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Abstract

Over the past several decades, home based work has grown to comprise a significant and varied form of work in Canada, which is expected to increase in the future. This phenomenon represents a dramatic departure from the separation of home and work place which has dominated the socio-spatial composition of our cities and suburbs for much of this century, and suggests significant implications for municipal planning. Using both a literature review and qualitative analysis of current and past planning practices in seven municipalities within the GVRD, this research explores those implications and the corresponding municipal planning response.

Findings from the literature reveal that home based work is not only the outcome of changing socio-economic trends, but also a reflection of social norms, hierarchies and values, which present both issues and opportunities for social well being, transportation planning, residential quality of neighbourhoods, and economic development. Potential municipal responses are multi-faceted and complementary, and focus on the creation of mixed use neighbourhoods, community economic development initiatives, and a supportive regulatory environment for home based work.

Actual practices in municipalities within the GVRD reveal that while some municipalities are moving towards such responses in their plans, policies and regulations, others continue to ignore or constrain home based work. Analysis of these differences suggests a clear link between initiatives associated with home based work and broader community goals and objectives for economic development, reduced automobile use, and the creation of more complete communities that meet diverse needs and interest. Individual attitudes of local planners and politicians are
also clearly influential, as is the inherent challenge in responding to and implementing processes of change.

Better information about the nature and extent of home based work and its relevance to municipal planning, combined with examples of how other communities are responding, could help facilitate this process of change and contribute to the positive growth and development of home based work to the benefit of individuals, communities and regions.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The social and economic composition of Canadian cities and their urban/suburban regions has undergone profound change over the past several decades into what some have termed a "post-industrial" society. These changes or transformations are characterized by: economic restructuring; global competition and market activity; changes in information, communications and production technologies; and changes in the socio-cultural make-up of our population. The latter includes shifts in demographics, family structure, work patterns and the ethnic make up of our population. Within this changing social and economic fabric, new patterns of activities associated with home and the work place are emerging, including a dramatic rise in home based employment.

Home based work represents a notable departure from the separation of home and work place that began with industrialization and was firmly entrenched in the pattern of development of our cities and regions by the mid twentieth century. This separation was based on the premise that industry and residences were incompatible from both a public health perspective, and an "efficiency" imperative driven by the production and distribution of goods and services.

Feminist scholars argue that this pattern of development also "expressed and reinforced differentiated gender roles" (Sandercook and Forsyth 1992), elevating and separating the male domain of paid work in the public realm above the female domain of unpaid work in the private realm of the home (Moore Milroy 1991). With the growth and expansion of our city regions, the effects of this pattern of development – evident in suburban sprawl, traffic congestion, depletion of natural resources, and social disparity and inequity – have raised questions and concerns about its sustainability from an environmental, quality of life, economic and community development
point of view. In response, planning movements have emerged which focus on the creation of more mixed-use, integrated, complete communities, and have gained prominence in many municipal and regional planning strategies.

From a physical planning perspective, home based work would appear to be an important consideration in such an approach by integrating the home and work place, using the home more efficiently for multiple functions, and keeping people working 'closer to home'. From a socio-economic perspective, home based work has implications for economic development and for community development. It also raises issues and questions around the public/private realm, the informal economy, gendered relationships around home and work, and socio-economic inequities manifest in the nature and place of work. As such, home based work is relevant to municipal planners interested in land use and transportation planning, economic development, and the social well being of communities.

Despite its apparent significance within the context of broader planning movements, and in its own right, research conducted to date indicates that the municipal planning response to home based work in Canada has been largely limited to highly restrictive and often poorly drafted zoning bylaws and business licensing regulations. Not only has this response failed to provide a supportive regulatory context for home based work, it fails to address the broader implications of home based work from a local and regional perspective and its importance in the context of shifts in planning practice. This situation has been attributed, in part, to home based work being a relatively new phenomenon. As such, there has been little reliable data on home based work, and fairly limited planning literature. Municipal administrators may not be well informed about the nature and extent of home based work in their communities, and may lack adequate tools and
resources to respond accordingly. It may also represent the fact that attitudes and practices take time to change. One would certainly expect, however, that with continued growth in home based work in the context of larger transformations in the way we live and work, change will come such that where once home based work fell into “a gray area of planning” and “just didn’t fit,” (AKD 1991; Orser and Foster 1992), it will be embraced in new approaches to planning which are moving towards a vision of more mixed use communities. The question of how that can and should be done is thus of increasing interest and importance, and is the primary research question for this thesis.

**Organization and Methodology**

A municipal planning response to home based work must be rooted in an understanding of the nature and extent of home based work, and the underlying socio-economic trends and issues that are driving it. To that end, Chapter 2 defines home based work and provides a detailed review of current data on home based work in Canada, looking at the work status, occupational categories, time spent working at home, and the demographic profile of home based workers. Chapter 3 follows with a literature review of the socio-economic trends and issues affecting home based work. These include: economic restructuring; changing labour market characteristics; and changing needs, preferences and norms around work and family life.

Using this information, in combination with the planning literature, Chapter 4 examines the implications of home based work from a municipal planning perspective and identifies ways that municipalities can respond in their plans, policies and programs. Key topic areas include social issues, transportation and energy use, residential quality of neighbourhoods, and economic development. As a whole, it is intended to be viewed as a “guide” to municipal planning for
home based work by discussing the possibilities, and where applicable, the weaknesses inherent in past municipal responses with the aim of providing new directions for the future.

What Chapter 4 does not provide, however, is insight into more recent changes that may (or may not) be occurring in municipal planning approaches to home based work, not yet captured in the literature. This is the focus of Chapter 5. Looking at seven municipalities within the GVRD, it provides a qualitative review of current planning regulations, policies and initiatives related to home based work based on three information sources: zoning bylaws governing home based work; Official Community Plan references to home based work; and telephone discussions with planning staff. It also looks at changes in the municipal planning response to home based work since the early 1990s by comparing these findings to those of a masters thesis completed in 1991 for the UBC School of Community and Regional Planning (Dmitrasinovic). At that time, Dmitrasinovic examined planning practices related to home based work in the same seven municipalities reviewed here. By comparing the findings, the intent is to provide insight into the extent to which municipalities are (or are not) moving towards new planning approaches to home based work that reflect its growing significance and relevance to much larger transformations in the way we use and plan our communities.

Chapter 6 concludes with an overall summary of findings, insights, and recommendations for further research, education and change.
CHAPTER 2 – HOME BASED WORK IN CANADA

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, home based work is defined and its extent and nature in Canada are discussed by looking at various segments by work status and occupational characteristics, time spent working at home, and home worker demographics. Key sources of data are the Place of Work data from Canadian Census (1991, 1996), the Canadian Survey of Work Arrangements (1991, 1995), the Current Population Survey in the United States (1991), and Gurstein’s Survey (1995) of home based workers in Canada. Other findings stem from a general literature review of home based work. It is hoped that by combining the findings described above, a more complete and up to date picture than has been previously available of home based work in Canada will result, and will contribute to more informed conclusions on its potential impacts.

2.2 Definition of Home Based Work

In its broadest sense, home based work can be defined as paid work conducted in the home or from the home by a self employed worker, independent contractor or employee, and includes most types of work found in society (Gurstein 1996). Home based work varies widely in terms of the extent or number of hours per week of work done in or from the home, the type of work, and the occupational status of the home worker. Self-employed professionals consulting out of a home office, employees of a corporation “teleworking” from home, employees bringing work home at night to increase productivity, and piece workers assembling goods in their homes are all examples of various types of home based workers. Added to this variability are differences associated with gender, economic class and race (Gurstein 1996; Leach 1993; Ocran 1993; Boris and Daniels 1989; Christensen 1988b). It logically follows that in evaluating and planning for home based work, it is important that this variability be recognized and understood, and that
home based work not be treated as one homogeneous category (Gurstein 1996; Orser and Foster 1992). To this end, various researchers have broken it down into segments for measurement and evaluation (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995; Deming 1994; Orser and Foster 1992; Christensen 1988b). The following typology was adapted from Gurstein (1995, 1996) and serves as a useful starting point in understanding the various kinds of home based work.

**Teleworker/ Telecommuter** - Works away from an employer’s facility, often in the home part or full time, communicating via telecommunications technology as an employee of a public institution, crown corporation, or private corporation.

**Independent contractor** - Works in the home, part or full time, as a contract employee or piece worker on contract to one company.

**Self-employed consultant** - Works in the home, part or full time, doing consulting work for more than one company or individual.

**Home-based business operator** - Works in the home, part or full time, providing a service or product to a variety of clients or customers.

**Moonlighter** - Works in the home on a part-time basis as a supplemental job in addition to a primary job.

**Occasional homeworker** - Brings work home after work hours from the work place on a frequent to occasional basis. Also referred to by some researchers as “supplementers” (Orser and Foster 1992).

In general discussions on home based work throughout this thesis, these terms will be used as defined above unless otherwise specified. Other breakdowns and classifications of home based work will also be discussed.
2.3 Nature and Extent of Home Based Work

Home based work has existed throughout history, and prior to industrialization, was the dominant work arrangement, primarily in agriculture and cottage industry (Deming 1994). This changed during the nineteenth century with industrialization which required a centralized work site outside of the home to accommodate shared equipment, worker supervision, cooperation, and large scale production. Although home based work continued to exist and in some sectors, such as industrial homework, developed alongside industrialization and the factory system (Boris and Daniels 1989), by the twentieth century the dominant pattern of paid work was separate from the home (Christensen 1988a; Gurstein 1996; Deming 1994). Over the past several decades, this trend has been reversing, as home based work has steadily increased to now represent a significant and highly varied form of work in Canada.

The variability in the types of home based work, combined with the fact that its rise is a relatively recent phenomenon, has made home based work notoriously difficult to define and measure (Orser and Foster 1992; Huws 1990; Gurstein 1996; Dmitrasinovic 1991). Added to this are inconsistencies in people’s willingness to report home based work, as many home based workers are part of the informal or underground economy and are reluctant to report their earnings because they do not want to pay taxes or be found in violation of municipal or other governmental regulations (Gurstein 1996). Not surprisingly then, estimates of the number of home based workers vary considerably, and there is very little consistent longitudinal data available with which to measure trends. Recent estimates of the current number of home based workers in Canada range from anywhere between 1 million to over 2 million workers (Statistics Canada 1998; Gurstein 1996; Orser and Foster 1992).
The most recent and reliable data on home based work in Canada comes from Place of Work Data from the 1996 Census. This indicates that 1.1 million or just over 8 percent of the Canadian workforce use their home as their usual place of work (Statistics Canada 1998). Excluding farm workers, the number is 800,000 or 6 percent of the employed labour force. Of these, over half (475,000) were self-employed. In terms of gender, a slightly higher number of women (443,350) than men (375,275) worked at home (Statistics Canada 1996); this is in contrast to the employed labour force as a whole, where men outnumbered women (Statistics Canada 1998).

Place of Work data from the 1991 Census indicates that five years earlier, the same number of Canadians (1.1 million) reported that they used their home as their usual place of work (Gurstein 1995). This suggests that home based work did not increase over this period, and in fact, may have declined as a percentage of the total workforce; however, Place of Work data from the 1991 and 1996 census cannot be directly compared (Statistics Canada 1998). The questions changed in 1996 to include “no usual place of work” as an option and about 7.6 percent or 1.01 million of the employed labour force chose this option. People who used their home as a base but spent most of their work day at various locations outside of the home may have chosen “no usual place of work” in 1996, whereas in 1991, in the absence of that option, they may have selected their home as their usual place of work (Statistics Canada 1998). Comparing 1991 and 1996 Place of Work data would therefore most likely result in a significant under-estimation of the growth in home based work.

The Survey of Work Arrangements (Statistics Canada 1998) also provides insight into the growth and extent of home-based work in Canada and is a more reliable source of longitudinal data than
the Place of Work data. Not including self-employed workers, the Survey of Work Arrangements found that in 1995 about 1.03 million or 7.5 percent of employed paid workers regularly did some of their work at home during their normal work hours (excluding occasional overtime). In 1991 the figure was 600,000 or 6 percent (Statistics Canada 1998; Gurstein 1995). This indicates a significant increase (30 percent) in home based work among employees during this period.

The Survey of Work Arrangements collects data on self-employed workers separately from employees and indicates that in 1995, 1.13 million self-employed workers operated their business from home (Statistics Canada 1998)\(^1\). When this data on home based self-employed workers is combined with the 1995 data on home based employees, the Survey of Work Arrangements suggests a much higher incidence of home based work than the 1996 Place of Work data cited earlier (2.1 million home based workers in the Survey compared to 1.1 million in the Place of Work data). This can be attributed to the fact that the Survey of Work Arrangements uses a broader definition of home based work (which asked people if they regularly did some of their work at home\(^2\)) than the Place of Work question (which asked people where their usual place of work was) and therefore would capture a greater portion of the total potential home based worker population. There are also problems in separating out “employed” and “self-employed” workers because although some workers may be working at home exclusively as either “employed” or “self-employed” workers, others could be working outside the home and operating a home based business, or working at home as an employee for a company and operating a home-business from home (Gurstein 1995).

---

\(^1\) The number of hours they spent working at home was not measured.

\(^2\) Only 38% of the people who reported work at home in this survey did so ten or more hours per week.
The other major source of Canadian data on home based work comes from research conducted by the Home Based Business Project Committee using data from a 1991 Gallup Poll,\(^3\) and 1981 and 1986 Census Canada information from Revenue Canada T1 returns (Orser and Foster 1992). Using this data, Orser and Foster (1992) estimated that 2.17 million or 23 percent of the total Canadian workforce fit within a broad category of home based workers which includes self-employed part and full time business owners, employees who work at home, and employees who bring work home evenings or weekends.

In addition to the Canadian sources on home based work, data from the United States provides insight into the extent of home-based work in North America. According to the May 1991 Current Population Survey,\(^4\) approximately 20 million non-farm employees in the United States were engaged in some work at home as part of their primary job, representing 18.3 percent of those at work (Deming 1994). Of these, 60 percent were taking work home from the office and were not specifically paid for that work. Of the remaining workers who were compensated for their work at home, most were self-employed.

A summary of findings on the extent of home based work is presented in Table 1. Taken together, the data and literature indicate that although it is difficult to determine exact figures, there is clear evidence that home based work has grown from a virtually unnoticed and

---

\(^3\) The 1991 Gallup Poll surveyed 1040 Canadian adults age 18 and over using a sampling procedure designed to approximate the adult civilian population (Orser and Foster 1992)

\(^4\) The Current Population Survey is a monthly survey of approximately 60,000 households conducted by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in the United States (Deming 1994).
unmeasured phenomenon several decades ago, to a sizable and growing proportion of work that now accounts for anywhere between 1 to 2 million workers in Canada.

### TABLE 1 - EXTENT OF HOME BASED WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research study/source</th>
<th>Definition of home based work used</th>
<th>Total #Home Based Workers</th>
<th>% of work force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *1996 Place of Work Data (Statistics Canada) | paid workers and self-employed workers who usually worked at home *(including farmers)*  
non-farm paid workers and self-employed workers who usually worked at home*  
- paid workers  
- self-employed workers  | 1.09 million  
(25% farmers)  
800,000  
(42%)  
(58%) | 8%  
6% |
| *1991 Place of Work Data (Statistics Canada) | paid workers and self-employed workers who usually worked at home *(including farmers)*  | 1.1 million  
(25% farmers) | 6% |
| 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements (Statistics Canada) | paid workers who regularly did some of their work at home during normal work hours (i.e. excluding occasional overtime)  
self employed workers who operated their business from home  | 1 million  
1.13 million | |
| 1991 Survey of Work Arrangements (Statistics Canada) | employed paid workers who do all or some of their regularly scheduled hours at home  | 600,000  
6% | |
| Home Based Business Project Gallup Poll 1991 (Orser & Foster 1992) | workers involved in home based business activity one day or more per week  
- self-employed part-time business owner;  
- self-employed full-time business owner;  
- employee who works at home;  
- employee who brings work home  | 2.17 million  
540,000 (25%)  
500,000 (23%)  
300,000 (14%)  
850,000 (38%) | 23% |
| U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics Current Population Survey 1991 (Deming 1994) | non-farm employees engaged in some work at home as part of their primary job  
- self employed workers who work at home  
- wage, salary workers who work at home  but are not paid specifically for it  | 20 million  
(28%)  
(10%)  
(61%) | 18.3% |

* NOTE: 1991 and 1996 Place of Work Data are not comparable because changes were made to the questions asked. The Place of Work question was altered in 1996 to include "no usual place of work" as an option.

The following sections provide more detailed discussion on the nature and extent of specific segments of home based work by work status and occupational categories, time spent working at
home, age, education and income of home based workers, and family structure. Gender patterns will be discussed throughout where applicable.

2.3.1 Work Status

Approximately half of all home based work is done by self-employed consultants or business operators (Gurstein 1996; Statistics Canada 1998). The next largest segment is made up of occasional homeworkers (38 percent), followed by independent contractors (11 percent), and a very small proportion of teleworkers (3 percent) (Gurstein 1996).

FIGURE 1

Proportion of Various Types of Home Based Work

- Home Based Entrepreneur 48%
- Occasional Homeworker 38%
- Teleworker 3%
- Independent Contractor 11%

Source: Gurstein 1996

Home-based Entrepreneurs (Self-employed Home Workers)

Gurstein (1996) estimates that 48 percent of home based workers are self-employed consultants and business owners, at least half of whom are engaged in service sector activities. The 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements indicates that approximately 1.13 million or 53% of home based
workers are self-employed (Statistics Canada 1998). Using a more restrictive definition of home based workers, the 1996 Place of Work data found that 475,000 or 58 percent of home based workers were self-employed (Statistics Canada 1998). Self employment overall makes up a significant and growing portion of work in Canada, and is associated with a high propensity towards home based work – 30 percent of all self-employed workers are home based (Statistics Canada 1998).

In terms of gender, the 1996 Place of Work data indicates that almost two-thirds (64 percent) of men who worked at home were self-employed (compared to 12 percent who were self-employed outside the home), and slightly more than half (52 percent) of women who worked at home were self-employed (compared to 5 percent outside the home) (Statistics Canada 1998). These figures indicate that although men were more than twice as likely as women to be self-employed outside the home, they were only slightly more likely than women to be self-employed at home. The rise in self-employment among women in the workforce as a whole has been particularly noticeable in recent years: between 1991 and 1996 the number of self-employed women grew by 27 percent compared to only 11 percent among men, and female “own account” workers (who work for and by themselves) increased 63 percent as opposed to 29 percent among men (Statistics Canada 1998). This may be in part due to the high success rate of businesses owned by women which is double that of businesses owned by men (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994).

5 Occasional home workers would not have been included among those using their home as their “usual place of work.”
Moonlighters, who provide services or products to a variety of clients or customers to generate supplemental income to their primary salary, also fall into this category of home based entrepreneurs, but are difficult to measure because most do not report their income from the work they do at home (Gurstein 1996). Nonetheless, the 1991 Current Population Survey in the U.S. found that about 2.3 million persons reported moonlighting (Deming 1994). This represents about 10 percent of all the non-farm workers in the U.S. who were working at home. Like other home based entrepreneurs, moonlighters were heavily concentrated in white collar jobs in service industries, retail trade, and finance, insurance and real estate (Deming 1994).

*Occasional Home Workers*

Occasional home workers who bring work home after regular hours but are not paid specifically for that work also make up a significant and growing portion (38 percent) of the home based work force (Gurstein 1996). Gurstein (1996:216) notes that “while academics, for example, have traditionally brought work home [after regular hours], this phenomenon is increasing in other sectors as much work now focuses on the creation, distribution, or use of information.”

*Independent Contractors*

Independent contractors comprise approximately 11 percent of the home based work force (Gurstein 1996). Unlike other segments of home based work which are largely an upper-middle class phenomenon, a significant portion of independent contractors are low paid piece workers or “industrial homeworkers” assembling clothing, electronics, toys and other products in their homes often under substandard work conditions⁶ (Ocran 1993; Canadian Council on Social

⁶ "industrial" refers to the manufacturing aspect of the work although data processing at home may also fit into this classification (ILGWU 1993)
Development 1988; Gurstein 1996; International Labour Organisation 1990; Johnson and
Johnson 1982; Harrington 1994). They generally provide their own equipment, and work for one
employer or subcontractor with no guarantee of regular hours, no protection of worker rights, and
no employee benefits (Gurstein 1996; Ocran 1993 and 1996; International Labour Organisation
1990). Industrial homework also differs from other segments in that it is characterized by a
distinct feminization and racialization of the work force (Gurstein 1996). The vast majority of
industrial homeworkers are visible minority women who care for their children at home (Johnson
and Johnson 1982; Ocran 1993 and 1996; Leach 1993; Harrington 1994; International Labour
Organisation 1990). Most industrial homework is part of the invisible or underground economy
and its extent is difficult to determine; however, it is estimated that Canada has approximately
100,000 industrial homeworkers, most of whom work in the garment industry (Ocran 1993 and
1996). A significant rise in industrial homework has been documented in industrialized and
developing countries worldwide over the past two decades (International Labour Organisation
1990; Leach 1993; Johnson and Johnson 1982). Clerical computer homework is also on the rise
and is another segment of low paying, low status independent contracting done primarily by
women (Chamot 1988).

More recently, independent contracting has been occurring among skilled professionals who are
hired by one company for a set period (or contract) on a particular project or task (Gurstein
1996). They may do their work at “mobile workstations” or “flexiplaces” in the client’s office,
or they may use their home as their primary work space, traveling to the client’s office as
required.
Telework/ Telecommuting

Telework or telecommuting is defined as the “use of telecommunications technology to partially or completely replace the commute to and from work” (Mokhtarian 1991:273). Telework is often conducted in the employee’s home, but can also be done from a satellite office or local work centre which some experts feel will eventually become the most popular form (Mokhtarian 1991). Ironically, telework comprises the smallest segment of home based work (3 percent), but has received a significant amount of attention in the popular press and literature, largely due to its association with computer and information technology, and its potential impact on transportation and land use planning (Gurstein 1996; Huws 1990; Handy and Mohktarian 1995). As suggested by Huws (1990), telecommuting “has gripped the public imagination and become for many a symbol of the way in which a future society, making intensive use of information technology, will be radically different from the familiar past” (Huws 1990:xiii). This interest has been particularly intense during major disruptions in access to transportation routes (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995:99); however, private and public sector corporations have been interested in telework for over a decade because of its ability to produce a more mobile, flexible labour force, and reduce overhead costs (Gurstein 1996). Formal telework programs have been initiated by government agencies and private sector corporations in Canada (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994; Treasury Board of Canada 1996), and it is speculated that there may be a significant number of informal telework arrangements as well (Gurstein 1996). Although the total number of teleworkers remains quite small, it is expected that this could grow quite significantly in the future. The U.S. Department of Transportation has predicted that between 5.2 percent and 10.4 percent of the total United States workforce will be telecommuting by 2002 (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995), roughly equivalent to the total home based work force in Canada right now.
The current telework population is predominantly comprised of managers or professionals, but it is anticipated that this will grow to include workers in administrative and secretarial jobs (Gurstein 1996). In fact, some have speculated that in these occupational groups, the potential for telework is as high as 40 percent (Women and Economic Restructuring 1994).

2.3.2 Occupational Categories

On the whole, service sector activities dominate the home based work picture, although as noted earlier, a significant amount of manufacturing takes place among independent contractors (Statistics Canada 1998; Orser and Foster 1992). Top occupational categories include: sales and service; business, finance and administration; and management (see Table 2) (Statistics Canada 1998). Commonly cited occupations in Gurstein’s 1995 survey included: educator; engineer; chartered accountant; lawyer; computer consultant; word processor; designer; and other occupations in communications and research. Other, less frequently cited occupations involved manufacturing and processing of crafts, food and clothing, and retail trade and product sales.

There are some distinct gender differences associated with the occupational categories of home based workers. Data from the 1996 Census indicates that the majority of women fell into one of two broad categories: sales and service; and business, finance and administration. Of the women working in sales and service occupations, almost half worked as baby sitters or nannies, or in early childhood education, and one-fifth worked in sales positions. Of the women working in business, finance or administration, almost two thirds were clerks, bookkeepers and secretaries. This occupational segregation of female home based workers in a limited range of primarily lower status job categories stands in contrast to the more positive recent changes for women in
the workforce as a whole towards a larger number of higher status managerial and professional jobs, and jobs in a broader range of non-traditional fields (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994). It is also markedly different from the occupational profile of male home based workers who are more evenly split among a range of categories: 21 percent were in sales and service occupations; 17 percent were in trades and transport occupations; 17 percent were in management occupations; and 14 percent were in business, finance or administrative occupations (Statistics Canada 1998).

### TABLE 2 - TOP FIVE BROAD OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES AMONG MEN AND WOMEN WHO USUALLY WORK AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - all occupations</td>
<td>443,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and service</td>
<td>159,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, finance and administrative</td>
<td>146,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, culture, recreation</td>
<td>40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>30,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science, education, government, religion</td>
<td>19,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other</td>
<td>45,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Statistics Canada 1996 Place of Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 2

**Top 5 Occupational Categories for Women Working At Home**

- Sales & Service: 37%
- Art, Culture, Rec.: 9%
- Business, Finance, Admin.: 33%
- Mgmt: 7%
- All other: 10%

Source: Statistics Canada 1996 Place of Work Data

### FIGURE 3

**Top 5 Occupational Categories for Men Working at Home**

- Sales & Service: 21%
- Natural & Applied Sciences: 9%
- Business, Finance, Admin.: 14%
- Mgmt: 17%
- Trades, Transport Equip. & related: 17%
- Trains & Oper.: 18%

Source: Statistics Canada 1996 Place of Work Data
2.3.3 Amount of Time Spent Working at Home

Within a broad definition of home based work, the actual amount of time spent working at home can vary considerably, from someone bringing work home a few hours a week in the evenings to someone operating a home based business full-time. Recognizing these differences is important when looking at the potential impact and significance of home based work on individuals and communities (Gurstein 1995).

Data indicate that a significant portion of home based work is conducted on a part time basis. The 1996 Census found that 36 percent of people who used their home as their usual place of work did so less than 30 hours per week (Statistics Canada 1998). This is a much higher rate of part time work than that of the workforce as a whole (14 percent). When broken down by gender, the figures reveal even higher rates of part time work among women: 44 percent of those who worked at home did so on a part time basis compared to 23 percent of men.

The 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements looked at the number of hours spent working at home and found that 62 percent of all paid employees who regularly worked at home during normal work hours did so fewer than 10 hours a week (Statistics Canada 1998). The survey did not measure the number of hours worked at home for the 1.1 million home based business operators.

Gurstein (1995:218) found that over half of the respondents in her survey worked part-time at home, although they often worked at another job location outside the home:

> On average the total number of hours worked per week is over 40 hours reflecting a long work week. A teleworker within the sample works mostly at home, but goes to other locations for meetings, and to confer with superiors and colleagues.
Self-employed consultants and home-based business operators use their home as their base, but often travel to other work locations, visiting clients and associates. Independent contractors almost exclusively work at home, travelling only to deliver completed work and obtain new projects. The profile of home-based workers that emerges from this sample is one where work forms a significant portion of their waking hours, both at home and other working locations.

The high rate of part time work among these home based workers suggests that the long hours that characterize their work week may be attributed to the fact that many reported having a home based occupation supplemental to their primary employment, and were therefore essentially working two jobs. These findings are consistent with data from the 1991 Current Population Survey which indicates that one-third of U.S. home based workers were moonlighting (Deming 1994). The Current Population Survey also compared the number of hours worked at home with the total hours worked to identify the number of people who worked exclusively at home versus those who worked part-time at home and part-time at another location. It found that of the 20 million people who did some work at home, 1.5 million worked exclusively at home and 58 percent of these did so 35 hours or more per week. Women working exclusively at home outnumbered men by 2 to 1.

2.3.4 Age, Education and Income of Home Based Workers

For both men and women, the likelihood of working at home increases with age (Statistics Canada 1998; Deming 1994). As illustrated in Table 3 below, 1996 Place of Work data indicate that 72 percent of women who worked at home were age 35 or older (compared to 58 percent of women in this age group working outside the home) and 77 percent of men who worked at home were 35 or older (compared to 60 percent working outside the home). Of all individuals age 55-64 in the work force, 12 percent of women and 10 percent of men worked at home. Of all individuals age 65 and over in the workforce, 29 percent of women and 23 percent of men
worked at home. This is a considerably higher rate of home based work than that of individuals under age 55 of whom only 7 percent of women and 5 percent of men worked at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3 - MEN AND WOMEN USUALLY WORKING AT HOME BY AGE/SEX (COMPAARED TO THOSE WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME BY AGE/SEX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 25-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 1996 Place of Work Data

Gurstein’s survey (1995:11-12) found similar patterns associated with age, as well as some interesting trends related to education, experience in the work force, and income, which indicate that overall, home based workers are “a mature, highly educated group with a considerable amount of experience in the paid labour force.” “Teleworkers have the most years of education,
while independent contractors appear to have the least” and “the median for the number of years in the paid work force is twenty.” Given this demographic profile, combined with the long work hours common to home based workers, it is not surprising that Gurstein also found they typically have higher incomes than the work force as a whole. It should be noted, however, in most cases, only a portion of this income is derived from their home based work, as many live in dual income households, and/or engage in work outside the home as well (Gurstein 1995). It is also important to note that although, on average, the total income of home based workers may be relatively high, other studies have found that for the actual time spent working at home, they make substantially less per hour than conventional workers doing the same type of job outside of the home, without the advantage of receiving company sponsored benefits (Orser and Foster 1992; Kraut 1988).

There is quite a high rate of home based work among people with physical disabilities (Allen and Wolkowitz 1987; Kraut 1988; International Labour Organization 1990), which is reflected, in part, by the higher rate of home based work among older people. Eight percent of the respondents in Gurstein’s survey (1995) had disabilities.

2.3.5 Family Structure

Both the Current Population Survey (CPS) in the United States (Deming 1994) and Gurstein’s survey (1995) looked at family structure in relation to home based work. Data from the 1991 CPS indicates that 43 percent of home based workers had children under 18 whereas only 38 percent of all persons at work had children under 18 (Deming 1994). This difference is almost entirely attributable to female parents. About 4.4 percent of women in the workforce with children under 18 were home based workers, compared to 2.9 percent of women in the workforce without children under 18, and this figure rises considerably for women with children under 6 at
5.2 percent. In contrast, the proportion of fathers with children under 18 was identical to that for men with no children under age 18 and fathers who are married are actually “less likely to perform home-based work than are married men with no children” (Deming 1994:17-18).
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The 1991 CPS also indicates that “not only were working mothers more likely than fathers to work at home for 8 hours or more per week, they worked longer hours, averaging 17.9 hours per week at home, compared to 10.5 hours per week for men with children” (Deming 1994:18).

Interestingly, single parents are less likely than married ones to work at home, with most of the difference attributable to single female parents (Deming 1994). Among single working men with children under 18 at home, 3.5 percent worked at home. This is just slightly higher than the proportion of men of all marital statuses with children who worked at home (3.2 percent). In contrast, among single working women with children under 18, only 2.1 percent worked at home compared to a rate of 3.5 percent for women of all marital statuses with children who worked at home (3.5 percent) (Deming 1994).
Gurstein’s (1995:11) found that almost half (49 percent) of the home-based workers in her survey lived in a two parent households, 30 percent lived with a spouse without children and 11 percent lived alone. Much smaller proportions lived in one-parent families (5 percent), with relatives (3 percent) or with others (3 percent).

It should be noted that patterns associated with family structure and home based work vary across sub-sectors of home based work. For example, while parents with children at home are just slightly over-represented among persons working at home overall, they are significantly over represented in certain sub-sectors of home based work such as industrial home work (Johnson and Johnson 1982; Ocran 1993 and 1996; Leach 1993; Harrington 1994; International Labour Organisation 1990). This is particularly true for female parents.

2.4 Summary

Home based work is defined as paid work conducted in or from the home by a self-employed worker, independent contractor, or employee. Home based work has increased steadily over the past several decades to now include approximately 1 to 2 million workers in Canada, representing between 7.5 percent and 15 percent of the total work force. The wide range in the estimates of home based work primarily reflects differences in the way that home based work is defined and measured. Lower estimates use a more restrictive definition limited to people using their home as their usual or primary place of work, and higher estimates use a broader definition that also includes people working at home a few hours per week.
Self employment comprises the largest segment of home based work, followed by occasional home workers, independent contractors, and a small proportion of teleworkers. Across these segments, the majority of home based work is in service sector activities, except in independent contracting which includes a significant amount of manufacturing. Much of home based work is conducted at home on a part time basis. Individuals who work at home tend to be older than those working outside the home, have higher levels of education, a greater number of years experience in the workforce, and above average incomes. Individuals living in two parent households are more likely to work at home than are single parents or individuals without children.

There are some notable trends associated with gender and home based work. In contrast to the labour force as a whole, a slightly higher number of women than men work at home. Women are twice as likely as men to work at home on a part-time basis and to work exclusively at home. Married women with children under 18 are more likely than women without children under 18 to be engaged in home based work, whereas married men with or without children at home show no difference in their propensity towards home based work. Independent contracting stands out from other segments of home based work in that it is almost entirely comprised of women. Self-employment is common among both men and women, however, the ratio of self-employed women to men is much higher among home based workers than those working outside the home. Gender differences are also apparent with respect to occupational categories. Women home based workers tend to be segregated into more traditional roles (e.g. in child care and clerical jobs) in few job categories, whereas men are more evenly distributed among a broader range of occupations.
CHAPTER 3 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH HOME BASED WORK

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is comprised of a literature review of socio-economic factors associated with the recent rise in home based work, including economic restructuring, changing labour market characteristics, and changing needs, preferences and norms associated with work and family life.

3.2 Economic Restructuring

The Canadian economy, like that of other developed nations, has undergone a significant transformation over the past several decades, characterized by a structural shift from a resource industry and manufacturing based economy to a service based economy (Coffey 1994). Services now account for over 70 percent of employment in Canada and have been responsible for three quarters of all job growth in the last two decades, including a significant portion of home based work (Coffey 1994; Statistics Canada 1998 and 1996).

Key factors contributing to the rise of the service sector are globalization of markets – associated with removal of trade barriers and improvements in communications technologies – and the rise of the new “information economy” (Coffey 1994; Gertler 1994). In this context, newly industrializing countries are successfully competing in labour intensive mass production.

---

7 As explained by Coffey (1994) "most national accounting frameworks allocate to the service sector all activities not included in the three goods-producing sectors: primary activities (agriculture, fishing, mining etc.), manufacturing and construction." Services can be broken down into: "distributive services such as wholesale and retail trade, communications, transportation and public utilities; producer services such as accounting, legal counsel, management consulting and financial services," and more recently "broader functions related to innovation, information and control"; consumer services such as restaurants, hotels, beauty salons and dry cleaners; not-for-profit services such as health, education and religion; and government services such as public administration and defence." (Coffey 1994:13-14)
industries, while advanced industrialized nations such as Canada have shifted attention to: the substitution of high technology capital for labour in goods producing processes; more flexible, specialized methods of production; and the new "knowledge based industries" in the information economy. These changes in production, combined with increasingly competitive global markets, have resulted in an increase in service sector activity by shifting companies’ attention from physical production to areas of corporate and product planning, research and development, advertising and marketing, and administrative control (Coffey 1994). In addition, across all sectors of the economy, the integration of electronic information and communications technologies into virtually all aspects of work have created enormous demand for new services that support these functions and help firms cope with the increasing amount of information they must process, store and gather (Huws 1990; Coffey 1994).

Advances in telecommunications and information technologies have made it possible for many of these jobs to be done from “almost anywhere” including the home (Gurstein 1996; Pratt 1989; Huws 1990; Christensen 1988). Not surprisingly, many point to the proliferation of the personal computer as a key reason people are working from home:

In the industrial age, you went to a factory because a machine was there. The machine was not portable. In the information age, you are working with portable machines, the computer and the telephone. It is now possible to work at any location at any time. (Pratt 1989:16)

While this is true to a certain extent, in examining the role of technology in home based work, it is important to note that the rise in home based work is occurring across all sectors of the economy, including manufacturing (Gurstein 1996). In fact, although a considerable portion of home based work has been made possible by changes in technology, the underlying reasons why

---

8 Lower wages and less restrictive labour laws give many newly industrializing countries a competitive advantage in
people are working at home are more directly related to corporate strategies for dealing with the increasingly complex, competitive, and changing economic climate associated with economic restructuring, than to technology itself. One of these strategies is that of "flexibility" (Gurstein 1996; Canadian Council on Social Development 1988; Ocran 1993) and, as described by Leach (1993:66) below, home based work is one of its outcomes:

As an employment strategy, flexibility permits companies to circumvent costly and restrictive union contracts, by reducing the numbers of workers employed, introducing multicrafting, and subcontracting (Pinfield and Atkinson, 1988). Through subcontracting and homework, companies can utilize a contingent workforce, always available yet called upon only when needed, which permits short runs and rapid changes in product design and production techniques. This provides them with both functional and numerical flexibility in production and employment (Wood, 1989:2). Workers too are counselled to be flexible in the kind of work they expect to do, willing to accept short-term work contracts and to adopt multiple skills. Worker flexibility, then, is presented as a necessary characteristic of the contemporary labour market.

In their move towards greater flexibility, firms are downsizing their organizational structure, and eliminating many permanent jobs in favour of more flexible low cost contract work. "A 1996 survey of private and public sector organizations indicated that contract work has risen significantly since 1993 and is identified as part of a long term trend. By 1996, 88 percent of respondents had used contract workers – 24 percent reported that they always used workers on contract" (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1997:18). Many of these workers are based out of their homes and work in a wide range of jobs in terms of skills and industries:

While traditionally, independent contractors have been low-paid piece workers, increasingly, independent contracting is occurring for skilled professionals as a result of corporate restructuring. As organizations strive to become more flexible to meet changing market conditions there is an emphasis on downsizing (now called rightsizing) and reorganization of the corporate structure or reengineering (Drucker 1988; Hammer 1990). As part of what is being called the flattening-out of an organization is the loss of middle managers and support staff (Tapscott and Caston 1993). While many of these jobs are being permanently lost, some former mass production industries.
employees are being hired back as independent contractors based in their homes or mobile workstations such as client offices (ILO 1990). (Gurstein 1996:215)

Technology, and office automation in particular, has played a key role in these changing work arrangements facilitating, the “‘unbundling’ or disaggregation of organisational structures by standardising processes, formalising decision making structures and increasing the potential for quantifying and monitoring the performance of individual parts of an organisation (Brusco, 1981)” (Huws 1990:7). This has resulted in “a vertical disintegration of organisations and an increase in the sub-contracting of a wide range of services...” This in turn is part of an overall shift among firms towards the use of externalized inputs and, like flexibility, it is part of a strategy for dealing with a changing economic climate (Coffey 1994; Orser and Foster 1992). For many firms, non-standardization and unpredictability of demand make it economically infeasible to have full service in house staff that deal with the full variation and range of demand for goods or services (Coffey 1994). There are technical and logistical limitations to keeping pace with the rate of change, and firms can often purchase specialized services “outside” less expensively than “inside” due to economies of scale of the specialized firm. There are also economic and organizational advantages in maintaining a small, highly focused pool of human resources with competitive expertise that may deter firms from attempting to provide a full range of services internally.

While many traditional “company” jobs have been lost in this context, there have been new opportunities, particularly for the white collar entrepreneur, to capitalize on the rapid rate of change and respond to the demand for new externalized services (Orser and Foster 1992). This is evident in the dramatic rise in self-employment by new business owners over the past two decades, a significant portion of whom are operating their business from home in service sector
activities. During the five year period between 1991 and 1996, the number of self-employed workers in Canada increased by 28 percent, and this trend is expected to continue in the future (Statistics Canada 1998). A report commissioned in 1997 by the Royal Bank found that the top career choice for Canadians between the ages of 18 and 35 was "entrepreneur" (North Shore News Oct. 12, 1997). The most substantial increases in self-employment were among "own account" workers who work for and by themselves (Statistics Canada 1998), and may be more inclined to work at home than self-employed workers who have employees. Home based business operators "find the home to be a desirable place in which to initiate such a venture because the home office can be written off taxes and the monthly business expenses can be minimized" (Gurstein 1996: 215) while reducing risks associated with a possible failure. Some operate their business from home over the long term, while others use the home as an "incubator" for a new business start-up, and move on to commercial space once a measure of stability has been reached (Orser and Foster 1992).

3.3 Changing Labour Market Characteristics

Although some people may choose home based work out of personal preference (for example, to seize a new business opportunity or to have greater control and autonomy over work), there is evidence that others are engaged in home based work involuntarily in the absence of other work options. The recent rise in home based work across all sectors has occurred during a period of persistent high levels of unemployment (averaging around 10% over the past five years), shrinking real incomes, and declining access to full-time, permanent employment in so called "good jobs" (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1997). "'Downsizing' has

---

9 According to the Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre (1997:13-15) "as job creation has slowed, there has been a marked increase in the number of part time jobs. These jobs tend to pay less, have fewer or no benefits
become an everyday occurrence... As a result, large numbers of workers are likely to find themselves without a steady paycheck. Many try to pick up the pieces by becoming free-lancers of one sort or another, and in many cases their home becomes their workplace” (Frank 1993:16). Home based workers themselves have indicated that one of the reasons they started working at home was that they were unable to find a satisfactory salaried position (Gurstein 1995). Orser and Foster (1992) note that “in the United States, Evans and Leighton find that unemployed workers, lower paid workers and men who have changed jobs many times are more likely to switch to self-employment” and “one place these disenfranchised workers create work is in home-based enterprise” (Orser and Foster 1992:108). Orser and Foster also note that the high rate of home based employment among older workers may reflect the “massive separation from the labour force of older workers due to early retirement” and there is “evidence that older workers, particularly those between 55 and 64, are leaving the labour force involuntarily.” The long work week characteristic of many home based workers, the high percentage of workers engaged in home-based occupations that are supplemental to their primary employment, and the fact that many home based workers make less money than they would in comparable “corporate” positions (Gurstein 1995, 1996; Orser and Foster 1992) also suggest that home based work is part of a strategy to maintain an acceptable level of income in the face of employment constraints. Thus for some, home based work may not be preferable to permanent corporate employment, but rather, preferable to unemployment or inadequate levels of income. Likewise, although the high rate of part-time work among home-based workers may reflect differing needs and priorities, it may also reflect the fact that given various constraints in the labour market, many are having to and less chance of career advancement.” Furthermore, while “part time work may be the result of individual choices” increasingly it reflects “the difficulty of finding a full time job.” “This suggests a level of underemployment in addition to official unemployment figures and highlights again the concerns about the ability of the economy to provide economic security for Canadians.” There has also been a marked increase in temporary contract jobs,
accept involuntary part time work at home as an alternative to no work at all (Canadian Council on Social Development 1988).

Historically, an increase in *industrial* homework has been documented in association with periods of economic decline or significant change, and a rise in unemployment and poverty (Johnson and Johnson 1982; Mitter and Rowbotham 1994). In addition to enabling employers to cut overhead and wages and therefore overall costs, homework serves as a means of generating income among workers who face constraints in the formal labour market, often linked to gender, race, class, and citizenship status (Ocran 1993; Johnson and Johnson, 1982). These constraints are, not surprisingly, exacerbated during times of high unemployment when more and more people compete for fewer jobs (Leach 1993).11

Another characteristic of the labour market in recent years is the continuing rise in female participation: “over the past three decades, one of the most important demographic developments has been the rapid entry of women into the labour force... by 1981 women’s participation rate

---

10 Studies indicate that the predominance of immigrant female labour in industrial homework is related to lack of affordable child care and exclusion from the formal labour market on the basis of citizenship, sex, language skills, and/or ethnicity regardless of experience (length of time in the labour market) and comparative education. Other reasons for choosing industrial homework are that: 1) more money can be made by using all members of the family to do the homework, even if they are employed elsewhere during the day; and 2) profound insecurity among older immigrant women about moving outside their ethnic environment: by doing homework they can often liaise directly with a home worker subcontractor person of their same ethnic background. (Ocran 1993)

11 Manufacturing in Canada has been in decline since the 1970s as a result of trade liberalization under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades. This decline was exacerbated by the recession of the early 1980s which led to more layoffs and high levels of unemployment. Even after the recession, the Free Trade Agreement between the United States and Canada maintained the pressure on the Canadian manufacturing sector, and is commonly blamed for plant closures since 1988. Between 1963 and 1986, the number of unionized workers in the clothing and textile industry dropped from 71,968 (1963) to 15,806 (1986) (Statistics Canada 1968 and 1986 as cited by Leach 1993). Since the Free Trade Agreement, many clothing manufacturers are going bankrupt and shutting down and larger than ever numbers of garment workers remain laid off. Many of these workers are taking on industrial homework as their only alternative. (Leach 1993).
was over 53%, and by 1991, 60% of women were in the active labour force... . As a proportion of the total labour force, women have grown from less than 30% thirty years ago, to 45% of the workforce in 1991” (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994:5). This has led to an increasing number of dual income families who may face greater challenges in balancing work and family responsibilities and in finding two jobs in a given location, resulting in a need or desire for alternative work arrangements.

3.4 Changing Needs, Preferences and Norms Around Work and Family Life

In addition to changes in the economy and labour market, there are also changing needs, preferences and norms around work and family life from the individual worker’s perspective which are contributing to the rise in home based work.

Commonly cited reasons for working at home relate primarily to a desire for control over time and space and include convenience, flexible hours, independence, control over work and work environment, and family responsibilities (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992). These reasons reflect a workforce that has different expectations and needs associated with work and family than those of the past.

The first industrial revolution severed the relationship between work and personal life. Symptomatic of the worker as commodity was the fact that factory workers were called “hands,” the parts of their bodies needed for the job. Later, we enforced this separation by building industry and office towers in one area of town, residences in another. The system operated on the expectation that workers would leave their family problems at home and their job problems at work. This expectation was reinforced by a belief in the female domain of the home, and the male domain of the work place - boundaries which were not to be transgressed.

This kind of separation will not continue. Indeed, the close connection among work, health and life is already breaking down barriers between the front door and the office or factory door. (Canadian Council on Social Development 1988)
Not surprisingly, there are clear parallels between the reasons people choose to work at home, and some of the major issues cited by employees for health problems at work. These include "stress due to lack of control at work, increased workloads, new technologies being poorly introduced, poor interpersonal relations, poor boss-subordinate relations, and lack of accommodation of family needs" (Canadian Council on Social Development 1988:22). In this context, more and more workers are opting out of the traditional work place in search of alternate arrangements:

People are clearly going to be seeking work which is more purposeful and which allows for, and indeed affirms, the need to integrate all of life’s elements in the workplace. While there are still plenty of traditional workplaces, it would seem that the days when we ‘punched in’ (either literally or metaphorically) for a specific amount of time and then ‘punched out’ to get on with our real lives are clearly limited. (Cascadia Learning Group 1997:20)

The increased participation of women in the work force and the corresponding rise in dual income families is a key factor in creating these changing needs which have led many to seek home based work. This has been particularly true for women who continue to spend considerably more time on child care and household activities than men (Statistics Canada 1998) and therefore may face greater challenges in managing paid work and family responsibilities. In fact, the link between domestic responsibilities, waged work and female participation in home based work is well documented in the literature (Boris and Daniels 1989; Johnson and Johnson 1982; Christensen 1988a, 1988b; Kraut 1988; Simonson 1988, Gurstein 1995; Gannage 1986; Allen and Wolkowitz 1987).
3.5 Summary

Economic restructuring, characterized by a structural shift from manufacturing to services, is a major factor influencing the rise in home based work. As companies strive to become more "flexible" in response to increased global competition, uncertainty, and change, they are downsizing, "trimming the fat" and searching for ways to respond to changing demand for goods and services by externalizing many of their functions. While many traditional corporate jobs have been lost in this context, there has been a marked increase in independent contract work by former "employees" now working from home, as well as new opportunities in self-employment, particularly in service sector activities. Advances in telecommunications and information technology have played a key role in this process by decentralizing workplace organizational structures, creating new forms of work in the information economy, and enabling people to work from almost anywhere including the home.

Labour market constraints are also key factors in the rise in home based work. These include high levels of unemployment, shrinking real incomes, declining access to full-time permanent employment, and increased competition for jobs. In this economic climate, many workers are creating their own work as independent contractors or self-employed business operators, or are supplementing a job in the formal labour market with home based work. This has affected workers on a broad basis and has given rise to home based work across a range of income levels and occupations. However, specific subsets of home based work, most notably, industrial and clerical homework, are associated with additional constraints faced by workers in accessing employment in the formal labour market on the basis of gender, race, class and/or citizenship status.
Other factors influencing the rise in home based work include: changing needs, preferences and norms around work and family associated with the rise in dual earner families; an uncertain and rapidly changing job market; and new attitudes and expectations associated with work place relationships.
CHAPTER 4 – MUNICIPAL PLANNING IMPLICATIONS OF HOME BASED WORK

4.1 Introduction

Based on the findings from Chapters 2 and 3, combined with a review of the planning literature on home based work, this Chapter examines the planning implications of home based work in terms of social issues, transportation and energy use, residential quality of neighbourhoods, and economic development. Each topic area includes a corresponding discussion of how municipalities could respond to these implications in their plans, policies and practices to encourage the positive aspects of home based work while addressing the negative implications as well. Two areas identified as being particularly relevant to the future growth and development of home based work are discussed in detail at the end of this chapter: Section 4.6 discusses findings from a recent study (Johnson 1997) on “Residentially Based Shared Work Centres” – a concept which came up repeatedly in the literature as holding considerable promise as an alternate work environment for home based workers; Section 4.7 provides nine “Recommendations for a Municipal Regulatory Approach to Home Based Work” – a response to the need, identified throughout the literature, “to achieve more balanced, effective regulations that will deal with new realities” (Bowden 1991). As a whole, this Chapter is intended to be viewed as a guide to municipal planning for home based work. It discusses the possibilities, and where applicable, the weaknesses inherent in past municipal practices with the aim of providing new directions for the future.
4.2 Social Issues

For the individual worker, there are multiple factors which influence the decision to work at home and the impact it has on daily life. From a social planning perspective, clearly, there are different issues associated with the self-employed professional working in a home office compared to a piece worker assembling goods from home. Understanding these differences is important in evaluating the implications of home based work and developing appropriate policies and programs. As noted by Moore Milroy (1991:16): “planners evidently make numerous choices as they decide the details associated with implementing political decisions. To this part of practice, planners bring various models, theories, and understandings that explain particular conditions and provide them with guidelines for handling them.” When planning for home based work, this understanding must be rooted in the full complexity of issues and opportunities which surround it.

Surveys of home based workers identify commonly cited advantages and disadvantages of working at home for individual homeworkers and their families (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1997; Ministry of Supply and Services Canada 1996; Gurstein 1995; Tessier and Lapointe 1994; Orser and Foster 1992).

Advantages include:

- greater flexibility and control over work and family;
- more autonomy and independence over work;
- reduced workplace stress;
- means of supplementing family income; and,
- reduced transportation costs and commuting time.
Disadvantages include:

- difficulty in managing family and work responsibilities;
- difficulty in making a clear distinction between home as work place and home as residence;
- long work hours and difficulty in “turning off” work;
- feelings of isolation due to reduced interaction with colleagues;
- financial and job insecurity;
- lack of self-discipline and motivation;
- lack of professional image;
- reduced pay compared to comparable work done outside the home; and,
- unsatisfactory workspace design.

The relative impact of these advantages and disadvantages for individual workers depends on their unique circumstances. Overall, it appears that for most home based workers, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and home based work is viewed positively (Ministry of Supply and Services Canada 1996; Gurstein 1995; Tessier and Lapointe 1994; Orser and Foster 1992). This is not surprising given that on average, individuals who work at home tend to have higher levels of education and above average incomes, suggesting a relatively high level of choice or autonomy inherent in their decision to work at home. However, the circumstances of specific groups of homeworkers vary and not all have the same degree of choice available. This is evident when looking at issues around women and home based work. It is commonly assumed that because home based work is closely tied to the need to manage paid work and family responsibilities, it is having a positive impact on families and workers. Some have speculated that home based work might actually “unite families” and exert an “egalitarian effect,” “encouraging partners to participate jointly in economic activity, child care and housework”
Similarly, others have concluded that “parents can take a more active role in raising their children. Assuming that ‘the family that works together stays together,’ working out of the home could provide the answer to those who believe action is urgently needed to ‘glue the family unit together again’” (Alberta Municipal Affairs 1985:33). These simplistic assumptions and predictions fail to recognize the different implications of home-based work for men and women and the strain created by trying to manage dual roles through home-based work (Duxbury et al 1992). Underlying the reasons men and women work at home are significant differences in their domestic responsibilities.

Homeworkers choose to work at home because they want flexibility and control over their work life. For female home-based workers with families, this means wanting to have a work life that allows an opportunity to maintain their family responsibilities. For male home-based workers, this means wanting more control over their work and daily schedule than when they worked away from home. (Gurstein 1995:21-22)

Equally revealing are gender differences in the disadvantages cited by men and women of work at home, with women more likely to report difficulty in managing and separating work and family life. These differences are not surprising given that increased female participation in the labour force over the past several decades has not been accompanied by a corresponding shift in traditional domestic responsibilities or an increase in access to affordable childcare (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994; Statistics Canada 1992; Christensen 1988b).

Regarding home-based work specifically, it is important to recognize that contrary to popular belief, rather than making it easier for women to balance dual roles, home-based work can make it more difficult (Duxbury et al 1992; Kraut 1988; Simonson 1988), particularly with respect to childcare responsibilities:

Christensen concluded that when homeworkers “have primary responsibility for child care, they report the combination as isolating and stressful. Furthermore, they express resentment that their hours are defined in response to the demands of their family or employer.” (Costello 1988:144)
Likewise, other studies have found that for women who report that home based work is a positive experience, the availability and quality of alternative child care services are major determinants of their satisfaction (Costello 1988).

Given such findings, home based work should not be viewed as an optimal solution for women trying to manage dual roles associated with work and family. Clearly, further changes in social norms and expectations associated with men's and women's domestic responsibilities are needed if women and men are to enjoy comparable benefits associated with home based work. Adequate access to affordable, quality childcare is also critical and has yet to be realized in Canada:

Canada's labour market policies and social infrastructure have failed to keep pace with today's economic and social realities, especially in relation to women's participation and the needs of working families.

For example, despite the dramatic rise in the number of working mothers with young children, the number of regulated child care spaces remains inadequate. In fact, the gap between the number of children with working mothers and the number of spaces available has grown by 800,000 since 1974. Just 12 percent of children with working mothers are now in regulated child care. (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994B:10)

As described in Chapter 3, another factor influencing the rise in home based work is an overall decline in access to full-time, permanent employment in the formal labour market. In this context, home based work may be the only means for individuals to generate income during difficult economic times. These pressures are being felt across genders; however, there is some evidence that women home based workers are more disadvantaged than men in this regard.

The existence of the homeworking labour force cannot be understood without reference to women's position in the labour-market. For instance, differences in the relative amount and kinds of training received by women and men, the over-concentration of women's work opportunities within a very narrow range of low-paid, often part-time jobs, and the differential impact of unemployment are also part of the explanation. The sexually segregated labour-market is both a reflection of women's unpaid work on behalf of the family as well as a cause of the limited
options open to them. In considering homeworkers’ circumstances we are concerned to show that the presence of dependent children is only one factor among many. (Allen and Wolkowitz 1987: 73-74)

The above findings are consistent with those of Chapter 2 which indicate there is a high rate of part-time work and work in lower status jobs among female home based workers compared to the female workforce as a whole, and compared to the male home based workforce.

The above issues affect women on a broad basis; however, for some, they are compounded by additional constraints associated with economic class, work status, and race. As noted in Chapter 2, industrial homework is one segment of home based work characterized by notoriously poor working conditions and a distinct feminization and racialization of the work force. For these workers, the decision to take on home based work is often the result of childcare and other family responsibilities, combined with “exclusion from the mainstream labour market” due to language barriers, citizenship status, and a devaluing of “non-Canadian (or non-European) work experience and educational credentials” (Ocran 1993:7). Clerical computer work done in the home is associated with similarly poor working conditions (Chamot 1988:172) which are directly linked to homeworkers’ isolation and invisibility in the home, the inadequacy of their legal protection, and their vulnerable position in the labour market (ILO 1990).

The circumstances described above have led to concerns that home based work “will lead to an atomisation of the workforce, bringing with it exploitative practices and a loss of worker protection” (Huws 1990:215). Some feel “it may lead to the development of a dual work force, with a widening gap between professional, managerial and other workers with scarce or easily marketed skills and those with only routine skills to offer who are increasingly likely to be paid on piece-rates and employed on a casual basis” (Huws 1990:215). Issues centre around
“employment standards, health and safety concerns, and legal issues” (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1997), with some critics viewing home based work as “the most extreme example ... of precarious employment” (Dagg & Fudge 1992:25 as cited by Johnson 1997:6).

The high rate of temporary contract work among home based workers is clearly a key issue, given the conditions associated with it:

By their very nature temporary jobs do not provide economic security for the job holder. Temporary workers generally have lower pay and fewer benefits. Many temporary workers may be excluded from employment standards provisions if they are employed less than the minimum period. Temporary employment characterized by periods of non employment can have significant implications for their access to employment insurance. Finally these workers are less likely to receive training that may make them able to get permanent employment. (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1997:18)

Trade unions have raised concerns that “decentralised workers will not be able to organise effectively... which will lead to an erosion of collective bargaining” (Huws 1990:215). There is also the concern that the rise in self-employment and independent contracting will mean a reduction in company subsidized benefits and contributions to major social welfare programs (e.g., social security, health insurance and pension schemes) ultimately resulting in either “a transfer to the taxpayer of welfare costs currently paid for by direct contributions” (Huws 1990:215-216) or a substantial reduction in much needed social services.

**Municipal Planning Implications**

While employment legislation and social services are not the formal responsibility of municipal governments, an awareness of these issues is important in understanding the full implications (long and short term) of home based work which planners and politicians may influence directly or indirectly in their plans and policies and must ultimately address in their communities. There are actions that could be taken at the local level to help address some of the gender issues
described earlier, particularly as they relate to the more marginal forms of home based work.

Moore Milroy (1991:16) sheds some light on this role in her discussion of planning and women’s paid work:

For most women, mainstream paid work is intertwined with domestic work, so selecting employment is a complex arbitrage of time, distance and remuneration cross-cut by motherwork and housework responsibilities. From a planning perspective, the analysis of work is therefore directly linked to the ways in which community institutions and structures influence women’s options for participation outside their homes. It is true that work and community structure are interconnected for men too. But their options for action have almost always been less constrained.

Community institutions and structures include both social services “which greatly influence women’s possibilities for employment” and spatial structures:

Researchers have delved into the experiences of women vis-a-vis aspects of urban form and functions, as they carry on the double responsibilities of domestic and paid work, or as they seek access to work given mobility and time constraints determined by family encumbrances. Key aspects are: residential location; neighbourhood design and services; availability and location of child care services and other aspects of child rearing; transportation; housing design; security of the person; and activity scheduling. (Moore Milroy 1991:19)

In the case of home based workers, as noted by Chamot (1988:174) “in the first place it is essential to provide conditions under which the decision to work at home is truly one of free choice.” Given the predominance of women with childcare responsibilities at home in some segments of home based work, these conditions would include access to affordable childcare. Municipalities could play a role by encouraging cooperative childcare programs at their community centres and other community facilities such as family places, neighbourhood houses or women’s centres which may be associated with municipal facilities, programs and/or funding. Ensuring that zoning by-laws allow for and encourage family and group day care is another consideration.
The predominance of immigrant women in exploitative segments of home based work suggests that work also needs to be done on settlement services targeted to immigrant women. Municipalities could play a role by supporting local multicultural societies in their efforts to provide ESL classes, support groups, and job search programs for immigrant women who may have better access to employment alternatives as a result. They could also support initiatives directed at making other community based services more accessible to immigrant women.

Municipalities with a significant proportion of lower status industrial or clerical homework may want to initiate or support more extensive programs. Recent literature on industrial homework indicates that multifaceted programs designed to empower homeworkers by addressing a wide range of needs represents a significant direction in addressing the exploitative and marginalizing conditions surrounding it. Such programs are usually aimed at organizing homeworkers through collectives, centres or other organizing means and "contain elements of research, leadership and technical training, consciousness raising and information sharing. They help homeworkers in their dealing with legal, government (local and central), educational, economic and social institutions and with trade unions, and provide advice on a range of employment related issues, legal rights, social security, health and child care" (ILO 1990:52). In Poland, more than 50,000 disabled homeworkers, representing over 28 percent of the total, were organised in this way (ILO 1990:53). These programs have resulted in improved conditions of work, higher levels of income, increased individual and collective confidence and dignity, access to credit through loans and banking facilities, acquisition of new skills and better employment prospects among home workers.
Many of these programs are organized around homeworker centres. “These centres have been established formally in different cities in the United Kingdom and Holland and informally in many other developing and industrialized countries” (Harrington 1994:83). Homeworker centres provide an alternative environment in which to conduct work previously done at home and/or meet other needs as described above. They can be very small scale (e.g. a co-operative initiated out of someone’s home), larger scale (e.g. at the level of a women’s centre) or anywhere in between. The best programs are “characterised by the adoption of a decentralised and participative approach,” (ILO 1990:58) and the development of facilities has “generally been the result of joint efforts by union organizers, homeworker self-help organizations and local and regional governments (Rowbothham 1993)” (Harrington 1994:83). Municipalities could play a role by helping to provide space for a home worker centre in existing facilities such as community centres or other public buildings, facilitating the development process, and providing information and support as needed.

There are other models of homeworker centres similar to that described above, but envisioned more broadly to address a wide range of home workers’ needs (e.g. for opportunities to network, socialize, participate in training programs, share equipment, access childcare, etc.) across a variety of occupational categories. Because of its significance to a wide range of issues and opportunities associated with home based work, Section 4.6 discusses this concept in more detail, focusing primarily on a recent study done by Johnson (1997) for CMHC.

In terms of physical planning, efforts to plan mixed use neighbourhoods where appropriate housing, neighbourhood services and amenities are in close proximity, and linked by flexible public transit and pedestrian routes could also benefit home based workers. Not only would such
neighbourhoods improve access to services and amenities, enabling home based workers to carry out multiple tasks and activities, they may help in alleviating the sense of isolation experienced by workers across all segments of home based work. A home based worker living within walking distance of a coffee shop, stationary or copy store, and/or community centre may be more likely to leave the house to pick up office supplies or do some copying, do household errands, and/or meet a client for a coffee. Municipalities could even zone for live/work units directly adjacent to or above commercial areas. General guidelines for work space designs which may better enable home based workers to separate their work and home lives could also be developed and made available to home based workers and developers alike (for more information on workspace design for home based work see Gurstein1995 and Orser 1993).

4.3 Transportation and Energy Use

One of the perceived benefits of home based work is that it will reduce automobile use, leading to reduced air pollution, energy consumption, congestion and road infrastructure demands. Telework or telecommuting has received the most amount of attention in this regard, primarily because of its direct association with “the use of telecommunications technology to partially or completely replace the commute to and from work” (Mokhtarian 1991:273). Over the years, major disruptions in highway travel have heightened this interest, often resulting in the establishment of new telework programs. For example, the 1994 Los Angeles earthquake, which destroyed much of the freeway system, resulted in the opening of the Sanata Clarita Telework Centre (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995:99). Similarly, a Washington State TV news station recently reported that several major corporations in the Seattle area adopted temporary telework programs over the summer in response to major highway reconstruction over the summer which would have increased the daily commute for some employees from two to four hours.
The Federal Government in the United States has taken an active interest in telecommuting for the above reasons and has initiated numerous research and policy efforts in its favour (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995). The Department of Transportation, Department of Energy, and the Office of Technology Assessment have all published reports on telecommuting in the past decade. The Clean Air Act encourages telecommuting as a trip reduction strategy and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act provides funds for telecommuting programs.

Less research has been done on the transportation and energy implications of telecommuting in Canada, although telecommuting programs have been initiated by the Federal Government. In 1992 the Treasury Board Secretariat introduced the “Telework Pilot Policy” which enabled Public Service employees across the country to work at home; however, the focus was on work and family and the 1996 evaluation report made no mention of transportation implications.

Research conducted on the effects of telecommuting has been fairly conclusive in finding a net benefit in terms of transportation and energy use, although the current and future extent of that benefit remains unclear (Huws 1990; Handy and Moktarian 1995). Earlier predictions regarding the extent to which telecommuting would be adopted have not been realized and some conclusions surrounding its potential benefits have been criticized for having methodological weaknesses (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995; Huws 1990).

In a 1993 study sponsored by the California Energy Commission, Handy and Mokhtarian (1995:107) attempted to assesses how much telecommuting was occurring in California in order to assess it impacts on transportation and energy use. They concluded:
Telecommuting is a sound strategy: studies show that there is significant net benefit from telecommuting in terms of reduced travel, energy use, and emissions. However the effects of telecommuting are complex, differing between the short run and the long run, and many questions about the exact degree to which telecommuting will help solve our transportation problems remain unanswered.

Key variables in evaluating the potential impacts of telecommuting include, not only the total number of people who telecommute, but also whether they do so part-time or full-time, and whether they work at home part of the day and work in the office part of the day, or if they go to the office some days and stay at home on others. Overall, most of the growth in telecommuting has been in part time work and it is anticipated that this trend will continue in the future (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995; Huws 1990). This suggests that on a daily basis, only a portion of the total number of telecommuters would actually be eliminating or reducing their commute. This seems to detract from its significance; however, researchers have pointed out that telecommuting levels vary from place to place and in some areas may be approaching levels of transit use (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995:109). They also note that “while transit use is often stagnant or declining” telecommuting is likely to increase in the future.

In addition to telecommuting, other types of home based work have been considered in terms of their transportation implications. Home based businesses and independent contracting are not generally included in the analysis of the transportation effects of telecommuting because they “do not represent the elimination of commute trips from day to day;” however, “they are of interest to transportation and energy planners because they often represent a long-term substitution of working at home for commuting to a work location” (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995). This is a logical conclusion; however, the actual transportation impacts of self employed consultants, business operators and independent contractors have not been looked at in detail. Gurstein’s survey (1995) produced some general findings suggesting that the frequency of car use may not
be diminished significantly among self employed workers (almost half of those in Gurstein’s survey actually use their car more when they worked at home); however, the total distance traveled for work, household chores and leisure activities is less than when not working at home, and may offer benefits in terms of reduced congestion during peak hours.

Some concerns have also been raised that telework and home based employment could actually lead to decentralization, resulting in increased urban sprawl or “leap frogging of development to rural areas” as telecommunications technologies enable people to move farther and farther away from central cities without feeling the effects of an increased commute (Handy and Mohktarian 1995:108; Gurstein 1996; Huws 1990). There is some evidence that this has occurred in some rural or semi-rural communities; however, the ultimate extent or likelihood of this occurring on a broader scale will largely depend on how local and regional land use policies direct future development. The need and desire for services and amenities will likely also be a factor in preventing widespread decentralization (Huws 1990; Levine 1998). Gurstein’s survey (1995) found that although home based workers appear to have mixed feelings regarding whether they would like to move closer to a city or farther away, generally, accessibility to services was viewed as being important.

**Municipal Planning Implications**

The extent to which telecommuting and home based work are adopted in the future and the transportation and energy implications that result from them will depend on the nature of individual communities and the role that the private and public sectors play in encouraging and supporting it. Handy and Mokhtarian (1995:101) emphasize the important role that planners have in understanding what telecommuting is and how much is going on in order to “evaluate the
ways in which telecommuting can (or can’t) contribute to solving critical problems.” They note that “planners should understand how their work both helps and hinders the progress of telecommuting” and “must anticipate the long term effects of telecommuting on urban form and travel behaviour.” “Land-use policies that allow for continued or accelerated sprawl in metropolitan areas could offset the benefits of telecommuting” and other forms of home based work, while those policies that “encourage infill, mixed use, and higher density development could help to preserve the benefits” if they are consistent and coordinated at a regional level (Handy and Mokhtarian 1995: 108). If the latter approach was combined with other strategies to actively encourage home based work, it is possible that benefits could be gained in terms of reduced automobile and energy use among home based workers. Nonetheless the effects that this will have on regional transportation demand are unclear. Some have speculated that those spaces “freed up” on the road infrastructure system will simply be replaced by new commuters, but do acknowledge that such alternatives may enhance household choice in favour of reduced automobile use which clearly could reduce the road infrastructure required to service greater numbers of people over the long term (Levine 1998).

4.4 Residential Quality of Neighbourhoods

One of the concerns about home based work is that it will negatively impact the quality of residential neighbourhoods by introducing commercial or industrial activities which will create noise, odour, parking, traffic and other problems to the detriment of the peaceful enjoyment of the residential setting (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Butler 1988; Alberta Municipal Affairs 1985).
A number of past surveys of municipal officials on the impact of home based work in their community indicate that complaints are received from neighbours regarding these issues. Bowden's (1991:55) survey of 112 municipalities in B.C. found that 78 percent had received complaints about home occupations, most of which came from neighbours regarding noise, appearance and traffic. Alberta's survey (1985) of 158 municipalities generated similar findings. However, these findings do not indicate the total extent and validity of the complaints. "Few departments systematically monitor citizen concerns to differentiate between isolated neighbourhood incidents and chronic problems associated with certain home occupations" (Orser and Foster 1992:23) and some research suggests that in terms of total numbers, "very few complaints are received by municipalities about the operation of home occupations" (Dmitrasinovic:1991:61). Of those, the most common are related to use of vehicles, parking problems and the outside storage of equipment. This is consistent with findings from Chapter 2 which indicate that the majority of home occupations are in service sector activities which are not likely to generate noticeable impacts in terms of noise and odours, although they may create some problems in terms of traffic and parking if clients are visiting homes. It is also consistent with how home based workers themselves perceive their work. Those in Gurstein's survey (1995:47-48) believed their work to be mostly "simple, unobtrusive activities" of "a non-toxic, non-hazardous nature" which have little impact on neighbours. Furthermore, the smaller number of more serious complaints can typically be "grouped into industry specific or chronic problem areas" in construction contracting, landscaping and automobile operations which make up a small proportion of all home based work activity (Orser and Foster 1992:26).

There has been speculation that home based work could actually have a positive impact on the quality of residential neighbourhoods, by increasing daytime activity and social interaction,
thereby contributing to increased safety with more “eyes on the street” and an enhanced sense of community and neighbourhood ties (Huws 1990:217; Gurstein 1995; Johnson 1997). However, while there is some evidence that home based workers “notice what is happening on their street more than when they are not working at home or before they worked at home” (Gurstein 1995:42), general findings from the literature regarding impacts on community activity are less conclusive (Huws 1990). There is, however, evidence to support the proposition that with more time and easier access to activities and services among home based workers, there is potential for enhanced community use, even if it is not yet being realized to a significant degree in existing neighbourhoods (Gurstein 1995). As suggested by Huws (1990:217-218) in her discussion of telework and community structure, rather than viewing home based work as the answer or solution to a more active and close knit community, it might be more appropriately viewed as a “facilitator” of tendencies within the community in which it exists: it may contribute to community life in a neighbourhood which is pedestrian oriented, has local neighbourhood services close to diverse housing types, good public transit, amenities, etc., or it may have little or no effect on community life in neighbourhoods which do not offer those features.

Looking beyond the effects of home based work which occurs in traditional residential settings, there are new forms of housing and work space options such as cohousing and neighbourhood work centres that hold promise for community building. Johnson (1997:3) identifies “the search for community” in North America as an emerging trend which is leading to growing interest among residents, developers and planners for alternatives to single use residential environments. Cohousing is one alternative which “involves residents in the design and management of communities that combine private living space with shared, communities facilities” and often includes shared work spaces for residents (Johnson 1997: 3). From these and other models of
alternative live/work environments, such as artists’ cooperatives, shared work space offices, corporate telework centres, etc., the concept of the neighbourhood work centre has also emerged as an attractive alternative to working exclusively from home (Gurstein 1995; Johnson 1997). Johnson (1997:5) notes that “the residentially-based workcentre is a construct that is part way between a home office and a well-resourced corporate office. We can envision it as something like a satellite work centre in a neighbourhood environment.” By providing a work environment which is close to yet separate from the home, with services and facilities which support workers’ needs, a neighbourhood work centre may enhance the quality of work life, and contribute a “social dimension” which stems from the “synergy from working in the company of others,” “general feelings of fraternity,” “collegiality” and “networking” opportunities (Johnson 1997:36). In addition to developing ties and networks among those who work in them, others such as people from the broader community who may volunteer or participate in training programs at a centre may also benefit. This concept is discussed further in Section 4.6.

Municipal Planning Implications

From a municipal planning perspective, home based work should be appropriately regulated to preserve residential amenity and ensure that negative impacts on neighbourhoods are mitigated, without unnecessarily restricting home based work (Gurstein 1995; Dmitrasinovic 1991; Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991).

Unfortunately, this balancing act has not had a record of great success in Canada. Municipal regulations governing home based work have been criticized for being overly restrictive on the one hand, and ineffective at addressing problems which do exist on the other (Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Gurstein 1995; Ferrara Conteras Architects 1994). This is generally
attributed to a lack of understanding among municipal administrators of the nature of home based work in their communities, combined with poorly drafted regulations, and a cumbersome and lengthy application process which deters home based workers from even approaching their local governments to inform themselves about the regulations. Municipalities must carefully review their existing policies and administrative practices with the aim to encourage the positive growth and development of home based work in their communities. Specific recommendations for doing so are provided in Section 4.7 on “Recommendations for a Municipal Regulatory Approach to Home Based Work.”

In addition, steps should be taken to encourage the potential benefits of home base work on community life and neighbourhood activity. Community building around home based work could be encouraged by making it easier and more convenient for home based workers to access and use community amenities and services. Purpose built live/work units could be planned close to existing neighbourhood amenities and commercial nodes, and efforts could be made to bring services closer to single use residential neighbourhoods by establishing new pockets of commercial and community services, possibly associated with local schools or community centres. Neighbourhood work centres could also be encouraged in these areas. Improved pedestrian linkages between and through residential communities to access such services might also increase their use among home based workers.

4.5 Economic Development

Over the past decade, home based employment, and in particular home based self employment and small businesses, have been recognized as an important source of job creation and economic growth and renewal (Alberta Municipal Affairs 1985; Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991;
Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994; Cascadia Group 1997; Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. 1998). The Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre (1994) notes that between 1981 and 1990 self employment grew by 29%, a rate twice that of total employment overall (14%). As discussed in Chapter 3, between 1991 and 1996, self employment grew even more rapidly at a rate of 28% in just five years, and this trend is expected to continue into the future (Statistics Canada 1998). In addition to creating jobs, self employment and small businesses are viewed as an important component of economic growth because of their potential to improve economic competitiveness through product and service innovation (Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre 1994). They are also viewed as having a significant role to play in economic renewal and sustainable development rooted in a bottom up model of community economic development which is in contrast to top down approaches based on local boosterism strategies (Orser and Foster 1992). In this light, small businesses are viewed as an important source of community based employment which emphasizes self-reliance and the use of local resources, and contributes to a diversified economy with inter-industry linkages.

For the above reasons, a number of Federal and Provincial programs were initiated in the early 1990s specifically aimed at supporting home based businesses and self employment. On the national level, the Home Based Business project was initiated as a joint effort of the Entrepreneurship and Small Business Office - Industry, Science and Technology Canada (ISTC), the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and Employment and Immigration Canada (Orser and James 1992). The mandate of the committee included assessing the economic impact of home based businesses and providing guidelines to municipalities for promoting a positive community environment which could enhance home based economic activity. Similar projects have also been initiated at the provincial level. In B.C., the Ministry of Regional and Economic
Development established the Home-Based Business Program in recognition of “the importance of home occupations in providing a training ground for the development of entrepreneurial talent” (Bowden 1991).

Since that time, changes in government and increasing cutbacks to programs have resulted in the elimination of many of these programs; however, their conclusions regarding the importance of home based businesses to local economies remain relevant and many spin off programs developed from them continue to operate today. Non-governmental and governmental reports and studies on local economies continue to emphasize the important role of home based businesses and self-employment in overall economic development, particularly in relation to the important and growing role of service sector activities. In particular, two recent studies on economic enhancement strategies for two areas within the GVRD have emphasized the importance of home based economic activity. “A Human Resources Strategic Plan for the North Shore” (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. 1998:32) included as a key recommendation, the need to “design programs in line with the new economy.” In order to do that, the report recommends:

Programs be geared toward occupations in the growth industries and help train job seekers in the types of skills necessary to find a niche in the new economy. This includes training in self-employment, how to succeed as a contractor (and subcontractor) and the fostering of entrepreneurial skills leading to the creation of SMEs and home-based businesses.

Similarly, a report commissioned for the District of Pitt Meadows entitled “Becoming a Centre of Excellence in the Open Collar Economy: An Economic Enhancement Strategy” (Cascadia Group 1997) emphasizes the importance of focusing on the “new knowledge-based economy” for economic enhancement. To this end, one of the eleven recommendations is to “target the home-based entrepreneur” and “encourage alternative work concepts” such as teleworking.
Notwithstanding, in the midst of all this enthusiasm, there has been some concern that home based businesses could have a negative impact on local economies by posing unfair competition to businesses operating in commercial districts which have higher overhead and generally higher taxes. This, it is feared, will lead to decline in commercial districts. This was the second most common concern cited by municipal officials in surveys on the impact of home based work in their communities conducted in the early 1990s (Bowden 1991; Orser and Foster 1992; Dmitrasinovic 1991). However, these concerns appear to be based on relatively few complaints by local businesses and have not been substantiated on a broader basis. In fact, there is evidence that home based work can actually increase the use of local business services (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992) and represents a large untapped market for numerous goods and services. This was the focus of a recent article in “BC Business” magazine entitled “The Hidden Market” (June 1998:90-91):

Not surprisingly, companies that have traditionally been marketing to companies with offices and Yellow Pages ads are finding the HBB [home based business] market is too significant to be ignored. Shrewd providers of goods and services are discovering the economies of scale may not be there, but nonetheless every HBBer represents an opportunity to make a sale. To the telephone company, it’s communications hardware and services. To a computer manufacturer, it’s the latest PC with all the bells and whistles. Just like their big city cousins, HBBs need desks and office supplies, postage meters and health insurance...

Interestingly, neither of the two more recent reports on economic enhancement strategies discussed earlier (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. 1998 and Cascadia Group 1997) raised any concerns about potentially negative impacts of home based businesses on existing commercial areas. In fact, Roslyn Kunin & Associates (1998:32) recommends that efforts be made “to
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12 The greatest concern is that home based work will have a negative impact on the residential quality of a neighbourhood.
facilitate and stimulate the growth of auxiliary services” to home-based businesses, suggesting that there may be spin off benefits to other business services.

**Municipal Planning Implications**

One of the most obvious and commonly discussed ways in which municipalities can encourage (or discourage) home based work is through their regulations governing home occupations. This is typically done through a combination of zoning by-laws and business licensing (Bowden 1991).

Unfortunately, past studies on home based work have found that overall, the municipal regulatory environment has not been very supportive (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992; Orser 1993; Bowden 1991; Dmitrasinovic 1991). From the home based worker’s perspective, municipal regulations are often overly restrictive, biased, difficult to interpret, do not reflect the nature of their work, require a lengthy and cumbersome application process, and generally offer no incentives for home based workers to seek proper authorization (Gurstein 1995; Orser 1993; Orser and Foster 1992). Rather than supporting home based workers, “the existing regulatory process tends to ‘catch’ the self-employed home workers who elect to obtain a municipal work permit” (Orser and Foster 1992:33):

> From the perspective of a home business proprietor there is no rational or fiscal reason to apply for a municipal business permit other than civil consciousness or fear of reprisal. The concept of reciprocal benefit is lacking in the current planning system. The prevailing corporate culture of planning and development departments is reactive as it fails to act in partnership with home business owners.

As a result, many businesses are forced “to locate in other communities or work underground” and “the benefits of many home businesses are never fully realized” (Bowden 1991:76).
This unsupportive municipal regulatory environment is largely attributed to a lack of information on home based employment and its impacts on the community, and a lack of understanding on how to design effective regulations (Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Ferrara Contreras Architects 1994). Unfortunately, this in turn creates a self-perpetuating problem: home based workers avoid going through the municipal approval process and municipalities lack information that could contribute to more informed and appropriate regulations.

In order "to avoid entrepreneur discouragement and a move toward an underground economy, it is essential to educate municipal leaders and provide them with direction to achieve more balanced, effective regulations that will deal with new realities" (Bowden 1991:94). Service providers and funding agencies need to "partner with municipal governments to streamline bureaucratic procedures facing home-based businesses and make the obtaining of business licenses and other permits more transparent" (Roslyn Kunin & Associates 1998:33). Municipal "staff and Council must review municipal bylaws as they affect home businesses." As part of this effort, they must clearly define those activities which are appropriate in a residential community "and then every effort should be made to ensure that there are no unnecessary legislative constraints" (Cascadia Group 1997:8).

Overall, the aim should be to provide a regulatory environment which avoids unnecessary restrictions and which is appropriate to the nature of home based work in the community, while providing adequate provisions to safeguard against potentially negative impacts on the residential quality of the neighbourhood (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Dmitrasinovic 1991). Numerous recommendations have been made throughout the literature for
achieving this goal and are outlined in detail in Section 4.7, "Recommendations for a Municipal Regulatory Approach to Home Based Work."

In addition to providing an accommodating regulatory environment, there are other ways that municipalities can support home based work. As mentioned earlier, one of these is to actively encourage the development industry to build suitable housing, particularly in areas where it is close to services and amenities often sought by home based workers.

Pitt Meadows has the opportunity to guide the residential development community to a new way of thinking and to a new market opportunity. New developments should have a certain percentage of the homes specifically designed for home offices. Within the development, there should be common area meeting space that can be booked by residents. (Cascadia Group 1997:8)

This process could be aided by providing up to date information on the extent and growth rate of home based work in a given community, combined with design guidelines for housing for home based work (see Gurstein 1995 and Orser 1993). Information packages could also be developed for home based workers that “include business performance standards, provincial small business hot lines, information on G.S.T., R.R.S.P.s, and information on home business associations, discount programs for home proprietors with local retail merchants, etc.” (Orser and Foster 1992:44).

Working to ensure that up to date telecommunications infrastructure is in place within the community is another role that municipalities can play in ensuring a supportive environment for home based work. This was considered an important component of the Pitt Meadows economic enhancement strategy (Cascadia Group 1997:9), particularly in relation to the knowledge based sector:
The one thing that unites home office, small office and alternate work concepts is the need for a sophisticated communications infrastructure. Without enhanced service into the area, no amount of marketing will attract the kinds of knowledge businesses that can fuel economic growth. The District needs to work in conjunction with BC Tel, Rogers Cable and other service providers to ensure that the areas targeted for economic growth have access to state-of-the-art telephone, cable and fibre-optic cable telecommunications.

Numerous researchers have pointed to the need to explore the potential of the neighbourhood work centre as a community economic development strategy associated with home based work (Huws 1990; Gurstein 1995; Cascadia Learning Group 1997; Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. 1998). Located in the residential community close to workers’ homes, neighbourhood work centres:

... can provide a physical, technical and social infrastructure to support work activities and foster community economic development. Such a centre can provide workers - employees and the self-employed - with a variety of support services, including child care centre, fitness facilities, and food service. (Johnson 1997:2)

It should be noted that the broad concept of a work centre can take many forms, and is often referred to in the literature in different ways. For clarification, the terms telework centre or telework satellite office are typically used to describe remote office spaces built or leased by a company in a location that is separate from the head office. This is done in order to provide a work site that is close to employees’ homes. Employees go to the telework centre to work some or all of their work week and they communicate with the central office via telecommunications technology.

A neighbourhood work centre is a broader concept. The defining element is that it is located in a residential neighbourhood setting. It provides shared office spaces or work stations, and resources that can be used by a range of home based workers - teleworkers, self-employed
consultants, independent contractors, etc. – who are looking for an alternative to working exclusively from home. It could be operated as a cooperative, a non-profit society or a private venture.

The term *Homeworker centre* is used primarily in the literature on industrial home work to describe a place where homeworkers can go to work or get support for other needs. These homeworkers are typically working as low status independent contractors under marginal work conditions, and their isolation in the home is viewed as being a key factor in these conditions. The homeworker centre is often developed and organized by homeworkers and is viewed as a source of empowerment that addresses multiple needs.

It should be noted that in recent years, some researchers have used the term telework centre interchangeably with work centre (Johnson 1997; Roslyn Kunin & Associates 1998). This can lead to some confusion but the overall meaning is generally evident in the context of the discussion.

Interestingly, one of the key recommendations in Roslyn Kunin & Associates’s (1998:32) “Human Resources Strategic Plan” for the North Shore was that “efforts should be made to facilitate and stimulate the growth of auxiliary services to home-based businesses such as neighbourhood “[work] centres,” copy and printing shops, and executive offices.” Similarly, the “Economic Enhancement Strategy for Pitt Meadows” (Cascadia Group 1997:9) recommends encouraging “alternative work concepts” for the home based entrepreneur modeled on the teleworker satellite office which gives “employees access to support and telecommunications
services without having to make the trip to the central office.” As noted in Section 4.2 in the discussion on homeworker centres, municipalities could play a role by facilitating zoning changes that would be required to accommodate such facilities, assisting in guiding the development process, contributing land and/or buildings, or providing some start up funding. Local governments could also bring key players from the private and non-profit sectors together to work in partnership to develop a work centre (Johnson 1997). In this context, it is important to recognize that securing funding for both capital and operating expenses is likely to be of critical importance. A significant finding of Johnson’s (1997:36-37) research was that “none of the existing high-tech telework centres is self-sustaining.” Similarly, studies of remote work centres in other countries have found that they “were typically created in response to policy objectives, generally to reduce automobile commuting, to stimulate economic development, or to support research” and consequently, tended “to receive considerable amounts of public funding” (Johnson 1997:11).

Action on any one of the above initiatives would require that home based work was considered part of an economic development strategy or other policy context related to transportation management, community development or social well being. In general, most past surveys of municipalities have found substantial variation in the way home based occupations are perceived in relation to economic development, and in general the municipal response has not been supportive (Bowden 1991; Ferrara Contreras Architects 1994; Dmitrasinovic 1991). Orser and Foster (1992:19-20) found that “within most municipal planning departments, a coordinated effort to stimulate micro/home-based business development is nonexistent” and “while many communities are revising existing by-laws dealing with home-based business, few consider these
businesses as part of the bigger economic canvas. Most development officers and policy analysts are yet to endorse home work as an important contribution and service in the local community.

4.6 Neighbourhood Work Centres

The concept of the neighbourhood work centre has re-emerged throughout the discussions on the municipal planning implications of home based work as holding considerable promise as an alternative work environment, and is cited throughout the literature as a concept which warrants further attention and research. A recent study for CMHC entitled “Beyond the Home Office: An Exploratory Study of the Residentially Based, Shared Telework Centre” (Johnson 1997) did just that, looking specifically at the Canadian context. As this work is considered somewhat ground breaking, some of the key findings and discussion are outlined below.

The residentially based work centre “has its origins in Sweden in the early 1980s” and in simple terms, “locates work stations in the residential community, close to workers’ homes. (Johnson 1997:2). It is “a construct that fits part way between a home office and a well resourced corporate office” with an organizational structure that could vary: it could be part of a housing development, community facility, or satellite office maintained by one or more employers.

The facilities provided by a workcentre might include: reception and message services, computer and telecommunications equipment, meeting and conference rooms. The work centre might also serve as a business incubator, offering fledgling and small businesses technical support, advice, training, and networking opportunities. (Johnson 1997:2)

Although no facilities of this kind currently exist in Canada, Johnson notes that there are other existing models of shared workspaces in Canada which incorporate various elements of the concept. These include: “business incubators which may be funded by public or private sector
sources; formal and informal arrangements for small firms to share workspaces and resources; drop-in or just-in-time office spaces in which employees book office space according to the requirements of a current assignment; artists’ cooperative studios” (Johnson 1997:2).

Johnson’s study involved a case study analysis of 20 shared workspaces of this kind. Also included in the study was a multidisciplinary expert round table to elicit opinion on the feasibility of establishing a residentially-based telework centre, and a public meeting to elicit public reaction to the concept.

Based on her findings, Johnson developed five prototypes of residentially-based shared workspaces. These include:

- High-Tech Suburban Community – a ‘wired’ modestly-sized townhouse development with a community workspace and child care facility located on a greenfield suburban site which would combine individual work areas with common resources;
- Converted Heritage Building – a historic building located that is converted into a wired workplace with Internet access and educational resources provided through a local community college;
- High-rise Condominium with Business Centre – located on the ground floor of a condominium complex, the business centre offers a variety of private offices, conference facilities, workstations and business services on a drop-in basis to condominium residents;
- Strip Mall Telework Centre – converted retail space in a suburban mall adjacent to a residential area for office space with reception/message services and meeting space, and child care service in adjacent premises; and
• Converted House in Residential Area – a large house in which the ground floor is converted to a shared workspace which could offer some business services to the surrounding community as well; the upper floors are the living space for tenants who live and work there.

The discussion on each prototype includes a description on the type of work and users likely to use each facility, typical programming, and the regulatory feasibility of implementing such a project from a local planning authority perspective. Based on participant responses to these concepts, Johnson (1997:35) concluded:

An essential aspect of the telework centre model is its combination of a number of individual workspaces with common resources, either space, equipment, human resources, training opportunities, communications infrastructure, or all of these. The target audience for the facility would be individuals who telecommute on either a full-time or part-time basis. The telework centre located in or near a residential environment offers a number of resources which could make home-based work a more attractive and more productive work option. A telework centre could be utilized on a short-term drop-in basis by many users, or it could provide a longer-term, dedicated workspace for a smaller number of users. The former model would be more appropriate to a facility that was a publicly-funded community resource; the latter model would more appropriately be a live/work facility to be used primarily or exclusively by residents.

In addition to the findings from this study, there is other evidence that such a facility would be supported by current and potential home based workers and teleworkers. A study for CMHC of housing-related attitudes among young families living in Canada’s three largest metropolitan areas by Johnson and Johnson (1995) “probed levels of interest in a shared, equipped office facility that would be available to residents of a housing development” and found “a fair amount of interest in the concept” (Johnson 1997:10). Gurstein’s survey of 400 home based workers also found “a significant number of respondents expressed interest in working either from a neighbourhood telework centre” or “a company’s secondary office located close to employees’ homes” with over one-quarter (27%) of those surveyed showing interest (Gurstein 1995:43).
From a planning perspective, the concept of the work centre fits in well with "renewed interest in the idea of the village" (Johnson 1997:3) evident in neotraditional planning and new urbanism movements which focus on reduced use of the automobile, pedestrian oriented environments, a variety of housing types, and a mix of uses – all intended to promote increased social interaction, enhanced community life and reduced impacts on the land and environment. From a community economic development perspective, the concept fits well with a multi-faceted approach to addressing home worker and community needs, with many spin off benefits in terms of enhanced social, economic and environmental well being.

4.7 Recommendations for a Municipal Regulatory Approach to Home Based Work

Throughout this chapter, the need for improvements to municipal regulations governing home based work has been identified as an important part of an overall strategy for encouraging and supporting home based work, while preserving residential amenity. Common weakness of municipal regulations identified in the literature (Bowden 1991; Orser and Foster 1992; Ferrara Contreras Architects Inc. 1994; Gurstein 1995; Dmitrasinovic 1991) include:

- failing to reflect the nature of home based work in the community;
- being ineffective at addressing problems;
- using vague, confusing and ambiguous language which makes regulations difficult to enforce;
- being biased in favour of "professionals" vs. "non-professionals," and "family" vs. "non-family" workers;
- relying on inflexible, easily outdated, and discriminatory lists of permitted and prohibited uses to control the negative impacts of home based work;
• failing to provide a broader policy context in which home based work is situated; and
• creating a time consuming and complicated process of approval for home based businesses seeking proper authorization.

The following nine recommendations address these problems and could serve as a guide for municipalities developing or revising their regulatory approach to home based work. They are based on a number of studies on municipal regulations governing home based work. Key Canadian sources for this information include: Bowden (1991) – literature review and questionnaire survey of 178 municipalities in B.C. with a response rate of 63%; Orser and Foster (1992) – municipal research study including a literature review and interview survey of 21 Canadian Municipalities; Dmitrasinovic (1991) – masters thesis which included a literature review and interview survey of seven municipalities within the GVRD. One American source is also used (Butler 1988) and is based on an American Planning Association survey of 1100 local planning agencies (response rate of 60%).

1. **Use a diagnostic approach to developing or revising home occupation regulations.**

In order to develop effective regulations, municipalities need to determine the nature and extent of home occupations in their community, identify existing or potential problems and benefits, and develop principles or objectives to be achieved through regulations that directly respond to the former (Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991). “Municipalities should not develop regulatory controls just for control’s sake, but should have a clear understanding as to why they are regulating home occupations” (Bowden 1991:79). Overall, the aim should be to achieve a
balance between encouraging home occupations and the positive aspects of them, and mitigating potential nuisances and disturbances to residential neighbourhoods.

2. Involve home based workers and the broader community, including residents and local business people, in setting objectives and developing or revising regulations.

This is an important part of recommendation #1 and could include the formation of a community based steering committee to guide the process, and/or a community survey or forum on the topic of home based work (Orser and Foster 1992). This would not only help to ensure a balance between the needs of the community and individual home based workers, it would provide the community with a sense of ownership of the by-law that should lead to greater compliance and buy-in (Bowden 1991; Orser and Foster 1992).

3. Incorporate into the zoning bylaw and OCP a statement of the purpose or objective for regulating home occupations, including some background or history on home occupations in the community.

This will make the interpretation and administration of the bylaw much easier, and will be helpful for future amendments by clarifying the rationale and context behind the original adoption of the bylaw (Bowden 1991; Butler 1988). Key considerations should include: the nature of complaints being received; the economic and social impact of home occupations; land use and transportation planning objectives; and the character of the community. Examining these factors will then assist in establishing the appropriate policies and regulations for home occupations (Bowden 1991).
4. **Categorize home occupations.**

Because certain types of home based work have noticeably different impacts or operating practices, it may be worthwhile to categorize home occupations and apply different operating parametres or administrative procedures for each (Orser and Foster 1992). Municipalities may want to differentiate between major or high intensity home occupations vs. minor or low intensity home occupations in zoning ordinances (Gurstein 1995). For example, while minor home occupations might be allowed as of right in residential zones, municipalities could require that major or high intensity home occupations obtain a rezoning for their specific use. This would give municipalities greater control over the specific use, and neighbours an opportunity to voice their concern or support through a public hearing process, while maintaining a simpler process for the majority of home occupations that are not likely to impact neighbours.

5. **Provide a simple, clear, inclusive definition of home occupation or similar term in the zoning bylaw.**

Definitions should not include any regulatory requirements which are more appropriate in the bylaw itself, and can make the definition unnecessarily complicated and redundant. Another common problem to be avoided is the use of vague, ambiguous terms, such as customary and incidental, which are unclear and easily misinterpreted, and discriminatory stipulations, for example, in favor of family members or professionals, which are biased and unenforceable under the Municipal Act (Bowden 1991; Orser and Foster 1992; Dmistrasinovic 1991).
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13 Gurstein (1995:56) describes a minor home occupation as “one in which no persons other than members of the household are engaged in the occupation, there is no visible exterior evidence of the conduct of the occupation, it does not create a need for off-street parking beyond normal dwelling needs, it does not generate additional traffic and no equipment is used other than that used in household, domestic, or general office use.” A major home occupation would apply in cases where people other than members of the household are employed on the premises, there is visible exterior evidence of the conduct or the occupation, and both dwelling and home occupation parking needs must be accommodated off the street.
6. Use performance standards, rather than lists of permitted and/or prohibited uses, in the zoning bylaw to regulate the undesirable externalities of home based work and ensure it remains an accessory use of the dwelling.

This recommendation predominates in the literature on municipal regulations governing home based work (Gurstein 1995; Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Dmitrasinovic 1991). The use of performance standards not only overcomes problems of discriminatory, ambiguous, inflexible and easily outdated by-laws associated with lists of prohibited and permitted uses, it provides a more effective, easier to interpret, and easier to administer bylaw which reduces discretionary decisions (Bowden 1991). “Standards of performance enable development officers to qualify/quantify the criteria of measuring business ‘output’ and therefore approve or disallow businesses/behaviours which are deemed detrimental to the community” (Orser and Foster 1992: Executive Summary).

Performance standards must be impact based. They must be directly related to the problems being experienced in each community, and they should not be combined with lists of permitted/prohibited home occupations which create ambiguity and confusion. The exception would be in the case of certain industries/occupations which have been identified as notoriously problematic and therefore are not permitted home occupations under any circumstances, and/or as examples to illustrate what kinds of occupations would typically not conform to the performance standard. Performance standards which are not impact based and which do not deal with the effects of home based work directly would include advertising, inside storage of goods, and limiting non-family workers. Performance standards which are impact based include:
• exterior evidence of the home occupation – e.g., by limiting signage, and outside use of equipment or storage of materials;
• pedestrian and vehicular traffic – e.g., by limiting client visits or deliveries, number of employees, and parking
• nuisances – e.g., by limiting noise, odours, smoke, glare;
• the intensity of the use – e.g., by limiting floor area;
• safety hazards – e.g., by limiting equipment or materials processing; and
• impacts on municipal services – e.g., by controlling the type and amount of waste generated by the home occupation.

The exact nature of the restrictions used to control these effects will naturally vary in each community, but municipalities should not be overly restrictive. Also, the regulations should complement rather than contradict one another. For example, there is no point in allowing a small sign to be placed on the exterior of a building being used for a home occupation if client visits, deliveries or other kinds of traffic are prohibited in relation to the home occupation. Performance standards should not be overly complicated or redundant, and a direct connection should be made between the performance standard and its underlying objective. For example, the purpose of restricting certain types of equipment should be directly related to potential safety hazards, noise impacts, or both. A statement of review and enforcement procedures for compliance with the standards should also be included in the bylaw (Orser and Foster 1992:46).

7. Use the business licensing process as an opportunity to ensure home based workers understand regulations, to actively monitor home based businesses, and to provide home
based workers with helpful information that may support and enhance their contribution to the community.

Where applicable, business licensing can be used in conjunction with the zoning bylaw to effectively regulate home based businesses.\textsuperscript{14} The licensing process itself provides an opportunity for administrators to review the home occupation regulations with applicants, clarify any questions they may have, and highlight any areas which typically concern residents (Bowden 1991). In doing so, problems are much less likely to occur among home based business owners who may otherwise not realize they are contravening regulations or negatively impacting neighbours. In order to facilitate this process, municipalities may want to develop a concise, easy to read information brochure outlining the bylaw and business licensing process, and highlighting key areas of concern. The business licensing process could also provide an opportunity to exchange other kinds of information in partnership with the province and local businesses. This could include information on provincial small business services, home business associations, G.S.T., R.R.S.P.s, small loan programs at local banks, and discount programs for home proprietors with local merchants (Orser and Foster 1992). Design guidelines for optimizing the home as workplace could be offered, and could be used by developers interested in building purpose built live/work housing as well. Voluntary questionnaires could also be developed that would provide municipalities and the broader community with more information about home based workers’ needs and activities (Bowden 1991). This may be particularly useful to businesses wanting to market goods and services to home based workers.

\textsuperscript{14} Home based employees of another company are not required to obtain a business license.
8. Establish appropriate business license fees that do not create undue economic hardship for home based businesses.

Recommendations regarding business license fees are mixed, with some researchers suggesting that a license fee be used to offset the costs of administration (Bowden 1991) and others taking the position that business licenses “should be used to control home occupations rather than generate revenue” (Dmitrasinovic 1991:72). The fee itself may be a variable or flat fee, but generally a variable fee is not recommended because it is time consuming and costly to calculate and can be discriminatory against certain types of home occupations. Naturally, each municipality will have established practices for determining business license fees, but as a general guide, Orser and Foster (1992:40) provide the most insightful recommendations:

Little information is available on the economic rational or quantitative assessment used to determine these amounts. The impact of variable licensing as a deterrent to small business start ups is also not clear. Lack of financial resources are however a chronic problem for many home proprietors (Orser 1991). The argument that variable licensing rates compensate for the loss of commercial tax is also weak. A long term perspective on the role of home-based businesses indicates that these businesses will provide the community with substantially more economic benefit if they are nurtured and supported in their incubation without financially debilitating licensing fees. A nominal flat rate schedule is therefore recommended.

9. Take a proactive approach to ensure compliance with regulations and address complaints.

Because of the time and costs involved in actively monitoring and enforcing home occupation regulations, it is recommended that municipalities enforce regulations on a complaint basis, while taking steps to prevent problems from occurring in the first place (Orser and Foster 1992; Bowden 1991; Dmitrasinovic 1991). Public information and education programs could be
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15 A variable fee is based on a number of components such as commercial mill rates levied against the property, different utility charges, etc.
directed towards new applicants for business licenses as well as businesses currently operating outside of the regulatory process. In communities where this approach has been combined with an effective and supportive regulatory environment, there has been “a significant increase in the number of home occupations ‘coming out of the woodwork’” (Bowden 1991:89). This in turn creates the opportunity for municipal administrators to review regulations with home based workers who may be less likely to cause problems as a result. Interestingly, Dmitrasinovic (1991:62) found that “most home-based business owners do not realize they may be affecting someone else until the matter is brought to their attention” and complaints are easily resolved on a “good neighbour basis.” It was also found that “upon notification of a violation by a city inspector, home-based business owners usually comply with the zoning bylaw within a reasonable time period.” This suggests that better communication between home based workers, neighbours and municipal officials on the nature of home base work and associated impacts could go a long way in addressing problems which do exist. The business licensing department could also develop an ongoing data bank to monitor complaints so that “new applicants can then be briefed on the nature of complaints associated with his/her home occupational category” and take steps to avoid problems (Orser and Foster 1992:45).

4.8 Summary

There are both issues and opportunities surrounding home based work. Based on the findings from this chapter, the following tables provide a summary framework for a municipal planning response to home based work. As such, it is intended to serve as a general guide on the range of planning initiatives that could support the positive growth and development of home based work.
### Social Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Planning Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourage and support access to affordable childcare services, settlement services, and employment training programs particularly directed towards women’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support multifaceted community economic development initiatives aimed at organizing homeworkers through collectives or home worker centres that provide a wide range of services, information, training, cooperative initiatives, etc. focused on empowering homeworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan neighbourhoods where housing, services and amenities are in close proximity and linked by flexible public transit, pedestrian and bike routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide guidelines or information to developers and residents which would encourage the appropriate design of purpose built live/work housing as well as modifications to existing housing to accommodate working at home; suitably designed housing may help to alleviate role interference and the difficulty for many home based workers in separating their domestic and work lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation and Energy Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Planning Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourage and support growth of telework by planning for appropriate neighbourhood services and amenities, and supporting the development of telework centres; encourage other forms of home based work which may also reduce traffic congestion during peak hours as well as overall automobile use; direct further research towards the transportation impacts of home based work and coordinate this with overall transportation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work towards a coordinated regional growth strategy which minimizes urban sprawl and meets objectives associated with creating more compact, mixed use communities which reduce pressure on land and infrastructure and meet the diverse (social, economic, ecological) needs of communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Residential Quality of Neighbourhoods
- Preserve residential amenity and ensure that negative impacts on the residential quality of neighbourhoods are mitigated, without unnecessarily restricting home based work.
- Build on the potential of home based work to increase community use, social interaction, safety and security.

### Municipal Planning Response to HBW
1. Improve the regulatory environment governing home based work, through effective zoning by-laws and licensing processes; provide better information to home based workers about how their occupations could be or are affecting neighbours.
2. Improve access to community amenities and services by planning purpose built live/work units close to neighbourhood amenities, and bringing services closer to those in traditional residential neighbourhoods; improve pedestrian linkages between and through residential communities.

### Economic Development
- Encourage home based work as part of an economic development strategy.
- Avoid development of an underground economy.

### Municipal Planning Response to HBW
1. Provide a supportive regulatory environment for home based work with demonstrated benefits to home based workers as outlined in Section 4.7.
2. Provide easy to access information for home based workers on: local regulations governing home based work; provincial support services for home based workers; local home based worker organizations; local businesses offering services targeted to home based businesses/workers, etc.
3. Encourage the development industry to build housing that is suitable for home based work close to appropriate services and amenities (and zone land to make this possible).
4. Ensure up to date telecommunications infrastructure is in place to support home based workers.
5. Support initiatives such as residentially based telework centres by facilitating zoning changes, guiding the development process, contributing land and/or buildings, or providing start up funding.
6. Direct research towards understanding the development and support needs of home based workers.
CHAPTER 5 – CURRENT APPROACHES TO PLANNING FOR HOME BASED WORK: A REVIEW OF SEVEN MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN THE GVRD

5.1 Introduction

Despite the wide range of planning implications associated with the shift to work at home, studies of municipal planning responses to home based work conducted in the early 1990s indicated that there were mixed feelings on the part of senior municipal administrators on the role of home base work in their communities, and for the most part, municipalities failed to provide a supportive regulatory environment for home based work. This was attributed, in part, to a lack of information regarding the nature and extent of home based work, and a lack of information on how to effectively regulate and plan for home based work. It was rooted in the fact that home based work represented a departure from a tradition of land use planning based on the separation of residential and commercial or industrial activities which has directed planning practice for most of this century. In the words of several municipal planners at the time, home based work fell into a “gray area” of planning and “just didn’t fit” (Orser and Foster 1992; Dmitrasinovic 1991).

During and since that time, numerous recommendations have been made for improvements to municipal policy and regulations governing home based work. Many of these recommendations and more detailed reports have been made available to municipalities at the national (in the case of Orser and Foster 1992) and provincial (in the case of Bowden 1991) level. At the same time there has been a shift in planning models and strategies towards a vision of more “mixed use” communities that meet diverse needs based on a more integrated approach to planning that considers social, economic and ecological needs at the local, regional and global level. This has
evolved out of a much larger movement toward the pursuit of more sustainable, equitable, inclusive communities. Locally, within the GVRD, municipalities are being asked to collaborate on the “Liveable Region Strategic Plan” which sets forth goals and policies for more complete communities. As part of that plan, municipalities have been required to develop regional context statements which describe how their community is working towards the objectives set out in the plan. In the near future, they will also be required to incorporate goals for employment and economic development into their regional context statement.

In this context, planning for home based work would appear to be increasingly relevant. The question is: have municipalities responded and if so, how? This chapter explores that question from a local perspective by examining planning regulations, policies and initiatives related to home based work in seven municipalities within the GVRD. Due to limitations in the scope of this thesis, this is not a detailed examination but rather an exploratory review of how municipalities are dealing with home based work and how their practices have (or have not) changed in the past decade.

Findings are based on a qualitative review of three current information sources from each municipality: zoning bylaws governing home based work; Official Community Plan references to home based work; and telephone discussions with planners in each municipality to ascertain if any special planning policies or initiatives involving home based work have been undertaken in their community (see Appendix A for a list of informants).\(^\text{16}\) In addition, an attempt is made to

\(^\text{16}\) Regarding the third information source (i.e. telephone discussions with planners in each municipality to ascertain if any special planning policies or initiative involving home based work had been undertaken in their community) there are two variations in the methodology. In the case of the District of West Vancouver, as a full time employee of the Planning Department since October 1997, my knowledge of planning initiatives related to home based work based on general discussions with planners, access to files, and direct involvement in the community planning process.
look at changes in the municipal planning response to home based work since the early 1990s.

This is done by comparing, where applicable, the current findings with those from a masters thesis which was completed for the School of Community and Regional Planning by Alexandra Dmitrasinovic in 1991. Chapter 4 of Dmitrasinovic’s thesis presents findings on local planning approaches to home based work in seven municipalities within the GVRD based on zoning bylaws and interviews with planners on the extent, nature, significance, and planning implications of home occupations. For comparative purposes, the seven municipalities selected for this thesis are the same as those used in Dmitrasinovic’s and are as follows: Burnaby, Coquitlam, New Westminster, North Vancouver (City), Port Coquitlam, Vancouver and West Vancouver. Dmitrasinovic notes that these municipalities were “chosen for illustrative rather than representative purposes” (43). This selection was suitable for the purpose of this thesis and had the advantage of including the District of West Vancouver, where I am currently employed in the Planning Department. Statistics on the percentage of home based employment in each community are also provided and discussed in relation to the findings.

5.2 Percentage of Home Based Work in the Selected Municipalities

Table 5.1 provides information on the percentage of home based work in each of the seven municipalities based on 1991 and 1996 Census Place of Work data (Statistics Canada).


### Table 4 - Home Based Work in the Seven Municipalities Under Review (1991, 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Percentage of Population using their Home as their Usual Place of Work&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver (City)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 1991 and 1996 Census

### 5.3 Zoning Bylaws

All of the municipalities reviewed rely primarily on the zoning bylaw to regulate the impacts of home based work (commonly referred to as home occupation in zoning bylaws). Business licensing is also used but is not the focus of this review. Zoning bylaws are reviewed and evaluated based on findings from Chapter 4 on common weaknesses of home occupation ordinances, as well as recommendations for improvements. Although this analysis is somewhat limited by a lack of information on the specific nature of home based work and associated problems (or lack of) in each community, it is possible to evaluate the regulations more generally on the following basis:

- Is there a clear, simple definition of home occupation that avoids ambiguous and discriminatory language?
- Is there background provided on the purpose or objective for regulating home occupations?
- How are restrictions placed on home occupations?
- Are there explicit conditions for safeguarding residential amenity while avoiding undue restrictions on home occupations?
• Are impact based performance standards that are enforceable and defensible (and focus on controlling undesirable externalities) used to do this rather than easily outdated and often discriminatory lists of permitted and/or prohibited uses?

The impacts that home occupation regulations intend to address can be grouped into four general categories: external evidence; intensity of use; pedestrian/vehicular traffic; and fire, safety, and nuisance impacts. The questions listed above are discussed through a summary and general evaluation of how these are handled by the seven municipalities, followed by a discussion of the overall clarity and consistency of the regulations, and the extent to which they avoid biased, outdated restrictions. The overview provided at the end of this section compares these findings to those of Dmitrasinovic’s from 1991. More detailed information and analysis on the zoning bylaws for each of the municipalities is provided in Appendix B. A summary of performance standards used by each municipality is provided in Appendix C.

*External Evidence*

In order to mitigate against unsightly premises, and ensure that the residential character of the neighbourhood is maintained, all the municipalities prohibit external storage of goods and other forms of external evidence of the home occupations. Three of the municipalities (Burnaby, Port Coquitlam, New Westminster) prohibit external and/or internal modifications to the dwelling associated with the home occupation. This may be problematic for many home based workers who need to modify their dwelling to suit their changing needs, and seems unnecessarily restrictive, particularly with respect to internal modifications which should have no impact on

---

17 Again, it should be noted that the 1991 and 1996 Place of Work data are not directly comparable as the questions changed in 1996 to include “no usual place of work” as an option; this may result in an underestimation in the
surrounding neighbours provided all other regulations are followed (for example, both Burnaby and New Westminster also limit the total allowable floor area that can be used for a home occupation or business). All of the municipalities except Port Coquitlam allow a small sign.

**Intensity of Use**

All of the municipalities require that the home occupation be accessory to the principal dwelling use in order to maintain the character of the neighbourhood as primarily residential. In order to achieve this objective, four of the municipalities clearly specify limits on the total floor area that can be used in conjunction with the home occupation (North Vancouver, Port Coquitlam, Coquitlam, New Westminster). Limitations on the number of employees of a home occupation are also used to control the intensity of use (as well as traffic and parking); however, it is unclear what amounts to an “appropriate” number that ensures the use remains accessory, without being overly restrictive. Limitations on persons working in the home occupation are highly varied, and often inconsistent with the overall approach reflected in the other regulations. Vancouver is surprisingly restrictive (compared to their other requirements), permitting only one resident family member to work in a home occupation. Similarly, although New Westminster is highly controlling in many other aspects of their bylaw, they have no restrictions on the number of employees for home occupations. North Vancouver, West Vancouver, and Coquitlam allow up to two workers, and Port Coquitlam allows up to three workers. North Vancouver, Port Coquitlam and Coquitlam allow non-resident employees to work in the home occupation. Both Vancouver and Port Coquitlam limit the number of home occupations per dwelling to one. North Vancouver and West Vancouver do not allow home occupations in combination with other uses such as child care and boarding uses. These limitations are clearly intended to ensure that growth of home based employment between 1991 and 1996.
the residential use is the primary use of the dwelling, but may be problematic where two people within a dwelling want to work at home in separate, small scale low impact occupations.

*Pedestrian and Vehicular Traffic*

Regulations governing pedestrian and vehicular traffic and/or parking are quite varied. Vancouver and North Vancouver have no specific regulations for traffic and parking. Burnaby only regulates traffic in multiple dwelling zones (where there must be no excessive traffic created). West Vancouver allows only occasional or infrequent deliveries or visits. Coquitlam prohibits any excess parking or traffic. Port Coquitlam’s regulations are quite confusing, prohibiting any traffic in relation to the home occupation but allowing up to five client visits per day. Given that traffic and parking are cited as common complaints associated with home occupations, it would seem important to address these potential impacts, without being overly prohibitive. Allowing some visits and traffic, provided it is not excessive, would seem to be the most flexible approach (Burnaby and West Vancouver) although it would be subject to a considerable degree of interpretation and may be difficult to enforce. Sales are not allowed in conjunction with home occupations in any of the municipalities except North Vancouver. This common restriction has been criticized by home based workers as overly restrictive and unfair, particularly where sales are prohibited but client visits are permitted. It may be that traffic and parking limitations are a more appropriate way to control potential impacts associated with sales from a dwelling.

*Nuisance/Fire/Safety*

All the municipalities prohibit undue nuisance impacts such as noise, odor, vibrations, dust smoke etc., and most prohibit fire, health and safety hazards. Such restrictions are reasonable and
important in ensuring that the health, safety and quality of residential neighbourhoods are maintained. Three of the municipalities (Burnaby, Coquitlam and New Westminster) restrict the use of mechanical equipment; however, only Coquitlam specifies detailed criteria by which equipment would be prohibited. The others use vague, and difficult to interpret statements such as equipment which would ordinarily be used for household purposes.”

*Clarity and consistency of the regulations, and the extent to which they avoid biased, outdated restrictions*

Home occupation definitions generally appear to be the most well drafted section of the bylaws. Most of the municipalities provide fairly simple, clear definitions, with the exception of New Westminster which has a lengthy definition that incorporates detailed restrictions and West Vancouver which uses unnecessarily complicated language. Unfortunately this is a small portion of the bylaw, and problems still exist in the actual regulations with respect to ambiguous, inconsistent, biased and/or confusing stipulations, particularly where performance standards are combined with permitted or prohibited uses. New Westminster’s list of “customary” home occupations is clearly outdated and their list of prohibited uses are potentially discriminatory (by specifically listing “personal services” such as “acupuncture” as prohibited, while medical and dentistry services are conspicuously absent). Similarly, Coquitlam’s list of prohibited uses adds confusion to the bylaw by including some uses (e.g. real estate office) and leaving others which would likely generate greater impacts, notably absent (e.g. doctor or dentist office). Preferential treatment is also evident in a number of cases. For example, by allowing additional vehicles to be used for certain types of businesses (e.g. driving school) but not others (Coquitlam) or by allowing mechanical equipment for some uses (doctor or dentist office) but not others (Burnaby) without explaining the rationale for the distinction. Vancouver, New Westminster and West
Vancouver all include biased and outdated employee standards which allow "family members" only to work in a home occupation. Two of the municipalities have contradictory regulations which prohibit any increase in traffic but allow on site sales (New Westminster) or client visits (Port Coquitlam). New Westminster’s regulations are particularly lengthy, confusing and repetitive, and contain many separate clauses controlling the same impact which could easily be combined. West Vancouver’s limitation on inside storage of “stock-in-trade, materials, supplies or goods” of up to $1000 in wholesale value is confusing and arbitrary and it is not clear what purpose it is intended to serve. None of the municipalities provided any background statements in their bylaws on the purpose or objective for regulating home occupations, or any history on the establishment of home occupation regulations in their community.

Overview

Based on this review, it appears that there have been some small improvements in the municipal regulatory approach to home based work over the past eight years. In 1991, Dmitrasinovic found that among the seven municipalities surveyed, the regulatory approach varied, with some overly controlling home occupations, “fearing disruption in single family residential and commercial areas” (57), and others accommodating them “as a reasonable response to economic and other social factors” (65). In particular, Coquitlam and New Westminster had adopted a “control” approach, Port Coquitlam and Vancouver a “tolerance” approach, and North Vancouver, Burnaby, and West Vancouver an “accommodating” approach. However, with the exception of North Vancouver, all of the regulations were found to be “lacking in some respects” by: using biased language; cumbersome and outdated lists of permitted and prohibited home occupations; vague, unreasonable or unnecessary performance standards; and/or by neglecting to address certain aspects of home occupation operations. Dmitrasinovic (1991:65) also found that “most
municipalities have little intention to amend or simplify their zoning bylaws to support or encourage the emerging interest in home-based work in their communities.”

Interestingly, with the exception of West Vancouver, all of the municipalities have rewritten or revised their home occupation bylaws since that time; however, only Vancouver appears to have made noticeable shifts towards more accommodating regulations. Overall, Vancouver, Burnaby, North Vancouver and West Vancouver are fairly accommodating. Port Coquitlam and Coquitlam fall somewhere between control and tolerance, and New Westminster has clearly maintained a highly controlling approach. In terms of the way the bylaws are drafted, with the exception of New Westminster, it appears some improvements have been made, although lack of clarity, bias and inconsistency are still problems throughout. Positive shifts are evident in the increased reliance on performance standards, with only Coquitlam and New Westminster continuing to use lists of permitted/prohibited uses, although North Vancouver and Port Coquitlam include some lists as examples. Based on the examples cited in Dmitrasinovic’s findings, it also appears that some efforts have been made to simplify and clarify regulations, address previous omissions, and reduce the use of discriminatory restrictions; however, as noted earlier, these problems do still exist, perhaps to a lesser degree. No changes have been made to include any background statements on the purpose or objective for regulating home occupations.

5.4 Other Policies and Practices Related to Home Based Work

Further to the overall question of this chapter, this section reviews the extent to which broader policies and planning practices or initiatives within the seven municipalities reviewed are (or are not) reflecting the increasing relevance of home based work from a municipal planning perspective. This is done by reviewing Official Community Plan (OCP) references to home
based work as well as other policies and practices identified by planners in each of the municipalities. The discussion begins with those municipalities which have taken a particularly active and supportive approach and moves on to those which have demonstrated less action. Notable changes in approach or policies are discussed throughout. As a starting point, it is interesting to note that in 1991 most municipal administrators were generally “unconvinced” of the significance of home based work in their communities and “did not view the promotion of home based work as a way to achieve planning goals for neighbourhoods and the region” (Dmistrasinovic 1991:46,68). At that time, six of the seven municipalities surveyed made no references to home based work in their OCPs, and no other policies or practices in support of home based work were apparent.

Vancouver has made some significant changes in their approach to home based work from that of “tolerance” in 1991, to actively supporting, encouraging and responding to it. Where before homecraft occupations were “viewed primarily as part-time enterprises,” they are now seen as a major new form of work. Home based work is discussed in CityPlan, which is considered the equivalent of an Official Community Plan, under “Healthy Economy - Healthy Environment” where one of the key directions is to “locate more jobs closer to home” and in neighbourhood centres. Statistics on recent and anticipated future growth in the number of Vancouver residents who work at home are provided as background, and it is noted that: “new technology and the changing nature of work has enabled many more people to work at home.” CityPlan also notes that: “how many people will decide to work at home in the future is hard to predict, but neighbourhood centres can provide support services for those who do.” Furthermore, many of the directions or strategies outlined in CityPlan complement and support potential needs (e.g. for housing close to services, reduced sense of isolation) and opportunities (e.g. reduced automobile
use) stemming from home based work, for example, by encouraging land use patterns and neighbourhood design aimed at focusing jobs around neighbourhood centres and improving pedestrian and bike routes to them. It is also worth noting that an entire section of CityPlan is devoted to “Accessible, Community Based Services,” which, as discussed in Section 4.2, can play an important role in addressing gender, race and class inequities associated with home based work. Notably, this section also emphasizes the importance of improving access to services for people who are currently excluded “due to age, language, income or abilities” and locating services in neighbourhood centres “where they are easy to get to.”

Vancouver has also taken an active role in other policy and planning initiatives. In 1996, a major review of current City strategies involving home based work was undertaken and included a review of live/work policies and projects in other cities across North America. Strategic directions were recommended for accommodating new forms of live/work developments for higher intensity commercial and industrial activities, and a consultant was hired to make recommendations on how the building code would need to be changed to accommodate these uses. This was initiated largely in response to interest from a major land owner in developing several hundred purpose built commercial and industrial live/work units as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of an industrial area near the downtown core (the False Creek Flats). In addition, as part of an overall review of city policies on home based work, the final report for this initiative recommended that staff review “the user (and neighbour) satisfaction with ‘homecraft’ regulations” and associated administrative processes in order to address some unmet needs associated with home based work in the city (City of Vancouver Council Report, 1996 March 27). Prior to the 1996 review, considerable work was also done on artist live/work policies and regulations, and specific areas of the city were targeted for artist live/work
development. More recently, home based work has been identified as a consideration in two major neighbourhood planning processes, Kensington Cedar Cottage and Dunbar, with the support of the community. In Kensington Cedar Cottage, 70 percent of participants supported more regulatory flexibility for home-based work “in order to encourage local job creation, reduce commuting needs, and add to community safety by having people at home during the day.” For similar reasons, 68 percent of Dunbar participants were in favour of pursuing “supports to make home-based work more viable” although only 58 percent supported more flexibility for home-based work “through loosening some of the current regulations.” This is quite significant in illustrating that not only did planning staff identify home based work as an important consideration, the broader community generally supported special provisions to encourage it, with some differences evident on a neighbourhood basis.

Like Vancouver, New Westminster has made some significant changes in their approach to home based work. In 1991, New Westminster was described as taking a “control” approach. Municipal administrators did not consider the home to be an appropriate place to “start and grow a small business” and the municipality as a whole was described as being “adamant” in their refusal to allow professionals to work at home based on the premise that doing otherwise would lead to the demise of the commercial core.

Viewing planning as the separation of incompatible land uses by zones, one planner stated that it was unacceptable “to go through the back door” to create commercial zones (e.g. by allowing professional home offices) without rezoning (New Westminster). It was feared that the building and leasing of office space would be affected, which could perhaps weaken the commercial core and cause concern for the business community (New Westminster). (Dmitrasinovic 1991:47-48)

Although New Westminster’s zoning bylaw remains highly controlling and poorly drafted, in sharp contrast to the above, planning staff now actively promote home based work in and around
commercial areas in pursuit of more mixed use communities. This is consistent with directions outlined in their recently completed OCP where the role of home based businesses is discussed under Section 2.7 on “Commercial Revitalization and the Economy.” At the outset, past and future anticipated growth in employment through home based businesses is highlighted and is followed by a discussion of relevant planning strategies which work towards the goal of promoting “a mix of commercial and employment opportunities close to residents.” This includes a recommendation to “review existing regulations to include new types of home-based businesses and provide more flexible regulations” and “encourage greater flexibility for home-based businesses in residential buildings located in commercial areas and between commercial and residential areas.” Notably, a key objective is to promote “mixed use developments in commercial areas as a key revitalization strategy.” The Plan notes that “residential uses in commercial centres generate a more lively and safe community atmosphere, by bringing residents closer to services, employment and cultural opportunities and transit options.” Another objective is to “encourage small scale neighbourhood commercial development” and “promote a neighbourhood design which is supportive of the daily needs and activities of home based workers.” Like Vancouver, this provides a supportive policy context for new forms of living and working such as home based work, as well as alternatives such as neighbourhood work centres.

Given these directions, it is not surprising that planning staff in New Westminster have actively supported home based work by encouraging developers to come forward with proposals for purpose built live/work developments. The Discovery Reach project (12th and Queens) provides a particularly noteworthy example. The project is located in an older industrial/commercial area of New Westminster with a history of crime and prostitution. Upon receiving an application for a 100 unit multi-family residential project, the planning department suggested to the developers
that they add extra “suites” to the ground floor units as studio extensions for home occupations. A variance was granted which allowed for additional square footage and enabled the units to abut the property line (within four feet), whereas the rest of the building was set back approximately 15 feet. This idea was initiated by the planning department as a strategy to “put eyes on the street” and respond to demand for live/work space in the City.

Some smaller changes in planning policies and initiatives related to home based work are evident or expected in the near future in West Vancouver and Coquitlam. At the time of Dmitrasinovic’s survey, West Vancouver was described as being “accommodating” of home based work. This was primarily reflected in the zoning bylaw at the time. The planner for West Vancouver was evidently fairly aware of the nature of home based work in the community and its associated trends and issues, citing corporate downsizing, technological advances in business and communications equipment, etc., but was not convinced of its significance, reporting that “home occupations have no impact on the community.” Furthermore, although West Vancouver had a reference to home based work in their OCP at the time, it clearly advocated “tolerance” rather than support and encouragement, simply stating that “home based economic activities are permitted, provided that they are unobtrusive, do not cause nuisance, and are compatible with neighbourhood objectives.” Neither the zoning bylaw nor the OCP reference to home based work have been updated since that time. An attempt was made in 1992 to revise the zoning by-law to simplify the language, eliminate the discriminatory restriction on non-family members, “provide more specific regulations that would assist with enforcement” and incorporate a greater degree of flexibility (Dmitrasinovic; District of West Vancouver Council Report dated 1992 April 8); however, the Council of the time rejected the proposed changes and no subsequent reports have been brought forth.
Not surprisingly, in this context, no major planning initiatives on home based work have been undertaken in West Vancouver. There is, however, some indication that this might change in the future with the Upper Levels Sector Plan. This plan covers a large, undeveloped portion of the District above the Upper Levels Highway. A draft plan is not yet complete; however, home based work has been identified by members of the community based steering committee as something that should be encouraged as part of an effort to meet diverse housing needs and enhance community activity around small scale neighbourhood centres. Interestingly, West Vancouver’s 1995 Annual Report identified home based work as a priority for future work programs. The lack of action since that time may be the result of changes in the political leadership of the community shortly after 1995 which has maintained a strict adherence to the status quo in virtually all their decisions and directions. Heavy work loads stemming from other council priorities have likely contributed to this situation as well.

Coquitlam was described as taking a “control” approach to home based work in 1991. The planning administrators “perceived that the economic and social benefits of home occupations accrue only to the individuals involved in their operation” and did not foresee any broader community benefits (Dmitrasinovic 1991:46). Concerns about the potential negative impact of home based work on commercial areas were paramount and, as a result, the municipality was “hardline” in their refusal to allow professionals to work at home (Dmitrasinovic 1991:47). In comparison, Coquitlam has recently identified home based work as something to be encouraged in their North East Sector Plan. Like West Vancouver’s Upper Levels Plan, the North East Sector Plan covers a large, undeveloped area of the City. The plan is still in draft form and no specific strategies for encouraging home based work have been identified; however, planning
staff felt it would likely involve revisions to zoning, and efforts to ensure appropriate telecommunications infrastructure such as fibre optics were in place. At the present time, Coquitlam still has no reference to home based work in their OCP; however, the planner felt that this may change in the future in response to the objectives identified the North East Sector Plan.

North Vancouver has changed their approach very little since 1991. They were described in 1991 as being fairly “progressive” relative to other municipalities in accommodating home based work, primarily due to their “model” home occupation ordinance. At the time, both their politicians and planners apparently welcomed and supported home based work as an important part of the business community and overall economy (Dmitrasinovic). In the current planning context, this approach appears to have been maintained, although no specific policy or planning initiatives have been taken. This is a reflection of the “passive” role assumed by planning staff in supporting home based work. Of the three recently developed housing projects in North Vancouver which incorporate a purpose built live/work component, planning staff were supportive but did not actively suggest, encourage or promote the live/work aspect. Special initiatives to develop live/work housing and telecommunications infrastructure have been driven entirely by the private sector, but are supported by “quite liberal” home occupation regulations. No references to home based work have been included in the recently updated OCP (1995); however, this is attributed more to the fact that the OCP is “not strong on employment” rather than a lack of support for home based work. It is, however, considered a “shortcoming” of the plan, and planning staff believe this may change in the near future, particularly given that the GVRD will soon be requiring municipalities to establish goals for employment in their regional context statements.
The municipalities with the least “progressive” approach to home based work in their plans and policies are Burnaby and Port Coquitlam. This is somewhat surprising in relation to Dmitrasinovic’s findings. In 1991, Burnaby was described as taking an “accommodating” approach to home based work, and appeared to have supportive planners and politicians who would “welcome the establishment of home based businesses which contribute to the local economy by generating spin-off demand for goods and services” (Dmitrasinovic 1991: 47). Port Coquitlam was described as being “tolerant” of home based work; however, the planning department was in the process of amending its zoning bylaw (which prohibited almost all home based work) in anticipation of the role of home based businesses in providing an “ever increasing source of employment” (Dmitrasinovic 1991:47). Currently, neither Burnaby nor Port Coquitlam have OCP directions for home based work (although both plans have been recently updated). Planners in both municipalities noted that home based work has not been a significant consideration in any of their planning or policy initiatives, and no specific steps have been taken to actively encourage or support it.

5.5 Summary

This Chapter sets out to determine whether or not seven municipalities within the GVRD have responded to the increasing relevance of home based work in the context of social, economic, and environmental issues and opportunities affecting communities at both the local and regional levels. A review of regulations, policies and practices is undertaken to evaluate current approaches and reflect on changes in the response to home based work over the past eight years.
From a regulatory perspective, the findings reveal some positive changes in municipal zoning bylaws governing home based work, evident in the increased reliance on performance standards as well as efforts to simplify and clarify regulations, address omissions, and reduce the use of discriminatory restrictions. Nonetheless, problems still exist with respect to ambiguous, inconsistent, biased and/or confusing stipulations, particularly where performance standards are combined with permitted or prohibited uses, and in most cases there is a definite lack of broader policy context within which the bylaws are embedded. Furthermore, only one of the municipalities (Vancouver) has demonstrated a noticeable shift towards a more accommodating regulatory environment for home based work. Overall, Vancouver, Burnaby, North Vancouver and West Vancouver are fairly accommodating. Port Coquitlam and Coquitlam fall somewhere between control and tolerance, and New Westminster has clearly maintained a highly controlling approach.

In terms of broader policies and practices, it appears that while some of the municipalities reviewed have exhibited little or no action in support of home based work, others have undertaken significant policy and planning initiatives which clearly support and encourage home based work, representing a notable departure from Dmitrasinovic’s findings in 1991. What is particularly interesting, however, is that the tendency of a given municipality to change or not change their approach was not predictable by Dmitrasinovic’s findings on the attitudes of planners and politicians in each of the communities at the time, and in some cases, nor by the extent of home based work in the individual communities (i.e. one might expect that in municipalities with a high percentage of home based work or significant growth in it, there would be a greater likelihood of change towards more responsive policies and practices).
The most dramatic changes in the municipal approach to home based work are evident in New Westminster and Vancouver. In contrast to the “adamant” “control” approach adopted in the past, New Westminster is now actively promoting the development of purpose built live/work units as a strategy to promote and revitalize older commercial areas, while improving the safety and security of neighbourhoods. Home based work is viewed as playing an important role in job creation and employment growth, and has a prominent position in the OCP. Related neighbourhood land use and design objectives also provide a supportive policy context for its future growth. Unfortunately, less progress has been made on New Westminster’s zoning bylaw which continues to be highly restrictive, confusing and complicated; however, this could be expected to change in the near future given that the OCP recommends existing regulations be reviewed and modified to accommodate a greater range of uses with more flexibility.

Interestingly, New Westminster has the lowest percentage of home based work (4.8%) of all the municipalities surveyed with very little growth evident between 1991 and 1996.

Vancouver has shifted its approach to home based work quite dramatically from that of “tolerance” in 1991, to actively encouraging and exploring development options to support a range of types of home based work including homecraft or occupations, artist studios, and higher intensity industrial and commercial live/work uses. They have initiated major planning studies to this end, and are currently addressing building code issues arising from new forms of living and working. Home based work is now addressed in CityPlan and recommendations are made to encourage the design of neighbourhoods and the services within them to meet the needs of home based workers. Reports to council have recommended that staff review current policies to ensure they meet the needs of home based workers, and two major new neighbourhood planning
initiatives support more flexibility and support for home based work. Vancouver’s rate of home based work has grown from approximately 6.7% in 1991 to 7.2% in 1996 representing a growth rate of at least 7.4%.

Coquitlam has made less dramatic changes, which are nonetheless significant. In 1991, Coquitlam was described as taking a control approach to home based work, and although this still applies to some extent in their zoning bylaw, changes in other planning practices are evident. Home based work has been identified as an important element of the North East Sector Plan, and it is expected that this may result in changes to the OCP as well. Coquitlam has a rate of home based work of approximately 6.7% (at least 14% growth since 1991).

Ironically, in the two municipalities (Burnaby and Port Coquitlam) represented by planners and politicians who appeared to recognize the growing significance and potential benefits of home based employment back in 1991, there has been little action towards more supportive planning practice. In both cases, home based work has not been acknowledged in the OCP despite the fact that both have been rewritten since that time (Port Coquitlam’s in 1993; and Burnaby’s in 1998), and nor have any special planning initiatives or policies been directed towards home based work. Burnaby has a rate of home based work of approximately 5.7 percent (at least 12% growth since 1991) and Port Coquitlam has a rate of home based work of approximately 5.7% (at least 16% growth since 1991).

The two municipalities who appear to have changed the least are North Vancouver and West Vancouver. North Vancouver’s apparent lack of action may stem from the fact that they have long since had an accommodating zoning bylaw for home based work and the planning
department generally takes a supportive (albeit “passive”) approach to home based work. Interestingly, North Vancouver has maintained a rate of home based work of about 6.5 percent with little growth apparent between 1991 and 1996. West Vancouver’s lack of action is somewhat more surprising, particularly given its extraordinarily high rate of home based work (18.8% representing at least 19% growth since 1991), and the fact that home based work was identified as a priority in the 1995 Annual Report. Since the mid 1980s, neither the zoning bylaw nor the Official Community Plan have been revised to be more responsive to home based work, although a failed attempt was made to update the zoning bylaw in 1992. West Vancouver’s lack of action may be attributed, in part, to a highly conservative political leadership bent on adherence to the status quo, as well as heavy work loads stemming from other council priorities; however, clearly home based work demands attention in this community. Whether or not a supportive response is incorporated into the Upper Levels Sector Plan remains to be seen, but the fact that it has been raised as a consideration is somewhat promising.

It is worth noting that there is an interesting correlation between directions for home based work identified in OCPs and the occurrence of special policy or planning initiatives. While this does not necessarily represent a “cause and effect” relationship, it does perhaps suggest that the two are mutually reinforcing and illustrates the importance of ensuring that clear directions for home based work are embedded in policy. Both Vancouver and New Westminster have the most supportive OCP directions, and have also taken the most active role in other initiatives or policies involving home based work. They also display a clear link between objectives for home based work and broader strategies aimed at the creation of more mixed use, integrated neighbourhoods which recognize that healthy communities meet multiple goals and objectives. Likewise, in those municipalities with no policy direction for home based work in their OCP
(Port Coquitlam, Burnaby, North Vancouver), no special initiatives or policies related to home based work are evident.

It was also interesting and surprising to find that in some cases, the likelihood of a municipality responding to home based work does not correspond to the amount of home based work in that community. For example, the municipality with the least of amount of home based work (New Westminster) has demonstrated the most significant change, whereas the municipality with the highest amount of home based work (West Vancouver) has exhibited virtually no change. It seems that whether or not home based work is addressed in plans and policies may depend more on the presence of undeveloped areas of a municipality currently being planned for future development (e.g. Upper Levels, North East Sector), or areas of the municipality undergoing significant redevelopment (Vancouver and New Westminster). The individual attitudes of the planners (New Westminster) and local politicians (West Vancouver) are also clearly influential, a finding that has been documented in the literature on home based work as well (Orser and Foster 1992). There is also some indication in this review that more affluent communities may be less likely to publicly support home based work in their residential settings (i.e. they would rather “turn a blind eye”) than less affluent communities, regardless of the significance of home based work in the community. West Vancouver is one example where, although there is an extraordinarily high rate of home based work, public policy has been virtually silent on the issue for almost 15 years, with the exception of one failed attempt to change the bylaw in 1992. Similar patterns are evident in Vancouver where the east side neighbourhood of Kensington Cedar Cottage showed more support for home based work than the more affluent west side neighbourhood of Dunbar. This trend has been documented in the literature on home based work as well (Walsh 1986).
Overall, it appears that there have been some fairly notable changes to practices and policies governing home based work in municipalities within the GVRD since 1991. With more examples of positive ways in which home based work can be incorporated and supported in communities to complement multiple goals and objectives, perhaps other municipalities which have been less proactive will take notice and follow suit. Perhaps then, new alternatives, such as residentially based work centres and new forms of purpose built live/work housing will also be developed. Clearly, however, it is a process that takes time, and one which is influenced by both work loads and planning programs, and the attitudes and practices of those in key political or administrative positions within a municipality.
The social and economic composition of Canadian cities and their urban/suburban regions have undergone significant changes over the past several decades. One of the outcomes of this “transformation” has been a dramatic rise in home based work. In many ways home based work has become “a symbol of the way in which a future society... will be radically different from the familiar past” (Huws 1990:xiii). From a community and regional planning perspective, one of these differences is the departure that home based work represents from the separation of home and work place which has dominated the form and function of our cities and regions for most of this century – a legacy of the industrial era which many have questioned from a social, economic and ecological sustainability point of view.

The suburb was the driving force of the post-WWII era, the physical expression of the privatization of life and specialization of place which marks our time. The result of this era is that both the city and suburb are now locked in a mutually negating evolution towards loss of community, human scale, and nature. In practical terms, these patterns of growth have created on one side congestion, pollution, and isolation, and on the other urban disinvestment and economic hardship. (Calthorpe 1992:9)

In response, a number of planning movements have emerged which focus on more mixed use, complete, integrated communities and have been incorporated into many municipal and regional planning initiatives. In this context, home based work appears to be highly relevant. Surprisingly, however, the municipal planning response to home based work documented in the literature over the past decade has failed to reflect its growing significance. This is, in part, attributed to the fact that despite the speculation, both the nature and extent of home based work and its ensuing planning implications have not always been clear.
It was in this context that the key research question and ultimate objectives of this thesis emerged. The first objective was to critically evaluate the municipal planning implications of home based work in the context of its nature and extent in Canada, and the key socio-economic trends and issues influencing its growth and development. The second was to gain insight into more recent changes (or lack thereof) at the local level in municipal planning approaches to home based work, not yet captured in the literature.

The findings in this thesis reveal that home based work is, indeed, a significant, varied and growing form of work which represents between 7.5 percent and 15 percent of the total workforce. Self-employed consultants and business operators comprise the largest segment of home based work, followed by occasional homeworkers, independent contractors and a very small proportion of teleworkers. On average, home based workers are older, relatively well educated, and have above average incomes. For these workers, there are advantages and disadvantages to working at home, but overall the advantages often outweigh the disadvantages and home based work is viewed positively. For others, however, home based work and the reasons they choose it are less positive, and are a reflection of deep seated socio-economic constraints linked to gender, race and class.

From a municipal planning perspective, home based work can be viewed as both symptom and salve. On the one hand, it is often the outcome of social and economic inequities and constraints. On the other, it can offer opportunities for individuals and the broader community to meet multiple goals and objectives. Both aspects need to be considered in the context of a municipal planning response to home based work, which in many ways can incorporate interwoven and complementary strategies.
From a social issues perspective this involves ensuring that social services and spatial structures “help rather than hinder” women’s access to better jobs and work conditions, whether at home or elsewhere. This would include providing more accessible and affordable childcare, family services and settlement services. Even more potentially effective would be multifaceted programs designed to empower homeworkers by addressing a wide range of needs. The most successful of these have centred around homeworkers centres of various scales and organizational structures based on a bottom up community economic development model. The residentially based work centre is a similar model aimed at a broader range of homeworkers needs from networking to training and services. Municipalities can play an important role in supporting such initiatives by facilitating required zoning changes, guiding the development process, contributing land and/or buildings, or providing funding.

In terms of physical planning, the creation of mixed use neighbourhoods where options for housing, services and amenities, which might include purpose built live/work housing and neighbourhood work centres, are provided in close proximity and linked by public transit and pedestrian and bike routes need to be encouraged. Such neighbourhoods would benefit home based workers and the broader community overall, while meeting the needs of women in particular, by improving access to needed services and amenities, increasing community activity and interaction on a daily basis, and alleviating the sense of isolation experienced across all segments of home based work. This in turn could lead to stronger community ties, support for local businesses that serve home workers’ needs, and enhanced neighbourhood security. From a regional perspective, with more and more people working and carrying out daily tasks and
activities "closer to home," the potential transportation benefits of home based work may also be realized, through reduced pollution, congestion, and road infrastructure demands.

From an economic development perspective, home based work, and in particular self-employment and small business, can and is having a major impact on local and regional economies by creating jobs, improving economic competitiveness and generating numerous spin-off benefits for other businesses. Municipalities that are concerned about the economic health and well being of their communities should respond with appropriate regulations, plans and policies. At the very least this requires a supportive regulatory environment which avoids overly restrictive, cumbersome and confusing regulations, while ensuring that the residential quality of neighbourhoods is protected. This is not an impossible task, but has not had a history of great success among municipalities and has been identified as a significant constraint on home based businesses. Municipal regulations governing home based work should be clear, unbiased, and most importantly, focus on controlling the negative externalities of home based work through performance based controls. Effective and supportive regulations could be combined with "proactive" initiatives that prevent or reduce problems associated with home based occupations, and even actively support home based work. For example, better tracking and monitoring of complaints could be used to educate home based workers about existing or potential problems. Information packets outlining regulations, providing "guidelines" for home workspace designs, and information on local services and programs targeted to home based workers needs could engender a sense of "reciprocal benefit" and encourage hidden home based businesses to "come out" from the underground economy to their own benefit and that of the broader community. Other municipal initiatives might include: encouraging the provision of up to date telecommunications infrastructure is in place; guiding the development industry to build housing
that is suitable and well located for home based workers through zoning and community plans; and/or supporting the development of neighbourhood work centres in their communities.

The extent to which the above responses are likely to be adopted undoubtedly depends on the unique characteristics and circumstances of each municipality – the nature and extent of home based work within it, as well as broader community goals and objectives. Nonetheless, one of the conclusions of this thesis is that municipalities do have a responsibility to address the underlying causes of marginalizing conditions associated with some segments of home based work, as well as seizing and supporting the opportunities which can and are emerging from others. At the very least they must recognize that home based work represents a major change in the way a significant portion of people are using their communities and is deserving of recognition in their plans, policies and programs. Clearly, home based work cannot continue to be ignored or constrained as it has been in the past.

In many ways, the findings from Chapter 5 on current approaches to home based work have substantiated that conclusion by demonstrating that change is occurring in some municipalities which are now actively responding to and supporting home based work in their plans and policies. Furthermore, there is a clear link between municipal initiatives associated with home based work and broader community goals and objectives for economic development, reduced automobile use, and the creation of more mixed use neighbourhoods that meet diverse needs and interests. Unfortunately, this changing approach is less evident in other municipalities where home based work continues to be ignored in plans and policies.
This raises the question of why there is a difference. Why have some municipalities responded more positively, and other have not? There are likely many factors which determine a municipality’s overall response to home based work, but surprisingly, findings from Chapter 5 indicate that the amount of home based work in a given community is not necessarily one of them. And, while this may be partly the result of inadequate information at the municipal level on home based work, other factors are clearly involved. One of these appears to be the presence of complementary policy and planning initiatives in areas of economic development and neighbourhood planning. Both Vancouver and New Westminster had strong policy objectives in these areas that also responded to issues and opportunities associated with home based work. In contrast, in the highly affluent community of West Vancouver where home based workers comprises 18% of the workforce, home based work has not received significant attention in plans or policies. This suggests that in such communities, where employment and economic development may not be significant issues for the broader community, related initiatives engender little support as priority work items. Community aspirations aside, the individual attitudes and practices of local planners and politicians also play a role.

More generally, the lack of action among some of the municipalities reviewed may also represent the inherent difficulty in responding to changing social, economic, and environmental goals and realities. It is probably fair to assume that virtually all the municipalities surveyed are working towards new directions in municipal planning in pursuit of more healthy, complete communities (as the GVRD would have it), and that many of the strategies of the past are being questioned. Yet change can take years to implement. As suggested by the findings, this may be easier to do in areas undergoing significant redevelopment than in established residential communities,
revealing yet another factor in the varied municipal response to home based work. This was
evident in Vancouver, New Westminster, Coquitlam and West Vancouver.

Nonetheless, despite the varied challenges and constraints, new approaches are required to
respond to new realities and needs, and ways of doing so need to be identified and discussed at
the municipal level. Clearly, better information about the nature and extent of home based work
in individual communities can play a role in furthering an appropriate response to home based
work, and municipalities must be proactive in determining the issues and opportunities
associated with it in their communities. With this in hand, the “framework” for a municipal
planning response to home based work identified in Chapter 4 may provide a useful starting point
or guide for planning initiatives that could support the positive growth and development of home
based work. Actual examples of how this is occurring in other communities may be even more
powerful. Chapter 5 has provided some insight in that regard, but clearly more examples are
needed, particularly of innovative, new alternatives such as neighbourhood work centres. One
thing is certainly clear. If municipalities do not consider the broader implications of home based
work and respond to it in their plans and policies, important issues and opportunities may
certainly be missed, and a significant portion of the workforce will continue to be “invisible”
from a municipal planning perspective.
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Appendix A – List of Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>Barry Wait, Planner</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>Jane Pickering, Planner</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>Brian Coates, Planner</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver (City)</td>
<td>Richard White, Planner</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>Janet Lee, Planner</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Trish French, Planner*</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>see below**</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the case of the City of Vancouver, discussions with the planner are supplemented by my involvement in a research initiative on home based work for the City of Vancouver as well as detailed Council Reports completed in the Spring of 1996 on live/work and work/live policies, directions and initiatives in the City of Vancouver.

** In the case of the District of West Vancouver, as a full time employee of the Planning Department since October 1997, my knowledge of planning initiatives related to home based work based on general discussions with planners, access to files, and direct involvement in the community planning process currently being undertaken for the Upper Levels Sector Plan is used as the information source.
Appendix B – Zoning Bylaws for Home Occupations

This Appendix includes a detailed discussion of the zoning bylaw regulations on home occupations for each the seven municipalities reviewed in this thesis:

- Burnaby
- Coquitlam
- New Westminster
- North Vancouver (City)
- Port Coquitlam
- Vancouver
- West Vancouver

Each discussion is followed by a copy of the relevant zoning bylaw excerpt for each municipality.
Burnaby’s home occupation zoning bylaw is clear, concise and fairly accommodating of home based work although there are some unnecessary restrictions. Their regulations were updated in 1996 and define “home occupation” as “an occupation or profession that is incidental to the use of a dwelling unit for residential purposes, or to the residential use of a lot occupied by a dwelling” which includes “the office or studio of a person engaged in business, art, health, crafts or instruction,” “the keeping of not more than two boarders or lodgers” and the “operation of a kindergarten or day nursery.” Overall, the definition is fairly straightforward, simple and inclusive, and the use of the three categories of home occupations is useful in that special operational guidelines apply to certain categories, here and elsewhere in the bylaw.

Burnaby’s zoning bylaw relies entirely on performance standards to regulate impacts from home occupations. Emphasis is placed on preventing “exterior evidence” of the home occupation. No external storage of materials is allowed, nor are any external or internal structural alterations to the principal building. This latter restriction seems somewhat unreasonable and unnecessary, particularly regarding interior alternations which may be required to meet the changing needs of home based workers and should not have any impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. Even prohibiting exterior alterations seems overly restrictive, given that any modifications would have to conform to the building regulations already set forth for residential dwellings. One small sign is permitted “to show the name and occupation of the owner.” Employees of the occupation must be residents of the dwelling but there is no limit on the total number of employees. No stock in trade is permitted and no sales are permitted on the premises. No specific restrictions are placed on parking in single family zones, although home occupations must not cause “excessive pedestrian or vehicular traffic in the common areas or parking areas of a multi-family building or traffic congestion on the street.” A home occupation must not cause nuisances such as “noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odour, litter or heat other than that normally associated with a dwelling” and “nor shall it create or cause any fire hazard” or “electrical interference.” Manufacturing, welding and light industrial uses are prohibited altogether. Specific restrictions are placed on the use of mechanical equipment, with special allowances given to physicians and dentists: “such occupations shall not involve the use of mechanical equipment save as is ordinarily employed in purely private domestic and household use or for recreational hobbies, except for such equipment as may be used for a resident physician or dentist.”
6.8 **Home Occupation:**

1. A home occupation shall involve no internal or external structural alterations to the principal building (dwelling) and there shall be no exterior indication that the building is being utilized for any purpose other than that of a dwelling, and no building, structure, fence or enclosure other than those in conformity with permitted residential uses in the Zoning District in which it is located, may be erected.

2. The premises shall not be used for manufacturing, welding or any other light industrial use, and the home occupation carried on therein shall not produce noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odour, litter or heat other than that normally associated with a dwelling unit nor shall it create or cause any fire hazard, electrical interference, excessive pedestrian or vehicular traffic in the common areas or parking areas of a multi-family building or traffic congestion on the street. (B/L No. 10398-96-08-26)

3. There shall be no external display or advertisement other than a sign bearing only the name and occupation of the owner, which may be illuminated but not flashing and shall not exceed 1,900 cm² (2.05 sq. ft.) in area.

4. There shall be no external storage of materials, containers or finished product.

5. No stock in trade shall be kept or handled and no commodity sold upon the premises.

6. Such occupation shall not involve the use of mechanical equipment save as is ordinarily employed in purely private domestic and household use or for recreational hobbies, except for such equipment as may be used for a resident physician or dentist.

7. No person who is not a resident in the dwelling shall be employed in such an occupation.
Coquitlam’s zoning bylaw is somewhat more restrictive than those of the preceding municipalities. The definition is fairly straightforward, defining “accessory home occupation” as “a use related to a craft, occupation or profession conducted within a building used for residential use or accessory residential use by a resident of the residential building.”

The bylaw uses a combination of performance standards and lists of prohibited and permitted uses to regulate home occupations. Performance standards prohibit exterior evidence of the home occupation (with the exception of one small sign) and require it to be accessory to the residential use. The home occupation must be “completely enclosed” within the residential building and must not include “associated equipment and vehicles stored outside the building” except children’s play equipment and up to two vehicles for a driving school office only. The area allocated for the home occupation is limited to 20% of the gross floor area of the dwelling. The number of people who can work in the dwelling is limited to two, only one of whom must be a resident. The home occupation must “not result in pedestrian or vehicular traffic to the home, or parking in excess of that which is characteristic of the zone” it is in, and sales are prohibited.

The home occupation must not discharge or emit “odorous, toxic or noxious matters, or heat glare, radiation or noise.” Coquitlam is unique in setting out a number of performance standards governing the use of special equipment, fire and safety regulations, and the volume and type of waste generated, and then stipulating in detail how an infraction of the standard would be determined. This results in some very lengthy and complicated language in the bylaw, but does provide clarity on what basis and by whom an infraction of the bylaw would be evaluated. For example, accessory home occupation uses shall “not result in the generation of any waste product or volume of waste product ... which exceeds the average volume of waste for homes within a 10 block radius of the home by 5%; except that, where any breach of this provision is alleged, the City may rely on the evidence of its independent waste disposal contractor or contractors as to the normal volumes and types of product disposed of as waste and the average volume for homes within the specified radius in determining whether this provision has been violated by the home occupation use.” Similarly, with respect to the use of special equipment, home occupations must “not require the use of any electrical, magnetic or radioactive equipment which will or could interfere with the electrical, cable television, telephone or other utility services provided to homes or buildings within 500 metres of the home occupation use, except that, … the City may rely of the evidence of representatives of the utility being interfered with… [etc.]”

The list of prohibited uses is quite restrictive and in some cases very specific, suggesting that some occupations may have been identified as particularly problematic. Again, however, there is a definite bias against certain uses. For example real estate offices are specifically prohibited, while others such as doctor and dentist offices are notably absent, although presumably they too would be prohibited given that “offices or facilities where visits by customers or clients take place” are prohibited. Nonetheless, this absence on the list might make one question that conclusion, leading to some confusion.
CITY OF COQUITLAM
ACCESSORY HOME OCCUPATION REGULATIONS

The following is an excerpt from Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 and amending Bylaws:

"902 Accessory Home Occupation Use

An accessory home occupation use must:

1. be completely enclosed within a building used for residential or accessory residential use, except where the home occupation use involves horticulture;

2. not involve the sale of a commodity on the premises;

3. not occupy more than 20% of the residential floor area or 50 m² per dwelling unit, whichever is less;

4. not indicate in any way from the exterior that the premises are being so used, except for one unilluminated name plate having an area less than 0.2 m²;

5. not discharge or remit:
   a. odorous, toxic or noxious matters; or
   b. heat, glare, radiation or noise;

6. be conducted by no more than two persons, one of whom must be a resident of the residential use to which the home occupation is accessory;

7. not detract in any way from the residential character of the building in which it is conducted;

8. (a) not include associated equipment and vehicles stored outside buildings, except children's play equipment and up to two vehicles not exceeding 2000 kg gross vehicle weight rating, when the vehicles are used in conjunction with a driving school office;
   (b) may include an office only for a driving school.

9. not include any of the following:
   a. beauty parlour or barber shop;
   b. dance school or dance recital area, except dancing lessons for children under 16 years old in classes of six or fewer;
   c. orchestra or band training;
   d. restaurant;
   e. stable or kennels for the boarding and breeding of animals;
   f. real estate office;
(9) (g) offices or facilities where visits by customers or clients take place, except dance school or dance recital area as permitted in subsection (9)(b), music teaching, day care and pre-school facilities;
(h) gospel meeting hall or place of public assembly;
(i) propagation of plants, shrubs, fruits and vegetables for sale;
(j) keeping of animals for sale of the animals or their by-products;
(k) the salvage or repair, or both, of motor vehicles;
(l) a dating service or social escort service;
(m) taxi office.

(10) not result in pedestrian or vehicular traffic to the home, or parking in excess of that which is characteristic of the zone within which it is located;

(11) not require the use of any electrical, magnetic or radioactive equipment which will or could interfere with the electrical, cable television, telephone or other utility services provided to homes or buildings within 500 metres of the home occupation use; except that, if such interference is alleged, the City may rely on the evidence of representatives of the utility being interfered with as to the cause or likely cause of such interference in determining whether this provision has been violated by the home occupation use;

(12) not result in any violation of the residential fire and safety regulations or bylaws in force in the City at any time and from time to time as the same apply to residential one-family dwellings or create any unusual fire or safety hazard; except that, where such unusual fire or safety hazard is alleged, the City may rely on the evidence of the Fire Commissioner for the City as to the existence of such an unusual fire or safety hazard in determining whether this provision has been violated by the home occupation use;

(13) not result in the generation of any waste product or volume of waste product not normally associated with single-family dwellings, including, without limitation, paper products, radioactive materials, solid wood or wood products, food, plastic or metals and must not, in any event, result in the home producing an overall volume of waste which exceeds the average volume of waste for homes within a 10 block radius of the home by 5%; except that, where any breach of this provision is alleged, the City may rely on the evidence of its independent waste disposal contractor or contractors as to the normal volumes and types of product disposed of as waste and the average volume for homes within the specified radius in determining whether this provision has been violated by the home occupation use."

Please note: For some food handling uses, the Provincial Health Department - Simon Fraser Health Unit, requires a separate set of cooking facilities. The Zoning Bylaw permits one set of cooking facilities, per dwelling unit, therefore, these uses would not be permitted.
NEW WESTMINSTER

Of all the zoning bylaws reviewed, New Westminster's is the most problematic and restrictive. New Westminster's zoning bylaw differentiates between "home based business" and "home occupation" in their bylaw. While the former is defined in simple, straightforward terms as "a business accessory to the use of a dwelling unit or to the residential use of a lot occupied by a dwelling," the latter uses terms that are vague and confusing, and includes overly detailed restrictions which would be more appropriate in the "requirements for home occupations" section of the bylaw than in the definition: i.e. "home occupation shall mean a customary accessory use of a gainful nature carried on within a dwelling by the person or persons residing therein, which use is clearly secondary to the use of the premises for residential purposes and does not change the character thereof nor have any exterior evidence of such secondary use other than the display of one sign not exceeding two square feet in area bearing the name of the resident and the nature of the home occupation he is engage in." The zoning bylaw provides no explanation for the purpose or rationale behind the distinction, or the differences in the regulations for each. The gender biased language is also inappropriate (and ironic given that more women than men work at home).

Both home occupation regulations and home based business regulations use performance standards to regulate uses, but they are intermingled with lists of prohibited uses.

Both sets of regulations prohibit external evidence of the home occupation or business (with the exception of a small sign for home based businesses). Home occupations "shall not include any exterior display of goods and no exterior storage of materials, commodities or finished products" and no structural alterations are allowed to accommodate the use. The latter restriction seems somewhat unnecessary and unfair given that all other residential building requirements would have to be met. The home based business regulations contain a similar restriction but are more specific about the intent, stating that they "shall involve no internal or external structural alterations to the principal building(dwelling) such that there shall be no exterior indication that the building is being utilized for a purpose other than that of a dwelling." The regulations also stipulate that home based businesses "shall not include associated equipment and vehicles stored outside buildings."

Two entirely separate clauses directed at ensuring home based businesses are accessory (i.e. the home based businesses "shall be clearly accessory use" and "shall not occupy more than 15% of the gross floor area" of the dwelling) are included in the regulations and could easily be combined. Home occupations can be carried on by any "person or persons" residing in the dwelling; however, home based businesses are limited to "members of the immediate family permanently residing on the premises." Not only does the home based business restriction discriminate against households comprised of non-related persons, it is hard to imagine what purpose the difference could serve.

Likewise, while the home occupation regulations allow for sales of "the principal product of the homecraft or home service being undertaken," the home based business regulations do not allow any on-site sales. With respect to traffic and parking, the home occupation regulations prohibit "any increase in automobile parking attributable to the use of the premises" (which seems to conflict with the permission of sales of the principal product from the premises). Home based
businesses must not create any extra traffic, or on or off street parking. Several additional restrictions are placed on visits and deliveries for home based businesses which are somewhat repetitive, prohibiting “office use that generates regular visits by commercial delivery vehicles or couriers services” in one clause, as well as prohibiting “office use that generates regular visits by clients customers, or patients” in another, both of which would appear to have been adequately covered by the first restriction.

Both sets of regulations prohibit nuisances including “any offensive noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odours, heat or glare” (home occupations) and “odorous, noxious or toxic matter or vapours, heat, glare, noise or radiation, or recurrently generated ground vibrations” (home based businesses) but use different language for each. Both home occupations and home based business regulations restrict mechanical equipment to that which is ordinarily used for household purposes, but in the case of home based businesses allows for small office equipment.

In addition to performance standards, the home occupation regulations include a list of uses “not deemed to be customary home occupations” which are therefore prohibited, as well as an arbitrary and clearly outdated list of permitted or “customary uses.” For example, of the seven or eight customary uses, three of them are millinery, stamp and coin collecting and sales, and public stenographer. The home based business regulations also include lists of prohibited uses which are intermingled with the performance standards and appear arbitrary and potentially discriminatory (although some may have been identified as “problem” uses). For example, “personal services” such as “acupuncture” are specifically listed as prohibited but no mention is made of doctors offices, chiropractors or other health care services, although they too are presumably restricted by the traffic and parking regulations. The listing of a few prohibited occupations and not others adds confusion to the interpretation of the regulations.

Overall New Westminster’s home occupation and home based business restrictions are ambiguous, repetitive and redundant, frequently addressing the same impact or problem in multiple ways. The two sets of regulations use decidedly different language to control similar impacts and it is not clear why there is the difference, or why there is a distinction between the two at all.
h) Requirements for Home Occupations

A home occupation shall not include any exterior display of goods and no exterior storage of materials, commodities or finished products, nor any structural alteration to the building to accommodate the use, nor shall there be any mechanical equipment installed except such as would ordinarily be used for household purposes or for hobbies nor any commodities sold on the premises other than the principal product of the homecraft or home service being undertaken, nor shall there be generated any increase in automobile parking attributable to

the use of the premises for home occupation, nor shall there be any offensive noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odours, heat or glare generated by or as a result of such use.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the following uses are deemed to be customary home occupations:

i) Dressmaking, millinery, tailoring and similar domestic crafts;

ii) Manufacture of novelties, souvenirs and handicraft objects as an extension of a hobby;

iii) Stamp and coin collecting and sales;

iv) Individual instruction for music or art students;

v) Small casual repairs to household equipment;

vi) Public stenographer;

vii) In (RS-1) Districts, bed and breakfast accommodation in not more than two rooms;

viii) Other uses similar in character to the foregoing ones.

The following uses are not deemed to be customary home occupations:

i) Beauty parlour, barber shop;

ii) Dance school;

iii) Orchestra and band training and practising;

iv) Restaurant

v) Stable or kennel for the boarding and breeding of animals;

vi) Real estate office, insurance office, accounting office;

vii) The sole or principal office of an architect, lawyer, doctor, dentist, optometrist, chiropractor, dental mechanic or other similar professional person;

viii) Gospel meeting hall and similar public assembly places;

ix) Taxi or driving school office;

x) Propagation of plants, shrubs, fruits and vegetables for sale
New Westminster Zoning Bylaw Excerpt on Home Based Businesses

i) Requirements for Home Based Businesses

Where permitted, a home based business shall conform to the following:

i) Shall be clearly an accessory use to the use of a dwelling unit or to the residential use of a lot occupied by a dwelling;

ii) Shall involve no internal or external structural alterations to the principal building (dwelling) such that there shall be no exterior indication that the building is being utilized for a purpose other than that of a dwelling, and no building, structure, fence or enclosure other than those in conformity with permitted residential uses in the Zoning District in which it is located, may be erected:

iii) Shall not occupy more than 15% of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit;

iv) Shall only be engaged in by members of the immediate family permanently residing on the premises; no more than two persons living on the premises shall be engaged in the business;

v) Shall only be engaged in by the owner(s) of the dwelling unit or must have written permission by the owner(s) of the dwelling unit;

vi) Shall not include associated equipment and vehicles stored outside buildings;

vii) Shall not involve the unenclosed storage or display of raw materials, components, or stock-in-trade;

viii) Shall not involve:

   a) occupations that discharge odorous, noxious or toxic matter or vapours, heat, glare, noise or radiation, or recurrently generated ground vibrations;

   b) occupations that result in extra traffic, extra on or off street parking, electrical interference, fire hazard or health hazard;

   c) the use of mechanical or electrical equipment, except as is ordinarily employed in purely domestic and household use or recreational hobbies or small office uses such as computers, facsimile machines and photo copiers;

   d) the salvage, repair, maintenance or sale of motor vehicles or motor vehicle parts;

   e) beauty parlour, barber shop, massage parlour, tattoo parlour, acupuncture and similar personal service;

   f) orchestra and band training or rehearsals;

   g) office use that generates regular visits by clients, customers, or patients;

   h) office use that generates regular visits by commercial delivery vehicle or courier services;

   i) sale of goods or products where customers regularly enter the premises to inspect, purchase or take possession of goods;

   j) public assembly use;

   k) commercial food handling;

ix) Shall not have any external displays, advertisements, or signage except for one non illuminated identification sign not to exceed 2 sq. ft. (.186 sq. meters) indicating a business is being conducted on the premises.
NORTH VANCOUVER

North Vancouver’s bylaw is also clear, concise and fairly accommodating. It defines “accessory home occupation use” as “a use accessory to a residential use where the householder carries on an occupation or practices a profession.” It specifically excludes escort service and includes private schools and child care uses.

The zoning bylaw relies primarily on performance standards to regulate impacts from home occupations, although some specific occupations are prohibited in higher density housing. Home occupations must be “completely enclosed” within the dwelling and show no indication from the exterior that it is being used for the home occupation, except for the presence of one small name plate. They must also be “accessory” to the residential use of the dwelling and must not occupy more than 20% of the gross floor area. Home occupations are not allowed “where the dwelling unit to which it is accessory contains an accessory boarding use, secondary suite use, a day care use or an assembly use” and are limited to “one accessory home occupation use per dwelling.” The number of people who can work in the dwelling is limited to two, but only one must be a resident. The sale of goods is not permitted on the premises. Like Vancouver, North Vancouver is one of the few municipalities which has no specific restrictions on traffic or parking, although the sale of goods is prohibited and may be a means of controlling these impacts. Home occupations must not discharge or emit: odorous, toxic or noxious matter or vapours; heat, glare or radiation; recurrently generated ground vibration; or excessive noise pursuant to North Vancouver’s noise bylaw. Certain occupations are prohibited in medium or high density apartments including “medical or dental offices, hairdressers, private schools, commercial food preparation, music or dance studios or other similar uses,” presumably because they have been identified as creating significant traffic, odour and/or noise impacts that may be problematic in higher density housing.
CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

(EXCERPT FROM ZONING BYLAW, 1995, NO. 6700)

SECTION 507 SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR USES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES

(5) Accessory Home Occupation Use

An Accessory Home Occupation Use:

(a) shall not involve the sale at retail or wholesale or commercial repair, manufacture, or handling of Weapons or Explosives;

(b) shall be completely Enclosed within the residential Dwelling Unit to which it is Accessory;

(c) shall not involve the sale of goods on the Premises;

(d) shall not occupy more than 20% of the Gross Floor Area of the residential Dwelling Unit, and in any event, shall not exceed 46.45 square metres (500 square feet);

(e) except for one name-plate of less than 0.1 square metre (1 square foot) in area, shall in no way indicate from the exterior that the Premises are being so Used;

(f) shall not discharge or emit:

   (i) odorous, toxic or noxious matter or vapours;
   (ii) heat, glare or radiation;
   (iii) recurrently generated ground vibration;
   (iv) excessive noise pursuant to the Noise Control Bylaw No. 5819;

(g) shall be limited to a maximum of two persons working in the principal Building, at least one of whom shall be a resident of the Dwelling Unit to which the Accessory Home Occupation Use is Accessory;

(h) shall not be allowed where the Dwelling Unit to which it is Accessory contains an Accessory Boarding Use, Secondary Suite Use, a Day Care Use or an Assembly Use;

(i) shall be limited to only one Accessory Home Occupation Use per Dwelling Unit;

(j) shall, in a Building for Medium or High Density Apartment Use or in a Building for Accessory Apartment Use, exclude medical or dental offices, hairdressers, private schools, commercial food preparation, music or dance studios or other similar uses;

(k) shall not be allowed where the Dwelling Unit to which it is Accessory is subject to the bylaws of a Strata Corporation or the terms of a tenancy agreement unless the Strata Corporation or landlord has acknowledged in writing that the Accessory Home Occupation Use does not conflict with the Bylaws of the Strata Corporation or the terms of a tenancy agreement, as the case may be;
PORT COQUITLAM

Port Coquitlam is highly restrictive in some aspects of their “accessory home business” regulations and unusually permissive in others. An “accessory home business” is defined as “a business, occupation or profession carried out in a dwelling unit by a resident of that dwelling unit which is accessory to the residential use of the dwelling unit and does not change the residential appearance or character of the building or lot on which it is situated.” This definition is clear, but incorporates standards which are more appropriately covered in the regulations themselves.

The zoning bylaw relies primarily on performance standards to regulate home businesses. External evidence of the home business is restricted by prohibiting “any exterior display or storage of materials or finished products” and requiring that the home business be “completed enclosed within the dwelling.” All signage is prohibited. The bylaw also prohibits any structural alterations or additions from being made to a dwelling to accommodate an accessory home business, which again seems unnecessarily restrictive given the previous regulations. It is hard to imagine why a modification to a dwelling to make it more suitable for a home business should be treated differently from any other home renovation presuming it meets the other home business regulations and building requirements of the zoning bylaw. Performance standards are used to ensure the home business is “accessory” by limiting it to 20% of the floor area (to a maximum of 495 square feet). In addition, a home business is not permitted in a dwelling unit which contains an accessory boarding use or child care use.

Surprisingly, in single family and duplex zones, Port Coquitlam is the only municipality that allows up to three persons (at least 2 of whom must reside in the dwelling) to work in one or more home businesses in the dwelling. With respect to traffic, the bylaw is inconsistent, prohibiting “any activity which produces traffic” in one clause, yet in a later clause, allowing “up to five visits on any day by persons visiting on business, or making deliveries” and up to ten visits a day for tutorial services. Retail sales are prohibited. Separate regulations govern parking or storage of commercial vehicles or trucks. In terms of nuisance impacts, the bylaw prohibits any activity which produces smoke, dust, odor, litter or heat beyond that normally associated with a dwelling. Any activities which create fire hazards are also prohibited.

Some additional restrictions apply to home businesses in multiple dwelling zones. For example, a maximum of two persons can work in the dwelling in connection with the business and they must reside in the dwelling. Accessory home businesses are not permitted to “receive any visits at any time by persons visiting on business, or making deliveries,” and they cannot be carried out within any common property in the residential development.

Some occupations are listed as prohibited to serve as examples of the type of uses which would not typically meet these performance standards. For example, home businesses must not include: “businesses whose main purpose is to provide service or advice to clients who must visit the premises in order to receive the service or advice. Such businesses include doctors, dentists, hairdressers and similar occupations.” However, rather than providing clarification, this list of examples is confusing given that the performance standards allow up to five client visits per day. Would a hairdresser or doctor who only had five clients per day be allowed? And if not, why? Several other occupations are prohibited outright, presumably because they have been identified
as particularly problematic. These include: commercial food handling and preparation, catering, and care, breeding and boarding of animals.
ACCESSORY HOME BUSINESSES:

(1) Accessory home businesses in any residential zone shall comply with the following regulations:

(a) An accessory home business is not permitted in a dwelling unit which contains an accessory boarding use or a child care use.

(b) An accessory home business shall not include:

(i) any manufacturing, welding, or other industrial or light industrial uses;
(ii) any activity which produces traffic, noise, vibrations, smoke, dust, odor, litter or heat beyond that normally associated with a dwelling;
(iii) a fire hazard or source of electrical interference;
(iv) any exterior display or storage of materials or finished products;
(v) retail sale, renting or leasing of commodities from the premises;
(vi) businesses whose main purpose is to provide service or advice to clients who must visit the premises in order to receive the service or advice. Such businesses include doctors, dentists, hairdressers and similar occupations, but exclude tutorial services where specifically permitted;
(vii) commercial food handling and preparation, and catering;
(viii) care, breeding and boarding of animals.

(c) An accessory home business shall be completely enclosed within a principal dwelling unit and within any garage attached to the dwelling unit, and shall not be carried on outdoors or in any accessory building.

(d) No structural alterations or additions shall be made to a dwelling to accommodate an accessory home business.

(e) No signs relating to an accessory home business shall be displayed on residential premises.

(f) An accessory home business shall occupy not more than the lesser of 20% of the floor area of the dwelling unit (excluding the area of an attached garage) or 46 square metres (495 square feet).

(g) For the purposes of the parking or storage of commercial vehicles or trucks, Section 504 shall apply.
(2) In addition to the regulations in 512(1), the following shall further apply to accessory home businesses in RS and RT zones:

(a) No more than three persons shall work in the dwelling unit in connection with any or all accessory home businesses in that dwelling, and at least two of the persons shall reside in the dwelling unit.

(b) Notwithstanding 512(2)(a) above, tutorial services shall be restricted to one instructor per dwelling unit.

(c) The principal dwelling in which the accessory home business is being carried out shall have at least two off-street parking spaces.

(d) Any or all accessory home businesses, except for tutorial services, shall not receive more than five visits on any day by persons visiting on business, or making deliveries to or from the premises. Tutorial services may receive up to ten business visitors in a day.

(3) In addition to the regulations in 512(1), the following shall further apply to accessory home businesses in RM zones:

(a) No more than two persons shall work in the dwelling unit in connection with any or all accessory home businesses in that dwelling, and both persons must reside in the dwelling unit.

(b) An accessory home business shall take place within the dwelling unit and not be carried out within any common property in the residential development.

(c) Notwithstanding 512(1)(b) and 512(3)(a), tutorial services shall not be permitted.

(d) An accessory home business shall not receive any visits at any time by persons visiting on business, or making deliveries to or from the premises.

(e) An accessory home business shall not be allowed unless the Strata Corporation or landlord has acknowledged in writing that the accessory home business use does not conflict with the bylaws of the Strata Corporation or the terms of a tenancy agreement, as the case may be.
VANCOUVER

Of all the zoning bylaws reviewed, Vancouver’s is by far the most simple, clear and concise, and is fairly accommodating of home based work. Vancouver defines “homecraft” as “a craft or occupation conducted as an accessory use subordinate to the principal residential use of a dwelling unit” and is permitted in any dwelling throughout the city. Also defined are “artist studios” (established in 1995) which are permitted in specific areas of the city. Unlike the homecraft definition, specific lists of artist uses (e.g. dance, live music, painting, and others) and materials that are allowed or disallowed (e.g. fibreglass, epoxy and others) are included, and vary based on two different classes of artist studio (Class A and Class B). This is not generally recommended in a home occupation definition, but may be appropriate in this instance given the specific nature of the home occupation in question (i.e. artist use).

The regulations include five succinctly stated performance standards. In terms of exterior evidence, the standards stipulate that “there shall be nothing to indicate from the exterior of the dwelling unit or building that it is being used for any purpose other than its principal or approved use.” No products or materials can be stored outside the dwelling, and/or sold from or within the dwelling. The most restrictive standard involves the number of workers that can be involved in a homecraft. This is limited to “one resident member of the family occupying the dwelling.” No specific restrictions are placed on parking or traffic. In terms of nuisance impacts, the bylaw states that “no offensive noise, odour, vibration, smoke, heat or other objectionable effect shall be produced.”

Separate regulations are provided for “artist studios” which are limited to a maximum size of 500 square meters and, when combined with a residential unit, can “only be used by the individuals residing in the residential unit.” As noted earlier, more specific restrictions for artist studios are incorporated into the definition of “artist studio” in the bylaw.
11.6 Homecraft – subject to the following:

11.6.1 No person other than one resident member of the family occupying the dwelling shall be engaged in the homecraft on the premises;

11.6.2 Where located in an R district, there shall be nothing to indicate from the exterior of the dwelling unit or building that it is being used for any purpose other than its principal or approved use;

11.6.3 No products or material shall be sold from or within the dwelling unit;

11.6.4 No products or materials shall be stored outside of the dwelling unit, building or accessory building;

11.6.5 No offensive noise, odour, vibration, smoke, heat or other objectionable effect shall be produced.

11.18 Artist Studio

11.18.1 Where an artist studio is combined with a residential unit, the studio may only be used by the individuals residing in the residential unit associated with and forming an integral part of the artist studio.

11.18.2 The maximum size for an Artist Studio shall be 500 m².

11.19 Residential Unit Associated with an Artist Studio

11.19.1 No more than 2 persons may occupy the residential unit associated with an artist studio except that the Director of Planning may relax this occupancy limit for the residential unit associated with an artist studio - Class A in an IC-3, HA or C district, provided that:

(a) a ventilated workshop space is provided in a room separated from the residential units;

(b) the Director of Planning considers the submission of any advisory group, property owner or tenant and all applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council.

11.19.2 The total minimum and maximum size of an Artist Studio when combined with a residential unit associated with and forming an integral part of an Artist Studio shall be 47 m² and 500 m², respectively.
WEST VANCOUVER

West Vancouver provides a fairly accommodating zoning bylaw although there are some discriminatory and arbitrary restrictions/accommodations. The bylaw has not been updated since 1984 and although the definition of “homecraft, occupation or business” is fairly inclusive, it uses complicated and confusing language, stating that a homecraft, occupation or business “shall mean any trade, business, profession, or other occupation carried on for remuneration, gain or otherwise in a dwelling unit, which use, except as may otherwise be provided for in this bylaw, is secondary to the primary use as a dwelling.”

The zoning bylaw relies entirely on performance standards to address potential impacts of home occupations. Outside storage of materials is prohibited. Stock-in-trade, materials, supplies or goods can be stored within the interior of the main or accessory building, but only if they do not exceed $1000 in wholesale value, a limit which appears somewhat arbitrary. A small sign is allowed outside the dwelling. On site sales are prohibited. Deliveries and “people making visits” are not allowed except “occasional or infrequent” deliveries or visits. One vehicle can be used in connection with the home occupation but must not be in excess of 5,000 pounds G.V.W. A maximum of two persons can work in connection with the home occupation and must be resident family members of the dwelling. The home occupation must not cause “any noise, heat, glare, odor, electrical interference or other nuisance to the immediate neighbourhood. Separate regulations are included for physicians offices in duplexes and multiple dwelling buildings.
31-105 **Home Craft, Occupation or Business**

105.1 A home craft, occupation or business shall be permitted within a dwelling unit subject to compliance with the regulations in this section.

105.2 No non-family member, and no more than two (2) persons of an immediate family shall be in any way engaged, occupied or employed to work on or from the premises in connection with such home craft, occupation or business and such family persons shall actively reside in the dwelling unit.

105.3 Notwithstanding Section 105.1, a physician's office shall also be permitted within dwelling units in the R.T.1, R.T.2, R.M.1 and R.M.2 Zones subject to compliance with the regulations in Section 31-108 only.

105.4 That no goods, wares, merchandise or other commodities are sold directly in, or upon, or from the premises.

105.5 That no stock-in-trade, materials, supplies or goods in excess of One Thousand Dollars ($1,000.00) wholesale value shall be stored or kept on or within the main or accessory building, nor shall any stock-in-trade, materials, supplies or goods related to the home craft, occupation or business be kept or stored exterior to any building.

31-105.6 That no more than one (1) vehicle shall be used in connection with the said home craft, occupation or business and no such vehicle shall be in excess of five thousand (5,000) pounds G.V.W.

105.7 That the home craft, occupation or business shall not involve, or be reasonably expected to involve any vehicle making deliveries to or from the premises or people making visits associated with the business other than an occasional or infrequent delivery or visit.

105.8 That the home craft, occupation or business shall not contribute or cause any noise, heat, glare, odor, electrical interference or other nuisance to the immediate neighbourhood.

105.9 Deleted by Amendment Bylaw No. 4060, 1997.
### Appendix C - Summary of Performance Standards for Home Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXTERNAL EVIDENCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>INTENSITY OF USE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUISANCE/FIRE/ SAFETY</strong></th>
<th><strong>PEDESTRIAN/VEHICULAR TRAFFIC</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Storage/ Evidence of HO</td>
<td>Limit on floor area</td>
<td>Nuisances (odors, noise, dust, etc.)</td>
<td>Sales/Stock in trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn.</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>neither are allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coq.</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade up to $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.West</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade allowed up to $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Van</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade allowed up to $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Coq</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade allowed up to $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanc.</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade allowed up to $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Van</td>
<td>max 2 - must be residents</td>
<td>no fire, safety, health hazards</td>
<td>no sales/stock in trade allowed up to $1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Burn.** applies to home occupation regulations. HB - applies to home based business regulations.
- **For New Westminster, HO - applies to home occupation regulations.**