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Public involvement in planning processes is increasingly expected and demanded by members of the local community and it is also a key method that the planner can use to gain insight into a community. The challenge which professional planners face is in finding effective methods for involving the public in complicated and technical decisions which planners have traditionally made in isolation. Specifically, technical zoning law can be overwhelmingly complicated for members of the public. Today's planners are challenged with establishing processes which are inclusive and which generate consensus-based solutions.

This thesis examines the use of collaborative planning to address the issue of compatible single-family infill housing. Specifically, this thesis addresses three questions: what are the elements of a collaborative public involvement process which can assist in creating a new single-family infill-zoning category; what are the limitations of using collaborative public involvement processes in neighbourhood re-zonings; and how does the Delbrook case study exemplify the use and implications of collaborative public involvement?

These questions are examined via two avenues: a literature review focusing on public involvement, collaboration and monster house infill construction; and a case study analysis examining the Delbrook neighbourhood zoning project. The major findings of this thesis define evaluation criteria, emerging from the
literature that can be applied to analyzing collaborative public involvement processes and also extract key lessons learned from the Delbrook case study.

Significant conclusions of this thesis are that the public expects inclusive processes; the public is capable of rising to technical zoning challenges; it is important that the levels and opportunities for involvement are appropriate to the planning process; it is important to identify and periodically re-visit the roles of those involved in public involvement processes; and a clear and attainable goal must be set for collaborative public involvement processes. The Delbrook case study further illustrates that issues which inspire a great degree of controversy and which are complex in nature will require a more collaborative public involvement framework; the time spent on collaborative processes can cause the public to burn out; consensus building among those involved must always consider the larger community; and that collaborative processes are dynamic.

In conclusion, it is noted that more research should be conducted on how the increasing empowerment of groups may or may not affect the power of the individual, the impact which the process chosen may have on the product or results; the extent to which limitations exist for lay persons involvement in technical planning subjects; and an exploration of other practical applications for dealing with large house infill construction.
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Chapter One

The Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Process: A Case Study of Collaborative Public Involvement

1.0 Introduction

The planning profession has entered an era of structuring processes within public involvement frameworks. Municipalities such as Calgary, the City of Vancouver and the District of North Vancouver are developing public involvement policies and manuals to facilitate staff and the public working together. In addition to the theoretical efforts expended on public involvement practices, municipalities have found that examining public involvement cases contributes empirical research which can serve to improve future process building\(^1\). With the proliferation of community groups and the increasing non-homogeneity of active community voices, the process used must strive to unite various interests to seek solutions on a common ground.

Public involvement processes have been applied extensively to Official Community Plans, Local Area Plans, implementation strategies and development proposals but have thus far had limited application in more technical zoning issues such as densities, dimensions and siting. These technical aspects of zoning have often been at the core of neighbourhood unrest over the construction of incompatible infill housing in established Greater Vancouver neighbourhoods\(^2\).
This thesis examines the re-zoning of one neighbourhood within the District of North Vancouver. The case study highlights the collaborative public involvement process used in the Delbrook neighbourhood re-zoning and how this approach facilitated the re-zoning. The experiences emerging through the Delbrook case study provide a local perspective which future neighbourhoods could apply toward lobbying for similar processes and which municipalities can use toward addressing micro-zoning issues.

1.1 Context

Controversy over infill housing in single family neighbourhoods, stemming from a neighbourhood perception of incompatible built form, has been pervasive in many cities throughout North America over the past decade. The Greater Vancouver Region has not been exempted from this controversy. The high cost of land combined with the aging stock of single family houses has caused extreme neighbourhood tension when large new houses are constructed next to modest older ones. These tensions have, at times, been associated with international immigration to the region.

In the District of North Vancouver these tensions have resulted in extensive District-wide initiatives aimed at addressing the Monster House phenomenon...
including single-family housing studies, task forces, new policies and zoning changes. While these initiatives were well intended and did achieve limited results, the District Council found that after 12 years of District-wide study\(^5\) the problems of loss of view, overshadowing by neighbouring structures, a perceived property devaluation, loss of privacy and other complaints related to incompatible infill housing persisted.

When the District-wide approach failed to achieve harmonious infill housing and neighbourhood satisfaction, the District decided to try a more inclusive neighbourhood-based approach. Neighbourhood zoning has its theoretical roots in collaborative public involvement processes which open the planning process to the entire neighbourhood. Collaborative planning is a comprehensive public involvement approach which London summarizes in the following passage:

Civic collaboration is a process of shared decision-making in which all the parties with a stake in a problem constructively explore their differences and develop a joint strategy for action. The ethic of collaboration is premised on the belief that politics does not have to be a zero-sum game where one party wins and one party loses, or where both sides settle for a compromise. If the right people are brought together in constructive ways and with the appropriate information they can not only create authentic visions and strategies for addressing their joint problems but also, in many cases, overcome their limited perspectives of what is possible. (London 1995, 1)

Public involvement in planning processes ranges from a minimum level, such as posting a notification sign, to full collaboration or joint plan creation. The
collaborative process described above by London has not traditionally been utilized to address the creation of new zoning legislation. The Delbrook case is one of six adopted area zones in the District of North Vancouver which used a collaborative public involvement approach for not only the re-zoning process, but also for the zone creation itself.

Delbrook is a neighbourhood of over 630 houses located immediately east of Mosquito Creek in the District of North Vancouver. It is predominantly a single-family neighbourhood of which a majority of the properties were zoned RS3 (minimum lot area is 7,200 sq.ft.) with a small component of RS2 (minimum lot area is 12,000 sq.ft.) prior to the neighbourhood re-zoning. The Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Study commenced in the summer of 1994, the bylaw was introduced at Council in September of 1995 and the new zone was adopted in November 1995.

The neighbourhood was rezoned from RS2 and RS3 to a new RSD or Single Family Residential Delbrook zone. The public involvement portion of the process required twelve months to complete and employed various vehicles for public involvement. The new zone was well supported by the community, the local community association, local architects, designers, builders and realtors as well as the District's Council.
Delbrook is an illustrative case study not only in that it was considered a successful process by those involved, but also because the neighbourhood itself is configured to include many particulars which are documented in the literature discussing infill housing issues. Specifically, the following local factors exist in Delbrook: the land topography has rendered Delbrook a view area and residents were concerned about view retention; the consistency of built-form which is typical to a 30 year old subdivision leaves new construction highly visible; a strong and established community opposition to local planning initiatives exists in Delbrook; and a concern about devaluation of properties if views were threatened was pervasive in the neighbourhood.

The Delbrook case analysis is an instructive example of collaborative public involvement in that it provides new evidence that collaborative public involvement can achieve positive and implementable results when applied to neighbourhood re-zonings. Problems traditionally associated with a collaborative public involvement approach for area re-zonings include both the public's limited knowledge of zoning technicalities as well individual's design preferences which can make consensus more difficult to achieve. The Delbrook case study provides a new approach which municipalities can utilize to deal with neighbourhood concerns regarding incompatible infill construction.
1.2 Problem Statement:

The traditional planning approach, that is to plan, announce and defend, has been typically employed as the preferred method for area re-zonings. This technique has proven not effective for neighbourhood re-zonings as decisions are made without public involvement and this results in a negative public reaction toward the zoning proposals. This late and sometimes token involvement can result in a process which does not move forward. Due to both the immense public interest associated with compatible infill housing and the fear associated with changes in property rights, a more inclusive approach to generating compatible infill housing regulations is required.

Traditional subdivisions are planned according to similar lot layout, housing style, housing size, placement of houses on the lots, and age of housing. The challenge facing the District of North Vancouver is to establish a process whereby the residents of a thirty to forty year old neighbourhood, along with other interested stakeholders, can work together with staff to create a new zone which addresses the issues of neighbourhood compatibility associated with integrating infill housing in established neighbourhoods.

Pursuing the objective of neighbourhood generated infill-zoning challenges two traditional planning mind-sets: first, that citizens are not able to
participate in creating the technical aspects of a new residential zone; and second, that zoning should be applied at a broad municipal or macro level rather than being applied at neighbourhood or micro level. Fundamental to the objective is a planning process whereby residents and stakeholders are enabled to make informed zoning choices and which creates a vehicle for the various interest groups to work together.

1.3 Research Questions:

The goal of this thesis is to assess the benefits of using a collaborative public involvement process to develop infill housing regulations. This is achieved through examining an area re-zoning case study which illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of a collaborative approach, and draws conclusions which can be applied to future strategies for addressing the infill housing dilemma.

In order to fulfill this objective, the research undertaken in this thesis will respond to the following three questions:

1. What are the elements of collaborative public involvement which assist in bringing the various interest groups together to generate
neighbourhood re-zoning proposals which address the goal of compatible infill housing?

2. What are the strengths and limitations of using collaborative public involvement processes in neighbourhood re-zonings?

3. How does the Delbrook case study exemplify the use of collaborative public involvement and specifically what does it illustrate in terms of the implications inherent in using a collaborative approach to achieve area re-zonings?

1.4 Approach and Methodology:

Two research techniques are employed to assess the use of collaborative public involvement processes in neighbourhood re-zonings, a literature review and a case study analysis.

The literature review provides a theoretical framework for studying the Delbrook case including a brief history of public involvement and a discussion of the spectrum of involvement to contextuate the usage of a collaborative approach. Elements relating to the application of collaborative processes and recent issues surrounding infill housing are explored. These findings from the literature review will be used to generate a set of evaluation criteria which will be applied to the case study as an analytical framework.
The case study analysis is conducted via a document analysis framework (detailed in Chapter Four). The data-set utilized in this analysis includes file notes, meeting minutes, reports, Public Hearing submissions, Public Hearing minutes, the survey database, submissions by participants and other related items (see Appendix Two). The case study analysis provides a qualitative assessment of the Delbrook area re-zoning process. Although the analysis has been conducted post-facto, it should be noted that the researcher was a participant in the Delbrook rezoning process. As the empirical data-set from the Delbrook case study used a variety of data sources, the conclusions are reliable, valid and can be replicated. This approach ensures the objectivity of the analysis.

1.5 Scope and Limitations:

The scope of this thesis is limited to research focused on the merits of using collaborative public involvement processes in area re-zonings and as such will not address other items related to the topic of compatible infill housing regulations. Specifically, the research will not extensively examine legislation which may be employed to address compatible single family construction; it will not analyze the approaches chosen by other municipalities; it will not debate the merits of using zoning as a tool to deal with the compatibility of
new housing built in established neighbourhoods; and it will not deliberate on
the complex topic of single family house design.

The research is focused on the collaborative method of public involvement
and does not explore the merits of various tools geared to elicit response
such as communication tools, facilitation tools, workshop strategies and
conflict resolution.

1.6 Description of Structure and Content:

Following this introductory chapter are four additional chapters. Chapter Two
examines the public involvement literature to generate the analytical
framework utilized in an examination of the Delbrook case study. Chapter
Three details the Delbrook case study and Chapter Four analyzes the
strengths and limitations of that process using Chapter Two's analytical
framework. Chapter Five extends the conclusions drawn from the Delbrook
study to make recommendations about elements which may be applicable to
other collaborative public involvement processes as well as to highlight
observations emerging from the Delbrook study which require further
research.
Chapter Two

Literature Review: Public Involvement, Collaboration and Monster House Construction

2.1 Introduction

Prior to introducing the Delbrook neighbourhood zoning case study, a general discussion regarding public involvement and collaboration, as they relate to neighbourhood inclusiveness in addressing the monster house syndrome, is warranted. Chapter Two reviews the literature to provide an analytical framework for analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the collaborative process applied in the Delbrook area re-zoning case study.

Given that there is a vast amount of literature on public involvement, this review concentrates on several areas which contextuate the collaborative public involvement approach and assist in the analysis of this approach. Specifically the following are investigated: a brief introduction to the terminology commonly utilized in the public involvement and monster house syndrome realms and an interpretation of how these terms are applied throughout this thesis; an exploration of the evolution of public involvement in context of how the shortcomings of past involvement has created a trend towards more inclusive community partnerships; an examination of the spectrum of public involvement leading to a discussion of collaborative public involvement; an investigation of the processes for which collaborative public
involvement is applicable; and an introduction to the monster house dilemma. The literature review will serve to generate a set of performance criteria which will be used in assessing the Delbrook area re-zoning collaborative process.

It is evident in the literature that a variety of opinions exist regarding the appropriateness of involving members of the public in government decision-making\(^9\). However, it is also clear that a community expectation of open and accessible processes is now pervasive at all levels of government. Some of the key issues which were prevalent during the Delbrook re-zoning include the complexity of the subject matter under consideration, the fact that a variety of opinions regarding the area re-zoning existed in the community and a concern over the potentially divisive nature of the topic. A broad understanding of the public involvement framework will assist in a detailed examination of the Delbrook case study.

2.2 Introducing Terminology

2.2.1 The Public and Public Involvement

The term public involvement is used somewhat loosely by land management professionals and members of the public alike. For the purpose of this thesis "the public" is a general term which applies to any group or individual interested in, but not directly professionally related to, a particular
government policy or regulation. A 'public group' describes both established organized groups as well as ad hoc groups formed to deal with one particular issue. The City of Calgary\(^{10}\) places the public in one of three categories: community associations; special interest groups (for example heritage or environment); and the general public which are usually unorganized and can include individuals. This distinction separates the public from non-government professional organizations which have an interest in a parcel of land.

When defining the public at the onset of a process, it is crucial to make the distinction between the various groups as some may have opposing interests to others. Callow et. al. (1992, 1) state that:

There is no such entity as the "general public". The public is not a single entity but is formed of many different, often opposing, interests and groups. Many members of the public that become involved in a public consultation process have their own personal or group agendas and use the public consultation process as a forum to further their aims.

There are many definitions of public involvement, but one by Desmond Connor (1988) discusses this term from the aspect of shared responsibility. As pointed out in Keyes (1992, 23), Connor states that public participation is:

a systematic process which provides an opportunity for citizens, planners, elected representatives and members of relevant area agencies to share their experience, knowledge and goals, and to combine their energy to create a plan. This plan can then reflect their knowledge and best judgment at the time and will be understood and actively supported by most of those affected by it.
Through a discussion of the Monster House syndrome it becomes evident that there is no one public. The complex nature of the topic results in part from the personal positions of those choosing to become involved. Among the residents of a neighbourhood there tends to be two camps, one which seeks to preserve an established neighbourhood with minimal changes and one which seeks to re-build older homes thereby changing the neighbourhood.

Other interest groups which may seek involvement in neighbourhood infill bylaws, are those which have a professional interest in the resulting bylaws. Groups such as architects, builders, designers and real estate boards have been critical of zoning endeavors which seek to address the monster house conflict\textsuperscript{11}. In the District of North Vancouver, many of these professionals are residents and have served on the re-zoning committees. In these roles, the resident / professional crosses boundaries to represent both the public and the professional group.

2.2.2 Neighbourhood Zoning

Neighbourhood zoning, also known as ‘Special District Zoning’\textsuperscript{12} is a process in the District of North Vancouver of re-writing the single-family zoning bylaws on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis to generate regulations which
are tailored specifically to each neighbourhood. By considering each
neighbourhood in turn, the aim is to analyze the unique character of an area
and institute controls which celebrate the area specific attributes which
residents feel are worthy of preserving. The impetus behind neighbourhood
zoning is to promote infill housing which is compatible with, but not intended
to be a mirror image of, the existing built form. Regulations which support an
equilibrium with the surrounding neighbourhood are sought.

2.2.3 Collaborative Public Involvement

Many methods for eliciting public response and involvement exist, and within
these methods there is a vast array of differences in the magnitude of
involvement. Collaborative public involvement is considered a process of
shared decision-making. In his article *Building Collaborative Communities*,

Collaboration reduced to its simplest definition means “to work
together.” The search for a more comprehensive definition leads to a
myriad of possibilities.... These range from the formally academic (“a
process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem
domain about the future of that domain [3]”) to the downright esoteric
(“an interactive process having a shared transmutational purpose” [4]).
[13]... Collaboration holds widespread appeal to people from every
position on the political spectrum, not because it offers everything to
everyone... but because it deals with a process.

In the neighbourhood zoning context collaboration is a process of bringing
the various interest groups together to formulate a viable set of new zoning
regulations.
2.2.4 Monster House

The term Monster House does not simply draw illusions to a house of substantial proportions, but also refers to a house in context with what exists around it.

The Monster House is a house which is huge by neighbourhood standards and as such is readily apparent on the street. It is conceivable that a house can be considered a Monster when it is unique on the street, and then considered typical when the rest of the street has also converted to large houses. The Monster House is not built following a defined architectural style; however there tend to be commonalities among those houses considered to be Monsters: they tend to be bulky or box-like structures; they tend to appear over-built on the lot; they may incorporate siting characteristics which are incongruous on the street; they may use building elements, materials or colors which do not complement the adjacent houses; and they tend to be higher and larger than the adjacent houses\textsuperscript{14}.

The following section discusses the evolution of public participation in the planning process.
2.3 Evolution of Participation

In the early 1900s, public involvement in the planning process in Canada was somewhat limited to the economically advantaged classes and focused on the aesthetic qualities of cities. Gerald Hodge describes these early planning movements in Planning Canadian Communities (1991, 361):

In the first decade of this century, the impetus for planning often arose from such community groups as boards of trade and arts organizations. Influenced by City Beautiful... these elite groups hired planners to prepare a plan that could be presented to the community to persuade it to launch its own planning activities.... In the 1920s, using the provisions of new planning acts, many municipalities established town planning commissions to prepare master plans and zoning by-laws. The appointed members of these commissions were usually selected from the real estate and construction industry or other lines of commerce.

The civic rights of exercising one's vote, a traditional method of public involvement, was advanced from the early 1900s to the 1960s as more citizens won the right to vote in Canada\textsuperscript{15}. The increasing empowerment of the public was coincidental with increased planning awareness due to urban renewal projects and government assistance projects.

During the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s public awareness of planning was increased by the educational efforts of the Community Planning Association of Canada (CPAC), a national organization with Central Mortgage and Housing (CMHC) funding. This organization lobbied for local planning initiatives and increased involvement of Canadian residents in the planning of
their communities. Also during this time, some well publicized, and opposed, urban renewal projects and expressways motivated citizens to become involved in their communities. Hodge (1991, 362) describes this time:

In coping with vast urban growth, the planning solutions were often large-scale and disruptive... the solution to one planning problem not infrequently created other problems for which "more of the same" seemed to many citizens to be the planners' perception... the advent of widespread public participation was not a movement against planning.... The concern was mostly over the conduct of planning... that it left out of the decision making those most likely to be affected.

In the 1970s and 1980s, as the planning profession has matured and the nature of public awareness has become increasingly sophisticated, it has become generally accepted that public involvement will be part of the planning process. The implications of this new planning approach have often led to politically-driven decision-making and public pressures for political resolutions. One result of this elevated citizen sophistication and political savvy is the need for methods to include the public in decision-making processes from which they have traditionally been ostracized.

In the 1990s, it is no longer acceptable to exclude the public in the planning process. The report of The B.C. Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (1994) states that:

Governments have been facing increasing pressure to involve the public in their decision-making, and this pressure seems to be a consequence of some basic changes in our society. It is becoming apparent that individuals and groups may be more knowledgeable than government
about certain issues as a consequence of their own background or experience. The public is also more informed about issues through education, media coverage, and access to information.... Given this raised level of awareness, there is a mistrust of traditional "closed door" decision-making and of the ability of governments and their experts to take all major factors into account (Dorcey et.al., 3).

Public involvement in decision-making has become a community expectation\textsuperscript{17}. A maturation of the ability of citizens to work within a planning framework has resulted. Current public involvement practices face a predicament as they are often viewed as either being ineffective, as when involvement is considered token, or swayed by political pressure from a vocal minority. Public involvement is at a cross-roads where viable methods for addressing community issues through inclusive and effective participation are needed.

With the emergence of a new style of participatory planning, an evolution in the nature of the public has occurred. The following section discusses this evolution.

\textbf{2.4 A Changing "Public"}

Over time the planning profession has witnessed an ever-changing public. The contemporary public is one which is becoming increasingly sophisticated
in their approach of dealing with the political, bureaucratic and development sectors. It is no longer acceptable to make land use plans and hope the public does not object; rather, it is expected that the public will be involved and consulted from an early stage. These changes have altered how the public is viewed.

The public is today, most often, viewed as groups rather than individuals. At Public Hearings and meetings the voice of the local ratepayer group or community association is often heard the loudest. One concern with the emergence of the recognized group as such a powerful entity is that a group can overshadow individual citizens or in extreme cases claim to represent individuals without polling the community or holding a general meeting. Kubiski (1992, 11 - 12) points out both the opportunities and challenges which community groups can produce:

Our society has seen literally thousands of citizen's groups emerge in the last thirty years, many of them formed to challenge the existing decision-making systems of government.... Because organized and sustained effort is required to make significant change, groups often are better equipped than individuals to be effective change agents. At their best, groups are vehicles for individuals to participate. There is a darker side to the emergence and growth of interest groups.... the empowerment of groups can disempower other individuals who do not belong, or who belong to less effective groups.... When power is held primarily by groups, the individuals come to be represented by an involvement proxy.

This changing public, coupled with an increasing reliance on group representation, can create barriers toward establishing consequential public
involvement processes. It is essential that a process be open to all individuals so that those affected can participate. An over-reliance on group representation may be misleading and result in some persons being left out of the process. The planning professional, through public involvement processes, can help address the inequality of non-representative community groups. The process can strive to make individual participation accessible.

2.5 The Spectrum of Involvement

The debate surrounding public involvement includes an argument that any level of involvement, no matter how slight, is beneficial. This conclusion is inherently weak in that a token gesture of involvement may impair a valid process. A genuine public involvement process, one where the opinions, concerns and preferences of the public at large are considered and deliberated upon, can be considered constructive. However, even genuine processes sometimes fail to achieve a productive outcome. Research has been conducted on the various levels, or the spectrum, of public involvement in order to determine when one approach may be more productive than another.

Public involvement can range between a casual telephone inquiry to participation on an Official Community Plan Steering Committee, from
submitting a letter of protest to making an impassioned delegation at a Public Hearing, from filling in a survey to actively lobbying for change. Within these examples lies a range of other options and all are forms of public involvement. Dorsey et. al. (1994, 5) point out that:

the kinds of decisions for which governments seek public involvement range from the general to the specific. At the more general level, governments may seek to clarify issues, determine public opinion, and develop public policy on such broad matters as constitutional change, health care or water export. At the more specific level, governments may seek input on strategies for implementing a policy.... Governments may also seek advice on the content of proposed regulations or standards; for example, the... means of regulating secondary suites.

The spectrum of public involvement is vast and depending on the level of interest or commitment required, members of the community will choose to be involved to differing degrees. This section discusses the spectrum of public involvement as described by Arnstein (1969), Godschalk et.al. (1994), Dorsey et.al. (1994), and the City of Calgary (1993). Arnstein’s ladder of involvement was an early identification of the broad levels possible in public participation, Godschalk makes distinctions between conventional and collaborative decision-making processes, Dorsey et.al. set out a basis for deciding levels of involvement and provide examples of methodology at the various levels and the City of Calgary applies levels of involvement to various processes.

Arnstein portrays an eight rung ‘Ladder of Citizen Participation’ ranging from manipulation at the bottom to citizen control at the top as follows:
• **Manipulation**: participation is used to educate or inform in order to sway public opinion to the bureaucratic goal;
• **Therapy**: used as a tool to divert attention away from concerns
• **Informing**: provides community with information on the process and may seek opinions or responses from community;
• **Consultation**: two way communication is a goal at the onset;
• **Placation**: perhaps the most damaging form of involvement, citizens are heard but not listened to;
• **Partnership**: shared responsibility through joint planning;
• **Delegated power**: gives citizens decision-making power (may not be possible in Canada unless provinces pass appropriate sub-delegation powers to the municipalities)
• **Citizen Control**: citizens take full responsibility, in all aspects, for a program e.g. grants for community improvements. (Arnstein 1969, Hodge 1991, 364)

One of the important elements to Arnstein’s ladder is that it clearly identifies when public involvement is not really seeking to involve but rather seeking to fulfill a public expectation, or as Hodge comments when it becomes “nothing more than an empty ritual” (1991, 365). Arnstein considers the levels of involvement in context of the degree of power-sharing which occurs.
The concept of sharing power is a controversial one. There is a strong argument that power cannot truly be shared if the agency with the power does not legally have the rights to sub-delegate that power. Efforts expended on joint plan creation therefore, some criticize, end up with no more than an
extravagant resident wish-list at the expense of wasted time, money and community / professional efforts\textsuperscript{18}. Despite the arguments against community and government partnership-based decision making, it had become evident in the District of North Vancouver during the early 1990s that nothing short of a partnership based approach would work to resolve the problems associated with infill construction. The years of studies and bylaw changes fell short as they failed to address many of the micro-issues associated with a series of aging subdivisions.

Godschalk et.al. discuss the items which differentiate between conventional and collaborative decision making processes. The conventional planning model which the District of North Vancouver used to address single family zoning changes prior to the inception of Neighbourhood Zoning in 1993, employs a process which was not open for extensive public influence until late in the planning stages when it becomes necessary for the professional decisions to be defended. The following diagram portrays the steps common to the conventional planning process.
Despite the time and cost savings which may be associated with a conventional planning model, there are negative consequences which result if the community does not agree with the recommendations. This type of 'Decide-Announce-Defend' (D.A.D.) or closed planning model can result in reactionary community resistance rooted in the fact that the public was excluded until late in the process. The very nature of conventional decision-making in planning processes encourages polarization and escalates conflict (Godschalk et.al. 1994, 16). The D.A.D. model can result in additional time and effort which may be required to repair damage done because of late or token involvement. When damage control is required, a small issue can be escalated into a much larger one.

As pointed out by Godschalk et.al. (1994, 17 - 18):

Recent research... has sought to identify the seeds of crisis that can escalate a minor dispute into a major confrontation. William Ury and
Richard Smoke, experts in negotiation and politics, have identified four conditions that can trigger a crisis: little time, high uncertainty, narrowed options, and high stakes.... Citizens have little time to respond; they do not have enough information to develop confidence in the decision; they are presented with unrealistic or no options; and the stakes are high, for if they are unable to move quickly, they will lose the battle.

The collaborative decision-making process adopts an approach which is virtually opposite from conventional planning process. In collaborative planning all interested parties come together early in a project to work through various issues and opportunities and then prepare a joint decision or recommendation.

**Figure 3: The Collaborative Decision-Making Process**

The Collaborative Decision-Making Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATORY PLANNING</th>
<th>CONSSENSUS PLAN</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION &amp; MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Stakeholders</td>
<td>Collaborative Decision Making</td>
<td>Broad Support for Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Godschalk et.al. (1994, 20)

Fundamental to collaborative decision-making is the goal of generating broad support for a plan, policy or bylaw. Godschalk et.al. (1994, 20) characterize a collaborative process as one which is inclusive, places the responsibility for success on the participants, has a clear purpose and definition, is one where the participants engage in mutual education, identifies and tests multiple
options, is consensus based, enables participants to share in implementation and includes ongoing information exchanges.

Collaborative decision-making dictates that parties work together in order to establish common goals and build consensus. It enables members of the collaborative team who hold disparate agendas or priorities to contemplate the viewpoints of others. A collaborative approach to single-family infill regulations can assist in dealing with the complexity of the issues involved.

Dorcey et.al. (1994) argue that there are two methods for improving public involvement processes: either choose the right type of process or improve the execution of the process chosen. Dorcey et.al. do not take the position that collaborative processes are superior to conventional ones, but rather that within the spectrum of processes available, there are implications associated with the process chosen. This spectrum divides public involvement into detailed levels and provides applicable methods for including the public throughout these levels (Figure 4, p. 29). Their paper presents options for public involvement to assist in choosing an appropriate process.
Figure 4: Dorcey's Public Involvement Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Educate</th>
<th>Gather information, perspectives</th>
<th>Consult on reactions</th>
<th>Define issues</th>
<th>Test ideas, seek advice</th>
<th>Seek consensus</th>
<th>Involve on on-going basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Some applicable methods:

- "White" (position) paper
- Open house
- Public meeting
- Toll-free phone line
- Focus group
- Workshop
- Public seminar or conference
- Survey, questionnaire
- "CORE" tables
- Round tables
- Public advisory planning/policy advisory teams

Increasing level of interaction

Increasing level of commitment, costs and time

Source: Dorcey et al. (1994, 5)
This public involvement spectrum does not criticize the less collaborative techniques, such as inform and educate, but rather provides examples where the application of these techniques are warranted. This spectrum also acknowledges the increasing time, cost, commitment and interaction levels which result as the process moves from informing to consensus-seeking and on-going involvement.

Choosing the right type of process depends on the complexity of the issue and the degree of public interest in the results. For those affected members of the public who do not have sufficient time or do not feel an impetus which motivates full collaboration, a combination of involvement techniques can create opportunities for increased participation. The following depiction of involvement techniques utilized by the City of Calgary illustrates this multi-technique approach.

The levels of involvement documented by the City of Calgary range from negotiation / consensus to appeal. The processes documented include development permits, subdivision, re-designation, area structure plans, special studies, area redevelopment plans and general municipal plans.
Figure 5: City Of Calgary’s Level of Involvement for Various Planning Initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Involvement¹</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>ARP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation/Consensus²</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify and Comment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervenor Appeal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This is a generalized presentation. There may be exceptions to the information shown in specific circumstances.

2. This level of involvement applies to discussions between the public and the civic administration leading to recommendations to City Council which alone makes the final decision.

**LEGEND**

- **GMP**: General Municipal Plan
- **ARP**: Area Redevelopment Plan
- **SS**: Special Studies
- **ASP**: Area Structure Plans
- **RD**: Redesignation (also known as a Land Use Amendment or a Re-zoning)
- **SUB**: Subdivision (combined outline plan/tentative plan process)
- **DP**: Development Permit

Source: City of Calgary (1993, 8)

Having guide diagrams such as this allows the public and the planner to enjoy mutual expectations of the process, timing and level of involvement.

Upon examining the spectrum of public involvement it becomes evident that the various levels have their associated applications and opportunities.

The use of the various public consultation techniques... will depend largely upon the following considerations: the nature of the project itself, the stage of the project..., the desired role the public is to play in the project, and the financial and time resources that are available.... The key to the public consultation process is early involvement by the public,
continuous involvement throughout the project, and the sincerity of commitment to public input by the project team (and proponents) of a project. (Callow et.al. 1992, 7)

The collaborative process chosen for the Delbrook neighbourhood zoning study attempts to bring a concerned and active public into a complex-issue decision making arena in order to adequately address the problem.

The following section further explores the collaborative public involvement milieu in order to justify when a collaborative process is warranted.

2.6 Collaborative Public Involvement Processes: Application

As increased requirements for alternate choices in land use arise, a struggle between planners, who want to provide balanced communities, developers, who want to maximize profit, and neighbourhood residents, who want to ensure quality of life, can result. Concerns regarding community issues such as increased traffic and traffic management, adequate provision of useful and safe green space, healthy communities, adequate school and daycare services, live-work opportunities and others, have prompted neighbourhood residents to invest much time and effort on their own planning work. A conflict arises when neighbourhood residents, city planners and developers embrace incompatible land management propositions.

Although these groups can share the ultimate goal of guiding the community’s future, each group is often working to realize its own ideal scenario. Individually, these groups may invest many hours researching local
area issues, creating strategies to address these issues, and developing programs for implementing the strategies. In some cases each group can create their own plan.

These plans are often incompatible. For example, a developer will want to maximize his / her profits by building to the highest and best use, while citizens (who may feel threatened by the possibility of increased density) may want the developer to develop in a manner that precludes a reasonable profit. The outcome for the resident group can be frustration and distrust toward both the bureaucracy and the developers. The resident group winds up fighting for what they need rather than working within the system as part of a positive planning process.

Collaboration holds widespread appeal to people from every position on the political spectrum, not because it offers everything to everyone (as some of the literature advocating collaboration seems to suggest), but because it deals with a process. Collaboration prompts us to look at the... process (London 1995, 2)

Through collaborative processes those who have a stake in the outcome of a process will have a shared role in decision-making. Once a process has produced joint recommendations or policies, these products should, according to collaboration theory, have the full support of the multi-stakeholder group20.

Collaboration is possible on certain projects. The key words are “certain projects”. There are some projects or instances where this type of a public involvement process may not be an appropriate tool. This section discusses the types of processes that collaborative public involvement are suited for,
the flexibility that can be built into this type of planning model and some processes which may not be appropriate for collaborative public involvement.

Collaborative public involvement is ideal for, but not limited to, official community plans, local area plans, area re-zonings, re-development plans, development application processes, community social policy processes, changes in land use and similar types of processes. Some common threads in these processes are that they deal with issues important to the residents of a community, there may be a certain degree of controversy associated with the issues, the issues under review are generally quite complex, the outcome of the process will have an impact on the community's residents, and they are all at the local government level. The significance which the outcome of these processes hold for residents assists in providing the required motivation to invest community efforts in the planning process.

Collaborative public involvement is not limited to the processes identified above. There may be others, such as regional land use issues, environmental issues, transportation issues and a host of others, where a collaborative process may be utilized. However, if a process is established to study a problem and not produce decisions, policies or other regulatory recommendations (recommendations which actually affect or impact upon a site or defined area) then another type of process may be better suited.

Collaborative public involvement can be used in decision-making processes at other levels of government and is generally engineered with a flexible approach. In essence, collaborative public involvement processes need to be generative or able to change.
Principal parties are involved in designing the process as well as in framing solutions. Early in the process, representatives for the parties can take part in a planning committee, or they can give guidance through discussion about the issues, procedures, and individuals who should take part in the actual decision making. Although effective consensus-building processes may be difficult to organize and manage, they succeed in producing functional solutions that all parties can adopt. (Godschalk et al. 1994, 21)

Despite the strengths of collaborative public involvement, there are times when this type of public involvement process may not be appropriate, for example: decisions which are under severe time constraints; decisions dealing with immediate public safety; decisions which are dependent upon professional liability; and decisions which necessitate that groups who are not willing to collaborate must work together. It would be impossible to list all the cases where collaborative public involvement would not be appropriate, but it should be stated that the scope of this paper recognizes that wherever collaborative public involvement can help municipalities generate a healthier community climate and shared plan creation it should be the model of choice.

Given the complex nature of Monster House construction in a modest suburban environment, the utilization of a collaborative public involvement approach is applicable. The following section describes and discusses the “Monster House” issue.

2.7 Monster House Infill Construction, Neighbourhood Reaction and Planning Approaches

Since the late 1980s there has been a construction boom in Vancouver and its surrounding municipalities. For a variety of reasons, small houses in...
established neighbourhoods are being demolished and replaced by large new houses. The changes in neighbourhoods are complicated by the fact that new construction often embodies houses which are being built at, or close to, the land's zoned potential as opposed to older houses which are typically under-built on the lot. The conflict between resident complaints over Monster Houses and legal land rights under permitted zoning densities creates a dilemma for municipal politicians and planners\textsuperscript{23}.

The Monster House phenomenon is not an issue limited to municipalities in Greater Vancouver. Many cities, including Saint John, Calgary, North York, and Toronto have created policies or legislation which deal with single-family infill and neighbourhood preservation. The following sections discuss the impacts of incompatible infill construction as well as some of the municipal resources currently available in British Columbia for addressing this problem.

2.7.1 Monster House Construction

It is understandable that as neighbourhoods age houses will be updated and replaced. However, not all replacement houses act as catalyst structures inspiring resident complaints about infill development. At the heart of the complaints seem to lie issues surrounding loss of neighbourhood character\textsuperscript{24}. Neighbourhood character is a difficult entity to define and hence protect. Complicated by a mix of inter-related variables, there are some specifics which seem common to Monster House criticism: size (floor space); bulk and height. These items, either alone or more frequently in combination, will often impact the streetscape and result in a conflict among the residential setting on the street. Further to this imparity of built-form, residents fear that the
eventual outcome will be a domino-effect on the street whereby one large house leads to more large houses. (Pettit, 159).

Along with the incongruity of scale and the fear of new dominating old (or large dominating small), other resident concerns associated with infill construction include incompatible design elements, loss of privacy, loss of sunlight and / or view; loss of mature vegetation; changes in street vernacular (often caused by changes in setbacks or parking structure placement); and the changing neighbourhood face or perceived values^{25}.

While neighbourhood residents may be opposed to infill development for the reasons outlined, the issues are often entangled with potential losses in property value. A neighbourhood survey of Marlborough Heights residents in the District of North Vancouver resulted in the juxtaposition of residents wanting lower and less bulky new houses but not wanting to lose any of their own development potential^{26}. The outcome in Marlborough Heights was to reduce upper storey bulk and height but increase lot coverage therefore allowing a retention of the Floor Space Ratio.

The problems associated with Monster House infill construction in established small house neighbourhoods can be investigated through a number of avenues in British Columbia. The following discussion introduces some of the resources available to address this problem including voluntary design guidelines, zoning amendments, heritage conservation legislation and restrictive covenants.
2.7.2 Available Planning Approaches

Through Neighbourhood Zoning it has become evident that residents will request zoning legislation which prohibits houses based on the merits of design and building elements rather than on the merits of a zoning analysis. This section discusses the powers available to municipalities which can be applied to new single-family house construction.

In British Columbia there are two bodies of legislation which govern the operation of municipalities: the Municipal Act (the Act), which applies to every municipality with the exception of the City of Vancouver, and the Vancouver Charter (the Charter) which applies to the City of Vancouver. While both pieces of legislation grant powers to the municipalities, there are some differences between the Charter and the Act which affect the extent of the zoning measures which can be taken. The following discussion concentrates on the powers granted under the Municipal Act, as this is the legislation which governs the municipality from which the case study is extracted. Where relevant, however, the Charter is also discussed.

Under the Municipal Act in British Columbia, design guidelines are enforceable in multi-family, commercial and industrial zones through a development permit area designation and associated requirements. Single-family zones are not currently permitted to be delineated as development permit areas for the purpose of design guidelines. Voluntary design
guidelines could be established for single-family areas, however voluntary guidelines would not carry any legal weight.

In Alberta, the City of Calgary has established single-family design guidelines for infill construction, and applies these guidelines through the requirement of a development permit under the power of their Land Use By-law. These guidelines are intended to “identify the City’s objectives and expectations regarding design quality and development” (Calgary 1993, 14). In essence, Calgary’s design guidelines are used in conjunction with adopted area redevelopment plans as an advisory document for applicants as well as a tool for staff to use when analyzing the merits of applications. Calgary’s guidelines focus on five areas including site context, site layout and parking, building mass or envelope, privacy and shadowing, and landscaping.

Both design guidelines and zoning can be used to guide new single-family development. Zoning regulates the size, shape, density and siting (or placement on the lot) of principle and accessory buildings. Zoning has impacted and sculpted the urban landscape since its origins27.

Zoning however, as applied through the Act, cannot dictate design elements, choice of materials, building colors or building schemes. Where design guidelines might be criticized for not providing concrete direction, zoning can
be criticized for being too inflexible\textsuperscript{28}. Under the Charter, Vancouver does have some discretionary zoning powers which allows a greater degree of flexibility within single-family zones as evidenced in the RS6 zone\textsuperscript{29}.

Some recently adopted legislation, now available through the Municipal Act, can assist municipalities in applying neighbourhood conservation preservation guidelines where the aim is to protect identifiable neighbourhood assets\textsuperscript{30}. These guidelines are applied through the delineation of a heritage conservation area within an Official Community Plan (OCP). The requirements for delineating a conservation area include a description of the special features which justify the designation, a clear statement of the objectives of the designation and the specific guidelines detailing the manner by which the objectives are to be achieved\textsuperscript{31}.

West Vancouver has applied the heritage conservation legislation in the Lower Caulfeild neighbourhood - a neighbourhood consisting of 66 houses. West Vancouver staff describe the intention behind the designation as follows:

The primary reason that Lower Caulfeild residents originally submitted their petition to Council was to ensure that new development would be compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood. (West Vancouver, 1995, 3).

The Lower Caulfeild study process began in 1988 (prior to the adoption of the neighbourhood heritage conservation legislation) and concluded with the
heritage conservation designation in 1996. In Lower Caulfeild, the designation regulates the following: site design and landscape; architectural design; circulation and parking; and streetscape elements. These elements are regulated through an OCP requirement for an exterior alteration permit.

A final approach to regulating the design of single-family infill construction would be for private owners to register covenants on their lots. This is rarely feasible in that there is a general resistance to self-encumbrance which is exacerbated by the financial costs associated with preparing and registering a covenant.

In the past five years, several Greater Vancouver municipalities have attempted to address the issue of Monster House construction and more are grappling with this issue as residents become increasingly displeased with the nature of adjacent infill construction. Most to date, with the exception of West Vancouver, have approached the issue via zoning amendments as they are relatively timely, have an immediate impact, and can address the issue of house bulk or massing in an effective manner.

2.8 Conclusions Emerging From The Literature

The foregoing discussion offered insights regarding public involvement levels, made an argument that public involvement is an inherently worthy endeavor in most planning processes; and, depending upon the degree of complexity and public interest, suggested that a collaborative process would be preferred
over a conventional (Decide, Announce and Defend) process. This chapter has also investigated the issues regarding Monster House infill and why this is apparently problematic in today's established neighbourhoods. This investigation establishes that there is a great public interest in policies regarding infill house construction, and makes the resulting argument for inclusive processes to address this issue.

Some conclusions from the literature are readily forthcoming such as: the challenges which arise when new construction begins to replace older houses; the foundation for involving residents in decision-making regarding neighbourhood changes; and, that the issues involved in Monster House infill construction are complicated. Further, the research shows that public involvement processes should achieve the following: early involvement; appropriate opportunities; open communication; inclusiveness; establishment of a clearly defined goal; a sense of community / government partnership; and, build community ownership.

Emerging from the preceding discussion regarding inclusive public involvement processes and the challenges associated with incompatible infill construction is an analytical framework for evaluating public involvement processes (detailed in Appendix One). The evaluation criteria, or analytical
framework, which emerged from the literature provide a qualitative gauge to assess the overall success of a public involvement planning process.

The criteria are set forth in eleven statements each accompanied by a statement of intent. The criteria deal with both the process itself as well as the results of the process. The highlights of the evaluation criteria include an examination of the following: process barriers; appropriateness of those involved as well as the process chosen; analysis of where the process fits within the spectrum of involvement; the proponents' views of the resulting product; the feasibility of the recommendations; and resulting neighbourhood feedback.

The following chapter will describe the Delbrook neighbourhood area rezoning process.
Chapter Three

The Delbrook Area Re-Zoning: A Collaborative Public Involvement Process

Chapter Two posits that collaborative public involvement processes are appropriately used when creating new zoning designed to curtail Monster House construction. The discussion stressed the importance of bringing all stakeholders to the table when issues are complex and interest in the issues is great. Chapter Three outlines the collaborative process used to complete an area re-zoning in the District of North Vancouver’s Delbrook neighbourhood.

3.1 Impetus for Examining The Delbrook Case

There is an increasing interest in the single family landscape and issues of infill development in the Vancouver Region, as elsewhere in Canada and the United States. In the Greater Vancouver area, many municipalities face an escalating struggle as traditional 1950s’ bungalow style homes are demolished and replaced by 1980s’ and 1990s’ Monster House style homes. The municipal reactions to date have been primarily reactionary in nature and have predominantly, with the exception of Lower Caulfeild, used zoning as the tool for guiding new construction. The Delbrook case study presents one
municipality's reaction to single family infill issues at a local level focusing on the process chosen and specifically the method for public involvement.

Implicit in the District of North Vancouver's Neighbourhood Zoning program is a proactive approach. In essence, this program mandates that planning staff, in collaboration with the public, examine each of the mature neighbourhoods within the District of North Vancouver and address the issues surrounding compatible infill construction through re-zoning. While other neighbourhoods in the District of North Vancouver, Burnaby and the City of Vancouver have also completed area re-zonings, the Delbrook case warrants analysis in that there are a number of factors in Delbrook which are also found throughout the region: physical topography of a hillside development; a politically active and savvy public; and a high percentage of remaining original structures. The Delbrook case study is timely in that other municipalities are currently facing the same dilemmas as those in Delbrook.

3.2 The Delbrook Neighbourhood in Context

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, Delbrook is a neighbourhood consisting of just over 600 single-family houses of which a majority were built during the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s. Delbrook is one of five neighbourhoods in the North Lonsdale community (see Map 1 and Map 2).
Map 1: Communities in The District of North Vancouver

Source: District of North Vancouver, Community Profiles, 1995.

Map 2: Neighbourhoods in North Lonsdale

Lots in the Delbrook neighbourhood are configured to maximize views of downtown Vancouver and Burrard Inlet. The typical Delbrook lot dimensions are 69 feet by 125 feet resulting in large lots of over 8,600 square feet in area. Despite the original zoning, which allowed houses of over 4,000 square feet excluding the below grade basement areas, a typical Delbrook house ranges from 1,000 square feet to 1,600 square feet above grade.

Photograph 1: Typical Delbrook Houses - North Side of Street

Photograph 2: Typical Delbrook House - South Side of Street
The above houses embody characteristics typical of the Delbrook neighbourhood: these houses have been retained in very good repair; they are small by today’s standards relative to the lot size; and they are sited to maximize views.

The Delbrook neighbourhood is a relatively affluent one. The 1991 census data shows that the average household income in Delbrook was $72,460 which is higher than both the District of North Vancouver’s average, at $66,068, and the Vancouver Census Metropolitan Area’s average at $46,137 (Statistics Canada, Canada Census 1991). The neighbourhood is also relatively stable with eighty-five percent of the area reported to be “non-movers”\(^35\) compared with seventy-eight percent non-movers in the Vancouver Region. Delbrook’s housing stock has seen a moderate amount of recent construction change with approximately five percent of the houses being replaced or having major additions since 1990\(^36\).

New construction which maximizes the zoning allowances will tend to loom over or dominate a traditional Delbrook house. Photograph 3 (following page) displays the incongruity of new construction in Delbrook in relationship to the existing houses.
Evident in the above photograph is not only the discordant design, but also the dominant height and scale of the infill home when compared with the adjacent house and the houses shown in Photographs 1 and 2. These features create an inharmonious appearance on the street.

In summary, the Delbrook area is a family oriented and stable neighbourhood. Delbrook's residents are active in local politics and planning issues. The process implications which result from the nature of the neighbourhood include: the need to respond effectively to a great deal of neighbourhood interest in new zoning regulations; a tendency for new construction to have an impact on the street-scape; an existing community group which is opposed to new houses that are considered large by
neighbourhood standards; and a group who wish to renovate or re-build their older house who are consequently opposed to stringent zoning restrictions.

The following section will present an overview of the single-family zoning efforts, which attempted to control Monster Houses, that took place prior to the establishment of Neighbourhood Zoning.

3.3 Synopsis: Single Family Zoning History in the District of North Vancouver

Single family house re-development of an incompatible scale became evident in the District of North Vancouver in the early 1980s. Resulting from residents' complaints to Council, requests for Planning Staff to analyze the problem and make recommendations to address the issues were generated. Early staff reports, dating back to 1981, began to examine issues regarding overly massive new house construction. These initiatives resulted in changes to the zoning bylaw in attempts to repress the impacts resulting from incompatible new construction\(^{37}\). Subsequent reports dated 1984 continued to address the issues of house height, bulk and floor space allowance as the earlier changes were insufficient to combat the escalating problem\(^{38}\).

Despite the efforts expended on single family zoning in the early 1980s complaints from residents continued as the zoning amendments had failed to
address the issues. Ensuing staff reports and bylaws through 1986 and 1987 continued to examine topics related to the size and compatibility of infill single family homes\textsuperscript{39}. When these efforts also failed to achieve the desired results, a Single Family Housing Task Force committee of Council was established in 1987.

The Single Family Housing Task Force was formed to review issues relating to house design in both new and infill neighbourhoods. The terms of reference for this task force included the following: to control the size of homes; to examine the implications of “Monster Houses”; to examine the compatibility of design with existing houses; to assess view protection issues; and to comment on streetscape design and architectural controls (Policy and Planning Committee Meeting Notes, April 13, 1987, File 6700.82382). This task force was comprised of 12 members and 2 staff representatives. Three of the 12 members were Council representatives and the other nine consisted of 7 members from other Council Advisory Committees plus one realtor and one builder. There were no members of the public “at large” and no members representing community associations.

While the recommendations resulting from the Task Force did impact new house construction\textsuperscript{40}, the resulting zoning bylaw continued to allow massive and box-shaped structures adjacent to modest bungalows with no provisions
for architectural transitions or relationship between the structures. The task force hired a second consultant in 1990 to examine building schemes, design guidelines, subdivision standards and streetscapes. As construction of Monster Houses continued, the censure from impacted neighbourhood residents and community associations intensified. The backlash against Council and the Planning Department culminated in 1993 and resulted in the bylaws which actualized the Neighbourhood Zoning program in 1994.

Bylaws 6644 and 6645 were products of reaction to a foregoing lack of neighbourhood input into zoning regulations. Bylaw 6645 placed a height restriction on all single-family zoned properties located west of Lynn Creek (subsequently expanded to the entire municipality) that replacement houses are not to exceed the height of the house legally existing on the lot at the time of application. The intention stated by Staff and Council was to replace this restriction in each neighbourhood once neighbourhood zoning was generated in partnership with residents of each area. This program was brought about due to twelve years of ineffective measures and it mandated collaborative solutions to the single-family infill crisis.
3.4 The Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Process and Outcome

Delbrook was the third neighbourhood zoning project undertaken within the District of North Vancouver. The collaborative process established in the first projects was expanded through the Delbrook project\textsuperscript{41}.

The collaborative process used for the Delbrook re-zoning encouraged early resident involvement and full neighbourhood partnership. The following sections describe the phases of the Delbrook re-zoning including: issue identification and survey creation; survey distribution and analysis; staff and resident sponsored information open house; staff and resident Working Group which generated the draft zoning regulations; neighbourhood feedback on draft regulations; and Council proceedings adopting the re-zoning bylaws. The process used is outlined in the diagram on the following page.

Phase 1: Determining Study Objectives

The first phase of the Delbrook re-zoning process focused on assessing the residents' issues surrounding incompatible infill housing. As the arrow on the information continuum indicates (following page), issue identification began prior to the process being initiated by Council. In part, the issues brought forward prior to process commencement were resulting from two contentious infill situations\textsuperscript{42} constructed during the early 1990s. As the formal process began in Delbrook, those residents who had previously expressed interest and opinions regarding single family infill regulations were invited to early working sessions with staff.
During this initial phase planning staff and residents established a positive communication base and agreed upon a clearly defined process goal. During Phase 1, the parameters of what zoning can address were articulated and illustrated. This phase involved mutual education and allowed staff and residents to jointly map out a process for the Delbrook re-zoning.

As illustrated through the literature review, collaborative processes can provide an opportunity for the public to guide or influence the process at an early stage. In the Delbrook case study, the initial involvement consisted of several meetings to fine tune the process and provide input on the issues of import.

Once the following had occurred: the study objectives for the Delbrook process had been identified; the process had been mapped out; the various parties had determined their issues or opportunities; the planner had identified relevant policies and regulations; and a goal has been determined; then it was time to proceed to Phase 2 of the process - The Planning Team.

Phase 2: The Planning Team
The Delbrook process had two planning teams or working groups. The early Working Group participated in generating a zoning survey for distribution to the neighbourhood, conducted a neighbourhood field test of the draft zoning survey, distributed the survey to residents throughout the neighbourhood and provided an opportunity for neighbours to ask questions regarding the process. The eventual Working Group was an expansion of the original team with new members who had a chance to volunteer through the survey. The expanded Working Group provided residents who were not connected to any
identified association or who had not previously made their interest known to staff and Council an opportunity to participate.

The make-up of the Working Group attempted to insure that all stakeholders were represented through the process. The Delbrook neighbourhood zoning process had a Working Group which included 2 planners and 10 participants as follows: 2 early members from Phase 1 who represented the community association including a; one engineer and one architect / builder representing interested professionals and residents; and 6 members at large. The Delbrook process provided an opportunity for anyone in the neighbourhood to volunteer to be a member of the Working Group thereby diminishing the potential for groups to disempower individuals. Participants were chosen based on geographical distribution of lots, to represent a variety of opinions, and to represent various stakeholder groups.

Throughout the Planning Team (Working Group) phase, opportunities for 'at large' public involvement were provided. The role of the Working Group was to consider the public input generated from surveys and information meetings in context with the issues which were identified by residents and staff throughout Phases 1 and 2. The Working Group reported back to the community after every round of 'at large' input through methods such as Council reports and information mail-outs to inform the community of the direction which was provided and how the Working Group intended to incorporate the 'at large' results into the zoning bylaw.

Both the nature of the Working Group, with a variety of opinions as well as the analysis or re-visiting of 'at large' public input, generated an environment
of willingness to solicit solutions, as opposed to divisive issue posturing, among the group members.

Phase 3: Recommendations
The recommendation phase is when the Working Group in Delbrook did some of its most challenging work. This is the phase where consensus based zoning provisions had to be generated and presented to the neighbourhood. Throughout this phase, the members of the Delbrook Working Group learned about the technicalities, definitional attributes and application of zoning law. The Group not only studied the problem in working meetings but also toured the neighbourhood to examine the issues of built form on the ground.

During this recommendation-making phase the Working Group continuously re-visited the original issues identified in Delbrook. The staff also ensured that the proposed zoning decisions were implementable from a legal, policy and construction standpoint. During this phase of the process, the Working Group had to grapple with well intentioned ideas that were not feasible once tested. The Group continued to labor until all parties were satisfied that the most appropriate consensus based zoning bylaw was proposed.

The Delbrook Working Group generated zoning recommendations after approximately 5 months of meetings. At this point, the Group circulated the draft zoning for one final round of community input prior to staff sending the bylaw to Council. This community check proved to be a strong communication tool and solidified the resolve of the Working Group that the regulations generated had been fair and did address the neighbourhood issues surrounding new development.
Phase 4: Approval

The last phase in the project involved Council adoption of the bylaws generated to re-zone the Delbrook neighbourhood. Although this final phase was heavily staff dependent, the community residents and Working Group members were involved by making presentations to Council in support of the bylaws prior to and at the Public Hearing.

Collaborative public involvement processes such as the Delbrook re-zoning are engineered with flexibility so that each process can evolve with appropriate opportunities for public involvement. The Delbrook Process Map (following page) was intended to provide early and ongoing public involvement in the creation of the new zone as well as to establish a collaborative process where proponents on all sides of the issue could work together to reach agreement. This Process Map identifies the major events or steps which occurred throughout the Delbrook process.

Key elements in the Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning process included early inclusion of interested individuals and groups, ongoing opportunities for ‘at large’ neighbourhood input, a Working Group which consisted of both neighbourhood and design representatives, ongoing information sharing throughout the process, and joint creation of the eventual zoning product.

The Delbrook Process Map recognizes the Information Continuum and overlap between the phases.
Table 1: Process Map RSD Single-Family Residential Delbrook Zone

Shows the Steps Followed During the RSD Re-Zoning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1 Study Objectives</th>
<th>PHASE 2 Planning Team</th>
<th>PHASE 3 Consensus &amp; Recommendations</th>
<th>PHASE 4 Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Map Created</td>
<td>2. Residents field test survey</td>
<td>2. Agreement on draft regulations, testing regulations, final draft</td>
<td>2. Advertise Bylaw, answer inquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Issues and opportunities discussed</td>
<td>5. Survey results analyzed and sent to Council</td>
<td>5. Analyze Open House feedback</td>
<td>5. Bylaw Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Background information collected</td>
<td>6. Working Group Formed (represents individuals, design professionals, Community Association - and cross representation of responses)</td>
<td>6. Fine tune new zone based on Open House feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working Group discusses issues and identifies opportunities</td>
<td>7. Bylaw prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFORMATION CONTINUUM
The steps within each phase of the Delbrook process were re-visited throughout the process providing opportunities for decisions to be re-examined as the process matured.

This Chapter has detailed the Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning process. The inclusive nature of this process was mandated by not only the philosophy of Neighbourhood Zoning but also by the commitment to collaboration which was evident in the process and the participants involved.

The results of this process included a zoning bylaw which reinstated the original setbacks, reduced the allowable height to permit a modest two storey building of 26 feet, reduced the allowable upper storey bulk to no more than 75% of the lower storey, slightly reduced the allowable floorspace and pushed parking structures farther back from the street\(^{43}\). This process also resulted in a new subdivision bylaw requiring larger, more typical to Delbrook, new lots should any property be subdivided.

In summary, the Delbrook process created opportunities for extensive community partnership at every step of the planning process.

The following Chapter analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the Delbrook process based on the analytical framework which emerged through the literature review.
Chapter Four

Analysis of The Delbrook Area Re-Zoning

4.1 Evaluating the Delbrook Process

This chapter examines the public involvement process used in the Delbrook area re-zoning as presented in Chapter Three. The intent of this analysis is to assess the effectiveness of employing an inclusive and collaborative process to generate technical zoning solutions aimed at addressing problems associated with Monster House infill. The analysis uses the criteria for evaluating public involvement processes which emerged through the literature review (Appendix One) and applies them to a database generated from existing documentation (Appendix Two). The assessment is qualitative in nature and responds to each of the evaluation criteria. The research methodology employed is based primarily on a document analysis approach as outlined in the following section.

4.2 Research Methodology: Document Analysis

4.2.1 Introduction To Document Analysis

Document analysis, a form of content analysis, is an unobtrusive research method which is applied to an examination of existing data-sets. This method of researching can yield either qualitative or quantitative data. When using this method in qualitative research, the documents will often be assessed based on both their manifest content, that is whether an element is present or
absent and the surface significance of that element, and their latent content or the underlying meaning which analysis of the data yields (Babbie, 298-299).

4.2.2 Why Use Document Analysis?

Document analysis is a tool which has proven appropriate for analyzing data-sets involving communication sources such as survey responses, letters, reports, file notes, verbal and written submissions and similar items (Babbie, 293). This approach has proven viable when applied to case study analysis as it encourages a systematic link of the data to the research propositions thereby ensuring the objectivity of the researcher and reducing potential biases (Yin, 13). By employing this approach, the researcher can achieve two ends: first, as the document analysis is conducted using a set of evaluation criteria, this analysis can be reproduced and replicated or even applied to a comparative analysis of other case studies; and second, it allows the researcher to conduct an analysis of a case study after the conclusion of that case study. Document analysis is considered “a more objective approach than other qualitative methods” (Marshall and Rossman, 85).
4.2.3 Aspects of Consideration when Employing the Document Analysis Research Methodology

There are five main factors which must be considered by the researcher when selecting this research method:

1. Reduction of Participant and Researcher Biases and Influences

By conducting an analysis of the data-set, the researcher is limited to an empirical investigation of existing documents, thereby reducing the dependence on researcher influences and participant opinions, both of which may be subjective in nature. Participant interviews conducted after the fact can also be swayed by a romantic or revisionist notion of what occurred rather than a precise remembrance of actual occurrences (Bell-Lowther, 125 and Yin, 85). Through the employment of post facto document analysis, the quality control of data analysis is ensured and the potential for a researcher to become entangled in the subject topic, or "going native" a problem associated with participant-observer case study analysis as described by Grant (1997), is minimized.

2. Produces Replicatable Results

When applying content criteria to a static data-set of existing documentation to produce a case study analysis, a great strength is that the results are replicatable and therefore reliable. This assumption has its foundation in the fact that if the same set of
3. **Use of Multiple Pieces of Evidence** The application of document analysis allows the researcher to explore multiple document sources or evidence. Using multiple document sources for a case study analysis permits the researcher to probe beyond superficial data or apparent outcomes and look for previously uninvestigated aspects of the case study. The ability to use a variety of document sources also provides corroborating evidence.

4. **The Researcher is Limited to Only those Data Which Exists** A primary concern inherent to using this research methodology is that the researcher cannot go beyond the data available in the existing data-set. This limitation can be overcome by conducting a preliminary investigation of the available resource materials and ensuring that the data-set is adequate to address the research question(s).

5. **Creates An Opportunity for Post Facto Analysis** The document analysis research methodology allows the examination of any study or process after the conclusion of that process. This is particularly useful when a research question can be explored by examining an outstanding resolution, either positive or negative, of a process after the conclusion of
that process. Once the opportunity for in-depth involvement (for example a participant-observer framework) has been lost, the researcher can still analyze a process through the utilization of document analysis.

4.2.4 Document Analysis Approach as Applied to the Delbrook Case Study

The document analysis approach was chosen for the Delbrook case study analysis for several reasons. First, as the researcher had been a full participant of the Delbrook re-zoning process, an objective, post-facto, empirical framework was required. This concern was managed by using the analytical framework (generated through the literature review) to examine the documentation from the Delbrook process, thereby maintaining an unbiased approach to the research. Another strength to using the document analysis is that the documentation can verify and direct the researcher's opinion as a participant. Finally, the availability of the documentation creates links or avenues to other file material and resources which assisted with this investigation.

The Delbrook case study is examined using the evaluation criteria which emerged through the literature review. These evaluation criteria create an analytical framework through which the Delbrook case study can be systematically reviewed. The evaluation criteria are investigated using the
empirical database available from the Delbrook project (that is the documentation itemized in Appendix Two).

The analytical framework for evaluating the Delbrook process are according to one of three general categories: opportunity to participate; appropriateness of process; and process results. The following sections present the findings from each of the evaluation criterion.

4.3 Opportunities for Participation

The first three evaluation criteria detailed in the analytical framework presented in Appendix One examine the opportunities for public involvement as follows: was the process open to all stakeholders; did the process involve the appropriate groups or persons and were any interested parties missed; was the timing of the process adequate to enable participation; and, how was the process viewed by the stakeholders? Barriers to participation can result from the process chosen and these evaluation criteria seek to analyze whether the Delbrook process embodied built-in barriers to participation.

4.3.1 Was the Delbrook Process Open To All Stakeholders?

It was argued in Chapter Two that one of the strengths of a collaborative process is that it brings together those affected by a decision and empowers them to make recommendations for change. William Fulton explains that
"collaborative decision making relies almost entirely on the various parties themselves to bring focus to the issues involved and come up with creative solutions" (6). In order to assess the Delbrook process, it is reasonable to undertake an examination of whether or not participation in the process was made available to all those affected. For the purpose of this analysis, the openness of the process is measured in terms of barriers to participation and awareness of the process by the identified stakeholders.

The stakeholders in the Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning case study include the adult property owners and residents of Delbrook, professionals interested in single family house design and construction in Delbrook, and those interested in marketing Delbrook’s single family properties. As outlined in Chapter Three, participation in the Delbrook process was available via the following avenues: participation on Working Groups; responding to surveys; attending information meetings; making phone and in person inquiries to the planning staff; and presenting a delegation to Council prior to or at the Public Hearing (see Process Map).

This section will measure barriers to participation and stakeholder awareness of the process by analyzing the materials provided directly to participants, the advertisements posted, the submissions to Council, submissions to the Planning Department and the overall response rate.
The District of North Vancouver Property Records Department Delbrook survey mailing file shows that participation was directly solicited from all property owners and residents in Delbrook. Staff phone lists for the Delbrook area identify persons from the community association, a resident architect, two resident contractors, a resident engineer and resident realtors who were contacted to provide information about the process, to solicit participation in this process and to note issues which these stakeholders identified. Participation was available to any non-resident individual or group via attendance at advertised open meetings or via presentations to Council as the survey mail out, information meetings and re-zoning were each advertised in the local newspaper\textsuperscript{44} and information signs were posted in the neighbourhood prior to the re-zoning\textsuperscript{45}.

The Delbrook process was characterized by an energetic attempt to reach all stakeholders which resulted in a strong participation rate. The process endeavored to reach all stakeholders via the following avenues: every property owner and resident in Delbrook was surveyed directly twice; two information handouts were mailed; two survey reminder notices were mailed to all households; and four newspaper announcements or advertisements were published (reference endnote \#44). The process responses included a 33 percent response rate from the survey, a 10 percent written response rate to
the draft regulations, and approximately a 20 percent neighbourhood turn out to advertised information meetings.

While the identified stakeholders in Delbrook were all either directly involved in the collaborative process or were provided an opportunity for involvement, participation may have been reduced by either communication barriers or because of intimidation caused by the technical nature of the issues involved. File records lack any evidence that the Delbrook process included an advertised language translation service and this may have decreased participation from those not speaking English (affecting one percent of Delbrook's population\(^46\)). Furthermore, the zoning survey was technical in nature and for some non-respondents the survey questions may have proved to be difficult to manage (file notes from telephone conversations indicate some respondents were having difficulty understanding the survey although there were no noted comments to this affect included with returned surveys).

In summary, documentation from the Delbrook files indicate that attempts were made to involve every property owner and resident and also that attempts were made to encourage participation when non-response was evident (through mailed reminder notices). When reviewing the District's display material regarding the Neighbourhood Zoning process, the emphasis is on public partnership with words such as "consultation, resident partnership, Working
Group, neighbourhood, participate, volunteer and Open House comments” mentioned frequently. Furthermore, 70 percent (7 out of 10) of the “process steps” outlined in this display material focus on resident partnership or public participation. There is no data available regarding literacy rates in Delbrook to measure barriers due to reading and writing difficulties.

The survey had a 33 percent response rate with owner / occupiers making up 98 percent of those responding. Census data indicates that approximately 19 percent of Delbrook residents are renters and District mailing records show that 11 percent of the single family properties are owned by absentee owners. The predominant response from owner-occupiers indicates that the process failed to elicit a proportional response from renters and absentee owners.

While the awareness of the process was made clear through multiple direct mail contact to all adult Delbrook residents and property owners, file records indicate that certain segments of the Delbrook stakeholders, in particular renters and absentee owners, tended not to participate for unknown reasons and also that barriers may have existed for those not speaking English or not able to read and write English.
4.3.2 Did the Delbrook Process Involve the Appropriate Stakeholders?

The Delbrook process can be divided into three phases: the pre-Working Group phase; the Working Group phase; and the post Working Group phase (District of North Vancouver, Neighbourhood Zoning Process, 1995, 1). Section 4.1.1 above concluded that all identified stakeholders were provided an opportunity to participate throughout these phases. File materials, including the initial contact lists, the participant volunteer list, the final Working Group membership list, the survey mail-out list, information sign text and newspaper notices verify that all stakeholders had an opportunity to participate throughout the process. This section examines whether the stakeholders identified were in fact involved and whether those identified encompassed all the affected population. In essence, collaborative processes are intended to be inclusive and so an examination of those included is warranted.

This examination is conducted by identifying the issue oriented groups which exist in Delbrook and by examining whether those stakeholders identified were included.

The Social Planning Department at the District of North Vancouver retains a current list of community associations. This list shows only one community association representing the Delbrook area. The Delbrook files from the Clerk's and Planning Departments do not reveal the existence of any other
community groups in Delbrook. Furthermore, no North Shore agency made submissions to Council regarding the Delbrook area re-zoning. Public Hearing records for Bylaw 6645 (which created Neighbourhood Zoning) include submissions from only one non-resident North Shore organization and that is the Real Estate Board. As records indicate that no agency, other than the realtor's agency and the community association, lobbied either the Planning Department or Council for inclusion in this process, there is no evidence indicating that any stakeholder groups were excluded. The following paragraphs discuss those included in the process.

The pre-Working Group phase included four members from the Delbrook Community Association (the only identified group in Delbrook) who worked with staff to identify the issues which had been raised in the community prior to the neighbourhood re-zoning project. These Community Association members continued to participate during all phases of the process and they continuously conveyed information back to other Community Association members and residents. Two of the members were also members of the Working Group. The Community Association, therefore, was represented during the Delbrook re-zoning.

The Working Group itself consisted of a registered architect and home builder, a registered engineer, and a designer (who also represented the community
association). While these members did not officially represent their professional organizations, they assisted by providing the Working Group a professional perspective based on their related experience. While there were no realtors directly involved as members of the Working Group, realtor residents of the neighbourhood and realtors selling in Delbrook attended information meetings and the outcome of the Delbrook process was forwarded to the President of the North Shore Real Estate Board for distribution to every real estate agency on the North Shore.

Residents who were not affiliated with any stakeholder group were also represented through the process, not only by filling out and returning surveys but also by participation as Working Group members. Maps, file notes and volunteer file lists show that the Working Group was selected to represent both a geographical criterion as well as a variety of opinions based on survey responses to the maximum house height question.

While file records show that there was no direct Working Group involvement from either a full time trade contractor or a realtor, they also show that representation of those groups was sought through advertising, related industry and forwarding of documentation to professional associations. Participation in the Delbrook process, therefore, was made available to all interest groups and
persons, and file records show that involvement was particularly sought from those deemed to be stakeholders.

Finally, there were no submissions at the Public Hearing or subsequent to bylaw introduction to indicate that any particular stakeholder group had been excluded from participating in this process. The conclusion based on the available documentation is that the Delbrook process identified and included the affected parties.

4.3.3 Was the Timing of the Process Appropriate?

Chapter Two discusses both the spectrum of public involvement and the nature of collaborative public involvement. Examining these topics conjointly, it becomes evident that the opportunities for participation are dependent on the schedule or timing of the process. Desmond Connor discusses the timing of the public component of a planning process and concludes that “since citizens... have many priorities more important than any project, it is essential to be cost-effective in the use of the public’s time” (1994, 6). If a process is too long the public may suffer from “burn out” and if the schedule is too short the public may not have a legitimate chance to participate.

This section investigates the timing of the Delbrook process to gauge whether the timing of the process was detrimental to participation. This investigation is
carried out through an analysis of the process steps, anticipated versus actualized timing, the inclusion of identifiable process phases and finally a review of submissions from the public.

The basic steps included in the Delbrook process, as discussed in Chapter Three, were mapped out prior to the process commencing. Since Delbrook was the third neighbourhood zoning project in the District of North Vancouver, previous experience showed that an overall time frame of approximately one year should be anticipated. The timing within the process sought to retain an informed collaborative Working Group during the process with bursts of "at large" community involvement dispersed throughout the process. The timing was balanced to avoid exhaustion of those involved and to achieve a fully participatory or collaborative involvement level. Documentation reveals that the actual process timing was consistent with anticipated timing as the process required approximately one year to complete.

Desmond Connor states that the majority of planning projects require three cycles or phases: an introductory phase, an options generating phase and an evaluation phase (1994, 6). As outlined and documented in the previous sections, the Delbrook process did include these three phases with the survey and associated introductory meetings serving as the introductory phase, the Working Group, generating draft zoning, serving as the options generating
phase, and the distribution of the draft zoning in survey format, coupled with associated meetings, serving as the evaluation phase.

Review of the submitted letters, Council direction, survey comments and Public Hearing comments does not reveal any positive or negative indicators regarding the length or timing of the Delbrook process. This would indicate that process length was a non-issue to the Delbrook stakeholders. However, there was some evident confusion whereby this process was entangled with other Planning Department processes (specifically the re-zoning of 600 W. Queens Rd. to multi-family, the adoption of the North Lonsdale-Delbrook Official Community Plan and the Council decision on the Montroyal connector). Survey comments and one recorded verbal comment indicate that uncertainty of the distinction between this initiative and other initiatives existed.

Upon overall evaluation, the document analysis indicates that timing of the Delbrook process was planned in detail, those plans were articulated to the public through meetings and advertising, it had been tested through previous processes and it accommodated both collaborative partnership involvement and at large neighbourhood involvement.
4.3.4 Public Comments Regarding the Delbrook Process

As part of the analysis of a collaborative public involvement process, the public's opinions regarding that process are valuable indicators as to whether the process was deemed a success by those most affected. The following section investigates public comments regarding the Delbrook process. Public comments are defined as any documented comment received by the municipality regarding the process used for the Delbrook rezoning. The analysis includes an examination of submitted letters and delegations to the Public Hearing as well as survey comments.

In response to the Public Hearing advertisement for the Delbrook zoning and subdivision bylaws, Council received a total of four written submissions (3 in favor and 1 opposed) and nine verbal submissions (6 in favor and 3 opposed) on the proposed zone. These submissions came from members of the public as well as members of the Working Group. Of the submissions presented in favor of the proposed Delbrook regulations, each of the written submissions and several of the verbal submissions either mentioned or focused on the open and representative nature of the process. One resident and planning team member wrote:

The Working Group represented a cross-section of the Delbrook Community... Initially, it appeared the challenge of building bylaw details was going to be too difficult to redefine and agree upon. However,... (due to) an open-minded approach, the Working Group was able to see the overall picture and put forth realistic criteria to ensure the character of Delbrook... The process provided the abstract concept of
“character”... in real terms of height, bulk, setbacks, lot size etc.... The process was certainly encouraging. (Janice Murray, 1995)

A representative of the Community Association wrote Council regarding the Delbrook process and commended the process in that it achieved new levels of staff and residents working together (Nikky Tutt, 1995). One resident who wrote Council stated that while he would prefer a larger floor space allowance, the process provided a "very acceptable compromise" and so he supported the proposed recommendations (Don Klassen, 1995).

Four of the 13 submissions to the Public Hearing were in opposition to the proposed bylaws (two of these submissions are from the same person). These submissions represented three properties in Delbrook. Three of the opposed submissions (including the duplicate) were in opposition to the subdivision bylaws and one was opposed to an unrelated item (secondary suites). None of the opposition submissions referred to the process applied in Delbrook.

The Delbrook survey responses included 102 written submissions to an open ended comments section. Among these submissions, eighteen included comments regarding neighbourhood input, the majority of which (13) were in favor of neighbourhood input. A further five surveys had comments of thanks that the survey was sent and that an opportunity for involvement was provided.
The findings regarding neighbourhood comments on the Delbrook process determine that no negative comments regarding the process itself were received, that several strong statements of support for the process were submitted to both Planning and Council and that the negative comments which were forthcoming focused on issue oriented, rather than process oriented, items.

The above sections have examined whether the Delbrook process provided open and appropriate opportunities for involvement. In summary, the Delbrook process endeavored to include every member from a large single family neighbourhood in a process focused on making choices about the neighbourhood's future zoning allowances. This scale of participation can be challenging to fulfill and the technical nature of the subject matter increases that challenge. File records show that there were over 280 survey returns and verbal / written submissions to the District, plus over 150 persons in attendance at meetings throughout the process representing over 630 properties.

The following section discusses the appropriateness of the process chosen for the subject matter under consideration in Delbrook.
4.4 Appropriateness of the Process

While the previous section focused on whether opportunities to participate were provided in a timely manner to all affected parties, this section examines the nature of the process itself and whether the process chosen was warranted by the subject matter. As outlined in the analytical framework, the analysis presented in this section focuses on the following: was the process chosen appropriate to the topic; did the process generate controversy with the stakeholders; where does the process fall on Arnstein's ladder of participation; and was the process decide-announce-defend (D.A.D.) or collaborative.

4.4.1 Was the Process Appropriate to the Topic?

Richard Roberts and Nancy Marshall focus on "Overload in Public Involvement" in their 1995 article by the same name. Following a theme similar to Desmond Connor's regarding the public's limited resources, Roberts and Marshall state that where an overload of requests for involvement exists, the public will limit the projects they choose to be involved in (1995, 54). They further criticize much of today's public involvement as ad hoc in nature as "few organizations have a consistent, coordinated approach to work with the public" (1995, 61). Accordingly, public involvement processes, especially collaborative processes which by nature tend to be intensive and time consuming, should be well planned and appropriate to the topic.
This section analyzes the level of public involvement used in the Delbrook process. The level is defined and measured using the Dorcey et.al public involvement spectrum presented in Figure 4 (p. 29).

The B.C. Round Table on the Environment and Economy paper by Dorcey et.al. presents criteria to assist in selecting a public involvement model from a spectrum ranging from informing the public to seeking consensus and involving the public through on-going interactions (Figure 4, p. 29).

The selection criteria are based on questions regarding public agreement over values, public readiness for government action, ability to identify the stakeholders, the certainty and agreement about available information and agreement between the government and the public over goals (Dorcey et.al., 7 - 8). The conclusions find that a process should have increased collaboration, as well as time and resources, where: the public values are conflicting or undecided; the public is unsure or not wanting government intervention; the stakeholders are difficult to identify; factual information is lacking; and / or the government and the public do not share the same goals (Dorcey et.al., 8). Using these five criteria, this section determines whether the collaborative process used in the Delbrook area rezoning was the appropriate public involvement method.
The history of the District of North Vancouver's (DNV) single family zoning regulations, as outlined in Chapter Three, provides evidence that there was a great deal of controversy regarding new house construction throughout the DNV. Delbrook was no exception. In Delbrook, the survey results indicate that there were conflicting public values about the outcome of new zoning regulations. For example, although survey comments showed that 30 percent of those noting comments wanted house size reduced, the most frequent survey response (from 40 percent of respondents) supported retaining the existing floor space ratio.

There was also uncertainty regarding government intervention during the Delbrook process as some residents were opposed to, or did not trust, bureaucratic regulatory measures (a comment made by 4 percent of survey respondents). This mistrust of the government among the residents of Delbrook blurred the ability to share goals at the outset of the study, requiring a more collaborative process.

While the stakeholders in Delbrook were readily identifiable, there was a diversity of opinions among the stakeholders, justifying a greater level of involvement. Furthermore, while information regarding new construction was
available, there is no one opinion regarding house design, rendering factual information regarding new house construction non-existent.

According to the above analysis, the Delbrook process falls in the “seek consensus” area on Dorcey et.al.’s public involvement spectrum (see p. 29). Using the criteria established by Dorcey et.al., this “seek consensus” level of involvement was warranted in Delbrook. The findings of this analysis therefore show that the process chosen for the Delbrook re-zoning was appropriate to the topic.

4.4.2 Did the Process Generate Division Among the Working Group?

The advantages to using a collaborative decision making process include the ability for participants to work together to reach consensus regarding complex issues where a variety of opinions exist. The debate surrounding Monster House infill construction can be vigorous when the rights of property owners who want to build large houses clash against the rights of adjoining neighbours who feel impacted by adjacent construction. In Delbrook, the opinions of the residents regarding new house construction were typically varied (as discussed in the previous section).

It is particularly vital that the process chosen does not further divide the stakeholders who are already involved in a multi-faceted topic. Carpenter
cautions public involvement practitioners using consensus models to "pay attention to relationships [as] parties need a climate of trust" and to "adapt the process to the community culture" (1990, 17.). This section investigates the impact of the process chosen on the Working Group. Specifically, this investigation seeks to determine whether the process created a divisive climate within the Working Group.

Whether division was generated among the Working Group members is measured by examining the method for determining the process, meeting minutes and documentation submitted by Working Group members.

The Delbrook process was generated in consultation with the initial Working Group in order to respond to the needs of the local area (see Chapter Three). In a post-process evaluation of Delbrook, Janice Murray cautions that "personality conflict or lack of objectivity may override the issue (for) individuals not accustomed to team problem solving" (January 1996). She does, however, go on to state that in Delbrook a "cooperative, communicative effort (was made) by all involved" (January 1996). Further, a letter by the same participant states that, despite a variety of opinions in Delbrook "one concern was shared and that was, that the character of Delbrook was changing, but not necessarily for the better" (Murray, August 23rd, 1995).
There is no evidence to conclude that the process increased or generated division among the Delbrook stakeholders. There are, however, file notes from the later meetings indicating that consensus was reached among the stakeholders and through this process, division was minimized.

4.4.3 The Delbrook Process According to Arnstein's Ladder and Godschalk's et.al. Conventional or Collaborative Theory

As presented in Chapter Two, Arnstein's eight rung ladder of citizen participation distinguishes when participation is contrived and manipulated by the government agency and Godschalk et.al. identify the process typology. Collaborative processes are not intended to simply inform or consult with the public, rather they are a method of bringing the public into the decision-making (or recommendation generating) arena. This section applies Arnstein's ladder and Godschalk et.al.'s process typology to the Delbrook process to ascertain whether participation was intended to manipulate or share power. The measures for this analysis are applied to display and public materials on neighbourhood zoning as well as to internal information files.

The top three rungs of Arnstein's ladder portray degrees of power-sharing with the public. The Delbrook process (as outlined in the DNV's "Neighbourhood Zoning: Process, Program, Volunteer" display, as explained on the DNV's web page, as outlined to Social Planning in a memo dated January 30th, 1996, as outlined in the Planning Institute of British Columbia awards program
nomination package, and as detailed throughout the staff resource file on Neighbourhood Zoning) falls in the top end of Arnstein’s ladder on rung six “Partnership”. The Delbrook process did not turn complete control over to the stakeholders, but rather the new zoning was generated in partnership with the stakeholders.

Chapter Three determined that the Delbrook process was a collaborative one. Godschalk et.al. discuss the failure of conventional, or Decide-Announce-and-Defend (D.A.D.), planning processes as they are no longer efficient to deal with today’s complex issues, increasingly sophisticated public and political realities. The single-family, Monster House construction issues dealt with in the District of North Vancouver between 1981 and 1994 were addressed primarily in a D.A.D. manner as far as the general public was concerned. Even with the advent of the Single Family Housing Task Force in 1987, the public at large and community associations were excluded. It was not until the public was brought into the decision-making loop, through Neighbourhood Zoning, that the issues were addressed to the satisfaction of the stakeholders.

4.5 Outcome of the Process

As part of an analysis of the Delbrook process the analytical framework identifies that the process outcome can be examined against the process
goals. On the surface, the goal for each neighbourhood zoning project is to replace the general RS zone with a neighbourhood specific one and this outcome was achieved in Delbrook. In order to pursue a more in-depth analysis, the following sections will explore the results of the Delbrook process in terms of consensus reached, feasibility of the resulting bylaw, and feedback from the neighbourhood.

4.5.1 Was Consensus Reached Within the Planning Team?

Collaborative planning efforts are fundamentally rooted in creating a shared opinion regarding the best strategy to deal with local situations. Scott London describes collaboration as “working toward joint decisions... and a collectively articulated goal or vision” (1995, 3). Carpenter discusses consensus and states that participants must continue to work toward a process goal until all parties can either agree on specific solutions or agree to disagree on specific issues (1990, 14 - 15). If a collaborative process fails to achieve consensus, then the process ultimately fails.

This section measures whether consensus was reached among the Working Group participants. Essentially, consensus here is defined as non-opposition to the proposed zoning regulations. The data reviewed include meeting minutes, Public Hearing minutes and other submissions by members of the Working Group.
Meeting minutes from the Delbrook Working Group indicate that consensus regarding the zoning solutions generated by the Working Group in Delbrook was ultimately reached. As outlined in section 4.3.2, meeting minutes indicate that while one member stated a preference for a lower maximum house height, she also said she would support the group’s proposal (reference endnote 57). Public Hearing minutes lack any negative comments from members of the Working Group and there are no letters of opposition from any Working Group members. The Public Hearing minutes, Council minutes and submitted letters from Working Group members indicate that consensus was reached among the Working Group members despite varied opinions regarding new construction (see Murray 1995, 1995 and Sections 4.2.4 and 4.3.2).

4.5.2 Were the Proposed Recommendations Implemented?
The work resulting from the collaborative efforts in Delbrook would have been unrealized if the resulting recommendations were not endorsed by the larger community, legally adopted by Council, and feasible from a design perspective. Godschalk et.al. discuss implementation and state that “all can be for naught if an agreement is not implemented or a series of recommendations is ignored” (1994, 71). This section measures the implementation of the Working Group’s proposed zoning regulations. Implementation is measured by the number of
changes that the proposed regulations required and whether the regulations were subsequently adopted by Council.

The Working Group produced a “draft zoning” brochure for distribution to the neighbourhood (March 1995). Public response to the draft zoning showed strong support for the regulations generated by the Working Group. Specifically, 71 percent of respondents supported the height proposal, 85 percent supported the setback proposal, 64 percent supported the upper storey proposal, 81 percent supported the floor space ratio calculation and 84 percent supported the regulations for accessory structures. A comparison of the regulations itemized on the zoning brochure and those included in the final bylaw reveals that the solutions generated by the Delbrook Working Group were ultimately adopted by Council with no changes required.

During the two years since adoption of the new RSD zone, these regulations have not required amendments for any reason (either construction related or neighbourhood complaint related). In general, the larger community supported the re-zoning at the Public Hearing. The data reveals that the Delbrook zone has been implemented by Council as generated by the Working Group through the collaborative process.
4.5.3 Nature and Frequency of Negative Feedback Since Re-zoning

The neighbourhood zoning program is intended to empower neighbourhoods to determine the future of single family construction. "The programme has met with positive results because of the level of public involvement and the opportunities for District residents to help generate solutions to their own local problems" (PIBC awards submission summary, 1996, 1). Neighbourhood impressions regarding construction completed under the new bylaw is a measure of the success of the process used to generate the neighbourhood based solutions. This section examines the nature and frequency of negative feedback since the implementation of the new zone through an analysis of building permit records, written submissions or submissions to Council, and documented telephone complaints.

Building permit records show that there have been 16 permits\(^54\) for major additions or new house construction issued for lots in Delbrook since the adoption of the RSD zone. Of the construction, one new house has generated telephone complaints from three adjacent neighbours\(^55\) due to loss of view\(^56\). This is the only construction under the new RSD regulations which has generated documented complaints.

Hence, one of sixteen infill situations has resulted in dissatisfaction with the Delbrook zone. None of the community association members or Working
Group members who actively lobbied for new regulations to address the monster house issue have expressed concern regarding the implementation of the new zoning. As the frequency of complaints in the Delbrook area has been low, a general satisfaction with the new regulations can be presupposed.

4.6 Summary

Council decisions and letters from participants indicate that the Delbrook neighbourhood zoning project was considered to be a success by those involved. The new zoning permits replacement houses which reflect current construction trends but which also reflect some traditional elements in Delbrook. As discussed in Chapter Two, there is an ongoing debate regarding the design of new houses and whether municipal regulations are overly restrictive or too permissive. This debate aside, the prevailing climate in the District of North Vancouver has been one of resident dissatisfaction with replacement houses and this issue had to be addressed in Delbrook.

The analysis presented above indicates that all persons affected by the rezoning had opportunities for inclusive participation and that there was good participation throughout the rezoning. Furthermore, while non-response was an issue among the renter and absentee owner groups, generally there was good representation from the community and professional interest groups.
Finally, with the exception of language translation, the process was a barrier free one. The results of the process have been implemented and are feasible for new construction.

The goal of new zoning to address the Monster House syndrome in the Delbrook neighbourhood was met via the employment of a fully collaborative public involvement approach. The implications involved with using this type of an approach are further explored in the following concluding chapter.
Chapter Five

Collaboration and the Monster House Infill Rezoning Issue: Observations and Implications

5.1 Synopsis

The research presented in this thesis investigates the implications associated with using a collaborative based planning approach to generate new zoning aimed at reducing the negative impacts associated with Monster House infill construction. Specifically, this thesis examines, through both a literature review and a case study analysis, the following three questions:

1. What are the elements of collaborative public involvement which assist in bringing the various interest groups together to generate neighbourhood re-zoning proposals which address the goal of compatible infill housing?

2. What are the strengths and limitations of using collaborative public involvement processes in neighbourhood re-zonings?

3. How does the Delbrook case study exemplify the use of collaborative public involvement and specifically what does it illustrate in terms of the following: the relevance of using a collaborative public involvement process in area re-zonings; the implications inherent to using a collaborative approach; and further research emerging from this case study?
Through documenting the Delbrook case study, some conclusions and summaries can be drawn. This final chapter will present the following: limitations inherent in collaborative processes (as highlighted through the analysis of Delbrook); the importance of the process chosen, Planning Team, and Planner’s role; and, some cautionary observations. This chapter will also summarize areas where further research efforts are justified.

5.2 Limitations Associated With The Delbrook Process

As the research reveals, issues which inspire a great degree of controversy and which are complex in nature will require a more involved and collaborative public involvement framework. The topic of single family infill housing has historically proven that it warrants a collaborative approach. However, there are some drawbacks associated with using this type of a public involvement model and these are discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.2.1 Length of Time for this Process

The collaborative process used in the Delbrook area re-zoning was time and staff intensive. While this could be justified in Delbrook, as the District of North Vancouver had been examining single-family zoning issues for many years prior to the Delbrook process, the time may not be justifiable in all neighbourhoods or all municipalities. The additional costs and time invested in the Delbrook process may be recaptured later on if subsequent changes to the zoning are not required.
5.2.2 The Nature of the Planning Team

The Delbrook process relied heavily on the Working Group or Planning Team. This reliance can cause inherent problems if the Team is hijacked by agenda driven individuals who do not subscribe to the process goal. The successful outcome of this process was also reliant on the willingness of Working Group members to provide information to the larger community. Further, a danger that working committees face is becoming bogged down by minor details which are continuously brought to the table. In the Delbrook process the Planning Team was limited to 10 in size. With this small number representing over 600 single-family properties it was crucial that a geographical distribution as well as a variety of opinions were represented to reach consensus.

5.2.3 Consensus Building

When examining zoning issues which require professional knowledge and technical expertise it becomes evident that a community consensus building process may not necessarily produce the best planning results for the community. It was a consistent challenge in the Delbrook process to adjust emotionally based opinions into workable zoning law. When generating consensus based zoning regulations in Delbrook, a key lesson learned was to engage in regular "testing" sessions of the zoning ideas to ensure that they were sound from a construction point of view.
5.2.4 Community Overload

Collaborative public involvement processes can, as the research discusses, create community burn-out or overload. If the time required of the citizens is too great, it may dissuade potential resident volunteers from wanting to get involved. The time resources required for the Delbrook area re-zoning can seem onerous and therefore may encourage certain types of individuals (for example those with excess time or excess emotions about a particular topic) to volunteer.

5.3 Importance of the Process

Through an examination of both the literature and the Delbrook case study it becomes evident that the process chosen is of paramount significance. As the submissions recorded from Delbrook participants brought to light, seemingly insurmountable conflicts among participants' points of view were successfully resolved through a consensus building process. Despite the success of this collaborative effort, however, collaborative processes are not applicable to all situations. A misguided process choice will place stress on both the public and staff resources. It is the conclusion of this research that the process chosen should be appropriate to the topic, level of public interest and timeline available. Furthermore, if the process chosen is an appropriate one, it will also be a defensible one.
5.4 Importance of the Planning Team

In part, the Delbrook study met with success due to the mix of the professionals and citizens who served on the planning team. The team was representative, it fostered the feedback loop, it remained goal oriented and various points of view were recognized. This team was assembled to not only represent a variety of construction opinions but also to bring specific skills to the planning table. More precisely, the team was intended to represent the stakeholders in the Delbrook area. The inclusion of an architect, engineer and designer, along with lay persons and community advocates, was an intentional act by the planning staff and was built into the framework of the process. The remainder of this section discusses the planning team in more detail.

5.4.1 Planning Team: Representative

The representative nature of the planning team worked particularly well in Delbrook in that the diversity of membership brought most of the local issues to the table. The sense of having a representative team produced neighbourhood support for the recommendations. The team itself was so supportive of the recommendations that they assisted at the Open House, they lobbied the neighbourhood to gain support for the new zone, they took
positive information back to the community association and they made speeches at the Public Hearing encouraging Council to adopt the new zone.

5.4.2 Planning Team: Fostering the Feedback Loop

Another important role of the Planning Team was that they strived to make a feedback loop or information continuum work. The members of the Planning team were aware at the onset of the process that they were responsible for reporting back to their constituency. This process of reporting back contributed to an increased awareness of, and support for, the new zoning. This reporting back also created a pipe-line of information to and from the Planning team. It kept the staff aware of prevailing concerns and it ensured that the community at large was informed about the process.

5.4.3 Planning Team: Focusing On the Goal

The Delbrook Working Group respected the process goal of new zoning from the onset of the study. Having a strong goal allowed the team to get back on track when incidental issues threatened to divert the process. With the diversity of this team and the variety of issues brought to the table, the importance of the goal became particularly evident. The ability of the team to rely upon the goal to keep the process moving forward was an asset.
5.5 Importance of the Planner’s Role

The role of the planner in any public involvement process is a pivotal one. The planner helps to educate, resolve conflicts and keep the process moving. Some aspects of the role of the planner can be highlighted from both the literature and the Delbrook experience: planner as communicator, educator and facilitator; planner as technical expert; and the planner’s ability to keep the group goal-oriented and thinking of the larger community.

5.5.1 The Planner as Communicator, Educator and Facilitator

The roles of the planner as communicator, educator and facilitator is an important one. If communication starts to break down among the Planning team, they will turn to the planner for assistance and resolution of the problems. The planner’s ability to communicate technical ideas to the team and educate them regarding planning fundamentals assists the team in moving forward toward their goal. The planner often becomes a bureaucratic source of information for the members of the Planning team and the public at large. Small barriers to communication, such as not responding to inquiries, can damage a process while a small amount of assistance from the planner, such as answering unrelated questions, can help build community trust in the Planning Department and help to move the process forward.
5.5.2 The Planner As Technical Expert

The role of the planner also includes technical expert. The planner must make sure the group makes recommendations which are legal, feasible and goal related. During the Delbrook process there were times the Planning team wanted to make recommendations which were not legal. These types of recommendations arise in collaborative public involvement processes and the planner's role is to keep the group on track with feasible options.

5.5.3 The Planner and The Larger Community

All professional planners have an obligation to produce land use recommendations which consider the larger community. The planner who facilitates collaborative processes must consistently remind the team to re-visit the obligations to, as well as opinions, desires and preferences of, the larger community and the stated goal for the public involvement process. This continual procedure of considering the bigger picture assists a collaborative team with remaining focused. It will furthermore result in recommendations which are not only viable on a broad land-use scale but ones which also have a great deal of community support.
5.6 Lessons Learned in Delbrook

5.6.1 Other Processes Which May Play a Role

As discovered during the Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning study, items not related to a process can interfere with that process. One of the pitfalls which may arise during collaborative public involvement processes are other ongoing processes which confuse or complicate the situation. In Delbrook the ongoing Official Community Plan work, a proposed road connector and a proposed apartment building all impacted upon the public's reaction to the proposed zoning. When this occurred in Delbrook, there were several methods used to clarify the confusion including: asking the community association to intercede with their constituents; placing advertisements in the local newspaper which concentrated on explaining the rezoning process; and by holding community meetings or sending bulk-mail information flyers. The important lesson learned through the Delbrook process is to address any confusion which may arise in a decisive and timely manner.

5.6.2 Personal Agendas Which Differ From The Goal

Another challenge for collaborative processes is the presence of personal agendas, which differ from the study goal and interfere with the process. Hidden agendas brought to the planning table by team members can steer the team or community at large away from the study goal. The temptation is
to address these agendas fully (being that collaborative processes are very
democratic), but it should be recognized through the process that there is a
limit to how much these agendas can be dealt with. In Delbrook there were
some team members concerned with a through road connector which they
anticipated would reduce their property values. Although a concern by some
team members, there was no mandate or forum for the Delbrook zoning team
to address this issue. The resulting action was to “table” this issue and re­
direct the concerns to the appropriate committee.

5.6.3 Misinformation

Spreading of misinformation can also impede the ability of the team to make
positive planning recommendations. This is one hazard which can be very
difficult to deal with should it arise. However, it does help if the planning team
has been reporting back to neighbours and constituents throughout the
process. Another aspect of collaborative processes which serves to reduce
misinformation is the fact that the public has been involved in generating the
process framework. In Delbrook, the members of the early Working Group
worked with staff to design the process, and by this action, they had a great
deal of ownership for the process itself.
5.6.4 Change In Time-Line

Another aspect which the planner should be aware of and prepared for is a change in time-line. Do not be caught off guard should the time-line be changed. Collaborative processes should be flexible enough to adapt to change from within. Change from within should be expected as these are dynamic systems. If the time-line is extended or shortened, the planner should be prepared to react quickly and the bureaucracy should be prepared to be supportive.

5.6.5 Public Burn-Out

The final pitfall learned from the Delbrook experience is public overload. With all the concurrent processes in Delbrook, burn-out of the community members was a potential issue. It became very important in Delbrook to ensure the issue warranted a collaborative process so that valuable community resources were not wasted.

These are some of the conclusions arising from the literature and the Delbrook case study. It is very important that mutual trust, respect and expectations are built at the beginning and throughout a process.

The following section discusses some of the research questions which arise from this thesis.
5.7 Further Research

An extensive amount of research and literature has been prepared on the topic of public involvement in government decision making and planning processes. This topic has become something the planning professional cannot ignore. The following aspects of this topic have been touched on through this case study analysis and warrant further research: how the increasing empowerment of groups may or may not affect the power of the individual and the impact which the process chosen may have; what limitations exist for lay persons involvement in technical planning subjects and how far should they reasonably be expected to extend themselves; and, an exploration of other practical applications for dealing with large house infill construction.

5.8 Closing Note

In an utopian world everyone would work together to generate solutions which are the best ones possible for the neighbourhood, region and globe as a whole. Unfortunately, the world is not utopian and in many ways the theory behind collaborative public involvement is. The aim in preparing this thesis is that, by understanding one collaborative public involvement process which was deemed a success by those involved and which successfully reached
the completion of its goal, this information will assist in moving future similar processes one step closer to the ideal.

Collaborative decision making relies almost entirely on the various parties themselves to bring focus to the issues involved and come up with creative solutions, all in the context of group meetings. In that sense, the collaborative technique is a more open-ended process.... At its best, the collaborative method creates an environment in which the various parties... begin to trust each other and move past the posturing of their opening positions.... All this may sound a little "touchy-feely" to the uninitiated, and, in fact, warring factions that enter into a "facilitated" meeting are often skeptical for that very reason. However, over time, collaborative techniques can be used to sort out issues and build a real sense of common purpose. (Fulton 1989, 6 - 7)
Endnotes

1 For example the City of Vancouver's postmortem on the Arbutus Industrial Lands development plan process which concludes that while all parties acted in good faith there was a clear lack of process understanding which eventually undermines the stakeholders' ability to collaborate on a plan, (see Fogel, 1992).
2 The issue of "monster housing" has been prominent in the late 1980s and 1990s as new two storey (or higher) housing replaces existing bungalow-type housing throughout neighbourhoods in Vancouver's west-side, Richmond, Burnaby, North Vancouver and West Vancouver.
3 Real estate statistics show the median selling price for a single detached house in June of 1997 was $655,000 in Vancouver West Side, $610,000 in West Vancouver and $370,000 in North Vancouver (source: Real Estate Weekly Home Guide On-line).

Barbara Pettit discusses the impacts of Asian immigration on Vancouver's single-family landscape and states that: "When Asians built houses that respected the local context, no one complained. But when Asians built houses that offended their neighbours, complaints were often linked directly or indirectly to race". (1993, 180)
5 Staff and committees studied single family zoning regulations and definitions from 1982 to 1994 at which time the Neighbourhood Zoning Program was established. A summary of these initiatives is presented in Chapter 3.

While the current mandate of the Neighbourhood Zoning program is to examine issues regarding size, shape and siting of single family houses, discussions regarding possible expansion of the program to examine land use issues such as creating opportunities for affordable ground oriented accommodation to meet the capacities specified in the Greater Vancouver Regional District document Livable Region Strategic Plan, 1996, have commenced.
7 Recent micro-zoning initiatives, specifically the RS5 and RS6 zones, in the City of Vancouver have been the source of criticism from the architectural and building world in that they are deemed to be taking too aggressive a stance on the elements of compatible design.
8 The author of this paper was the primary planner responsible for the Delbrook re-zoning process and as such prepared all staff reports, bylaws, made staff presentations at the Public Hearing as well as established and conducted the public involvement framework for this study.
9 For example, Seelig (1995, 1997) who postulates that planners engaging in public participation are acting more frequently as pollsters for politicians than they are as trained experts in social, economic, environmental and demographic matters.
10 The City of Calgary, Public Participation in the Planning Process (1993, 6).

The Architectural Institute of British Columbia criticized the City of Vancouver's RS6 bylaw as the institute's position is that this bylaw impinges upon design elements in its control of certain building materials and façade elements.
12 Described by Babcock and Larsen as "a perceived antidote or 'cure' for 'neighbourhood' problems" (1990, 3), the Special District approach is one of tailor-making zoning ordinances to deal with a unique set of characteristic for one particular neighbourhood for which generic zoning bylaws are not applicable.
14 "In east Kerrisdale... residents were unhappy about the red roofs, grandiose entrances, square 'wedding cake' or big-box look, and lack of landscaping or outright paving or the lot." Vancouver Sun, 14 June, 1996.
15 Women could not vote until 1918 with the exception of Quebec where women could not vote until 1940, Chinese and East Asian people could not vote until 1947, and First Nation people living on reserve could not vote until 1960 (Kubiski 1992, 3).


Seelig, Michael and Julie Seelig, *Plan Canada*, Vol. 37, No. 3, May 1997, p. 18-22, in which the authors criticize the City of Vancouver’s City Plan efforts as producing nothing more than a Christmas wish-list from the involved participants at a cost of more than $15 million dollars.


Arthur Himmelman states that “Collaborative empowerment advocates that those most affected by a collaborative change effort should be full partners in decisions made about it. When all those in a collaborative have substantial ownership, there is a far greater likelihood that its primary purposes will be achieved and sustained.” (1994, 27).

Moore and Keller, 1988, assert that “Governing at the local level is intrinsically a conflict situation. Local governments must interact with a large number of other levels of government with... frequently conflicting priorities. The regular conduct of local government, therefore, inherently gives rise to the need for dispute resolutions and collaborative problem solving on a fairly regular basis.” (p 2).

The introduction to the problem of change in single-family neighbourhoods has touched lightly on housing affordability, the global movement of people and investment capital, and the hard choices regarding density that cities may have to make in response to urban growth and change. The brief discussion of urban planning described the interdependency between government policy and market forces that produced the exclusionary single-family zone, the sprawl that such low-density development has engendered, and the contemporary pressures on older single-family districts. The large house is, in short, a messy planning problem that brings together a number of serious issues and defies neat and tidy solutions. (Pettit, p.8).

These physical, social and economic changes -- and the reasons for them -- are not clearly understood and have become a new challenge for planners (Pettit, p.1).

The District of West Vancouver discusses neighbourhood character in its 1988 report on large houses in traditional neighbourhoods and finds that “residents frequently speak of the ‘single-family character’ of their neighbourhood... when concern for the... ‘character’ of a neighbourhood is expressed, it usually related to perceived increases in density”, (p. 4).

The ethnic variable firms up, at least for Vancouver, the notion that the global market has become a factor in neighbourhood change. The global movement of people and wealth, therefore, may set up new conditions for invasions that are based on the purchasing patterns of newcomers. These patterns have cultural repercussions that bring community rights -- a non-issue in the homogeneous single-family zones of the past -- to center stage. (Pettit, p.48).


In Canada, planning was introduced as a formal discipline for organizing the urban landscape in the early 1900s. Since its inception, zoning has been one of the most powerful tools. (Pettit, p.3).

In an article by Francis Bula, Peter Simpson, president of the Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association, is critical of Vancouver’s attempts to use zoning to address the ‘Monster House’ problem by saying that “I think that all through the years, we’ve seen an encouragement of innovation in Vancouver and this stifles it.” (Bula, 1 Nov. 1995).

The RS6 zone does regulate the use of certain building materials if an applicant chooses to maximize their development potential and also applies the Director of Planning’s ability to exercises discretionary approving abilities, City of Vancouver, 1996.

Adopted in 1994, the Heritage Conservation Statutes Amendments Act grants municipalities the power to designate heritage conservation areas within Official Community Plans and by doing so established the ability to require the retention of identified elements such as views, landscaping, certain design characteristics to name a few.


The following municipalities have taken steps to abate large houses: Burnaby, the City of Vancouver, Coquitlam, the District of West Vancouver, and the District of North Vancouver.
A recent edition of Business in Vancouver (Issue 409, August 26 - September 1, 1997) states that Squamish is now investigating this topic: "The 'monster home' controversy has hit Squamish and residents are not pleased.... Most of the concern seems to be centered around preserving the character of Squamish's downtown, where many longtime locals dwell in older homes and bungalows" (p. 7).

Those portions of the basement which are below four feet above grade do not count toward floor space in any single-family zone in the District of North Vancouver.

34 A non-mover is a persons whose usual place of residence on Census Day is the same as his or her usual place of residence one year earlier (Statistics Canada 1991 Census Dictionary, 84).

35 Building Permits indicate an estimated 30 new houses and major additions, just under 5% of the total properties, have been issued since 1990 (source: file notes and working papers RSD Re-Zoning process 53.95).

36 A staff report dated November 18, 1981 was titled "Study of the Bulk of Single-Family Dwellings" and presented "concern of existing residents and Council that these (new houses in established single-family neighbourhoods) are too bulky or too massive in comparison with existing units" (1). This report subsequently concluded that "good design is not amenable to legislation, yet it is necessary that municipal siting regulations encourage the construction of new buildings in existing neighbourhoods in harmony with the existing houses" (6).

37 Staff reports "Height and Bulk of Buildings" January 25 1994 and January 30, 1994 responded to Council's request that "staff report on the possibility of developing siting regulations which relate to adjacent buildings".

38 The following staff reports are notable: June 9 1986 "Regulations re: Size of Homes on Small Lots"; November 13, 1986 "Unusually Large Houses"; October 29, 1986 "Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments to Establish a Maximum Floor Area for Certain Single-Family Residential Zones"; February 10, 1987 "Unusually large Houses - Follow-up Report"; and, June 2, 1987 "Maximum Dwelling Unit Size Bylaw Regulations."

39 Bylaws during the 1980s served to implement a floor space ratio, implement a maximum dwelling unit size and reduce maximum house heights to 32 feet.

40 Delbrook had a larger Working Group, expanded information meetings, inclusion of residents beyond the boundary of Delbrook and more intense early resident involvement than that which occurred through the Marlborough Heights and Norgate projects.

41 One house which was considered a Monster House (see Picture 3) and a subdivision of two lots into six lots all with large houses were catalysts for neighbourhood zoning in Delbrook.

42 A comparative table of before and after zoning regulations for Delbrook is attached as Appendix Three.

43 Newspaper notifications published in the North Shore news dated May 14th 1995 advertised the draft zoning Open House, October 12th, 1994 advertised the survey kick off, and October 6th and 8th 1995 advertised the Public Hearing.

44 Three 4 ft. by 8 ft. signs were posted from October 6th through the 18th 1995 to advertise the Public Hearing and zoning changes.

45 The 1991 census indicated that 5% of Delbrook's population did not speak English at home, but that less than 1% did not speak English at all.

46 Laurie Levangee and Nikky Tutt assisted staff with early issue identification and survey distribution, Janice Murray and Dianna Bellhouse participated directly with staff by drafting and field testing the zoning survey.

47 Doug Johnson is a registered architect, John Shestobitoff is a Professional Engineer and Janice Murray is a designer.

48 An e-mail from the Planning Department sent May 2nd, 1996, updated Cherry Bouton, then President of the North Shore Real Estate Board of the outcome of the Delbrook process.

49 Six of the ten Working Group members represented no organized group.

50 The Marlborough Heights and Norgate Neighbourhood Zoning projects each required approximately one year to complete.
Four written submission (3 in favor and 1 opposed) and nine verbal submissions (6 in favor and 3 opposed) were entered into the public record at the Delbrook Public Hearing. Of the three submissions in opposition (including one duplicate submission), two (Mr. E.A. Butterworth and Dr. T. Taylor) were opposed to the subdivision standards which would prevent their lots from being subdivided and one (Mr. Brad Morris) was opposed to an unrelated item (secondary suites).

It was noted that at the concluding Delbrook meeting, Linda Fisher a participant who wanted the house height to be reduced further than the Working Group proposed, stated that while she would prefer the height to be 2 ft. lower, she realized that hers was not the only opinion and that she could accept the proposed consensus (March 1995).

As of the end of September 1997.

Telephone complaints from residents at 517 Vienna, 511 Vienna and 505 Vienna were received by the Chief Building Inspector throughout the month of June 1996.

The complaints regarding loss of view specific to this site are slightly anomalous as the new house is constructed on the last of the sloping lots rendering the flat lots behind vulnerable to view loss. An argument can be put forth that any new two storey house would have caused a view loss in this location even if it was not built to the maximum height permitted under the RSD zone.

The original front and side yard setbacks were reinstated through the new zone, and new construction is required to be tapered on the upper storey to reduce the visual impact of new houses which are larger than adjacent houses.
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Appendix One

Analytical Framework: Evaluation Criteria for Public Involvement
Process Generated From a Review of Pertinent Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of the Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome of the Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two

Data-Set Used for the Delbrook Zoning Case Study Analysis

Many sources of documentation were explored during the analysis of the Delbrook case study. The following provides a detailed list of the documentation resources available:

Available Documentation By Type:

Correspondence From District of North Vancouver:
- Public Hearing Notification Letter Delbrook, Mailed to all property owners and residents in October, dated October 4th, 1995
- Letter to Dhorea Orphan Agent for Mr. E. Butterworth re: Potential Subdivision of Butterworth Property, October 13th, 1995
- Letter to Every Property Owner and Resident in Delbrook, re: Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Initiative, October 12th, 1994
- Letter to Working Group Members, re: Survey Results, January 31st, 1995
- Letter to Every Non-survey Respondent Property Owner and Resident in Delbrook, re: Reminder to Return the Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Survey (with extension of date), November 23rd, 1994
- Open House Invitation “Delbrook Zoning, Have a Say In Future Regulations”, mailed with zoning brochure to all property owners and residents in April, 1995
- Open House Explanatory Letter, mailed with zoning brochure to all property owners and residents in April, 1995
- Open House Zoning Brochure Reminder Notice, bulked mailed to all Delbrook properties, May, 1995
- Letter to Margaret Taylor enclosed staff report, zoning bylaw and zoning brochure for the Delbrook neighbourhood, September 1, 1995
- Letter to Dhorea Orphan re: Butterworth Property - Cartelier Road Frontage, September 8th, 1995
- Letter to Mr. and Mrs. Butterworth re: North Lonsdale OCP - Large Lot Zoning Changes, July 8th, 1992
- Award submission package to American Planning Association for APA Planning award
- Award Submission package to Planning Institute of British Columbia for PIBC Planning award (received Award of Commendation)
- Fax of information package to Tom Phipps, City of Vancouver Planning Department: Program, Process and Volunteer series, July 4th, 1997
• District of North Vancouver Web site: Neighbourhood Zoning information page

Surveys and Information Mail-Outs From Planning Department:
• Neighbourhood Zoning Survey, mailed to every property owner and resident in Delbrook, October 12th, 1994
• "Open House Zoning Brochure" Proposed Size, Shape and Siting of Residential and Accessory Buildings in Delbrook, Proposed Lot Size Regulations in Delbrook, Open House Survey, Mailed to all property owners and residents in April, 1995
• Mailing label database: Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Process, District of North Vancouver Property Records Department file, 1995 revised 1995

Memos, Reports and Bylaws:
• Bylaw 6783, Delbrook Residential Regulations, August 18th, 1995
• Bylaw 6784, Delbrook Subdivision Regulations, August 18th, 1995
• Report to Council: Delbrook Single Family Zoning Regulations, August 8th, 1995
• Report to Council: Delbrook Single Family Zoning Regulations, September 7th, 1995
• Report to Council: Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning: Survey Analysis, January 24th, 1995
• Report to Council: Subdivision of Large Lots in Established Areas, January 23rd, 1992
• Report to Council: North Lonsdale OCP - Issues Workshop, February 5th, 1992
• Report to Council: North Lonsdale Official Community Plan Open House Survey Results, July 31st, 1992
• Memo to Social Planning and Long Range Planning Liaison Meeting: Neighbourhood Zoning Program, January 30th, 1996

Survey Responses and Open House Submissions:
• 204 completed surveys with responses to zoning questions and written comments sections
• Hard copy of all survey comments
• Survey comments analysis tally sheet
• Staff presentation to Advisory Planning Commission, September, 1995
• Staff presentation to Public Hearing, October, 1995
• Field test of draft survey written submissions from 11 at large participants (not on working group)
• Notes from survey kick off meeting including a rough “head count”
• Notes from Open House including a rough “head count”
Meeting Minutes:
- Regular Council Minutes August 28th, 1995
- Regular Council Minutes September 11th, 1995
- Public Hearing Minutes, October 17th, 1995
- Process Kick-Off meeting, file notes, October 27th, 1994
- Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission, September 20th, 1995
- First Delbrook Zoning Working Group meeting, January, 1995
- Second Working Group Meeting, February, 1995
- Third Working Group Meeting, February, 1995
- Notes from Working Group Neighbourhood Tour, February, 1995
- Fourth Working Group Meeting, March, 1995
- Final Working Group Meeting, March, 1995

Submissions from Public and Agencies to Council and Planning Department:
- Letter from Lenore Howard, November 15th, 1995
- Letter from Tom Taylor, October 19th, 1995
- Letter from Don Klassen, October 17th, 1995
- Letter from E.A. Butterworth, October 17th, 1995
- Letter from Maureen and Steve Miller, September 7th, 1995
- Letter from Nikky Tutt, August 28th, 1995
- Submission to Council, Nikky Tutt, September 11th, 1995
- Letter from Janice Murray, August 23rd, 1995
- Submission to Council, Janice Murray, September 11th, 1995
- Follow-up Interview with Participant Janice Murray, January 6th, 1996
- Letter from Janice Murray, Re: 600 W. Queens re-zoning, April 10th, 1995
- Letter from Janice Murray in support of the Planning Department’s submission for an American Planning Association and the Planning Institute of British Columbia awards program, September, 1995
- Press release from Sara Baker, PIBC, noting the award for Neighbourhood Zoning and the program’s response to public concerns, May 23rd, 1996
- Statement of Support for process by Vicky Cowan in reference to awards submission packages, September 6th, 1995
- Letter from Margaret Manefold, City of Burnaby Planning Department, re: house height information, May 2nd 1996

Maps, Graphics, Displays and Photographs:
- Lots with Subdivision Potential attachment to November 5th Report
- Map 505 - Bylaw Map Delineating the Delbrook Zone, August 1995
- Public Hearing Lot Map 1:2000 Scale, October, 1995
- Survey Results Graphic Displays for Open House, May, 1995
- Map: Proposed Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Area, July 28th, 1994
- "Delbrook Zoning Construction Series" a series of wall displays for use at working group meetings and at Open House, explaining: building height; height required for a 2 storey house; eave height; grade; point of maximum eave; and floor space ratio calculation, March 1995
- Graphic depicting maximum height line on a sloping lot, March 1995
- Presentation to Advisory Planning Commission detailing process and outcome, September, 1995
- "Delbrook of the Highlands" sales flyer, 1952
- Series of Delbrook houses photographed, series responds to varying house heights
- Photo manipulation displays: before and after depiction's of houses at various heights
- Working group meetings and neighbourhood tour photos
- Isometric diagrams and photo series depicting reduced upper storey bulk
- Map of responses to maximum allowable house height question
- Neighbourhood Zoning: Program, Process, Volunteer, Other Neighbourhoods display series used at Open Houses, Kick Off meeting and for information to other municipalities, agencies, neighbourhood associations etc.

Public Notifications:
- "What's Happening in Our District", Delbrook Public Hearing Notification Printed in newspaper and available as a flyer, October 6th and 8th, 1995
- Public Hearing Notification Letter Delbrook, Mailed to all property owners and residents in October, dated October 4th, 1995
- "What's Happening in Our District", Notice of Delbrook Neighbourhood Zoning Initiative, printed in newspaper, May 14th, 1995
- text and map placement from 3 four by eight notification signs advertising bylaw changes and public hearing, October 6th to 18th, 1995

File Notes and Technical Data:
- Written submissions from survey Field Test Volunteers re: comments on draft survey
- Address list of all Delbrook properties, July 1994
- List of telephone calls received and comments made during call as a result of survey notification, October, 1994
- File notes on subdivision including municipal act regulations, irregular lot calculations, subdivision as affected by zoning calculations, RS2 subdivision potential, RS2 survey responses, RS2 vs. RS3 subdivision standards in comparison with proposed RSD standards, consolidation possibilities and analysis of lots with potential subdivision under current and proposed zoning
• Construction database (hard copy) for every property in Delbrook including: address, zoning, year constructed, gross floor area, number of bedrooms and lot dimensions, September 1994
• List of all available building permit records by address and house height, 1994
• List of out of area but adjacent building permits, July, 1994
• List of new building permits by street in Delbrook including number of storeys, setbacks, site coverage, eave and ridge total building height, lot dimensions, floor space and address, July 14th, 1994
• Technical testing notes of a variety of scenarios of height allowance and construction parameters
• 1950 zoning bylaw for Delbrook with suburban single-family regulations that Delbrook houses were constructed under
• Technical notes and diagrams relating to grade slope, height, roof slope, datum determination points, lot line measurements, maximum sloping height line, finished and natural grade, and maximum eave measurement. Used to inform working group of regulation details
• Roof pitch and resulting height calculation sheet as relates to house width, for working group information, 1995
• Calculation sheets, potential for subdivision on Del Rio Drive
• Potential maximum RS2 floorspace compared with potential maximum RSD floorspace for Delbrook RS2 lots
• Neighbourhood Zoning Research Process: Hints, Tips and Tricks: a look at background information and resources, survey creation, survey returns, working group and drafting regulations, open house, and zoning brochure, 1995/1996
• District of North Vancouver Building Permit Records

Participant Volunteers:
• Delbrook survey generating participants: phone list
• Delbrook Working Group File List (Address and Phone Numbers)
• List of all volunteers for the working group (including those not chosen) with addresses and phone numbers and response to house height question, December, 1994
• House Construction Tour for Delbrook volunteers, 11 stops on tour with construction specifications including peak and eave height, roof pitch, lot coverage, floor space, lot dimensions, floor space ration and siting area ground slope
• Working papers narrowing selection of working group based on geographical location, response to house height and identified professional affiliations
• Notes from telephone conversations with each Delbrook Working Group member regarding application of RSD regulations to 100 houses bordering the Delbrook neighbourhood, spring 1996
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• North Vancouver Community Associations List, Social Planning, v.
  1995

Public Hearing Audio Tape:
audio file from public hearing presentations, October, 1995
Appendix Three

Delbrook Regulations Compared With Former RS Regulations:
Changes Resulting From Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>RS3/RS2 REGULATION</th>
<th>ADOPTED DELBROOK REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Generally Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) flat roof</td>
<td>6.71m (22 ft.)</td>
<td>6.71m (22 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 3 in 12 roof slope or greater</td>
<td>7.92m (26 ft.)</td>
<td>7.32m (24 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 4(^{1/4}) in 12 roof slope or greater</td>
<td>8.53m (28 ft.)</td>
<td>7.92m (26 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 6 in 12 roof slope or greater</td>
<td>9.14m (30 ft.)</td>
<td>7.92m (26 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. West of Lynn Creek</td>
<td>not to exceed height of existing house</td>
<td>not related to height of existing house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Eave Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Generally Applied</td>
<td>6.71m (22 ft.)</td>
<td>6.71m (22 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. West of Lynn Creek</td>
<td>not to exceed height of existing house</td>
<td>not related to height of existing house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) front and rear each</td>
<td>7.62m (25 ft.)</td>
<td>7.144m (30 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) combined front and rear</td>
<td>18.29m (60 ft.)</td>
<td>18.29m (60 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) side lot</td>
<td>1.22m (4 ft.)</td>
<td>1.83m (6 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) combined sideyards</td>
<td>minimum of 20% of lot width</td>
<td>minimum of 20% of lot width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) flanking street corner lots</td>
<td>10% of lot width + 3m (10 ft.)</td>
<td>10% of lot width + 3m (10 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Depth</td>
<td>19.8m (65 ft.)</td>
<td>19.8m (65 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Storey Floor Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a percentage of the main floor area</td>
<td>not regulated</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENT</td>
<td>RS3/RS2 REGULATION</td>
<td>ADOPTED DELBROOK REGULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal structure continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) for lots &lt; or = 464.5m² (5000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) for lots &gt; 464.5m² (5000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.35 + 93m² (1000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Dwelling Unit Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) RS2</td>
<td>600 m² (6,459 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>600 m² (6,459 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) RS3</td>
<td>465 m² (5,005 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>465 m² (5,005 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Sited in the Required Front and Rear Yards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. front lot line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking structures</td>
<td>4.57m (15 ft.) for straight-in entry access or 3.0m (10 ft.) for side entry</td>
<td>6.1m (20 ft.) for straight-in entry or 4.57m (15 ft.) for side entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other structures</td>
<td>4.57m (15 ft.)</td>
<td>6.1m (20 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. from rear lot line or any other building or structure</td>
<td>1.52m (5 ft.)</td>
<td>1.52m (5 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. corner lot situation</td>
<td>not less than 6m (20 ft.) or ½ of the lot width, whichever is less from flanking side lot line</td>
<td>not less than 6m (20 ft.) or ½ of the lot width, whichever is less from flanking side lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. floor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking structures</td>
<td>37.16m² (400 sq.ft.) for attached, no size limit for detached</td>
<td>37.16m² (400 sq.ft.) for attached, no size limit for detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other structures</td>
<td>25m² (269 sq.ft)</td>
<td>25m² (269 sq.ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. building coverage</td>
<td>shall not occupy more than 25% of the required front yard</td>
<td>shall not occupy more than 25% of the required front yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat roof</td>
<td>3.66m (12 ft.)</td>
<td>3.66m (12 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slope of 3 in 12 or greater</td>
<td>4.57m (15 Ft.)</td>
<td>4.57m (15 Ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENT</td>
<td>RS3/RS2 REGULATION</td>
<td>ADOPTED DELBROOK REGULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessory structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sited Within the Required</td>
<td>all regulations affecting the principal residential dwelling apply</td>
<td>all regulations affecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front and Rear Yards</td>
<td></td>
<td>the principal residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setbacks, height and size</td>
<td></td>
<td>dwelling apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front setback</td>
<td>3m (10 ft.)</td>
<td>6.1m (20 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rear setback</td>
<td>3m (10 ft.)</td>
<td>3m (10 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Antennae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) siting</td>
<td>must be in the rear yard</td>
<td>must be in the rear yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) setbacks</td>
<td>minimum 5 ft. from rear lot line and 10% of lot width from any side lot line</td>
<td>minimum 5 ft. from rear lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) corner lot</td>
<td>not less than 6.1m (20 ft.) from any side lot line common to the lot and street</td>
<td>not less than 6.1m (20 ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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