**

The Working Group will meet throughout the planning program. Councillor Rod Day will Chair the Working Group. A meeting schedule and dates will be established at the first meeting based on the area planning program.

8.0 **DECISION MAKING APPROACH**

The Working Group meetings will be productive sessions where issues are discussed and debated. The objective will be to reach consensus, but in the absence of consensus direction/advice of the Working Group will reflect the majority opinions of the Working Group.

9.0 **SUPPORT/PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UTILITIZED**

In addition to Planning staff, staff from Environment, Parks, Engineering and Community Services will be available to meet with the Working Group throughout the process. A considerable body of work has also been undertaken by BPP. Those consultants are available as well to act as resources to the group.

10.0 **APPROVED BUDGET**

A nominal budget is required for the Working Group to cover meeting room expenses, if necessary, and refreshment.
Appendix 3. Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Key Organising Principles

The Key Organising Principles were one of the most important features of the ADP. They were developed by the Working Group and involved significant input from the public demonstrating a greater contribution into the design of the development. They also incorporate the seven West Vancouver Streamkeepers principles which were developed independently by the organization during the process.

Key Organising Principles for the Rodgers Creek Area Plan

OCP Community Building Principle 1 for Upper Lands – Establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities

1.01 Keep development outside of environmentally sensitive areas (i.e. riparian areas, steep slopes, geotechnical hazard lands) and protect significant natural features; place both environmentally sensitive areas and significant natural features in public ownership wherever possible

1.02 Avoid fragmentation of environmentally sensitive lands by creating large, continuous forested/natural areas throughout the planning area

1.03 Avoid wide-scale clearing intended solely to provide uninterrupted, panoramic views, and minimise tree clearing on single family lots

1.04 Employ site sensitive built forms by:
   - designing buildings to step into the terrain and using material and colours that harmonise with the forest setting; and
   - minimising footprints and visual impacts

1.05 Minimise the need for ‘constructed’ responses by providing for road layouts, design standards and alignments that are sympathetic to the terrain and minimise site disruption including clearing of entire road right-of-ways, as set out in the Roads Policy 1999

1.06 Watercourses remain open and unimpeded, and are protected from change of course, piping, unnatural erosion and other human impacts

1.07 Provide multi-use utility corridors to minimise impact on the landscape

1.08 Trails may be provided along creek corridors, when located so as to minimise the impacts on riparian areas

1.09 Natural, undisturbed areas (open spaces) and green connectivity belts are maximised and planned into housing complexes, and horizontal connections are treated as importantly vertical connections

OCP Community Building Principles 2 for the Upper Lands – Create a strong community

2.01 Concentrate higher densities in areas that will foster strong community interaction (including a proposed commercial centre located to the west of the planning area) and outside environmentally sensitive lands

2.02 Ensure that the concerns and impact of new development on existing development adjacent to the planning area are identified and considered
2.03 Provide a 'mountain pathway' defined as:
- an east-west multi-use oath, with gentle grades, for future residents of the planning area and the community at large; and
- a path that provides a connection to the natural setting and a physical connection to each neighbourhood within the Rodgers Creek Planning Area, and to a future commercial centre and neighbourhoods to the west, and
- a path that provides a variety of experiences and opportunities for people to meet, interact and connect

2.04 Ensure that all destinations and public spaces including the mountain pathway (both it's primary and secondary routes) provides for multiple activities by a variety of age groups and capabilities

2.05 Within the future Collingwood and Mulgrave Neighbourhoods, provide activity nodes along the mountain pathway that bring neighbours into regular social contact with each other. In the future development area at the west end of the Rodgers Creek Planning Area, provide community amenity buildings and facilities in addition to activity nodes along the mountain pathway

2.06 Incorporate cultural heritage (such as logging and skilift history) and natural features (such as viewpoints, boulders and waterfalls) in activity nodes

2.07 Connect pedestrian and vehicle networks (including transit and cycling) into existing networks and with future amenities, including trails to and from the mountain

2.08 Include appropriate vehicle staging areas to ensure access to various public amenities and facilities

2.09 Provide for clear way-finding

2.10 Ensure all residential buildings are integrated into the landscape and have easy access to the mountain pathway

2.11 Continue the 1000-foot connector as the major east-west connecting road above the Upper Levels Highway

2.12 Consider potential areas of synergy through the integration of Rodgers Creek Planning Area with future developments west of the Rodgers Creek Planning Area

2.13 Identify existing recreational activities within and adjacent to the planning area and consider opportunities to retain, enhance and/or connect with these recreational activities

**OCP Community Building Principles 3 for the Upper Lands – Encourage a diverse community**

3.01 Facilitate a diverse and more complete community by providing a variety of housing types and unit sizes

3.02 Provide opportunities for accessory housing such as coach houses, carriage houses and suites over garages and in the main dwelling, and do so by excluding them from total unit count

3.03 Ensure non-single family housing types include ground orientated options such as duplexes, triplexes and townhouses

3.04 Ensure single family housing accounts for no more than 20% of the total housing units in the Rodgers Creek planning area

3.05 Integrate housing with public/ quasi public spaces and facilities, and connect with schools within the planning area and with the proposed commercial centre to the west
OCP Community Building Principles 4 for the Upper Lands – Focus on environmental and economic sustainability

4.01 Reduce the car-centric nature typical of new development with a focus on effective movement system for pedestrian, cyclists and transit

4.02 Green/ sustainable design and operation standards, to a municipal standard that is being developed, form the foundation for building design

4.03 Strive for innovative, green infrastructure design and operation standards that minimises immediate and life cycle cost

4.04 Think of rainwater as a resource, not a problem

4.05 Contribute to a resilient natural environment including healthy, properly functioning watercourses. Minimising impervious surfaces and designing storm water systems to enhance watercourses are examples of measures that should be used to contribute to a resilient natural environment

4.06 Ensure that sustainability encompasses social sustainability, along with environmental and economic sustainability

4.07 Fish and fish habitat are conserved and protected

4.08 Native vegetation is retained

(Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, 2008)
Appendix 4. Executive Summary

This thesis evaluates the impact of multi-stakeholder planning and design process on large-scale residential developments. The case study for the research is the Rodgers Creek Area development, a 215 acre residential development located in West Vancouver British Columbia. The Rodgers Creek process differs from traditional processes because it adopted a science-based approach and has a community-based plan created by a unique and engaging planning and design process with a strong focus on sustainable development. It is expected to achieve development very different from previous development in the Upper Lands.

The Area Development Plan for the site was approved in September 2008 and includes six neighbourhoods comprising a total of 736 residential units. To avoid fragmentation of the land the development is condensed into pods and connected through a mountain pathway. Approximately 55% of the land will remain as environmentally protected green space. The next stage of the British Pacific Properties (BPP) development is the future Cypress Village, this played a pivotal role in the planning for the site.

The Rodgers Creek development is not a standard large-scale residential development and did not use a conventional planning and design process. The project is unique in terms of its history and the majority ownership of the land by BPP. It is also unique in terms of the characteristics of the site. It is large, undeveloped, located close to Downtown Vancouver and encompasses many physical constraints including steep terrain and a multitude of creeks. The topographic and ecological constraints of the site meant it was essentially undevelopable under the application of the traditional planning process. It called for something very different from past approaches. The solution was to develop an innovative and experimental planning and design process demonstrating that unconventional sites require different and varied types of processes.

This thesis describes the planning and design process for the Rodgers Creek development. It identifies what worked well and points towards implications for applying the process to future large-scale residential projects. The analysis and evaluation brought together a variety of qualitative and qualitative data ranging from academic sources, practitioner guides, municipal planning documents and reports, specialist reports, websites, newspaper articles and historical statistics. Academic and practitioner sources were used to develop an understanding of the research topic as well as contextualise the case study. Interviews were undertaken with key stakeholders including the District of West Vancouver, British Pacific Properties, specialist consultants engaged by the developer and the community Working Group.
The Rodgers Creek planning and design process is path-breaking, innovative and precedent setting. It was a vast improvement on conventional processes. The process was based on transparency, openness, trust, flexibility, inclusiveness and collaboration. It bridged the gap between the community, local government and the private sector. It led to development of a plan that was accepted by the community and easy to endorse for elected officials. The process has addressed a greater diversity of interests, needs and desires. It has also created long term benefits including the reestablishment and strengthening of relationships between stakeholders, empowerment of community groups, greater equity and the sharing of skills and knowledge.

In 15 years of doing this it is the best one that I have been involved in (E1)

I do think that this process is quite different from anything I have ever seen and I have been at this game now essentially since 1964. I have been doing this a long time and I don’t ever remember anything that resembles this (E2)

I think it was a very successful model (CR)

I think from an ecological conservation point of view it is probably one of the best hillside developments in Western Canada (P3)

It identified that there is actually a planning process that is successful that we can use to accelerate a far more sustainable type of development (E2)

There were four key steps within the overall planning and design process for Rodgers Creek: (1) Background; (2) Technical Analysis; (3) Working Group; and (4) Bylaw Development and Consideration. The research provides a broad insight into the overall process to provide a richer understanding of what the process was, what worked well and what the implications are for applying it to future large-scale residential development. To further build on the analysis, the core steps were identified and evaluated in greater detail drawing attention to the substance of the process and pointing to recommendations.

Phase 1: Background included the Upper Lands Study which established strategic direction for the development and the Envisioning Study which involved charrette style workshops which sparked creativity and led to the creation of the mountain pathway, a distinctive design element of the development. The Envisioning also resulted in commitment to sustainable development which was carried throughout the planning and design process.
Phase 2: Technical Analysis comprised integrated technical sessions between the municipality, developer, landowners and their consultants. This saw the municipality become part of the design team and have a more active role in planning and design. Rather than being presented with a plan, they contributed to the design of it. The technical team was also responsible for the sieve analysis which was a detailed assessment of the base information which was the foundation for the development. The design approach engaged by the technical team was based on Ian McHarg’s 1960s Design With Nature methodology. This played a significant role in the location, form, density and style of development. The final ADP dictates development that is more sustainable and responsive to the landscape, this is evident through the relationship of urban form to the environment.

Phase 3: Working Group was a critical component of the process. The Working Group was a new form of community engagement that was being trialed by Council. It did not follow a prescribed format, rather it was self designed and steered by the participants. The Working Group differed from traditional Advisory Committees because it was project based and its members were selected based on their experience and knowledge in the planning, environmental and development industries. The meetings were open and visible to the public and through these meetings and the public open houses, the Working Group responded meaningfully and effectively to public input. The Working Group were responsible for driving changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP) which was a major achievement that otherwise may not have occurred. The recommendations from the group were endorsed by the municipality, community and Council. Open, transparent and inclusive processes add credibility and integrity to the process, satisfy stakeholders more successfully and help achieve buy-in to the final plan through developing a broad-based ownership. The new form of public participation meant the community was not only involved, but had genuine, meaningful input and capacity to influence the final decision.

Phase 4: Bylaw Development and Consideration included Review and Evaluation, Bylaw Development and Consideration as well as the final Public Hearing. The Review and Evaluation emerged as a critical step that should be part of every planning and design process for large-scale residential development. The bylaws created for the ADP illustrate how to obtain greater certainty and commitment through Phased Development Agreements (PDAs) and zoning. By the time the project reached the Public Hearing the ADP had responded to the interests and concerns of stakeholders. The process led to a plan that was more accepted, popular and easier to vote for by politicians and easier to implement.
The Rodgers Creek planning and design process demonstrated a movement towards integration and reduction in the fragmentation that is embedded in conventional processes and management within and between stakeholders. The real success of the planning and design process will be evident in its implementation which will occur over the next ten years. The plan provides some certainty with sufficient flexibility for it to change and adapt.

Fostering the motivation to change from the conventional process is essential to improving the process. If you always do what you always did, then all other things being equal, you will always get what you always got. Obtaining political support for such change is crucial. The Rodgers Creek development suggests communities are increasingly demanding more efficient processes and better outcomes. The needs of the community arise from a desire to solve problems associated with development and to achieve a preferred form of development.

Every project is different hence every process should be different. Systematic and conventional approaches often do not respond to the circumstances of the project and do not have sufficient flexibility to alter the process to suit the project. Planning and design processes should be tailored to the individual development, particularly in the case of large-scale and unconventional developments. The Rodgers Creek process was risky and new but it worked. The results of the evaluation suggest that better processes lead to better outcomes. The core finding from the evaluation is that the Rodgers Creek planning and design process can be applied to future development. The success of the Rodgers Creek development should provide greater confidence for future stakeholders to engage in a similar process.

*Can we replicate it somewhere else? Not only can we, we must… It must be applied again. Because I think if it isn’t we are going to continue building what we have always built*

Future replication of the Rodgers Creek process should consider the recommendations from this evaluation.
### Summary of Recommendations

**General**

- Ensure the process is open and transparent
- Document and record the process
- Consider time limits, deadlines and milestones from the outset of each step and continually manage throughout the process
- Look for opportunities to improve time efficiency (e.g. overlapping steps)
- Identify and acknowledge community input
- Every step should be inclusionary, not exclusionary
- Expect to deal with the unanticipated
- Promote self designed processes tailored to the project
- Invest time getting key players to take risks, commit and put their cards on the table
- Overcome power and trust issues
- Promote flexibility and self design but provide structure to ensure certainty and encourage creativity and imagination
- Create equal opportunities for input and access to information (basic and technical)
- Build relationships, trust and respect between stakeholders
- Use education to stimulate awareness and responsibility towards sustainable development and its relationship to urban form
- Address implementation and practical considerations at all stages
- Integrate planning and design with construction
- Provide a combination of techniques to improve inclusiveness
- Provide a common information base (e.g. overview document)
- Encourage equal opportunity to participate and contribute. Be cautious of dominating personalities or those with more experience or influence.
- Identify common interests within and between groups
- Encourage informal interaction (e.g. fieldtrips)
- Create flowcharts to illustrate how the process will proceed

**Phase 1: Background**

- Undertake regular review and evaluation of development and processes. Recognise the need for change through acknowledging the failures and the outcomes of the conventional process
- Obtain political support to implement new processes
- Establish strategic direction for growth and development
- Establish site-specific direction and initiate discussions on future development of the site
- Foster innovation and creativity through a charrette style visioning process to establish design concept
- Establish commitment to comprehensive planning as opposed to piecemeal development
- Commit to sustainable development through establishing sustainability objectives and principles.
  Agree that a sustainability review and evaluation will be undertaken and establish a criteria and targets for that future evaluation

**Phase 2: Technical Sessions**

- Form a purpose driven, multidiscipline, integrated design team
- Build a strong foundation through bringing together the physical characteristics into a sieve analysis
- Include all landowners and relevant municipal departments in meetings and site visits
- Ensure equity of power distribution to enhance accountability

**Phase 3: Working Group**

- Ensure participation is voluntary
- For a multi disciplinary based working group with a diversity of perspectives, experience, expertise and knowledge
- Ensure the scope of work is broad to enable necessary policy changes
- Address stakeholder concerns effectively and meaningfully
- Consider targeted liaison as a supplementary process
- Take time to identity affected parties and ensure they are informed and aware of the process. Avoid making assumptions of individual/ group interests
- Acknowledge and celebrate voluntary participation
- Allow for affected parties that emerge during the process to be included
- Empower the working group to enhance involvement and accountability
- Empower local organisations and groups by inviting them to the table

**Phase 4: Bylaw Development and Consideration**

- Undertake the sustainability review and evaluation by a mutual third party
- Find ways to address recommendations and enhance sustainability performance
- Review legal requirements for public hearings
- Provide PDAs to secure the approval and community benefits package
- Ensure commitments made at zoning stage are carried through to development permit
- Provide flexibility in approval for design to respond to market changes
- Provide for ongoing management and monitor of implementation
- Consideration of multi-stakeholder involvement in monitoring
- Reduce time of process by fast tracking development permits to account for lengthy ADP process