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ABSTRACT

Despite interest in meaningful citizen participation and in cooperation with community organizations in planning, local governments generally work haltingly, sporadically, and often ineffectually with neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations. Little previous work has examined the factors which affect the adoption of power-sharing decision-making models or structures between neighbourhood or community organizations and local governments.

A selected literature review suggests participation is important to functioning democratically in representative systems, and that power-sharing forms of citizen participation are most meaningful. It situates neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations as units capable of enhancing democratic functioning, if properly resourced and supported.

This thesis collected data from a review of documents and from fourteen interviews with key informants involved with the introduction of a power-sharing policy on neighbourhood planning in Seattle, Washington. The findings indicate that in Seattle’s case, four factors combined to lead to the policy’s adoption: (1) the presence of functional neighbourhood organizations, (2) a conducive local political context, (3) application of pressure, and (4) inclusion of elements in the policy addressing political needs and the quality planning imperatives of inclusiveness and balance.
These findings suggest that cities benefit when community (of many kinds) is fostered, a conducive context is created, neighbourhood and community groups apply pressure effectively, and planning policy is devised which engenders both inclusiveness and realism.

A discussion of the significance and six suggestions for further research close the thesis.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Why would elected governments share with citizens the power they have obtained with such difficulty?

Rene Parenteau, Professor of Planning interested in public participation¹

1.1 Purpose

This thesis examines the sharing of power between local governments and community organizations, and the development of policy to support it. It analyzes the case of the City of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy, a municipal government power-sharing policy, to discover the reasons for this Policy's genesis, development and introduction. The purpose of this thesis is to understand the factors which lead local governments to adopt power-sharing policies with their community organizations.

1.2 Assumptions

This thesis originated from recognition of electoral democracy as an acceptable (or at least prevalent) political form, in which citizen participation is integral in theory, though limited and often ineffectual in practice. The idea that it is challenging and demanding to balance representative democracy, as practised, with the ideals of democracy, in theory, is central. Citizen participation, when effective, is

¹1988, p. 63.
taken as an extremely valuable contributor to maintenance of appropriate tension and dynamism in this balance.

The sharing of power with community organizations is taken as facilitative of citizen participation. Neighbourhood organizations are taken as structures in which citizens properly can and do exercise their right and duty of participation. Neighbourhood planning by neighbourhood organizations is accepted here as one type of collective citizen participation in power-sharing democratic systems, operating in this case in the arena of planning and governance at the local government level.

1.3 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 presents a review of literature which establishes participation as integral to democratic functioning, and introduces distinctions between kinds of participation activities, based on their capacity for sharing power. It introduces neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations as community groups which, in the appropriate environment, are capable of enhancing representation, balance, and responsiveness in democratic functioning, within a system which retains accountability.

Chapter 3, comprised primarily of results of a document review, outlines the foundation for and major features of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy, and summarizes the Policy's genesis in recent and historic actions of governments
and community groups. Chapter 4 introduces and evaluates the methods of data gathering for the thesis, and explores issues of qualitative research and interviewing, used in the original research.

Chapter 5 reports and analyzes the interview research findings. Literature and document review findings are inserted to facilitate analysis. Chapter 6 presents conclusions and implications for planning, as well as questions for further research, and discusses their significance.
2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING IN THE CONTEXT OF DEMOCRACY, CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, AND POWER-SHARING

I think the decision ought to be made at the lowest possible level, consistent with being made reasonably well.

Jim Street, Councilmember, City of Seattle

This chapter presents findings from a literature review which served to inform case study research and later to highlight and complement case study research findings. The review focused on four issue areas or constellations of issues: (1) the place of participation in a democracy and of power-sharing in participation; (2) neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations; (3) considerations for functioning democratically; and (4) effectiveness considerations for neighbourhood organization participation in planning and democracy.

2.1 Democracy, Participation, and Power-Sharing

This section situates citizen access to decision-making, or power-sharing, at the heart of participation in democracy. Its foundation is Carole Pateman's theoretical conception of a "participatory democracy," in which participation plays an integral role in representative systems of democracy. It employs Sherry R. Arnstein's typology or "ladder" of citizen participation to separate power-sharing participatory activities

2Interview, July, 1995.
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from token and nonparticipatory citizen involvement mechanisms. Canadian case study findings about public participation in environmental decision-making are cited to link democracy, participation, and power-sharing to the local level. Carole Pateman's exposition of the place of participation in democracy opens the section.

2.1.1 Democracy and Participation

In her 1973 book, Participation and Democratic Theory, Pateman observes that a number of recent political theorists conceive of democracy in such a way that "the concept of participation has only the most minimal role" (1). She develops a theory of "participatory democracy" which is founded on her belief in the intimate connection between participation and democracy. She states that "for a democratic polity to exist it is necessary for a participatory society to exist" (43). Her theory recognizes the representative system of democracy as an accepted part of the present Anglo-American political landscape. The theory's contribution to this thesis is the coupling of representative systems of democracy with an integral position for participation. Pateman's concluding statement: "We can still have a modern, viable theory of democracy which retains the notion of participation at its heart" (111), captures the fundamental belief about the importance of participation to democracy which underpins this thesis.
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The actualization of participation into activities conducive to democratic functioning is challenging in practice, however. Sherry R. Arnstein created a typology for the evaluation of such activities, which connects citizen participation to power-sharing. For Arnstein, as the typology demonstrates, the essence of participation is the sharing of power.

2.1.2 Participation and Power-Sharing

In her 1969 article "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Arnstein accurately observes "that there are significant gradations of citizen participation" (217). She creates an eight-runged "ladder" or typology to categorize this range of participation activities, according to "the extent of citizens' power in determining the end product" (218). The concept and the resultant "ladder" framework assist in distinguishing power-sharing citizen involvement activities from those which, while perhaps serving other valid purposes, do not contribute to a "participatory democracy" as conceived by Pateman.

In Arnstein's hierarchy, there are three evaluative classifications which span eight descriptive levels. Levels 1 and 2, termed Manipulation and Therapy, do not for Arnstein represent participation. The purpose of these is not to offer citizens access, but to "educate" or "cure" (217). She classifies these kinds of relations with citizens as
"nonparticipation." Levels 3, 4 and 5, termed Informing, Consultation and Placation, afford citizens the opportunity to hear and be heard. However, "they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded" (217, original emphasis), as they "retain for the powerholders the continued right to decide." (217) These she classifies as "degrees of tokenism."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Degrees of citizen power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citizen Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delegated Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Placation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation (from Parenteau, 1988, p. 8).

Levels 6, 7 and 8, termed Partnership, Delegated Power, and Citizen Control respectively, represent for Arnstein valued models of power-sharing, and she classifies these as "degrees of citizen power." In Partnerships, "power is in fact redistributed through negotiation between citizens and powerholders" (221). In Delegated Power, "citizens have a clear majority of seats and genuine specified power," (222) or else "separate and parallel groups of citizens and powerholders, with
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provision for citizen veto if differences of opinion cannot be 
resolved through negotiation." (222) In Citizen Control, 
citizen organizations have "full managerial power" (217).

A list of some common public consultation activities, 
evaluated against ladder of participation classifications, is 
provided by Parenteau. He assesses the naming of citizen 
representatives to advisory committees, and organization of 
cultural and social activities, as Level 1 and 2 activities, or 
"nonparticipation" (1988:7). He cites the most common and 
well-known of public participation activities, the community 
meeting and the public hearing, as level 3 and 4 "tokenism" 
activities (Ibid.:7). Negotiation or bargaining over the 
effects of decisions are examples of level 6 activity, the 
beginning of actual citizen participation or "degrees of citizen 
power" (Ibid.:8). Delegation of power to local citizens' 
committees, citizen veto power, and resource allocation to 
groups are seen by Parenteau as examples of level 7 and 8 
activities, representative of full-blown citizen participation, 
or power-sharing (Ibid.:8).

Arnstein's article also introduces three other important 
issues in power-sharing. The first is a recognition that 
absolute citizen control is never possible. She states:

Though several citizen groups (and their mayors) use the 
rhetoric of citizen control, no [model] can meet the 
criteria of citizen control since final approval power and 
accountability rest with the city council. (223)
The second is an acknowledgement of the pitfalls commonly associated with community control. These include balkanization, cost and efficiency challenges, the arrival of opportunistic "hustlers," and clashes with merit- and professionalism-based value systems (224).

Most notable, though, is her third observation, that community control "can turn out to be a new Mickey Mouse game for the have-nots by allowing them to gain control but not allowing them sufficient dollar resources to succeed" (224). Arnstein observes:

[This model] can work most effectively when there is an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable; when the citizen group has the financial resources to pay its leaders reasonable honoraria for their time-consuming efforts; and when the group has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers and community organizers. With these ingredients, citizens have some genuine bargaining influence over the outcome ... (221-222).

Arnstein's landmark article makes several important contributions. Most notably, it establishes the connection between participation and power-sharing. As Parenteau correctly observed: "For Arnstein, participation means power-sharing." (1988:8) Parenteau himself presents a number of illuminating conclusions about public involvement in decision-making, which are presented next.
2.1.3 The Local Level

Parenteau, in his 1988 report, *Public Participation in Environmental Decision-Making*, discusses citizen involvement in environmental decision-making in Canada and arrives at a number of interesting conclusions. First, he asserts at a number of turns the connection between participation and decision-making in democracy, consistent with the contributions of Pateman and Arnstein. He states, for example: "Participation aims to democratize decision-making and administrative apparatuses." (64) Second, he recognizes the challenges inherent in the balancing act which power-sharing invokes, stating:

The most difficult aspect ... may well be delimiting and exactly defining the areas in which they will exercise their relative autonomy in decision-making and action. (65)

Third, like Arnstein, he recognizes the importance of mechanisms for citizen effectiveness in participation. In this regard he recommends that: (1) groups and organizations receive generous subsidies; (2) technical experts and objective technical info be made available to them; (3) laws be passed to endow the process with credibility; and (4) process and issues be brought to the local level (pp. 63-64).

Fourth, he recognizes that citizen participation effectiveness is enhanced when situated at the small scale and local level, and that it is affected by context and relationship to power. He states:
2. Neighbourhood Planning in Context

While participation is best conducted in a specific local context, its effectiveness may depend on its proximity to the site of power and of the final decision. (63)

The next three sections examine neighbourhood organizations as local level citizen participation organizations. Neighbourhood organizations are situated as integral players in systems of representative democracy, and the requirements for their effective participation are considered.

2.2 Neighbourhoods and Neighbourhood Associations

This section and the two following introduce definitions and concepts which contribute to understanding neighbourhoods and their role and function in governance at the local level. Topics covered include: neighbourhoods and neighbourhood associations; democratic considerations, including representation and balance, and accountability and responsiveness; and effectiveness considerations, including resourcing and support, and the necessity of a system or structure for neighbourhood groups. The three sections draw heavily from the works of Howard W. Hallman, long-time neighbourhood supporter, and the 1993 work by Jeffrey M. Berry, Kent E. Portney, and Ken Thomson, The Rebirth of Urban Democracy.
2. Neighbourhood Planning in Context

2.2.1 Neighbourhoods

"Neighborhood means different things to different people," as Hallman acknowledges in his 1984 work *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life* (12). Hallman sees neighbourliness as a human trait, neighbourhoods as natural phenomena, and the presence of neighbourhoods in all large human settlements as inherent (11). Following research of definitions of neighbourhood proposed by a number of scholars, Hallman presents a set of definitions and component factors of definitions which contribute to his understanding of neighbourhood. This set includes: a physical, geographic or spatial place-ness (often with identifiable boundaries); some degree of psychological unity, and possibly, some concentration of identifiable ethnic or cultural characteristics; a tradition of identity or continuity, such as residential or other personal self-identification with an area (either cognitive or sentimental); concentrated use of an area's facilities; fulfilment of functional purposes (often represented by the presence of institutions) in social, political, economic or inter-personal arenas; and to varying degrees, a joining together, participatory, sharing or communal aspect (13-17).

---

Supportive of sociologist Suzanne Keller’s definition and drawing upon it, while noting the great variation in characteristics of neighbourhoods, Hallman concludes: "In sum, a neighborhood is a limited territory within a large urban area where people inhabit dwellings and interact socially." (original emphasis, 13) While an exact definition of "neighbourhood" is not required for the work of this thesis, Hallman’s comprehensive conception as presented here is accepted for the purpose.

2.2.2 Neighbourhood Associations

For Berry, Portney, and Thomson, neighbourhood groups "have been an important factor in American political life since the turn of the century" (166). Citing influential roles for neighbourhood groups since the era of the settlement house movement, and through to the "new populism" of the 1970’s (along with the importance to urban life attributed to neighbourhoods by "influential observers" such as Jane Jacobs, Herbert Gans, Suzanne Keller and Gerald Suttles), they, like Hallman, note the community function of neighbourhoods, and the broader social and psychological contexts in which neighbourhoods operate (166).

Berry, Portney and Thomson also consider the political aspect of neighbourhood organizations. They note that some writers situate neighbourhood organizations in the category of "parapolitical systems," along with churches, universities, and
other non-profit organizations (167). While others, such as Marvin Kotler, propose the neighbourhood as the natural political entity, rather than the city. They consider as well the force advocating full-scale neighbourhood governance, which is supported by writers such as David Morris and Karl Hess (who promote decentralization of activities to a "more human scale" to increase quality of life), and other works which present the importance of neighbourhood councils, decentralization, and community control (167).⁴

Berry, Portney and Thomson conclude their overview of the role and place of neighbourhoods in urban democracy by stating that "neighborhoods and their organizations [have] special status, particularly in planning, development, and community organizing" (168). They accept the position that "'residents of a neighborhood do not constitute a private group at all, but a miniature 'public';--more like citizens than like members of a private association' " (Censon 1983, 16-17; in Berry, Portney and Thomson, 168).

2.3 Democratic Considerations

Democratic participation can be extraordinarily demanding of citizens, and many citizens do no more to exercise their democratic rights and responsibilities than to vote. Yet Berry, "

⁴Including Howard Hallman, Alan A. Altshuler and Burt W. Griffin.
Portney and Thomson recognize neighbourhood associations as units which can contribute to the effective operation of democratic systems. They see these groups as vehicles capable of enhancing participation, while also providing some measure of representation, balance and responsiveness. Berry, Portney and Thomson's limited perception of the need for accountability is criticized here, but their overall thrust in support of neighbourhood organizations, like that of Hallman, is accepted as valuable.

For the purposes of this thesis, representation involves both the match between the leadership of an organization and its constituency, and the presentation of issues from across the breadth of a city. Balance refers to the achievement of fairness and equity in the trade-off's between competing groups and sets of issues in decision-making. Responsiveness refers to the ability to heed and take action on issues presented. Accountability refers to ultimate answerability and responsibility for decisions.

2.3.1 Representation and Balance

Berry, Portney and Thomson wisely observe that neighbourhood organizations provide "responsiveness to those who choose to participate ..." (189). Neighbourhood organizations can be accused of attracting participation and leadership which is, on the whole, unrepresentative of their respective
constituencies. Hallman acknowledges that people active in local issues tend to be less poor, better educated, and more professional than non-participants from the same neighbourhood (citing, to draw this conclusion, works by other researchers\(^5\)). He also finds, however, that "participants in neighborhood associations generally express perceptions of neighborhood conditions which are similar to those of nonparticipants' ... [and that] participants and nonparticipants rate city programs similarly" (White and Ender, 1981:51-52; in Hallman:251). It would appear that though unrepresentative in terms of participants' socio-economic status, neighbourhood organizations nonetheless promote concerns and interests consistent with those of their constituencies. Berry, Portney and Thomson arrive at similar conclusions (189).

Representation in regard to neighbourhood organizations should be considered on another stratum as well. Local governments need to balance neighbourhood issues on their decision-making agendas alongside city-wide or regional issues. If they lack mechanisms to ensure city or region-wide issues are also appropriately and effectively brought to and dealt with at the decision-making table, they can be particularly hampered when attempting to address issues which are not perceived to have neighbourhood or local area content, or which are in

conflict with perceived neighbourhood preferences. The problems this can pose for effective local governance are potentially enormous.

Berry, Portney and Thomson believe neighbourhood associations acquit themselves very capably on many issues affecting their own local area, such as land use and local developments, for example. They accept also that neighbourhood groups are less effective on "broader issues such as protection of water quality ... and on huge development projects with major economic impact for the whole city." (177) Nonetheless, they posit that systems of neighbourhood associations can assist in the process of finding balance between these large and small scale, or neighbourhood and citywide, issue dichotomies (158).

A more realistic evaluation of the role of neighbourhood organizations in regard to neighbourhood-city/region balance is provided by Hallman. He states: "Although neighborhood organizations don't have the answer to some of the broader societal issues, ... they are showing that they can contribute to community betterment within their sphere of operation.... In the process they strengthen the social fabric and enhance the sense of community." (252).

Issues which may not have a locality or neighbourhood-based constituency, or which operate at a scale large than the neighbourhood (such as air quality management and transportation planning, for example) may not receive adequate attention in
cities or regions with powerful and/or effective neighbourhood groups or systems, if balancing mechanisms are not in place. Such governments may occasionally find themselves paralysed, even on (or especially on) issues of great importance, if they are unable to balance local issues with citywide and regional issues. Mechanisms to balance accountability for citywide and regional needs with neighbourhood and local needs are essential in neighbourhood planning power-sharing models.

2.3.2 Accountability and Responsiveness

"One of the attributes of democratic societies is that governments are expected to be responsive to the will of the people." Berry, Portney and Thomson, from whom this quote is taken (101), observe that local governments must achieve a "delicate balance," as they term it (195), in deciding how to maintain accountability for the public purse and process on the one hand, and responsiveness in both policy and sharing of power to neighbourhood and other groups on the other.

Some sources believe that for any citizen participation structure, such as neighbourhood organizations, to be effective, "exclusive powers" must be turned over, particularly control over zoning, in the case of neighbourhoods (Berry, Portney and Thomson, 295). Berry, Portney and Thomson themselves state that such a transfer should be mandated in legislation, and that "what neighborhood associations do must be integrated into the
existing administrative structure of the city" (295). Similarly, Hallman recommends institution of legal authority for neighbourhood associations to operate (274).

The position adopted in this thesis prefers weighing legal and moral requirements for accountability somewhat more heavily, and achievement of increased responsiveness though collaborative effort and careful structuring of the areas in which responsibility is shared. Sharing of responsibility should occur, coupled with provision of resources and support commensurate with the task. However, it should be carried out in limited spheres of operation, and only once structures and policies are in place within the larger city and regional contexts which ensure power over large scale issues continues to be held at the supra-neighbourhood level.

To ensure neighbourhood organization effectiveness within such a context, a number of requirements must be in place. These relate to the administrative ability of neighbourhood groups (which is important but which will not be addressed in this thesis), the adequacy of resourcing and support, and the creation and support of a system for such organizations.

2.4 Effectiveness Considerations

There are a number of requirements for effective functioning of neighbourhood organizations. Only two, however, will be discussed here: resourcing and support, and a citywide
system.

2.4.1 Resourcing and Support

"The greatest difficulty neighborhoods in local politics face in influencing city hall is simply getting organized in the first place" (Berry, Portney and Thomson, 287). As Arnstein and Parenteau observed, without financial and other support to provide for some measure of outreach, staffing, coordination, and issue and policy analysis and development, most groups will be unable to be effective. Hallman correctly indicates that there is a wide range of parties which can be considered potential supporters of neighbourhoods, including local governments and agencies of local government. These players can support neighbourhood organizations in a number of ways, but most essential for these groups is adequate provision of staff time, training, technical assistance, and for poorer organizations, financial support (Hallman, 267).

Along with nurturance of individual organizations, a system or network of neighbourhood organizations should also be supported. Berry, Portney and Thomson believe that one of the most important actions city governments can take to assist neighbourhood organizations is the creation and support of a neighbourhood association system (287). Similarly, Hallman has written about federations, or a "congress" of neighbourhood organizations (265), which can fulfil this purpose.
2.4.2 A Citywide System

Berry, Portney and Thomson believe that for neighbourhood organizations to be effective, systems must be structured which are "citywide in nature" (296). They believe that not only are these necessary for the health of the neighbourhood organizations, but that such structures strengthen valuable bonds between people and their governments, and change the nature of these relationships in positive ways:

"The operation of the systems of neighborhood associations, rather than competing with the existing systems of democratic electoral politics, actually strengthens the links between citizens and elected officials. Moreover, it appears to do so in a way that fosters a more equal distribution of influence. (134)"

Such systems also ensure broad-spectrum representation from the neighbourhood level across the breadth of a city or region, and provide a concerted voice on local issues to city and regional governments. Identifying the resources to devote to neighbourhood systems can be extremely difficult, yet support of such systems is essential for the democracy-enhancing participation of neighbourhood organizations.

In sum, whether or not neighbourhoods constitute quasi-political entities or "mini publics," to support democratic functioning, neighbourhood planning models need to incorporate representation and balance, accountability and responsiveness, proper resourcing and support, and a citywide neighbourhood organization or system. Representation to support democratic functioning requires inclusiveness within neighbourhood
organization activity, and a mechanism to ensure citywide issues are balanced with local or neighbourhood issues. Accountability and responsiveness can be achieved through collaboration and careful articulation of the areas of shared responsibility. Adequate and appropriate resourcing and support assist neighbourhood organization effectiveness, as does a citywide neighbourhood organization network.

The next chapter outlines these and other aspects of the case of power-sharing policy studied here, in presenting the City of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy.
3. THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING POLICY OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE

"Neighborhood planning means giving a great deal of authority and resources back to the neighborhoods."

Norman B. Rice, Mayor of Seattle

The Neighbourhood Planning Policy, for the purposes of this thesis, is a policy on planning, comprised of a connected set of elements drawn from foundational City of Seattle planning documents, and certain implementation activities intended to give life to aspects of these documents. This chapter opens by introducing the City of Seattle’s Neighbourhood Planning Policy, and describing the features which make it an appropriate case for study of policy development on power-sharing. The second section outlines the documents and activities which provide the foundations for the Policy, while the third provides information about the Policy’s genesis.

3.1 Features of the Policy

The City of Seattle’s Neighbourhood Planning Policy can be described as a power-sharing model of neighbourhood planning, which has two important and distinguishing elements: boundaries

6"Neighborhood Planning Workshops" brochure, front page.

7A policy governs action directed toward given ends, and yields a changed situation, system, practice or behaviour (paraphrasing Titmuss).

8Planning specifies goals and objectives, and identifies mechanisms and choices for implementation (Dorcey, 1986:4).
to contain it, and a framework to support it. The boundaries reserve to the City those planning powers and responsibilities which the City believes it cannot or should not share (such as establishing and distributing growth targets for the City, for example). The boundaries also identify for neighbourhoods those areas in which they assume responsibility (such as development form and scale in the neighbourhood and neighbourhood character, for example). The framework supports neighbourhood organizations and neighbourhood planning by identifying and making explicit the product components (such as growth targets) and process components (such as inclusiveness) which must be incorporated into neighbourhood plans and planning processes. The framework also serves to indicate the points at which City involvement may be invoked.

Only those neighbourhood plans which meet process and product requirements are promised City approval and implementation. The boundaries and framework are therefore essential to this Policy's operation and effectiveness, as they provide structure and support for the work of both City and neighbourhoods in developing plans which can receive approval and ultimately be implemented. Upon approval, neighbourhood-developed plans have the same force as other planning products created and approved by the City. Neighbourhood plans may also confirm, alter, refine or add to the City's Comprehensive Plan.
This power-sharing policy provides balance between neighbourhood and citywide needs by retaining with the City the responsibility for issues of citywide nature or import. Representation is addressed by requiring neighbourhood organizations to undertake an inclusive process. The Policy addresses accountability by retaining responsibility for the public purse with City Council. It addresses responsiveness by mandating City-neighbourhood collaboration, which ensures attention to neighbourhood concerns. The effectiveness of the neighbourhood planning effort is addressed through provision of financial, technical and human resources to neighbourhood organizations, and recognition of the network of neighbourhood organizations.

3.2 Foundation for the Policy

The official basis for the Neighbourhood Planning Policy is contained in connected elements of a number of City of Seattle documents, as well as in some of the initial work to give life to aspects of these documents. Elements from the City's 1992 Framework Policies, the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and the Comprehensive Plan's Neighborhood Planning Element comprise the primary sources.
3.2.1 The Framework Policies

The City of Seattle Framework Policies document, adopted in 1992, is described as the product of extensive citizen input exercises carried out by the City during the early 1990's. The document is designed in part to provide "guidance to the Planning Department in drafting the city’s comprehensive plan" (Attachment 1 to Resolution 28535, June, 1992:1) and to assist long-term planning generally. The Framework Policies contain sixteen sections, including a Neighborhood Identity section and a Relationship Between Citizens and Government section. These two sections direct the City to "rely on broad-based planning at the neighborhood level to define the identity, values, needs, priorities and goals of each neighborhood" (Ibid.:12), and to ensure "[p]lanning by neighborhoods for their own futures shall be accomplished within the context of the City’s comprehensive plan" (Ibid.:14).

3.2.2 The Comprehensive Plan

Adopted on July 25, 1994 by Seattle City Council, Toward a Sustainable Seattle: A Plan for Managing Growth 1994 - 2014, Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan "is a 20-year policy plan designed to meet the requirements of Washington State’s Growth Management Act ... and articulate the vision of a preferred future for Seattle" (Issues Guide:8). It designates "Urban Centers" within an "Urban Village Strategy." It explicitly recognizes
neighbourhoods as the basis of the city's composition, and as a resource for planning (Citizen's Guide: 4-5). It is a 118-page text comprised of a Vision Resolution, a Plan Adoption Ordinance, a 151-page Appendices document, and eight areas of endeavour or "elements." Each element is addressed in its own section containing goal and policy statements and a discussion segment in some cases. The Plan is described as an evolving document, with neighbourhood planning and amendments initiated by the City seen as key sources for future revisions. The Plan has the force of law (Issues Guide: 9).

3.2.3 The Neighborhood Planning Element

One of eight elements in the Comprehensive Plan, the Neighborhood Planning Element is a "critical tool for turning the vision of the Comprehensive Plan into a reality" (Issues Guide: 105). Operating within the context of citywide policies, and in a framework where "legal authority and responsibility for land use and capital investment rest with the City Council" (Citizen's Guide: 15), the implementation of the Neighborhood

---

9These are land use, transportation, housing, capital facilities (physical infrastructure for institutional uses, separate from water, waste and transportation facilities), utilities (water, waste disposal, power and communications), economic development, and neighbourhood planning. A "general issues category" (demographics, families, shaping growth, and phasing and monitoring of the Plan) forms an eighth issue area which, though not included in the Comprehensive Plan document itself, is generally considered an eighth element of the Plan nonetheless (Issues Guide: 13-27).
Planning Element relies heavily on the existing extensive network of neighbourhood organizations.

It also arranges for the provision of resources (financial, human and technical) to neighbourhood organizations, and to ensure all neighbourhoods are able to plan, the City has publicly committed to "adequate funding of the neighborhood planning process; ... [and] City budgets which respond to citywide and neighborhood plan proposals." (Citizen's Guide:15). Recognizing that a few neighbourhoods are not yet ready to plan for themselves, "training and community organizing" will be provided where needed, and in a few cases, the City will initiate planning for certain neighbourhoods (Ibid.:111).

In return for the development of neighbourhood plans within articulated parameters, the City offers a promise of implementation, provided certain conditions are met. It "states up front that neighborhood plans which are collaborative, follow City guidelines and address citywide needs will be adopted and implemented" (Issues Guide:109).

3.2.4 Some Implementation To-Date

To plan within the spirit of the Framework Policies, implement the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, and put the Neighborhood Planning Element into action, the City has taken a number of steps. These include continuing to provide the
services of the "little city halls" and to offer the Neighborhood Matching Fund and the other programs of the Department of Neighborhoods (which are described in the next section). It has also initiated inclusion of neighbourhood plans in departmental works programs, hired a team of eleven "project managers" to assist neighbourhoods, set aside resources from City budgets, including funding, staff time and facilitation, and created a special office to oversee the work. The City is also compiling a "template" for the use of neighbourhood organizations in neighbourhood planning. It will include:

- "community profiles," providing a range of information about neighbourhoods, including Comprehensive Plan goals and targeted amounts and types of growth;

- a "toolbox," comprised of information on regulatory mechanisms and capital and program options addressing City goals for land use, housing, transportation and capital facilities;

- neighbourhood planning "guidelines," identifying steps to adoption of a plan; and

- a "scope of work checklist" or information on procedures which the City requires a plan to undergo to ensure equity and adequacy (Issues Guide:113 and "The Neighborhood Planning Project" single-sheet handout).

In sum, the City of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy can be described as a policy which shares power, through the sharing of the key resources of money, information and access to personnel, though it does not delegate decision-making. It focuses on the production of neighbourhood plans, by neighbourhood organizations, which are both contained by pre-
established boundaries and facilitated by a supportive framework. It develops criteria for process and product inclusiveness and fairness, and provides support to neighbourhood organizations to work effectively to achieve these. It serves democratic functioning purposes by assisting achievement of representivity, balance and responsiveness while maintaining accountability. Its essence is collaboration between neighbourhood groups and the City.

The presence of a number of these features of the Policy can be traced to aspects of the Policy's genesis, which is considered next.

3.3 Genesis of the Policy

The Neighbourhood Planning Policy's genesis spans both recent and historic events. It was capped by State-legislated growth management requirements in the 1990's and two pivotal 1980's City initiatives, but also includes a lengthy history of neighbourhood planning in the City and federal involvement in American neighbourhoods, both dating from the 1940's.

3.3.1 History of Federal Involvement in Neighbourhoods

In the United States, federal programs, some situated as far back as the late 1940's, influenced policy on neighbourhoods and on neighbourhood involvement in planning and local governance. Some of these programs were directly involved in
Seattle planning activity, while others affected the larger environment of poverty, race relations, and inner city decline and regeneration within which most large American cities of the time operated.

The earliest direct federal influence on neighbourhood planning in the United States, from the late 1940's, related to urban renewal (Fainstein, 1987:384). Subsequent programs were developed, in part at least, to address societal issues which, in the United States particularly, found their expression in physical place as much as social phenomenon. The resultant social activism components of these programs heavily influenced neighbourhood and community organization and development in a number of American cities.

In the early 1960's the Office for Economic Opportunity (OEO) initiated the Community Action Program (CAP). The OEO advocated "political autonomy for the neighbourhood, confrontation if necessary between neighbourhood groups and city hall, [and] claimed 'absolute' sovereignty for its 'community'" (Wood, 1990:72). The War on Poverty program, in concert with CAP, laboured under the statutory objective of "maximum feasible participation, ie the establishment of separate neighbourhood power bases independent of local city halls" (Ibid.:69). However, by 1965 Housing and Urban Development had created the Model Cities Program, which "developed the process of mutual interdependence between advocacy groups and elected officials"
By the early 1970's a number of other federal programs, including the Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP), had come and gone from the federal scene (Tobin et al., Background Report:9). Soon, changes at the federal political level would lead to the decline of federal funding involvement in neighbourhoods: "By 1974, and the passage of the Housing and Community Development Act of that year, virtually all federal backing for neighborhood planning was gone" (Fainstein, 1987:386).

Neighbourhood planning in Seattle was influenced by a number of these federal initiatives. Federal programs to address urban renewal and later, societal issues manifest in neighbourhoods, as well as the social activism of the era, were all part of the times and the federal funding packages. Seattle accessed a number of these programs, and was in turn influenced by their citizen involvement in decision-making and community organization power aspects. As federal dollars dried up, the City, as well as its neighbourhoods, continued with other neighbourhood and neighbourhood planning initiatives.

3.3.2 History of Neighbourhood Planning in Seattle

The City of Seattle has produced a number of planning products with a neighbourhood orientation or neighbourhood
component over the last half decade. These include several neighbourhood or area plans developed in the 1940's and 1950's, the establishment in the 1957 Comprehensive Plan of neighbourhood and larger community district boundaries, and the development of the 1960 Central Area Plan on a neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood basis. In the mid-1960's the City prepared a series of urban renewal plans and identified a set of general needs for neighbourhood improvements. These fed into or were motivated by federal programs of the era, including the Model Cities and Neighborhood Improvement Programs. Among the important legacies of this era were the emphasis on citizen participation as part of comprehensive planning, and an important by-product of the Seattle Development Program (SDP), the Office of Neighborhood Planning (ONP).

The SDP initiated a 1963 study of 112 SDP planning areas, including 98 Seattle neighbourhoods. In 1968 a county bond issue provided $12 million to implement the SDP physical development recommendations, with $.8 million set aside for administration and planning. To oversee this work, the City created the Office of Neighborhood Planning. The ONP, or its successors, went on to participate in a number of developments of import to Seattle neighbourhoods and neighbourhood planning.

---

10This sub-section, excepting the final two paragraphs, is adapted from Tobin, Moy and Dight's 1987 document, *Background Report*, pp. 9 - 20.
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From 1971 to 1976, NIP activity in Seattle was administered by the ONP. The process for implementation was intended to involve citizens in local decision-making, create or strengthen community organizations, develop trust and credibility between staff and neighbourhood people, serve as an information conduit between the City and the community, and identify and attempt to meet neighbourhood needs. Mini-comprehensive plans for each neighbourhood, once adopted by City Council, clarified elements of the City Comprehensive Plan and refined the Comprehensive Plan for their areas. The planning process included assignment of a neighbourhood planner to each neighbourhood, and joint identification and initiation of public improvements by citizens and neighbourhood planners.

Through this process constituencies for the plans were created and neighbourhood community councils gained considerable power. This was in part because of a high level of community participation, which led to local support for plans developed by neighbourhood organizations. Consequently, most neighbourhood plans were adopted by City Council without significant change. Although other positive developments were to occur, the planning process between city and neighbourhood would not recover this blend of sharing and interdependence for decades to come.

In 1972 Community Service Centers were established under the Citizens Service Bureau. Providing assistance to community organizations and citizens at the local level, they continue
this service today. Now expanded in number and in range of services, they are known colloquially as "little city halls."

In the mid-1970's the City developed the New Neighborhood Program, financed by Community Development Block Grant funds. This program dropped the land use and zoning recommendation capacity of neighbourhoods from neighbourhood planning. The ONP administered the program, in what was informally considered a City-neighbourhood partnership manner. None of the final neighbourhood products from this process were adopted by City Council, however.

In addition to City initiatives, the initiatives of neighbourhood-level organizations were also important. This activity, documented as far back as 1929, has become institutionalized, and acknowledged in Seattle as a potent force. Today's one hundred-plus recognized neighbourhood associations are "considered very powerful." In contrast, Berry, Portney and Thomson writing in 1993 in The Rebirth of Urban Democracy observe: "Neighborhood associations are common in American cities, but rarely are they found in each and every neighborhood, taken seriously, and institutionalized into a

---


12 Gary Lawrence, then the Director of Planning for the City of Seattle, speaking at a workshop in New Westminster, British Columbia, in November, 1994.
city's policy-making process." (286-7)

In sum, neighbourhood planning in the post-War years up to the 1980's, initiatives by both the City and Seattle's neighbourhood organizations added important features to those introduced by federal initiatives. These include the creation of the Office of Neighborhood Planning (now known as the Department of Neighborhoods), the introduction (if only for a while) of a collaborative workstyle between neighbourhoods and the City, the introduction of Community Service Centers, and the failure in the 1970's to produce neighbourhood-created plans which the City felt it could adopt. Two other initiatives, both positive City endeavours, complete the overview of the genesis of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy.

3.3.3 Pivotal City of Seattle Initiatives

Two City of Seattle initiatives during the 1980's were of particular importance to the development and introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy. The first was the charging of the City of Seattle Planning Commission with the task of studying neighbourhood planning, in late 1986. This study resulted in a number of products, including three reports,13 a number of public meetings, and ultimately the creation of the

---

13These are Tobin, Moy and Dight's 1987 Background Report and Alternatives Report, and the City of Seattle Planning Commission's November, 1987 Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Recommendations.
Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF). The Planning Commission activity brought people and information together around the issue of neighbourhood planning in a way which stimulated a number of future developments and citizen initiatives. A number of these ultimately contributed directly or indirectly to the formation of the Policy.

The NMF, first funded from the City budget of 1988, was the other important City initiative of the 1980's. Then as today it "supports local, grassroots action within neighborhoods, ... [providing] cash to match community contributions of volunteer labor, professional services, materials, or cash in support of neighborhood-based self-help projects" ("Quick Information" brochure, n.d.:inside panel). Its original mandate, arising from the 1987 City policy to expand neighbourhood-generated planning opportunities (page 3 of Attachment A to Council Resolution 27709, October, 1987) was given added vitality by provision of additional resources to communities through the NMF in 1989. The neighbourhood organization orientation of this mandate and of the NMF itself was further strengthened in 1989 by addition of the words "to support the preparation of neighborhood plans by neighborhood organizations" (original emphasis, Attachment A to Council Resolution 28115, December, 1989:3).

Created as one component of a number within the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program, the NMF, along
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with the other components, ushered in a renewed interest on the City's part in neighbourhood involvement in neighbourhood planning. The NMF, the study by the Planning Commission, and actions of both the City and neighbourhood organizations over the decades represent important influences at the local government level on neighbourhood planning policy in Seattle. At the senior government level, in addition to federal initiatives described above, one initiative in particular of the Washington State government was pivotal. This was the introduction in 1990 of the Growth Management Act.

3.3.4 The Growth Management Act

With passage in 1990 of the Growth Management Act (GMA), and strengthening amendments introduced in 1991, Washington State created a demanding new planning paradigm for local and regional governments within its jurisdiction. Intended to control and manage growth in an acceptable and sensitive manner, and increase cooperation and coordination in planning, this Act requires cities and urbanized areas to "prepare, adopt, and implement comprehensive plans" (Bannister and Heintz, 1994:89). To achieve these ends the Act introduced an urban growth boundary requirement, and consistency, comprehensiveness and concurrency requirements. The following excerpt explains the urban growth boundary requirement well:

Section 29 of the act stipulates that counties (in consultation with cities) planning under the Act "shall
designate an urban growth area or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature" (State of Washington 1990a, 30).... Future urban growth is to be restricted to areas that are already characterized by urban growth ... (Bannister and Heintz, 1994:94).

The concurrency requirement:

stipulates that public facilities and services be adequate to support the increased population attributable to new development. It further specifies that this must occur without jeopardizing service levels for existing neighbourhoods. This measure ensures that existing residents do not assume an additional financial burden resulting from growth. (Ibid.:94)

Two additional critical aspects of the Act are: the requirement for comprehensiveness and the requirement for consistency. According to the Seattle Planning Department’s Citizen’s Guide, comprehensiveness requires

[looking] at the city as an integrated set of urban systems of land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities and utilities. All areas of the city and all elements of the Plan are addressed from a citywide perspective. (14)

The consistency requirement has been described as follows:

The plan avoids internal contradictions, and must not interfere with the successful implementation of the plans of neighboring jurisdictions. Seattle’s Plan must be guided by King County’s growth management policies, and those of Vision 2020, the regional plan developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council. (Ibid., 14)

The GMA also articulated a number of goals addressing social, environmental, economic, and fiscal areas, and included one for citizen participation and coordination. This provision is intended to "[e]ncourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts ..." (Ibid.:91). Seattle’s
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Framework Policies, reflecting a set of articulated community values, also provide guidance within the consistency rubric.

Each of these growth management requirements, along with the Framework Policies, narrows in one way or another the City's latitude in its relationships with neighbourhoods. The combined effect is to require continued urbanity, respect for existing neighbourhoods, a comprehensive outlook in citywide and neighbourhood planning, and consistency between neighbourhood and city plans. The result in Seattle was an imposed necessity for some kind of neighbourhood planning program. As the Comprehensive Plan itself states, it was these policies which inspired the inclusion of a neighbourhood planning element (v). Seattle adopted its Comprehensive Plan pursuant to this legislation in July, 1994.

The City of Seattle Neighbourhood Planning Policy embodies a number of elements whose origins can be traced to the factors described above in the Policy's genesis. These elements arise from a unique confluence of requirements and events involving interventions by neighbourhood organizations and all three levels of government. These reflect the social activism of the 1960's, the neighbourhood planning orientation of the 1970's, pivotal City initiatives of the 1980's, and certain 1990's pressures which contributed to its formation. Citizen involvement in decision-making, community organization power, supportive City agencies, City funding for neighbourhood
organizations doing neighbourhood planning, a history of planning cognizant for the most part of the neighbourhood level, and an emphasis on neighbourhood plans by neighbourhood organizations all contributed to creation of a policy which shares power between the City and neighbourhoods in ways consistent with democratic functioning and neighbourhood organization effectiveness.

A number of these themes emerge in the Interview Findings, which are presented in Chapter 5. The methodology for the research which provided these findings is considered next, in Chapter 4.
4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit.

Michael Quinn Patton, evaluative research expert

This chapter outlines the three kinds of data gathering undertaken for this thesis, discusses qualitative methodologies and interviewing as the tool chosen for the original research, and closes with a brief discussion of the limitations and benefits of the methodology.

4.1 Research Overview

Material for this thesis was gathered from three main sources: (1) a literature review, the results of which are presented in Chapter 2; (2) a document review, the findings from which comprise the major portion of Chapter 3; and (3) interviews with fourteen informed participants involved in the genesis, development and introduction of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy, which are reported in Chapter 5. The document review and interviews comprise the case study research. Material from the literature review and both strands of the case study research are woven together throughout Chapter 5, to be analyzed in parallel with presentation of interview findings.

141990, p. 278.
4.2 Interview Research

The purpose of the case study research was to identify the factors which led the City of Seattle to develop and adopt its power-sharing neighbourhood planning model. The purpose of the interviews was to complement and extend document review findings, by learning about the factors for the Policy's genesis, development and introduction from people who were involved with one or more of these aspects. Interviews were carried out using the Guided Interview Approach, a qualitative research methodology.

4.2.1 Qualitative Methodologies and Interviewing

Canadian public policy expert Stephen Brooks, in his book Public Policy in Canada: An Introduction, states that "[qualitative] methods are frequently employed in the study of policy formation, through interviewing the participants in the decision process" (1993:30). Interviewing, used as a qualitative research methodology, was selected for the original research of this thesis for two main reasons. The first is that this methodology accommodates the possibility that a diversity of views may all validly explain the same phenomenon. As it seemed likely that policy on power-sharing would develop because of multiple (and even competing) factors, an open-ended approach to inquiry seemed appropriate. As Shulamit Reinharz observes, "interview research explores people's views of reality and
4. Research Methodology

allows the researcher to generate theory. In this way it complements quantitatively oriented, close-ended interview research that tries to test hypotheses" (1992:18).

The second reason was that no academic or other material was uncovered addressing the topic of formation of power-sharing policies in neighbourhood planning. The development of an understanding of the motivating factors, if not of an actual theory, involved in the formation of such policy suggested a non-quantitative, discovery-oriented methodology.

4.2.2 Sampling

Unlike quantitative methodologies, which rely on randomness and size in sampling, qualitative methodologies allow inferences and conclusions to be drawn based on the richness of data gathered, the keenness of observation and analysis, and the care exercised in design and execution of the study. Questions about how to sample in qualitative research were initially the most perplexing in design of this aspect of the research. Direction was found in the remarks of Michael Quinn Patton, who states:

Perhaps nothing better captures the difference between quantitative and qualitative methods than the different logics that undergird sampling approaches. Qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples, even single cases (n=1), selected purposefully. ... The logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. (original emphasis, 1990:169)

For this study, sampling was initiated via a snowball technique, in which names of potential interviewees were
continuously solicited from a wide range of sources, until September, 1995. Selection of interviewees from the evolving list thus generated was then refined, based on "maximum variation" sampling techniques (after Patton:172). This sampling process was chosen because it yields "two kinds of findings: (1) high quality, detailed descriptions ... and (2) important shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity" (Ibid.:172).

The variation in this sample is derived from inclusion of interviewees from the three main categories of involvement with the Policy: (1) appointed official (bureaucrat), (2) elected official (politician), and (3) representative of neighbourhood organization. A fourth category was comprised of a representative from each of the following groups: media, academia, "city builders" (representative of the chamber of commerce or development community), and planning consultants.

In selection of individuals within these categories, a fundamental requirement in every case was the individual's involvement with the genesis, development or introduction of the Policy. A second requirement was characterization of each potential interviewee by others as both reflective and articulate. Some consideration was also given to characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, geographic representivity, and profession. In this way a degree of
demographic diversity within the total interviewee population was also achieved.

Finally, some interviewees were selected to provide data for what Patton termed "confirming or disconfirming cases." Their selection involves testing ideas, confirming the importance of meaning of possible patterns, and checking out the viability of emergent findings with new data an additional cases. Confirming cases ... elaborate the findings, adding richness, depth, and credibility. Disconfirming cases ... are a source of rival interpretations as well as a way of placing boundaries around confirmed findings. (Ibid.:178)

Seventeen individuals were eventually selected and approached to participate, and fourteen interviews were ultimately completed. However, many other thoughtful and articulate persons involved with the introduction of this Policy were also identified in the course of this research, who were not interviewed. The list of people approached and interviewed is provided in Appendix A.

4.2.3 The Interview Guide Approach

The interview research adopted the "interview guide approach" (after Patton:280), in which a set of issues is identified for exploration with every interviewee. The interview guide ensured these issues were addressed in a similar way in each interview, while allowing tailoring of the ensuing discussion to address strengths, interests and issues specific to each interviewee and discussion. Questions moved from
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general to specific and from open-ended to close-ended. Issues of rapport-building, progression through time, degrees of difficulty, and level of detail were also addressed in design of the interview guide.

Questions were posed in every interview addressing: (1) attributes unique to Seattle related to the Policy's introduction, (2) the role of neighbourhood organizations in the Policy's introduction, and (3) acceptance of power-sharing by the City. In most interviews, a fourth question addressing either balance among neighbourhood/city/region, or problems neighbourhood planning should not be used to address, was included.

Every interview closed with discussion of a pre-set seventeen-item checklist of factors which might have played a role in introduction of the Policy. Interviewees were asked to indicate which items/factors in their opinion played a role, to add any which were missing, and then to assign priority among the factors selected. The checklist allowed unaddressed topics to arise, and provided an opportunity for refining or redefinition of concepts and phrasing. In some cases it also stimulated generation of additional factors. Additional detail about research interview implementation is provided in Appendix B. A sample Interview Guide and checklist are provided in Appendices E and F.
4.3 Limitations and Benefits

The findings from qualitative interviewing can be problematic if care is not taken in selection of interviewees, execution of interviews and subsequent analysis, and if, in this case, the interviewees themselves do not constitute a particularly thoughtful or analytical population. Corroborative findings in the document and literatures reviews support interview results, and remove some of these reservations. The relatively broad, diverse and exceedingly articulate and reflective nature of the interview population as a whole, for a sample of this size, also suggests reliability.

As is often the case with research bent on discovery rather than verification, subsequent research to "test" some of the findings or conclusions could be worthwhile. The methodology's reputation for respect for people's capacity to know and for diverse and competing perspectives to stand side by side proved its greatest contribution.

The next chapter presents the results from the interview research.
5. INTERVIEW FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

"But the real answer why municipal governments come to support neighbourhood planning in any form is quite simple: political pressure.

David Sucher, Seattle Planner

This chapter reports the findings of interview research with "key informants" involved with the Neighbourhood Planning Policy's genesis, development and introduction. The purpose of the interview research was to identify the factors which led the City of Seattle to adopt and implement the Policy. The Policy was chosen as the case for study because it shares power between government and community groups, in the area of neighbourhood planning.

The people interviewed include two who have run or are running for elected office, four appointed officials, four representatives of neighbourhood organizations, and four others involved in various capacities with the Policy's genesis, development and introduction. These people are:

Elected office:

- Jim Street, Councilmember and President of the Seattle City Council;
- Pat Strosahl, candidate for Seattle City Council; and Vice-President, Vision Seattle (a community organization), and

---

\(^{15}\)E-mail discussion, July, 1995.
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member of the City of Seattle Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee, and the Seattle Neighborhood Coalition;

**Appointed office:**

- Jim Diers, Director of the City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods;

- Ellen Kissman, Senior Planner, Office for Management and Planning, City of Seattle;

- Gary Lawrence, immediate past Director of Planning, City of Seattle, and current Director, Center for Sustainable Communities, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Washington;

- Karma Ruder, Director of the Neighborhood Planning Office, City of Seattle;

**Neighbourhood organization:**

- Kent Kammerer, President of the Seattle Neighborhood Coalition;

- Vivian McLean, President of the Seattle Community Council Federation, Secretary of the City Neighborhood Council, Vice-Chair of the Seattle Neighborhood Coalition, Co-chair of the Delridge District Council, and member of the Open Space Oversight Committee and The Creek People;

- Tom Wales, original Queen Anne-Magnolia District Council Chair, and past Chair of the Queen Anne Community Council, member of the City of Seattle Planning Commission, and City of Seattle Design Review Board;

- Eugene Wasserman, Executive-Director of the Neighborhood Business Council;
Various:

- Dennis Ryan, Chair of the Department of Urban Design and Planning, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Washington, Chair of the City of Seattle Planning Commission, and one of two Commission members on the City’s Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee;

- Tim St. Clair, Staff Writer for the "West Seattle Herald" (a community newspaper);

- Caroline Tobin, previously an independent planning consultant, and currently serving on the Seattle Landmark Preservation Board as a historian representative; and


All of these individuals, despite notation here of their various roles and affiliations, were asked to speak only on behalf of themselves.

The following four sections present the interview findings according to themes, or factors related to the Policy’s introduction. These are: neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations, context, and pressure. A fourth theme, dealing with needs which the Policy meets, is discussed last. These findings are presented for the most part according to frequency of mention. Literature and document review findings are inserted where appropriate to facilitate analysis. The words of the interviewees are used wherever possible.
5.1  Neighbourhoods and Their Organizations are Present and Functional

What people cherish here is their neighbourhoods.

Jim Diers

Seattle's neighbourhoods are distinctive and Seattle's tradition of organization at the neighbourhood level dates from the early part of the century. The neighbourhood fact and the consequent presence of citizen organization at the neighbourhood level were fundamental to the genesis and development of the Policy.

5.1.1  Identifiable and Identified—With Neighbourhoods

If you're in Seattle and you ask somebody else from Seattle where they live, they never say Seattle. They always give their neighbourhood designation.

Gary Lawrence

Almost all interviewees introduced the theme of Seattle's fundamental nature as "a city of neighbourhoods." One (Tobin) also said that neighbourhoods form "an important part of the City's identity," while a number went further, specifying that Seattleites identify with their neighbourhoods rather than with

\[^{16}\text{This heading quote and all subsequent heading quotes in this chapter are taken from thesis interview material.}\]
the City as a whole (Diers, Kammerer, Kissman, Lawrence, St. Clair).

Seattle's "very long tradition of neighbourhoods" (Ruder) featured in a number of comments (Diers, Kissman, Ruder, Strosahl). Several interviewees elaborated on the origins of and explanations for this tradition and for Seattleites' identification with their neighbourhoods. Kissman and Ryan noted the series of annexations which continued until the late 1950's. These swelled Seattle's land mass and incorporated into Seattle a number of small towns or villages which already had their own names and sense of community. Other interviewees, including Street notably, spoke about topography, geography, historic hubs of economic activity, and social factors, mirroring many of these comments of Diers:

I think our geography, the hills and valleys and the water, makes for pretty defined neighbourhoods. In addition, there are pretty strong neighbourhood commercial districts, and those help to define each neighbourhood .... [M]ost neighbourhoods have an elementary school and the elementary school often has the same name as the neighbourhood. So that also provides a real identity. And then there are others things, too. I mean often there's sometimes the houses, the housing stock is of a particular type, ... we've got a floating homes neighbourhood that's pretty distinctive. It's sometimes, although fairly infrequently, it's defined ethnically as well. We have one neighbourhood that was largely Norwegian. We have another neighbourhood that was sort of a traditional African-American neighbourhood, although now it's a very diverse neighbourhood.

In sum, interview findings indicate Seattle's self-characterization as a city of neighbourhoods and the identification of its citizens with these neighbourhoods were
important features in the genesis and development of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy. The important place Seattleites accord their neighbourhoods undoubtedly contributed to the development of organizations at the neighbourhood level, and these organizations were also a factor in the Policy's development.

5.1.2 Presence and Action of Neighbourhood Organizations

As a whole they are wonderful groups because they do amazing things in our neighbourhoods.

Karma Ruder

The presence of neighbourhood organizations in Seattle was generally considered by interviewees to be a factor in the introduction of this Policy. However, interviewees were for the most part unwilling to evaluate the power or effectiveness of neighbourhood organizations collectively, or to commit to a statement about the exact role of neighbourhood groups in the Policy's genesis, development or introduction. They were more likely to say that neighbourhood group effectiveness or power "depends on the neighbourhood" (Wasserman), and on considerations such as "numbers, leadership, how politically attuned they are, and how they fight their battles" (Wasserman).

Often interviewees responded to the question about neighbourhood organizations' role by providing background
information about neighbourhood organizations, as Ruder did:

There are over a hundred neighbourhoods in the City, that include everything from community councils that are very strong, take on projects, do amazing things, to groups that are like one or two people groups who call themselves an organization. They are the whole spectrum from people who are genuinely reaching out to try and include as many people from the neighbourhood in issues to groups which are very focused on a particular issue and trying to move the particular issue.

A few responses evaluative of neighbourhood organizations in general terms were received. For example, Strosahl found that neighbourhoods organizations are occasionally effective; they are occasionally powerful. They are not organized enough to be consistently so. So, if they get exercised enough about something they can do something. But other than that they tend to end up sniping from the sidelines.

Washburn framed his response about the influence and effectiveness of neighbourhood organizations in terms of area of neighbourhood organization endeavour:

If you’re talking in terms of creating infrastructure in their community, no. If you’re talking in terms of imposing legislative mandates on the City [i.e., development of City policy], limited. If you’re talking in terms of where they want to be significantly impacting private projects in the area [i.e., to stop or alter a proposed development]: probably.

In response to the question of neighbourhood organizations’ role in the Policy’s development and introduction, two interviewees (Strosahl, Tobin) noted neighbourhoods’ important contribution to the 1987 work of the City of Seattle Planning Commission. Strosahl explained:
A group of us, called Vision Seattle, back in 1987 worked our tails off to try to get a neighbourhood planning element, because we were discouraged at the City's view of how [the City] should grow. And we felt that neighbourhoods would be much better prepared to take on the task in a way that contributed to their neighbourhood fabric rather than destroyed it, as it was perceived was the case with the 'plannerly' view of how the City should grow. That effort led to the introduction in 1988 of the Neighborhood Matching Fund Program that came out of the work of the neighbourhood business community and the neighbourhood residential communities kind of getting together.

Tobin also affirmed the role of neighbourhood groups in relation to the 1987 initiative of the Planning Commission. She and others also identified the resultant creation of the Office of Neighborhoods and the Neighborhood Matching Fund in 1988 as pivotal. No comments were received to contradict the assertion of importance given to this event.

One interviewee (Ryan) did not believe that Seattle neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations are terrifically different from neighbourhoods elsewhere in the United States. He did state however, that "because of the stuff that's in the water [such as populism, the love affair with the local level and even the State's Constitution], it's a pretty potent ingredient in our behaviour around decisions." The observation by Berry, Portney and Thomson that neighbourhood organizations are common in American cities, but rarely broadly representative of the breadth of a city, suggests that in Seattle's case, the neighbourhood organization situation is somewhat unusual.
5.1.3 A Citywide Phenomenon

Each community and neighbourhood is different, and we have to look at the neighbourhood not just the City ....

Vivian McLean

A small number of interviewees (including Street, Ruder, Tobin) gave some (though generally limited) prominence to the fact that a network or constellation of neighbourhood organizations exists to provide neighbourhood-level representation of some description in almost every neighbourhood of the City and in all parts of the City. It is surprising this factor was not more highly rated in interview findings, given the literature review discussion of the important role it plays in neighbourhood organization effectiveness and in representational balance across the City. The loose and overlapping nature of organization and coordination of neighbourhood groups across the City may explain this.\(^{17}\) As Kammerer noted, and Ruder commented: "There isn't a single one [neighbourhood umbrella group or coalition], but there are a number that operate."

A related factor, which was not explored in interviews, is the presence and effect of a number of existing neighbourhood

\(^{17}\)This point was not directly addressed in interview questions, and this may also explain its general absence in interviewee response.
organizations in Seattle having a track record of accomplishment and organizational capacity, which serve to engender confidence. It seems unlikely that a policy to share power and resources with neighbourhood organizations would be developed if neighbourhood organizations were not already in place in most neighbourhoods, well distributed across the City, and in possession of adequate capacity to assume the responsibility.

In sum, it is clear that the "neighbourhood fact" in Seattle, and the consequent presence and influence of neighbourhood-level organization were important to the Policy's introduction. Though opinion was divided on the degree to which neighbourhood organizations in Seattle in a general sense possessed power at the time of the Policy's development, and was similarly equivocal on Seattle neighbourhood organization's overall effectiveness, the neighbourhood organizations' collective capacity, citywide distribution, and loose federation appear to have combined to help propel formation of the Policy. It seems unlikely that a policy to share power with neighbourhood organizations would have arisen, even with the presence of the other key factors of conducive context and appropriate pressure, without these two important elements.
5.2 Context Is Important

Neighbourhood planning is just a tool to get things done -- it's not a be-all and end-all. It depends on who's at the table and the implementability [of the plan].

Eugene Wasserman

As already stated, neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations are perceived as important aspects of civic life in Seattle. Their presence and activity constitute a prominent feature of the context in which Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy was developed. Two other features of the context were also important: the climate at Seattle City Hall during the period of the Policy's development and introduction, and features of the political culture and politics of Seattle and its setting. This section presents interview findings about the second and third of these three contextual elements which contributed to formation of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy.

5.2.1 Climate at City Hall

[Councilmember] Jim Street felt a real commitment to trying to get into the hands, insofar as possible, of the neighbourhoods, decisions that were going to be having a direct impact on them. And he was joined on the Council by other Councilmembers who felt pretty much the same way.

Tom Wales
Political support at the Council level for neighbourhoods, for planning at the neighbourhood level, or for neighbourhood organizations was specifically cited by seven of the interviewees as an important element leading to the Policy's introduction (Diers, Lawrence, Ruder, Street, Tobin, Wales, Wasserman). A large number of other comments citing factors which contributed to the development of this climate (presented in the next sub-section) further support this finding. No contradictory comments were received.

A small number of interviewees (including Diers, Tobin, Wales) cited bureaucratic support, especially from well-placed individuals in key departments, as an essential ingredient as well. Tom Wales' comment summarizes these two points:

On the other hand, I don't think that the Neighborhood Planning Component that now exists would exist at all if the neighbourhoods had not found a very sympathetic ear among members of the City Planning Department and the City Council. There are neighbourhood organizations and certainly individuals who would dispute that vehemently, believing that the City has only been dragged kicking and screaming into any kind of neighbourhood planning, but I really don't subscribe to that view.... But my point is none of it would have come about if the City hadn't had a pretty sympathetic ear for those concerns.

However, a few comments specified that bureaucrats as a group had not been helpful and had, in fact, been obstructive. Street commented on the beginnings of a change in attitude:

I don't think that bureaucrats in general have been wildly enthusiastic. Although ... [there's a serious effort in the City to] require bureaucrats to start thinking differently.... [R]ather than focusing on programs or bureaus, we need to focus on people and communities.
The positive effect of Council and senior official support cited here is buttressed by Chapter 3 document review findings, which discuss the pivotal role of two City initiatives, the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program, and the Planning Commission study.

The conducive climate at City Hall was itself fostered by other factors, which are in and of themselves important to the question of how a policy with power-sharing came to be. Interview findings about these factors are considered next.

5.2.2 Contributors to a Conducive City Hall Climate

[This neighbourhood planning policy] has been in the works for a long time, and it's taken a lot of different steps.

Jim Diers

The development of a conducive climate at Seattle City Hall appears to have been bound up with four contributing factors. These are: (1) the creation of the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF), (2) the 1987 work of the City of Seattle Planning Commission, (3) the effect of the previous planning emphasis on land use, and (4) increased awareness at the Council level of citizen and neighbourhood concerns.

The NMF appears to have provided a vehicle for the City to develop an appreciation of neighbourhoods' trustworthiness, and for neighbourhoods to learn the value of partnership with the
City. Other City initiatives, including the other activities of the Department of Neighborhoods and the network of "little city halls," also appear to have fostered this trust and capacity for collaboration.

The NMF, along with the work of the Department of Neighborhoods and the thirteen Neighborhood Service Centers, was cited by ten interviewees (Diers, Kammerer, Kissman, Lawrence, Ruder, St. Clair, Strosahl, Tobin, Wales, Wasserman) as important to the development and introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy.¹⁸ No comments contradicting this finding were received from other interviewees.

Ruder spoke to the learnings of both City and neighbourhoods resulting from the NMF:

This history of the Neighborhood Matching Fund was actually very important both because it established the precedent that you could give money to a community group and they could in fact do a community-driven process and make it work. And it also showed that if you didn’t have a partnership with the City working with those groups that you were not likely to get products that would be adopted by the City Council. And because neighbourhoods had a lot of experience with that through the Neighborhood Matching Fund they could see that that was a relevant issue, the partnership issue.

Strosahl described the value to city government of the NMF’s emphasis on pro-active citizen involvement:

That notion that if you give people, give citizens, a chance to interact proactively, rather than having to

¹⁸See Appendix G, History of Department of Neighborhoods, and the Neighbourhood Matching Fund, Through to Establishment of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy, verbatim comments from the interview with Jim Diers, for an excellent overview.
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simply react, you have a much better chance of incorporating the energy that they brought to their community in a positive way, in building the city rather than in simply stopping things. Which had been mainly their role over the course of at least the three or four years before that [the introduction of the NMF].

The NMF also taught the City the importance of containing and channelling citizen group involvement in planning. Kissman explained:

And this is important because I think the lessons that we learned from neighbourhoods who were doing plans under the Matching Fund fed into what we ended up with in the Comprehensive Plan a lot. Because one of the things that we realized over the years, is that you can’t just turn a neighbourhood loose and say ‘go forth and plan’ and then expect to be able to deal with the results. So we ended up being in a position where we would get these plans at the end and they were, sometimes they were great and sometimes they had things in them that were really problematic. And, they always had a large number of people who were thoroughly invested in them as well. So it was very difficult for everyone when we had to say, I’m sorry, that’s illegal, we’re not going to do it. Nobody liked that situation.

The Matching Fund opened the door in practice for what was later formally introduced conceptually as the notion of power-sharing. It also re-enforced for the City the belief that citizen involvement can be productive and effective (and worth the risks), and it strengthened for neighbourhood organizations the notion that partnership with the City can be valuable. Perhaps most important in terms of the development of the Policy, the City learned that structure and support for neighbourhood organization involvement in planning are essential.
A second factor in the development of a conducive City Hall climate was the 1987 work of the City of Seattle Planning Commission to study City relationships with its neighbourhoods. This work seems to have led more or less directly to the City's adoption of the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program, and its NMF component.

Five interviewees (Diers, Kammerer, Kissman, Ryan, Street) explicitly recognized the work of the City of Seattle's Planning Commission in 1987 as contributing to the ultimate adoption of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy. Kissman explained:

In the mid '80's, '86, '87, the Planning Commission took this on as an issue.... [T]hey wrote a report that looked at City and neighbourhood relations in general and planning particularly.... I think that was the genesis of the pre-Comp[rehensive] Plan generation of neighbourhood plans.... That report and probably some other stuff ... led to the creation of an Office of Neighborhoods which then became a Department of Neighborhoods.

Though not specifically mentioned by interviewees, the Commission's initiative also brought together people, information and ideas in a sowing of seeds and a cross-fertilization which led to the later development and adoption of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy. As Ryan said, the Commission was "the instigator." In effect, the Commission's work prepared the ground.

A third factor was the nature and length of the City's land use and zoning exercise, immediately preceding the development
of the current Comprehensive Plan. For most of the ten years of the 1980's, Seattle City Hall planning energy was devoted to rezoning the entire City. Single land use or zoning elements were taken up one by one, in succession, yielding exclusion of integration and other elements important to a planning process. Choosing to plan in this way, and then continuing with the exercise, appears to have created enormous neighbourhood frustration. This frustration was compounded by a related problem, the rejection by the City of a number of plans developed over the years by neighbourhoods—plans in which neighbourhoods were heavily invested.

Five interviewees (Diers, Kammerer, Street, Strosahl, Tobin) referred directly to the land-use focused citywide planning exercise of the 1980's. By choosing to undertake this massive rezoning effort, the City essentially deferred dealing with neighbourhood needs and requests, for the entire decade. As Street said: "... the City had been saying to neighbourhoods for ten years, wait, wait, until we finish the land use plan." The effect of this deferral appears to have been a solidification of neighbourhood demand for neighbourhood planning, rather than an abatement. One interviewee (Strosahl) linked the political problems created by the City's massive land use planning process of the 1980's to the delivery of increased

---

19 See Appendix H, 1980's Land-Use Rezoning, and CAP Initiative, verbatim comments from the interview with Jim Street, for a fuller explanation.
power to the neighbourhood planning proponents:

... everybody felt it [the land use planning process] was a deeply, deeply flawed plan and process. I think the Mayor and the Council, to get out of it, basically turned to this thing that was waiting, which was neighbourhood planning. And so they delivered a tremendous amount of additional power than I think they ever contemplated they would to the neighbourhood planning effort, because they got into this sticky mess ....

A small number of interviewees (Kissman, Lawrence, Ruder) specifically cited the problems which arose when City Council did not adopt or implement these plans. As Kissman noted: "Nobody liked that situation." Citizen frustration coupled with City Hall recognition of the detrimental effects of these situations appear to have combined to motivate the City to address neighbourhood planning. These events together created a "frustration factor," which mounted.

A fourth factor in development of a conducive City Hall climate was the election to Council of a number of people from neighbourhood organizations or neighbourhood-friendly groups. The effect of neighbourhood-sensitive people on Council was re-enforced by the passage in 1989 of the CAP initiative, a citizen initiative which overturned parts of the Downtown Plan.

The transformation of a number of neighbourhood activists into City Councilmembers was cited by five interviewees (Diers, McLean, Ruder, Street, Wales) as a factor in City Hall's ultimate ability to support neighbourhood planning. As Ruder observed: "There are a number of Council people who come out of that [neighbourhood history and organization] and are responsive
As well, the CAP initiative, though infrequently cited in interviews, seems to have heightened Council awareness of mounting frustration. This initiative signalled to political leaders that certain citizen and neighbourhood frustrations could no longer safely be ignored. It, like the frustration engendered by unadopted or unimplemented neighbourhood plans, seems to have alerted City Hall to the need to address citizen concerns centred on neighbourhood demands. Street explained:

Then we had a revolt, in the form of the so-called CAP initiative in '89 which was a citizen initiative to overturn the Downtown Plan.... [T]he political symbolism of that was very significant because ... that set in motion, even within the City before anything happened at the State level on growth management, a sort of commitment to do a better job of looking at the inter-relationships between Downtown and neighbourhoods and so forth.

In sum, interview findings indicate that a large number of factors contributed to a conducive climate at City Hall. Major among these factors were the NMF, which opened the door, the work of the Planning Commission in 1987, which prepared the ground, the land-use focused planning exercise, which along with rejection of neighbourhood-prepared plans, introduced and increased frustration, and the CAP initiative, which signalled a problem, and combined with election to Council of neighbourhood-sensitive candidates, increased Council awareness.

The City Hall climate which these created, marked by politicians and key senior bureaucrats prepared to acknowledge the importance of neighbourhoods and neighbourhood
organizations, represent the second important element in the context for this Policy's development. Interview comments also pointed to a third element, politics and political culture.

5.2.3 Political Culture and Politics

(Perhaps) it's in the water.

Dennis Ryan

Organization at the neighbourhood level, a conducive City Hall climate, and the factors which brought these about were all fostered in part by the larger political culture in which Seattle neighbourhoods and Seattle city government were situated at the time of the Policy's genesis and development. Interview comments cited citizen activism, government willingness to listen to and involve citizens, a history of federal involvement in neighbourhoods and neighbourhood planning, a history of neighbourhood planning activity additional to that led by neighbourhoods, a particular regional political culture, and political and societal factors as contributing elements.

Some interviewees (Diers, Kissman, Lawrence, Ruder, Strosahl) pointed to the generally civicly active nature of Seattle citizenry as an important factor in the politics and culture which contributed to the Policy's development. As Kissman stated, "we have an extremely participatory citizenry." Diers noted evidence of this citizen activism in other arenas as
well, citing the labour movement and environmental movement as two examples.

Two interviewees (Diers, Ruder) also mentioned the complement to citizen activism, citizen inclusion in governance by the City. Diers spoke to a "genuine belief by a lot of elected officials that things really do work better when the people are involved." He noted this as a long-standing Seattle practice.

Several interviewee comments addressed Seattle's history of neighbourhood planning, noting planning activity additional to that led or shaped by neighbourhoods. Wasserman noted the development of neighbourhood-focused plans where the City led the effort (such as the Northgate Plan, for example). A number of interviewees (including Kissman, Street, Tobin) spoke of the significant federal presence in neighbourhoods and neighbourhood planning. These observations are consistent with document review findings about the lengthy history of planning of many descriptions at the neighbourhood level, and federal development programs focused on neighbourhoods.

Two interviewees spoke of the effect of historic social and political vanguardism of the Pacific Northwest region, though a few others alluded to this. Lawrence explained by saying:

It was in the Pacific Northwest that the Workers of the World Party [the Wobblies] was created. There is a history of utopian communities in the Northwest that is different than any other part of the United States. We have Scandinavian utopian traditions here, we have the history of potlatch (Native American culture), we have the Asian,
particularly the Japanese, influence of community and family.

Ryan referred to "threads that have been here a long time [such as] populism, ... the love affair with the local level, the individual in the city .... They've always been for the small unit."

A few other interviewees cited other features of the local political situation as important to the Policy's development and introduction. Washburn and Wasserman pointed to the fact that Seattle is served by an at-large system of representation. Wasserman suggested that where neighbourhoods or sets of neighbourhoods are unable to identify an elected person or office directly responsible or answerable to them, as a ward system for example might allow, people in neighbourhood or community organizations may turn to other mechanisms, such as power and resource sharing policies, to achieve connection with government. Street mused that City politicians' guilt over the lengthy delay in getting around to addressing neighbourhoods' demands may have positively affected Council's ultimate receptivity. Street also noted that timing was of the essence in this Policy's introduction, following as it did the CAP initiative and the effect of the previous land use planning exercise.

Other related observations were also presented in interviews. Tom Wales cited a generalized societal trend to "try and move decision-making down to, as far as you can, the
people who are affected by it." He saw the power-shifting aspects of the Policy as having

a lot of parallels with other kinds of thinking in our society, like Total Quality Management, and the quality of working life, and ... the democratization, or increasing democratization and decentralization of city governments, as they try and cope.

Ruder referred repeatedly to the fact that, in relation to neighbourhood organizations coalescing and the finding of "a clear community consensus, ... when people find common ground and common directions, it is inherently powerful." She cited as an example:

when the Comp[rehensive] Plan came out, there was a coalition that included the Chamber [of Commerce], small business groups, and it included the Downtown Association, and it included big business, ... environmental groups, and it included residential groups. And when they coalesced to say that they had changes that they wanted, that was a very powerful group. Who in fact got the changes that they wanted.

In sum, a conducive climate at City Hall was an important factor in the Policy's development and introduction. It was created by a number of factors, including Seattle's political culture and politics. In addition to the presence and effect of neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations, and this conducive context, two other factors were important to the introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy in Seattle: pressure, and elements contained in the Policy itself.
5.3 Pressure is Essential

They [the City] wouldn’t have done this without a gun to their heads.

Tim St. Clair

The presence of a context conducive to development of a neighbourhood planning power-sharing policy was complemented by the presence of neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations, as already discussed, and by application of pressure. This pressure was found chiefly in two sources: neighbourhoods and state-introduced growth management legislation.

5.3.1 Neighbourhoods Request

As organizations and as individuals, they’ve been playing a consistent role for fifteen years in saying we want neighbourhood planning.

Jim Street

A number of interviewees pointed to pressure applied by neighbourhood organizations as an important factor in the development and introduction of the Policy, despite some collective hesitation (discussed earlier) to directly assess neighbourhood organization power. In the application of pressure, neighbourhood organizations were generally perceived as tenacious, rather than aggressive. Their tenacity appears to
have re-enforced their demands, which were generally recognized to be of long-standing stature. Among comments to this effect (Diers, Ryan, Street, Strosahl, Tobin, Wales, Washburn), Strosahl described neighbourhood effort as "continuous, like Chinese water torture." Tobin noted that despite City initiative to keep a citywide [ie, non-neighbourhood] focus on planning:

the people in the neighbourhood, the activists, the community councils and the neighbourhood business groups, always felt really strongly that there needed to be a focus at the neighbourhood level, and that voice would not go away.... The pressure has been on continuously from the community people to move into this level of planning.

Tom Wales described the impact on the City of these efforts:

I think the neighbourhoods have served a very useful role in keeping City planners and City Council focused on the need for meaningful neighbourhood planning, and have served an important role in making sure certain elements are contained in the Neighborhood Planning Component.

Document review findings confirm the lengthy history of neighbourhood-level organization in Seattle, and support the contention that neighbourhood organizations have continuously applied pressure over a large number of years.

The issue of leadership in neighbourhood organizations emerged in a number of comments (Kissman, Ruder, Street, Tobin, Washburn) and in several contexts, including that of neighbourhood organizations' capacity to propel the neighbourhood planning issue forward. As Kissman noted in regard to effectiveness of neighbourhood organizations as a collectivity, "it's just not a consistent picture at all, and it
really depends on the individuals involved." She commented further on:

The result [of neighbourhood involvement in the NMF] is there are "people who are very educated about planning, very experienced in planning, know the successes and pitfalls about the way it was done in the past, and had a lot to say about how to improve it. And we've definitely worked with those folks.... The citizens who helped the most to shape neighbourhood planning, by and large had been involved in neighbourhood planning in some way in their own neighbourhoods. And had an interest in it generally and understood something about it, and what makes it work and what makes it not work.

Diers provided input very similar to Kissman's.

An intriguing aspect of the discussions about neighbourhood organizations' application of pressure to bring about change they desired, including the introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy, was the commentary about influence, or perceived influence, on election and other outcomes by neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations. Street agreed with the proposition that neighbourhoods in Seattle are often able to cobble together apparent power adequate to sway lukewarm decision-makers toward a neighbourhood cause. However, he also stated:

I'm not actually sure that [neighbourhood organization] voting power is as great as their apparent power. And I don't know that actually Councilmembers necessarily believe [in neighbourhood power to affect outcomes] today as much as they might have believed in the late '80's ....

A number of interviewees (including Diers, Strosahl, Washburn) also pointed to issues of concern at the local level which were different from but related to the neighbourhood push
for neighbourhood planning. These were perceived as contributing to neighbourhood-generated pressure on City Hall, and included topics such as density, traffic and transportation, neighbourhood character, public safety, parking, basic infrastructure, city facilities, open space, economic development, and scale of development, among others.

5.3.2 Growth Management Legislation Confirms

So it's kind of a confluence of events. The final catalyst for this has probably been the Growth Management Act.

Tom Wales

Nine interviewees (Kammerer, Kissman, McLean, Ryan, St. Clair, Street, Tobin, Wales, Wasserman) pointed directly to the introduction of the Growth Management Act (GMA) as a factor in the introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy. Kissman explained:

The other thing that happened in 1990 was that the whole region was coming off a growth boom, or kind of in the heart or peak of a growth boom, and growth management planning was a very, very big deal. And we ended up with a state act called the Growth Management Act, that required cities and counties to produce comprehensive plans. Seattle had kind of independently arrived at the decision that we needed to do that as well. We had not done a comprehensive plan, really, for quite some time .... [As well, t]he Growth Management Act places pretty heavy emphasis on public involvement in planning, both in terms of coming up with comp[rehensive] plans and in terms of sub-area plans that follow from the comp[rehensive] plan.... So we had this situation where our existing neighbourhood plans were very ad hoc, ... [a]nd the
products were, as I say, oftentimes very problematic. We had the need to do a comprehensive plan.

In short, pressure from neighbourhood organizations and the pressure placed on the City by the legislated requirements of the GMA appears to have combined to conclusively seal the City’s decision to move toward a new planning schema, featuring a growth management focus and a neighbourhood orientation. The GMA requirement for citizen involvement also mobilized the City on a citizen involvement component. That the Comprehensive Plan’s citizen involvement component adopted the particular form of neighbourhood involvement appears to be due to the shaping forces of the contextual elements described earlier. The result was the City’s 1994 Comprehensive Plan for growth management, the cornerstone of which is its implementation through neighbourhood planning. The next section briefly considers how these factors played out.

5.4 A Power-Sharing Policy Develops

*We couldn’t do every little detail from City Hall. And didn’t want to do every little detail from City Hall. And as the political process went on, we could do less and less, from City Hall.*

Ellen Kissman

In the face of the combined pressure from neighbourhoods and the recently introduced growth management legislation, the
City sought relief. The Neighbourhood Planning Policy provided a mechanism for handling a variety of political needs, and for resolving a common planning challenge, the need for inclusiveness, and these appear to have assisted its introduction.

5.4.1 Political Needs are Met

[Council members do not need to be involved] in every little detail.

Carol Tobin

A number of interviewees (Diers, Kammerer, Kissman, Lawrence, St. Clair, Street, Tobin, Wales,) saw inclusion of the Neighborhood Planning Element and its shaping into the form of the current Neighbourhood Planning Policy as providing a range of solutions or components of solutions to some of the City's thornier political problems. These included provision of validity and public palatability for the Comprehensive Plan, creation of a place to which difficult decisions could be temporarily (or perhaps permanently) deferred, and provision of a cash-free replacement for a dwindling selection of cash expenditure-based options in an era of shrinking budgets. The shape of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy also addressed some City needs in the areas of communication channels, Council workload, and political cover for politicians and bureaucrats,
some interviewees believe.

Tom Wales spoke to the need to make the Comprehensive Plan palatable:

The Neighborhood Planning Component was designed to, or the motive behind it, one of the motivations anyway, was to make more palatable to people in the City the mandate of the Growth Management Act, and ultimately, the Comprehensive Plan.

Lawrence noted the importance of political validity:

[The Neighborhood Planning Element gives the Plan] political validity. There's a real difference between a legal document and something that has political currency.

Diers noted that as the development of the Comprehensive Plan progressed, politicians "kept deferring more and more to the Comprehensive Plan and neighbourhood planning as they came up with thorny issues."

Tobin and others saw this Policy as administratively convenient for Council, releasing politicians from tiresome and time-consuming elements of planning work, as they would no longer be involved in "every little detail."

Wales identified the value of increased choice in an era of shrinking budgets:

The fact of the matter is that the modern city, and Seattle is no exception, has very little cash ... so ... you need to offer more intangible inducements. And certainly one big such intangible inducement is to say 'well we'll give some control over what your neighbourhood looks like as it grows into the future.'

St. Clair, like Wales, saw the Policy as a conduit for information for the City, and as a way for the City to take soundings, so that the City could "see how things are playing
out in the trenches." St. Clair also noted that the Policy provides cover and "spreads out political liability." In the case of politicians, he explained:

they can also always, if they come up with a plan for example for a neighbourhood and there's an uprising or something, they can always come back and say 'we got this directly from X community council and here's the record, ... and they [the community council] supposedly represent the rest of you.'

For bureaucrats, he found the Neighbourhood Planning Policy provides:

political cover for them because if things blow up in certain projects, [they can say] 'we didn't have a bunch of planners ... cooking up schemes for the neighbourhoods, that's not the way it worked. You guys told us this is what you wanted.'

However, many of these potential benefits were probably only clearly visible to most Seattle decision shapers and decision makers after some earlier work preliminary to the Policy's development was undertaken. The City carried out two tasks in particular which shaped the Policy. First, it researched neighbourhood planning initiatives in other jurisdictions,\(^{20}\) and second, it re-evaluated some concepts fundamental to planning and governance (Diers, Kissman). Though this was an infrequently mentioned interview finding, it seems likely that these contributions were nonetheless important to the Policy's ultimate adoption.

\(^{20}\)Notably those in Minneapolis, and Portland, Oregon.
It seems that the nature of the Policy, not just its power-sharing character, was important to its ultimate adoption. Yet a number of interviewees were uncertain about the Policy’s actual capacity for sharing power. This finding is discussed next.

5.4.2 But Does it Share Power?

_The City’s finger prints are going to be all over these plans._

Tom Wales

Most interviewees vacillated on answering questions formulated on an assumption of undefined power-sharing in this Policy. A few perceived no real change in the power balance between neighbourhoods and the City. They pointed to the fact that there is no legal delegation of decision-making power, and the fact that Council must still approve all proposed plans, as well as any changes proposed by neighbourhoods to the Comprehensive Plan. Others felt that the political obligation was so great that, as long as neighbourhoods respected the framework, power would in effect be shared.

On the question of whether power is actually in the neighbourhoods’ hands, Washburn stated firmly that: "The neighbourhood folks will tell you that they’re running the show now, but they’re deluding themselves." He supported this
position by noting that "if you take a look at those requirements [with which groups must comply in order to receive Council approval], you'll see each of them is very mushy, and you can drive a freight train through them. So, it's ultimately still a very political process." Wasserman was of a similar opinion, stating this is "just another form of politics."

Yet St. Clair pointed out that "politicians will be hard put to say no" if neighbourhoods take them up on the challenge. Strosahl adopted the same position. Lawrence elaborated:

So while it was, before the Comprehensive Plan, always safe to talk about neighbourhood empowerment but making decisions on a citywide basis, given the legal standing that the GMA puts in the Comprehensive Plan, it actually became time to either put up or shut up for the elected officials. So there wasn't really any valid political course other than to allocate to neighbourhoods some of the, not decision making but certainly decision shaping.

Lawrence also pointed out that though delegation in order to share power was not a possibility, respect for neighbourhood input had become a political imperative:

Because again you have to remember that the Council did not abdicate any of their legal responsibilities. They did not nor could they, under Washington State law. What they've said is that we have obligated ourselves politically to pay really serious attention to what you are going to tell us you would do in order to achieve these societal goals. And you will have the opportunity to hold us politically accountable for the extent to which we've paid attention. And the way to entrap us, as elected officials, is to satisfy the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

St. Clair among others noted that politicians have another reason as well to share:

There's just so much other power that they have, ... this is no more than say 6% of all their power ... and some of
this stuff is a kind of a pain in the neck anyway.... I think it was an easy thing for them to give up.

Yet even those who firmly believe power has been shared specified that there are "rules and parameters" (Strosahl). Wales' comment that "the City's finger prints" would be all over neighbourhood plans was part of this. He noted:

The City has professional planners who are going to be involved in the process. And who, while they may, if they are good at their jobs, ultimately produce documents that the neighbourhoods believe fairly reflect their own hopes and aspirations and desires, they are also, if they are good at their jobs, going to have steered the neighbourhoods down a path which leads the plans to be consistent with the overall Comprehensive Plan, and which ensures that the neighbourhood is aware not only of its selfish, kind of parochial concerns, but also that there are citywide issues that have to be addressed in any neighbourhood plan. So we'll see what happens.

As Wales observed, the answer to the question of whether power was really shared with the introduction of this Policy lies with the future, when various aspect of the Policy and its implementation can be evaluated. For the purposes of this thesis, the term "power-sharing" was retained, despite the reservations noted, because as St. Clair said:

There is power there mostly because ... the City has thrown out this framework, and said here's money and come and tell us what you want your neighbourhoods to look like. And that's an offering to share power.

As Arnstein observed, there is no possibility of absolute citizen control, since accountability rests with city council. As Parenteau noted, negotiation and bargaining over projected outcomes represent the first rung of real citizen power, and these elements are present in this Policy. Collaboration, when
properly structured, can be a power-sharing form of partnership, and appears to be so here.

5.4.3 Inclusiveness and the Essence of Planning

We [neighbourhood organizations] have to change our thinking [about inclusiveness in neighbourhood planning], just like the City had to change from them doing the planning to us doing the planning.

Vivian McLean

Inclusiveness was discussed in interviews both in terms of the neighbourhood planning process and in terms of avenues of citizen participation. A few interviewees (Kissman, Lawrence, McLean, Ruder) spoke directly to the issue of neighbourhood organizations' need to increase the inclusiveness and representivity of their activities. Ruder commented:

Another piece was about inclusiveness and representation. There were a lot of issues that we have to be careful on, [to ensure] that planning efforts don't end up representing only one group of people. A lot of the people who've been most involved in planning tend to be white, middle class, single-family home owners. And if this process was going to work it had to be a lot broader than that.

Inclusiveness in neighbourhood process was clearly identified as important. A larger issue about who citizens are and how they participate was also raised within the inclusiveness rubric. Neighbourhoods, as Ryan pointed out, are geographic communities, or communities of place, and as such are only one kind of community in a city. Lawrence identified a
second kind of community:

There are many communities in the City that are not geographically-based. There is no Native-American neighbourhood. There is no neighbourhood actually for any ethnic group.... So as we do our neighbourhood-based planning, the City has an important role of trying to get the neighbourhoods to address the communities of interest that don’t have the political power to make their needs expressed in any specific neighbourhood.

In addition to communities of interest and geographically-based communities of place, two additional aspects of inclusiveness in terms of participation were raised: people also need avenues for participation as individuals, and there is another community, the "community of the future." Lawrence elaborated:

There is a fourth, and that is community of future. Who speaks for the future in a neighbourhood planning process? Most of the concerns and values that get articulated are about the present or the past.... And who speaks for those people who are disenfranchised and here today, and even more importantly, who speaks for those people who we know will be here in the future, who are not going to be able to have the same choices as those people who are dominating the neighbourhood planning debate today?

Good planning, planning which is comprehensive in outlook, integrative in workstyle, and balanced in process and product, addresses all these kinds of communities. Good governance provides avenues of participation for the range of participatory needs of its citizenry. For neighbourhood organizations in neighbourhood planning, the challenge is to bring people together within the neighbourhood to achieve these ends at the neighbourhood level. As Ruder observed:

I think that the best hope for local government is to in fact bring people together so they are talking to each other, rather than having each of them independently talk
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... to the government about what they want the government to do. And that's not going to be an easy matter to pull off. Ruder also noted that neighbourhoods can in themselves incorporate and embody the diverse elements present in a city. Nonetheless, this is not any easier for neighbourhoods and neighbourhood organizations than for cities and local governments. As Kammerer pointed out,

democracy is ... confusing, it is slow, it is messy, it is complicated, it is time-consuming, it is a great struggle. ... [I]t takes you a long time to get there, but when you do, you have a lot more support.

Clearly, some of the challenges of governance are shared with neighbourhoods, when some of the power is shared.

In sum, the interview findings indicate that the genesis, development and introduction of the Policy was a result of three major factors. The first factor was Seattle's nature as a city of neighbourhoods and the presence and citywide distribution of neighbourhood-level organizations. Distinctive neighbourhoods and a long tradition of active neighbourhood organizations are prominent Seattle features. The second was the context for the Policy's development. During the period of development and introduction of the Policy, the climate at Seattle City Hall became increasingly open to neighbourhood community group participation involving degrees of power-sharing in neighbourhood planning. As well, the nature of city politics and of the larger political culture presented avenues for introduction of power-sharing. The third factor was the
creation of tremendous pressure on the City, resulting from combined neighbourhood demand and the new requirements of the Growth Management Act. The City relieved the pressure through development of a plan which capitalized on the two major pressure sources, neighbourhoods and the need to manage growth. A fourth factor, development of elements in the Policy to meet political needs and to add the fundamental planning imperatives of inclusiveness and balance, facilitated its introduction and adoption.

The final chapter of this thesis considers the conclusions and implications of this research, its significance, and suggestions for further research.
6. CONCLUSIONS

Because it's scarier not to.

Gary Lawrence, immediate Past Director of Planning, City of Seattle

This chapter identifies suggestions for research to further the development of policy on power-sharing, considers the significance to planning and local governance of work on power-sharing policy development, offers a summary of the work of the thesis and its findings, and closes with a discussion of the implications for planning practice.

6.1 Further Research

A number of interesting questions arose during work on this thesis, which were not within its scope. These merit attention in discussion of power-sharing in planning, and are listed here.

The first concerns articulation of the kinds of activities, issues or roles that neighbourhoods or communities cannot or should not take on in shared planning, both for the good of the city and for the good of the neighbourhood or community. How far can the boundary of shared power usefully and reasonably be extended? The second, related to the first, concerns the effect on neighbourhood or community organizations of the assumption of planning power. As decision-making responsibility in planning is inherently political (in the sense of requiring tough choices

where some one or more parties will inevitably be unhappy), at what point can, should or do neighbourhood or community groups involved in planning cross the line into governing?

A third is about the role of local governments in enhancing neighbourhood and community organization activism, effectiveness, and capacity. Since it is not their responsibility alone, should they pro-actively identify and cultivate other resources, and if so, how and for what purposes?

A fourth, related to all of these, concerns trust and control in governance generally, and between neighbourhoods or communities and local governments specifically. How much is good, and how can it best be generated?

A fifth is about a clearer understanding and fuller evaluation of the various loci for making decisions and for taking action in the diverse arenas of local government planning. The choice is not limited to neighbourhood, city or region. It ranges from individual or household, through block, neighbourhood, community and district, to city and region. Which decision-making responsibilities and which implementational capacities should be placed where? The sixth has to do with identifying and developing other alternatives to the traditional planner-dominated, community meeting/public hearing-focused method of planning and community involvement. What are some additional options to professional domination and token involvement? Power-sharing policies in planning represent
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a valid option, but only one of a number in a healthy and functioning democracy.

6.2 Significance

Power-sharing policies, one choice in a suite of options available to local governments, can assist them in the daily work of grappling with the challenges and dilemmas of planning and governance. Proposals for a ward system, or calls for re-examination of the distribution of powers between city and regional government, for example, demand a reconsideration of the fundamental questions of the meaning and application of democracy. Similarly, efforts to introduce or augment meaningful opportunities for citizen involvement in planning and governance often encounter a dearth of effective systematic or institutional frameworks to emulate or work within. Such efforts often build from a catch-bag base of earlier ad hoc, one-off, or one-time experiences. Planning policies on power-sharing with community groups constitute one component in the connected set of systems, structures, programs and polices which address such challenges and dilemmas. Understanding the factors which contribute to the development and introduction of power-sharing policies contributes to understanding how planning can strengthen communities and cities, how planning policy can be improved, and how democratic functioning at the local government level can be strengthened.
6.3 Conclusions and Implications

In this thesis, development of an understanding of the factors which lead to adoption of power-sharing policies between local governments and community organizations has involved a literature review, a document review, and original interview research about the case of the City of Seattle's Neighbourhood Planning Policy, an example of local government power-sharing with neighbourhoods in neighbourhood planning. The literature review in Chapter 2 provided an understanding of neighbourhoods, their organizations, and their place in and needs for democratic functioning. This material, along with the document review and interview findings, sketched a picture of inter-connecting webs of factors involved in the genesis, development and introduction of power-sharing policies between government and neighbourhood organizations.

Analysis of this picture of inter-woven elements led to the conclusion that for power-sharing policies between local governments and community or neighbourhood organizations to develop, context is important and pressure is essential. The context needs to include the presence of community or neighbourhood organizations worthy of the trust of shared power, which are also appropriately resourced and supported. The pressure for power-sharing ideally yields inclusion of elements in the policy which address political needs as well as the imperatives of quality planning, inclusiveness and balance.
Examination of the genesis, development and introduction of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy in Seattle demonstrates that this particular power-sharing policy developed in the presence of these four factors. The Policy was founded on the palpable presence of neighbourhoods and a lengthy history of action at the neighbourhood level, including action by neighbourhood organizations. It was fostered in a conducive context, comprised of a supportive climate at City Hall during the period of its development, the presence of a political and cultural milieu featuring citizen activism, local and federal government intervention in neighbourhoods, and a number of supportive historic and present-day political elements. Born ultimately from the application of pressure (from more than one source and graced with good timing), the Policy gained a firm foothold from its ability to address political exigencies and offer inclusive processes and outcomes.

This research did not bring to light several aspects of local government relationships with its neighbourhood or community groups which are important to note. These include NIMBYism ("not in my backyard" syndrome), which plagues many efforts to introduce increased local involvement, and conflict between neighbourhoods and within neighbourhoods. Similarly, the American phenomena of "white flight" (from the inner city to the suburbs), "redlining" (the bank practice of refusing to lend to owners in certain areas), ghettos, and racial issues finding
expression in communities of place, such as neighbourhoods, did not surface in the case study. These are undoubtedly part of the context for the Policy's formation, but they are by and large not part of the Canadian urban experience.

The Seattle policy on neighbourhood planning is a conceptually strong and creative response to the particular challenges of the Seattle planning situation of the time. Built on an apparently difficult dichotomous situation, which it has turned into an asset, it improves democratic functioning through support to neighbourhoods to plan for themselves. Other communities and jurisdictions can develop similar democracy-enhancing power-sharing policies, if they choose to foster community, develop a conducive context, and apply and respond wisely to pressure.

Several principles for neighbourhood and community group involvement in planning, which appear to be transportable to other jurisdictions, arise from the work of this thesis. They fall under the categories of community, context, pressure and policy.

1. Embrace and foster community

Cities will do well to ensure the presence of a number of avenues for citizen participation in local governance, including some through involvement of neighbourhood and community organizations. Neighbourhood organizations, and other kinds of
community organizations, for their part must be present and vibrant for their participation to have impact. People in neighbourhoods and other communities can organize, gain skills and experience, and develop leadership and procedures which are representative of the diversity they encompass. The organizations they form need depth and capacity, and some need financial and technical support, including support for a system or network, to be effective. Wise local government planning will recognize the legitimacy of these groups and of the involvement of some of them in planning and governance, through ensuring provision of funding and technical support and resourcing to them.

2. Create a conducive context

Though a number of factors in the creation of a conducive local government context are beyond the immediate reach of community and city action (such as direct influence on senior government policy, spending or legislation, or on historical and sociological facts), development of trust, attitudinal openness at city hall, and community organization readiness are within the spheres of local government and community group influence. Citizens can elect local government leaders who are aware of and sensitive to community groups' needs and aspirations. Elected leaders can search for and appoint senior staff with this same capacity. These two parties can together organize local
government operations to reflect and encourage a citizenry active as individuals and in community organizations. To do this, local government structures and procedures, including those involved in planning, can be re-oriented to communities, and away from "bureaus."

Local governments can also develop and introduce programs and policies which support neighbourhood and community organizations, through funding and technical assistance and through community group involvement. Both local government and community organizations can strive for communication and openness in order to foster trust in the relationship they develop.

3. Press for change

Neighbourhood and community groups, to bring about policies which share power with them, must learn to demonstrate their worthiness, along with presentation of their demands. They can continue to identify needs and issues, assess resources, develop proposals for action, including action by local and senior governments, and to present and press these with appropriate parties. Governments and other responsible parties must in turn be prepared to listen and respond.

Individuals, organizations and all levels of government can press for legislated or other meaningful requirements for contextually appropriate citizen involvement. This is
particularly so in planning activity. Activity of all descriptions which ensues between communities and governments will progress more quickly and be more effective if both parties learn to value inclusiveness and seek balance.

4. Plan inclusively and realistically

Though absolute citizen control is not possible, meaningful involvement of community and neighbourhood organizations is possible. To give credibility to power-sharing policies and processes, governments need to endow these with force, either through legislation, or through formal and public articulation of the policy. Communities in their turn must accept that there will be boundaries, though these should be subject to negotiation, and clearly articulated. Communities and governments must both strive for inclusiveness and balance in their planning policy and practice.

Though there are obvious benefits available to local governments which choose to support power-sharing policies, unquestionably there are costs associated as well. In addition to the challenges of identifying sources of support for community and neighbourhood organizations, Berry, Portney and Thomson noted in their research that civic administrators found delay to be a consequence and sizeable detracting factor. Yet the same administrators "overwhelmingly felt that the benefits
outweighed the costs" (213). For Berry, Portney and Thomson, the greatest benefit, however, lay in the value rendered to governments which strive for increased democracy, but often find it beyond their grasp:

Government programs will always be the subject of intense scrutiny and frequent criticism from many community sectors. In a functioning democracy, such scrutiny is essential. But participation can lead to greater mutual understanding among citizens and between citizens and their leaders. It can lead to greater appreciation of the limitations and potential of government. Above all, it can encourage and nurture cooperative efforts to address community concerns ... (255).

A policy on neighbourhood planning allows local government to direct local group-led neighbourhood planning so that it is consistent with citywide needs, including those of achieving broad societal goals and addressing difficult issues which function at a scale larger than that of the neighbourhood or local area. Power-sharing within the policy allows neighbourhoods to participate meaningfully to influence the process and final product. If instituted within a contained and supported system to ensure balance, and if adequately resourced, power-sharing neighbourhood planning policies can render immense value.
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N.B. Though interviewees' affiliations are noted, people were asked to speak only on behalf of themselves.
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Chair  
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Mr. Tim St. Clair  
Staff Writer  
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Mr. Jim Street  
Member, Seattle City Council and Council President  
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Mr. J. Patrick Strosahl  
Vice-President  
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member of the City of Seattle Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee and the Seattle Neighborhood Coalition  

Ms. Caroline Tobin  
previously an independent planning consultant; currently serving on the Seattle Landmark Preservation Board as a historian representative  
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Past Chair  
Queen Anne Community Council  
member of the City of Seattle Planning Commission and City of Seattle Design Review Board, and original Queen Anne-Magnolia District Council Chair  

Mr. Tayloe Washburn  
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Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce Task Force on the Implementation of the Growth Management Act  
Head of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan Review Committee
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* * * * *
INTERVIEW DOCUMENTATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

An introductory letter about the researcher and the project was mailed, or sometimes faxed and mailed, to each potential interviewee. (A sample introductory letter is provided in Appendix C.) A follow-up telephone call to each potential interviewee provided an opportunity to discuss the project and interview, and once agreement to participate was granted, to arrange an interview.

A "Consent to Participate" form outlining interview expectations was sent to potential interviewees (a sample is provided in Appendix D). It provided a forum for discussion of any concerns surrounding data collection or use. People who agreed to be interviewed signed and returned the form.

Interviews were of approximately an hour's duration in most cases. Four interviews were completed in person, and ten by telephone, between July and October, 1995. All interviews were tape recorded. As well, hand-written notes were taken to capture key elements of responses, and to identify location of particular responses on the tape recording. A list of those people approached is provided in Appendix A.

The Interview Guide for this research was organized to allow interviewees to start with discussion of their personal involvement with the Policy's introduction, and to identify a
point in time they considered to be the beginning of neighbourhood planning for Seattle. (Two interviews requiring completion within thirty minutes rather than the sixty minutes the Guide was designed for omitted this starting point.) Subsequent questions were arranged to move from the general to the specific and from open-ended to closed, with more difficult issues usually arising last.

* * * * *
INTRODUCTORY LETTER

Dear,

I am a graduate student in the Masters Program at the School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP) at the University of British Columbia (UBC). For my thesis I am researching the introduction of neighbourhood-led planning in Seattle. I am interested in the factors which lead local governments to formally and officially support neighbourhood planning, and will be looking at how this aspect of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan came into existence. I am conducting interviews with key informants involved with the introduction of this policy, and on the suggestion of __________, would like to interview you about this.

I will be conducting this set of interviews by telephone, in late September, and would like to arrange a telephone interview appointment with you, of approximately one hour. In the interim, you will note that among the attachments to this letter is a Consent Form, which describes the involvement requested of participants in interviews for this project.

This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Alan F. J. Artibise, Professor in the School of Planning (SCARP) at UBC. Dr. Artibise can be contacted by telephone at (604) 822-2388, or at the University address given above.

As the primary data for this thesis will be gathered in these interviews, I am relying on the involvement and assistance of key players such as yourself. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me either by telephone at (604) 254-7324, or at my Wall Street address above left, or by e-mail at kenyon@unixg.ubc.ca.

I do hope you can participate. I will be telephoning you in the near future regarding an appointment.

Yours truly,

* * * * *
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

I, ________________________________________

agree to participate in the research being carried out by Susan Hollick-Kenyon, Graduate Student, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, on neighbourhood-led planning in Seattle.

I understand that interviews may be tape-recorded.

I understand the contents of the interview as well as documents and other material provided are to form the research data, and that they may be quoted and reproduced in the thesis or other reports.

I understand that comments made by me may be attributed to me.

Signature ________________________________________

Date ________________________________________

* * * * *
Appendices

Appendix E

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Introductory: At the genesis, or conception or beginning of neighbourhood planning, where were you and when was that?

Preamble: I'm interested in identifying the factors which led to and/or allowed Seattle to formally introduce neighbourhood planning (sharing certain decision-making powers with neighbourhood groups and provision of resources to them to plan).

1. What was it about Seattle, what was important about Seattle then that led to introduction of neighbourhood planning in Seattle -- what factors brought Seattle to introduce this as an official policy? [general]

2. I've heard that Seattle already had a large number of neighbourhood organizations, considered by some to be exceptionally powerful. [history of effective neighbourhood action] Is this so?

If so, how has their presence and power or effectiveness influenced the introduction of this policy?

3. Under this policy, the City retains certain authorities, and shares other powers with neighbourhoods. [power-sharing]

How did the City come to be prepared to share power in this way, come to have such an idea in terms of neighbourhood groups?

4. Some people say the next important move in planning is to work at the small scale or local level, and to bring balance among region/city and smaller scale/local/neighbourhood. [scale and locus of decision-making; balance between city/region & neighbourhood/local].

How do you see this kind of thinking or idea played out in the Seattle context?

5. For what kinds of issues is neighbourhood planning not appropriate?

* * * * *
CHECKLIST

Which of these played a part in the introduction of today's formal policy of neighbourhood planning in Seattle? (please tick)

A __ growth management (or growth management legislation)
B __ belief in citizen participation
C __ history of effective action by neighbourhood organizations
D __ citywide system/structure of neighbourhood organizations
E __ politicians' needs -- distance from difficult decisions or ??
F __ certain key individuals
G __ belief in value/importance of local/neighbourhood level -- in local governance? -- in planning and development? -- in ??
H __ other supportive groups, organizations, departments, etc.
I __ belief this will yield more efficient or effective local government (cheaper administration or ??)
J __ desire to create balance between local and city/region levels
K __ interest in "community development"
L __ belief in democracy and functioning democratically
M __ bureaucrats
N __ interest in neighbourhood character, or heritage
O __ concerns with residential or other density
P __ concern with economic growth or economic development
Q ___ voter satisfaction
R ___ other:__________________
S ___ other:__________________

* * * * *
HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOODS, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING FUND, THROUGH TO ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING POLICY

Verbatim comments from the interview with Jim Diers

[The Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program] was largely in response to some real interest by a couple of Council members, but also a very strong pressure from neighbourhood organizations, that were really feeling impacted by growth. ... There were [issues of] scale with the neighbourhood, and increased traffic problems, parking, and so neighbourhood groups were really becoming revitalized, and new groups were forming around these growth issues, and were always coming down to City Council fighting one project after another. And I think both the City and neighbourhoods said, there's got to be a better way to do this. And the solution was neighbourhood planning.

Instead of being reactive and fighting projects after they were already sort of in the works, why not involve neighbourhoods at the front end in planning for growth and in determining how best to accommodate growth in the neighbourhood: where it should be, what it should look like, that kind of thing. So the City, through the Planning Commission, went and looked at other cities' models for neighbourhoods planning, in places like St. Paul, Portland, Atlanta, San Diego, a number of cities. And based on that, the Planning Commission and
consultants wrote up some recommendations for a Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program in Seattle, which was then approved.

And it had lots of components to it. And frankly, I came from a background of community organizing, and was not that enamoured with planning. It seemed like planning was something that was done to communities and that communities often had very little say in. It was primarily a planner downtown who did the planning. And there usually wasn’t a lot of ownership of that plan except by that planner, and as a result nothing much ever happened with plans, and if it did, it wasn’t always favourable to the neighbourhood ....

[T]he common theme across all these neighbourhoods was they wanted more attention to neighbourhoods, and greater access to city government. So the scope of the Program was greatly enlarged and called the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program, to reflect those other pieces. My initial concern was, yeah, we can have all these programs out there, we can be doing neighbourhood planning, getting money out to neighbourhoods, which was another big piece of the Program, but if neighbourhoods aren’t organized, they can’t take advantage of this. And the problem I thought at that time was that the neighbourhoods with the greatest needs tended to be the least organized. So rather than focus on neighbourhood planning initially, we focused a lot more on community organizing, and helping organize primarily low income neighbourhoods, but also
providing some training and assistance to other neighbourhood groups as well. Because all of them had a need to become more broadly based. And we did a lot of community organizing, leadership development....

Another Program we had is called the Neighborhood Matching Fund, that made about a million and a half dollars a year available to neighbourhood organizations for neighbourhood-initiated projects. And we've been doing that for seven years now, and we fund over a hundred projects each year. And those are projects in which the neighbourhoods have, projects that have been a priority for the neighbourhoods, but not necessarily for the City. So, the idea is that the City meets the neighbourhood half way, it's a matching program. We match with cash the neighbourhoods' contribution, and that could be cash, but more frequently it's volunteer time or donated goods or services, or some combination of those. And through that neighbourhoods will build playgrounds, for example, ... or people plant street trees in their neighbourhood, or build a new park or piece of public art, or renovate a facility, or sometimes do non-physical projects, like do an oral history of the neighbourhood.

And the Neighbourhood Matching Fund really became the vehicle then for doing neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood planning was not a priority for the City. We didn't have like separate resources devoted to neighbourhood planning....
And I got very excited about neighbourhood planning because of my experience with the Matching Fund. And I think the difference between the plans that were done through the Matching Fund and plans that I had been used to, that had been called neighbourhood plans, were that, one: they were initiated by the neighbourhoods, and not by the City; ... secondly: neighbourhoods defined the planning areas, they defined their own boundaries; third: they defined their own scope of work, and they defined what their issues were; and fourth: they hired their own planner, outside the City, they could hire whoever they wanted; and fifth: there was the match requirement....

So, there was an incredible investment by the community in those planning efforts, in terms of from the very early stages, just kind of thinking through what it was they wanted to plan and what kind of expertise they needed. To doing the process to apply for a Matching Fund, hire a consultant, work with them to do surveys, to do needs assessments, resource inventories. And then just a lot of the work all the way through the process, you know, of laying out the vision, of putting together an action plan, and because of that incredible community involvement there was real community ownership by the end of the process. When the planning was done, it was really the community's....

So when the Southeast Plan was done, for example, it wasn't a planner presenting it to City Council, there were 300 people there presenting it to City Council. And it really makes sure, it helps hold the City accountable for action....
But I think also we learned that because there is so much community ownership, that the community also takes a lot of responsibility for implementing the plan. And that there's a lot of things the community can do that the City is not in a position to do, either because the City lacks the resources or lacks the authority. And neighbourhoods, for example, in Southeast Seattle, they went after some slum landlords, and got one to tear down some problem taverns the City had never been able to shut down.... And then went after the adjacent grocery store to totally redevelop the store and expand into that area, to make a real asset for the neighbourhood. Or they developed community school programs, where the schools are open at night for community use, or they dealt with the graffiti problem.... They did all kinds of things to revitalize that neighbourhood, and it all started with that plan. So, that became, it was almost like an organizing tool....

Although, there's always been this feeling that the community shouldn't have to match, that you shouldn't have to use the Neighborhood Matching Fund for this, that neighbourhood planning really should be a City priority. And so that's sort of been an ongoing theme. And I think when the City did the Comprehensive Plan, realized it would never be able to do a plan at the citywide level that would have broad ownership in the neighbourhoods. And because the neighbourhoods are so important to Seattle, and because distinctive character is so important, that by definition you can't write a comprehensive, a citywide
comprehensive plan, because you can't write a plan that will work for all neighbourhoods. Each one is different. And basically a comprehensive plan will be the framework, then, for more detailed planning at the neighbourhood level. So neighbourhood planning was written in as a key component of our Comprehensive Plan, that that would be the next stage of planning. So those are kind of all threads that led to the current neighbourhood planning program. It was the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance resolution from seven years ago, it was the Comprehensive Plan that started about four years ago, and that had a commitment to neighbourhood planning, and then finally when that Plan was done last year, we started talking about what, now we have these resources that we can shift from comprehensive planning to neighbourhood planning, and what should that program look like.

* * * * *
1980'S LAND-USE REZONING, AND CAP INITIATIVE

Verbatim comments from the interview with Jim Street

[A]round 1980 or so, the City Council made a decision to review all of the zoning of the entire City and to rezone the entire City. And they made a very conscious decision, which was greatly resented by many neighbourhoods, to basically stop doing neighbourhood planning at that time and to start the rezoning effort. And from that time on, that's where the effort went, for the next ten years. And the way in which they decided to rezone the City was sort of one zone at a time. So they did single-family neighbourhoods first, multi-family neighbourhoods, neighbourhood commercial areas, industrial areas, and Downtown. Downtown was the only area they did as a whole. That also was a source of ongoing dispute and irritation, because I think with some validity, people said 'you should look at ... a neighbourhood holistically and see that it's a combination of more than one kind of zoning and that those all inter-relate to each other.' ... We spent most of the '80's in that process and in fact completed most of the zoning for the City by the end of the '80's.

Then we had a revolt, in the form of the so-called CAP Initiative in '89 which was a citizen initiative to overturn the Downtown Plan.... [T]he political symbolism of that was very significant because ... that set in motion, even within the City
before anything happened at the State level on growth management, a sort of commitment to do a better job of looking at the inter-relationships between Downtown and neighbourhoods and so forth.

* * * * *
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